7-2022

Investigating Counterproductive Work Behavior Motives —— An Attempt to Reveal Underlying Processes of Counterproductive Behaviors at Work

Siqi Gu

Investigating Counterproductive Work Behavior Motives —— An Attempt to Reveal Underlying Processes of Counterproductive Behaviors at Work

by

Siqi Gu

A thesis submitted to the School of Psychology of
Florida Institute of Technology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Industrial/Organizational Psychology

Melbourne, Florida
July, 2022

We the undersigned committee hereby approve the attached thesis,
"Investigating Counterproductive Work Behavior Motives —— An Attempt to Reveal Underlying Processes of Counterproductive Behaviors at Work"
by
Siqi Gu

Patrick Converse, Ph.D.
Professor
School of Psychology
Major Advisor

Darrell Norman Burrell, Ph.D., D.H.Ed.
Associate Professor
Nathan M. Bisk College of Business

Gary Burns, Ph.D.
Professor
School of Psychology

Robert A. Taylor, Ph.D.
Professor and Dean
College of Psychology and Liberal Art

Abstract

Title: Investigating Counterproductive Work Behavior Motives —— An Attempt to Reveal Underlying Processes of Counterproductive Behaviors at Work

Author: Siqi Gu

Major Advisor: Patrick Converse, Ph.D.

Counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) are actions that may harm employees or organizations. Understanding CWB motives may facilitate better conceptualization of different types of CWBs and reveal more about the underlying processes leading to CWBs. However, to date no systematic conceptual frameworks or empirical investigations have been developed to study CWB motives comprehensively. To address this research gap, we proposed a taxonomy of CWB motives based on both theoretical foundations and empirical results. In addition, we aimed to develop a CWB motives measure. The measure development research was carried out in two studies. We found evidence supporting our hypotheses of the factor structure of the CWB motive items, although further research is required to clarify these results. Our measure demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties. Implications and future research direction were discussed as well.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgement

Without all the help and support I have received, completing the thesis research, as a part of my journey in graduate school, would not be easy and smooth. Therefore, I would like to take the opportunity to express my gratitude for those have aided me along the way.

Thank you, all my committee members, for your support, insights, patience and encouragement to my research: Thank you Pat for guiding my thesis idea, discussing questions and issues with me and polishing my manuscript; Thank you Gary for the inspiring questions and advice on data analysis; Thank you Dr. Burrell for always bringing up new perspectives and challenging me to connect the research to the practice.

Thank you, my friends and fellow I/O mates, for generously helping my thesis study. Thank you Ccy, Cuoqun, Johnny, Gaijie, Peiquan, and Zining for your suggestions on the survey design; Thank you Allyson, Alyssa, Edward, Emily, Kauyer, Michael, Mina, Nick, Jackie, Rob, Sherif, Steph, and Zach for participating in my study; Thank you Christian and Zach for the help in the item generation process.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) are volitional behaviors that harm or intend to harm the well-being of an organization, its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Spector & Fox, 2005). CWB is a general term that covers a broad range of behaviors, such as aggression, theft, and production deviance.

Given the wide range of CWBs and their focus on undermining organizations' interests, employers are concerned about this phenomenon. Moreover, although the total cost of CWBs is difficult to estimate precisely, the available statistics are astonishing. According to the National Retail Security Survey (2017), employee theft accounted for 30% of inventory loss, which cost the U.S. retail economy $14.67 billion in 2016. In addition, less tangible forms of CWBs have tremendous costs as well: Cisco estimated that workplace incivility cost them $12 million a year. Their employees also respond to workplace incivility by decreasing work efforts and the quality of work (Porath & Pearson, 2013).

Given this, both researchers and practitioners are interested in understanding reasons employees engage in CWBs. Indeed, findings related to this issue may inform us more regarding interventions for CWBs and thus improve the well-being of both the organization and its members. Although research on the predictors of CWBs has been extensive, the direct examination of motives to engage CWBs is rare (Robinson, 2008). The examination of CWB motives complements existing research findings by revealing more about the underlying processes leading to CWBs and the nature of different types of CWBs. Therefore, to address this research gap, this study aimed to examine the motives underlying CWBs and develop a measure for them.

Definition

CWBs are defined as volitional behaviors that harm or intend to harm the well-being of an organization, its members, or both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Spector & Fox, 2005). Different classification systems have been proposed for CWBs. One widely accepted classification is based on the target of the behavior: the organization itself (i.e., CWB-O) or individuals in the organization (i.e., CWB-I; Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Research has demonstrated that these are highly correlated but distinct concepts (Berry et al., 2007).

In addition, Spector et al. (2006) proposed a more fine-grained five-factor framework of CWB: abuse, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal. Abuse refers to physical or psychological mistreatment towards coworkers or others. Production deviance represents the purposeful failure to perform the task as it is supposed to be performed. Sabotage is the deliberate attempt to undermine the work being done in the organization. Theft is the act of taking property that does not belong to oneself. Withdrawal consists of behaviors that employees enact to disengage from the work.

Antecedents

Research examining the antecedents of CWBs has mainly focused on two categories of variables: (a) person-based causes, such as conscientiousness, self-control, and narcissism and (b) situation-based causes, such as norms and injustice (Jex & Britt, 2014). For example, extensive research has been done to examine the relationships between personality traits and CWBs. Research has demonstrated that Honesty-Humility, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness are negatively related to CWBs (Anglim et al., 2018; Berry et al., 2007; Lee et al., 2019; Sulea et al., 2010). Findings have also indicated that facets—that are narrower than Big Five or HEXACO factors/domains—may outperform broad domains when predicting

CWBs because aggregating facets may result in the loss of substantial criterion-relevant variance (Pletzer et al., 2020).

In addition, meta-analyses have demonstrated that the Dark Triad personality traits—Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy—are positively associated with CWBs. Machiavellianism and Narcissism were found to have a moderate association with CWBs while Psychopathy weakly predicted CWBs (Forsyth et al., 2012). Furthermore, self-control is a strong predictor of CWBs, and it was found to be the dominant predictor among a set of 25 independent personal and situation variables (Marcus & Schuler, 2004).

Research has also indicated that situational-based factors, such as organizational justice and organizational constraints, are related to CWBs (Hershcovis et al., 2007; Zhou et al., 2014). Organizational justice, including distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and interactional justice, was found to have weak or moderate negative relationships with CWBs (Berry et al., 2007). Moreover, interpersonal conflict and organizational constraints were strong predictors of CWB (Hershcovis et al., 2007).

Finally, some antecedents could be examined as both a person-based and a situation-based cause. For example, boredom is a factor that has person-based aspects (boredom proneness) and situation-based aspects (job boredom). Research has demonstrated that one factor of boredom proneness (boredom proneness external stimulation; BP-ext) and job boredom are positively related to CWBs (Bruursema et al., 2011). Moreover, BP-ext moderated the relationship between job boredom and CWBs, such that the relationship was stronger when BP-ext scores were higher.

Theoretical Models

Studies investigating the relationships between these variables and CWBs can be beneficial for predicting CWBs. Further work examining the underlying processes involved in these relationships can complement these studies by explaining the occurrence of CWBs in more detail and informing us more on managing CWBs. Theories have been proposed to explain the underlying processes resulting in CWBs and they can be categorized into two different approaches.

The first approach incorporates negative emotions as antecedents of CWBs and views CWBs as reactions to emotion-arousing situations in organizations. The best example of this approach is the Stressor–Emotion Model of CWB (Spector & Fox, 2005). This model integrates and expands ideas on human aggression and occupational stress. The central element of this model is the causal flow from environment to perception-appraisal of the environment to emotion to CWB. That is, the model suggests that CWBs are a response to emotion-arousing situations in organizations. In addition, various factors, including individual variables (e.g., personality traits), situational factors (e.g., perceived stressors), and cognitive perceptions affect the causal flow directly or indirectly.

Fox and Spector (2010) described their theory as a “hot affective” theory of CWB (p. 93). Such theories link personality trait, cognition, emotion, and CWB together in an attempt to reveal the causal flows to CWBs. However, conceptualizing CWBs as emotional reactions results in some ambiguity regarding the nature of CWB: it can be difficult to tell whether CWBs resulting from negative emotions reflect merely self-control failures or deliberate choices after some degree of careful thought. This is a relevant issue because self-control failures and careful deliberation could lead to different forms of CWBs.

Therefore, the Stressor–Emotion Model of CWB may not fully explain all kinds of CWBs. Indeed, Spector and Fox (2005) acknowledged that not all CWBs have a single underlying process and some CWBs may serve to achieve some

purposes or goals. Given this, it may be beneficial to examine motives to reveal more about the underlying processes leading to CWBs. Furthermore, Spector and Fox (2005) pointed out that the CWB literature has focused more on behaviors themselves while ignoring motives underlying CWBs.

The second approach attempts to address the missing part of CWB motives by taking a more "cold cognitive" approach, implying that CWBs are more thoughtful and well-planned actions (Fox & Spector, 2010, p. 93). Fox and Spector (2010) also proposed a different framework for CWBs by applying the theory of planned behavior to explain these behaviors. The theory of planned behavior indicates that behavior is predicted by attitude towards the behavior, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control. Attitude towards the behavior indicates the belief about consequences of a behavior and the favorability of its outcomes. Subjective norm is the individual's perception regarding others' expectation for the individual to perform the behavior. Perceived behavior control refers to the individual's beliefs about their ability to perform certain behaviors and overcome obstacles. In the context of predicting CWBs, if individuals' evaluation of these three components yields a favorable outcome for performing CWBs, they are more likely to engage in these behaviors. Therefore, CWBs are enacted to achieve certain purposes, not necessarily as reactions to emotion-arousing conditions.

Another example of the "cold cognitive" approach is the Conservation of Resources Theory (COR) (Hobfoll, 2001). This model suggests that CWBs are the end products of a set of cognitive processes and information processing. COR postulates that people are motivated to build on their resources over time and losing resources is stressful. In addition, people experience more intense emotional reactions when experiencing loss of resources, compared with gaining resources. CWBs, such as withdrawal, could be applied as a strategy to restore resources while encountering stress or injustice. For instance, CWBs could mitigate negative emotions or offer employees a break. Some research has supported the idea that

CWBs could be used for emotional coping (Krischer et al., 2010; Shoss et al., 2016).

The distinction between "hot affective" and "cold cognitive" approaches is consistent with Cullen and Sackett's (2003) distinction between reactive CWBs and initiated CWBs. They proposed that initiated CWBs are started by the individual to satisfy some needs or motives, whereas reactive CWBs are individuals' responses to some actual or perceived organizational events. Within this approach, it is likely that different types of CWBs satisfy needs or motives differently and people with different motives or needs will engage in different types of CWBs. Furthermore, although these two approaches make distinctions across the range of CWBs, in reality, CWBs could be both reactive and initiated and probably serve different needs at the same time. For example, suppose an employee had an unpleasant supervisor and the employee was often mistreated and marginalized by the supervisor. Eventually, the subordinate might decide not to bring full energy and effort to the job. As a result, the supervisor will have a difficult time finishing the work assigned and keeping up with organizational goals or deadlines and thus may look bad in front of his/her peers. In this case, actively disengaging from the work is both a way to cope with the negative emotions resulting from the mistreatment of the supervisor and a tactic to undermine the supervisor's performance.

CWBs and Motives

Although the functional approach to CWB, which suggests that CWBs serve certain needs or motives, is not entirely new, the motives underlying CWBs have not been examined extensively (Krischer et al., 2010). There are a few examples of limited conceptual discussions and empirical studies. For example, the idea of using CWBs to get revenge has been proposed and discussed (Bies et al., 1997; Folger & Skarlicki, 2005). Moreover, research evidence has demonstrated that employees engage in production deviance and withdrawal to reduce emotional

exhaustion (Krischer et al., 2010). However, we know of neither a systematic framework of CWB motives nor empirical studies examining CWB motives comprehensively so far.

The consideration of motivation in CWB research may help researchers develop a more fine-grained understanding of CWBs. Different types of CWBs may have different predictors and outcomes. For example, examining different types of interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors (CWB-Is), including task-focused CWB-Is and person-focused CWB-Is, Ho (2012) found that work-dependence relational stressors predicted task-focused CWB-Is, while negative-affect relational stressors predicted both forms of CWB-Is. In addition, trait competitiveness was found to have different moderating effects on the relationship between stressors and different types of CWB-Is. Therefore, people with different motives or goals may choose different strategies and engage in different types of CWBs. Investigating different motives and their relationships with different types of CWBs may shed light on the varying underlying causes of different types of CWBs and may address the lack of specificity of some types of CWBs, such as CWB-Is.

Moreover, Robinson (2008) argued that, although distinctions among different types of CWBs have been based on the motivation of actors, the intent of actors was seldom examined. Therefore, more consideration of motivation in CWB research will not only clarify the nature of different types of CWBs but also the factors leading to these behaviors.

Examining motivations in related research areas has resulted in progress, suggesting this may also be useful for CWB research. Rioux and Penner (2001) noted that the dominant explanation of why people engage in organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs; “Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization”, Organ, 1988, p. 4) is that these behaviors are a response to job and organization perceptions. However, they

argued that OCB could be proactive and people engage in OCBs to satisfy certain needs or motives. Therefore, their study was based on a functional approach, which assumes that human behavior is motivated by a person's goals and needs, to understand the underlying processes of OCBs. They found that different OCB motives had theoretically consistent patterns of relationships with different dimensions of OCBs (Rioux & Penner, 2001). For example, their results demonstrated that organization concern motives were strongly related to the conscientiousness dimension of OCB and prosocial values motives were strongly related to the altruism dimension of OCB. In addition, motives accounted for a significant amount of unique variance of OCB.

Therefore, theoretical considerations and empirical evidence support the value of examining motives to understand behaviors. Understanding CWB motives will help us conceptualize different types of CWBs and underlying processes leading to CWBs better. The calls for studying motivations associated with CWBs are not new (Cullen & Sackett, 2003; Krischer et al., 2010; Robinson, 2008; Spector & Fox, 2005). However, we know of no systematic conceptual framework or empirical study taking a functional approach to examine CWBs. In the following section, we will introduce our proposed taxonomy of CWB motives, based on both theoretical and empirical evidence. More specifically, we used two approaches to develop this proposed taxonomy. First, we consulted literature on CWB and relevant motive constructs. Second, we also administrated a survey with open-ended questions to 31 employed individuals recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) asking them to describe recent CWBs and explain their reasons for engaging in these behaviors. This survey allowed us to obtain preliminary confirmation related to our literature review results and identify any additional motives that may not have received much attention in the literature.

Motives

Attempts to conceptualize the nature of human motives/motivation have been numerous. Given its multiple aspects and changing perspectives on the subject, definitions or even labels in this area have differed across time and researchers (Heckhausen, 2018).

Because we examine the nature of one type of work behaviors, CWBs, the definition of motivation in the context of the workplace was consulted and utilized. Pinder (2008) defined work motivation as "a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration" (p. 11). This definition stresses the energizing and directional aspects of motivation, which is consistent with the functional approach we take for CWBs. Moreover, the definition is compatible with our focus on the reasons and processes underlying CWBs. Examining the forces underlying CWBs may reveal more about the nature of CWBs and processes leading to them.

Therefore, based on the definition of work motivation and the functional approach, we define CWB motives as forces that initiate and direct work behaviors that are counterproductive in nature. These forces can often be thought of as goals or needs, where individuals engage in CWBs in order to achieve certain goals or meet certain needs.

A classification system may facilitate our understanding of CWB motives. The distinctions between "hot affective" and "cold cognitive" approaches and reactive CWBs and initiated CWBs suggest a way to classify CWB motives. The "hot affective" and reactive CWBs result from negative emotions caused by stressors in organizations. Therefore, CWB motives in this context often involve intense emotions. Whether CWBs themselves are natural reactions to aversive experiences or reflect conscious choices, these behaviors can help cope with

negative emotions. Given that emotions are central to this category of motives, we name it self-care.

On the other hand, the "cold cognitive" and initiated CWBs stem from individuals' needs or self-interests, so motives in this context often involve more deliberate information-processing and planning. Although all CWB motives could be seen as instrumental to some degree, the self-care category emphasizes the importance of taking care of one's feelings and emotions, whereas the second category focuses on specific rewarding ends individuals would like to pursue. As a result, we label it self-interest.

Based on this, we propose that self-care and self-interest may emerge as two overall factors in the structure of CWB motives. It should be noted, however, that despite conceptual differences between CWB motives, in reality, one CWB may satisfy both categories of motives. For example, spreading rumors about a rude coworker is likely to not only feel good but also undermine the coworker's reputation or even performance appraisal ratings. Nonetheless, conceptualizing and examining different CWB motives is likely to be useful. As noted previously, a motive-based approach will reveal the underlying causes and processes of CWBs in more detail and could result in a more fine-grained understanding of different types of CWBs. Research on CWBs utilizing a motive-based approach is limited and closing this research gap will also inform us more on managing CWBs.

These two overall motive categories can be further divided into more specific motives, and the limited existing literature investigating CWB motives suggests five relevant motives: revenge, coping, power, assimilation, and instrumentality. These will be discussed in more detail in the following sections and a description of each CWB motive can be found in Table 1.

Table 1: Proposed Structure of CWB Motives

	Factor	Motive	Definition
CWB Motives	Self-care	Revenge	The goal to inflict damage, injury, discomfort, or punishment on the party judged responsible in response to perceived unfairness or personal harm by another party.
		Coping	The goal to initiate efforts to manage perceived work stressors.
	Self-interest	Power	The goal to gain more influence over the environment or other people.
		Assimilation	The goal to become accepted or socially compatible with other people in a group.
		Instrumentality	The goal to achieve diverse individual needs or goals.

Self-Care: Revenge

First, the revenge motive is a popular notion that has received a lot of attention in both academic work and ordinary conversation. This popularity may be due in part to the incorporation of revenge in narratives in the media surrounding workplace violence, but violence is a rare form of revenge in workplace (Tripp & Bies, 2009).

Although researchers have defined and named the revenge motive differently, their core ideas are very similar: revenge is a response to perceived unfairness, injustice, or personal harm (e.g., violation of a social order or norm). For example, Bies et al. (1997) outlined a thermodynamics model as the theoretical framework for understanding revenge in organizations. From their point of view,

revenge is a response to “a perceived personal harm or violation of the social order” (p. 19). Folger and Skarlicki (2005) proposed the concept of organizational retaliatory behaviors (ORB) and defined these as “a subset of ... negative [workplace] behaviors … used to punish the organization and its representatives in response to perceived unfairness” (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997, p. 435). These conceptualizations overlap substantially. Based on previous work, we define the revenge motive for CWB as the goal to inflict damage, injury, discomfort, or punishment on the party judged responsible in response to perceived unfairness or personal harm by another party (Aquino et al, 2001; Tripp & Bies, 2009, p. 3).

Furthermore, it is worth noting that revenge is multifaceted. Bies et al. (1997) indicated that the conventional view considers revenge only in behavioral terms and evaluates it as a destructive and emotional act. Workplace violence is a good example of this characterization. However, the revenge motive could exist solely in cognitions as well. For example, workplace injustice may spark the revenge motive but it is never acted on due to status differences between the parties. In addition, revenge could be constructive and rational. For example, revenge may aim to deter abusive leadership. Folger and Skarlicki (2005) also argued that ORB could be both dysfunctional and functional for organizations. ORB may hinder organizational goals but also hold people accountable for their wrongdoings. Moreover, retaliation could result from self-interest but also from a third party’s reactions to others’ misdeeds (e.g., refusing to help the colleague who is mean to other colleagues). To sum up, the revenge motive is multifaceted and captures a wide range of behaviors and cognitions in organizations.

We know of only one study examining the revenge motive of CWB empirically (Hung et al., 2009). This study demonstrated the connection between the revenge motive and CWB in that results indicated that the revenge motive fully mediated the relationship between perceived coworker loafing and self-rated CWB-Is and CWB-Os. A few survey responses also confirmed that revenge is a reason to engage in CWBs. For example, one participant indicated “I felt underpaid in the

job, so I took stuff from office to reimburse myself." Therefore, it is likely that studying the revenge motive further will reveal more about underlying causes and processes related to CWBs. Considering the role of emotions in revenge, we expect that the revenge motive may load more on the self-care factor than self-interest factor.

Self-Care: Coping

The second proposed CWB motive is coping. The widely used conceptualization defines coping as "constantly changing cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external and/or internal demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person" (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, p. 141). Therefore, in the context of CWB, we define the CWB coping motive as the goal to initiate efforts to manage perceived work stressors.

A widely used classification of coping is problem-focused and emotion-focused coping. Problem-focused coping directly addresses the source of the problem, whereas emotion-focused coping reduces emotional distress. Some forms of emotion-focused coping include distancing, avoidance, and venting (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). These emotion-focused coping strategies resemble some forms of CWBs, such as withdrawal and aggression. It is well-established that emotion arousing situations will produce action tendencies to cope with the unpleasant emotions or the stressors causing the aversive experience. Therefore, it is plausible that CWBs are enacted by individuals to deal with unpleasant experiences caused by various stressors in the workplace.

It is likely that individuals sometimes engage in CWBs to address problems, such as undermining an abusive leader's performance to hold the abusive behaviors in check. However, problem-focused coping tends to occur when individuals perceive they are in control of the situation, and individuals' influence over stressors in organizations is usually limited. Furthermore, CWBs could be less

effective considering the possibility of escalation, counterretaliation, or discipline from organizations. Therefore, we argue that CWBs occur more frequently as an emotion-focused coping strategy than as a problem-focused coping strategy. As a result, the coping motive may load more on the self-care factor than self-interest factor.

Researchers have proposed that CWBs may function as a coping strategy (Krischer et al., 2010; Spector & Fox, 2002). For example, Ng et al. (2016) proposed that non-work-related social media usage (a form of CWB) is an avoidance coping strategy for new graduates who are unsatisfied with their first job. They argued that new graduates may feel reluctant to leave their first but disliked jobs due to various concerns; therefore, they may feel "trapped" in the disliked jobs. The feeling of being trapped undermines the perception of control over their work but social media usage is a convenient method to cope with the subsequent emotional distress.

Empirical investigations on the coping function of CWB are rare. It appears that Krischer et al. (2010) is the only empirical research to examine CWB's function as emotion-focused coping directly. Their results supported this notion by demonstrating that withdrawal and production deviance mitigated the emotional exhaustion caused by perceptions of injustice. Moreover, Shoss et al. (2016) found evidence that coping acted as the mediator between personality and CWB. Bruursema et al. (2011) also suggested that employees may engage in CWBs as a means of coping with boredom. Consistent with the empirical evidence, many of our survey respondents indicated that disengagement from work, either physical or psychological, is a coping method. For instance, one participant stated that "I took a sick day even though I was not sick, because I just need a break." Evidence on the relationship between emotion exhaustion and CWB also provides indirect support for the notion that emotional coping may underlie some CWBs. Emotion exhaustion is a job stressor that has been found to predict CWBs (Bolton et al., 2012; Dahling, 2017; Yan et al., 2020). It is likely that coping bridges the

connection between emotion exhaustion and CWB and CWBs help replenish depleted mental resources stemming from stressors and strain in organizations.

Self-Interest: Power

The first proposed motive in the self-interest category is power. The key motivation involves being able to influence the environment or other people and therefore we define the CWB power motive as the goal to gain more influence over the environment or other people.

Power is often discussed in motivation theories. For instance, it is among the "big three" implicit motives, defined as "recurrent preference for certain experiences" by McClelland and his colleagues (Emmons, 1993, p. 190). Researchers have proposed that the implicit power motive could be further distinguished into socialized and personalized implicit power (Runge et al., 2020). The socialized implicit power motive is enacted in a more cooperative and socially acceptable way, whereas the personalized implicit power motive is more self-serving and inconsiderate. Runge et al. (2020) found that the socialized implicit power motive is negatively related to CWB, and other research supports the prediction that personalized implicit power motive and CWB are positively correlated (Moon et al., 2021).

Although power could be involved in many kinds of social situations, the discussion of power in the context of CWB is limited. Popovich and Warren (2010) discussed the role of power in one specific form of CWB, sexual harassment, and argued that sexual harassment and other related CWBs could be an attempt to influence or take authority over others. They also pointed out that sexual harassment and other CWBs may reflect a culture of power issues in the organization, not limited to the level of individual interactions. For example, if an organization has a culture of abuse, sexual harassment is likely to be more tolerated.

People with a higher power motive pursue opportunities to influence others, lead, and move higher in organizational hierarchies. Although CWBs are not necessarily constructive methods to earn status in the long term, they could be used to gain influence in some circumstances. For example, individuals might undermine others' projects so that they could take over in the future. The notion that the power motive might underlie some CWBs is parallel with the notion that instrumentality might underlie some instances of aggression. The aggression literature suggests that aggressive behavior could be a means to achieve certain ends, such as imposing control (e.g., Campbell et al., 1992). It is likely that CWBs can serve the same purpose as well. Research also found that people higher in self-monitoring, characterized by a strong status enhancement motive, tended to engage in more CWBs in private, non-interpersonal settings (Oh et al., 2014).

Self-Interest: Assimilation

The next proposed CWB motive is assimilation, and we define it as the goal to become accepted or socially compatible with other people in a group.

Like the power motive, human social needs have an important place in motivation theories. For example, love and belonging needs in Maslow's Need Hierarchy (Maslow, 1943) and need for relatedness in Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000) point to the importance of social connections and acceptance. Therefore, it is possible that engaging in CWBs is a part of socialization with the goal of getting social approval and acceptance. For example, if newcomers to an organization found that stealing office supplies is common and even acceptable, they may engage in this to fit in.

Previous research does not appear to have directly addressed this motive. However, studies have addressed similar ideas related to social norms. For example, research found that injunctive norm perceptions of CWBs moderate the positive relationship between descriptive norm perception of CWBs and CWB such

that higher injunctive norm perceptions of CWBs strengthen the relationship (Jacobson et al., 2020). Descriptive norm refers to the perceived prevalence of a behavior and injunctive norm represents the perceived degree of social approval of a behavior. In other words, if engaging in CWBs is considered to be both common and acceptable in an organization, members of the organization will engage in more CWBs. In addition, this two-way interaction is stronger for people with higher need to belong. Therefore, the results suggested that people may engage in CWBs when norms are accepting of their occurrence and doing so is one way to fit in with the group. This is consistent with the idea that engaging in CWBs may be one way to socialize, fit in, or get social approval, particularly in an organization where engaging in CWBs is perceived as typical and acceptable.

Self-Interest: Instrumentality

Lastly, a number of other individual motives may exist that are fairly diverse and difficult to group. Given this, we propose examining these in an exploratory fashion under the general heading of instrumentality within the self-interest factor. Some examples can demonstrate the potential diversity of other CWB motives: One study found that abusive leadership is used as a way to improve performance by leaders who hold the lay belief that abuse boosts performance (Watkin et al., 2019). In addition, Kelloway et al. (2010) proposed that CWBs could be a form of protest used to express dissatisfaction and draw the organization's attention to injustice or other problems. Additionally, Lawrence and Robinson (2007) argued that CWB is a form of resistance to organizational power. It is unclear whether such CWBs are purely expressive or instrumental, although it is plausible that employees engage in CWBs to both demonstrate their attitudes and fulfill self-interests. What's more, people may engage in CWBs just for fun. Bruursema et al. (2011) proposed a sixth category of CWBs, horseplay, which involves fun or interesting behaviors that may be harmful to the organization or

other organization members. Therefore, it is possible that CWBs could be a way for employees to seek fun or excitement.

Analyzing our survey responses also enabled us to identify a few additional narrow motives. For example, several participants indicated that they stole from their workplace for material or financial benefits. Some participants left work early so that they could have more leisure time. Some participants did not concentrate fully on their work because they needed to deal with some personal issues.

Therefore, because no interpretable and coherent themes could be drawn from these diverse reasons to engage in CWBs, we decided to put them together under the heading of instrumentality and examine them in an exploratory fashion.

Current Research

To sum up, we propose that self-care and self-interest are two general factors in the structure of CWB motives. These two factors may be further divided into specific motives. Based on theoretical considerations and empirical evidence, the revenge and coping motives may load more on the self-care factor, whereas the power, assimilation, and instrumentality motives may load more on the self-interest factor.

To examine these ideas, the current research was designed to develop and evaluate a measure of CWB motives. First, in Study 1, we developed a CWB motives measure with sound psychometric properties and examined the proposed structure of CWB motives. Second, in Study 2, we tried to confirm the structure of CWB motives and provided an initial examination of the nomological network of the motives.

Chapter 2 Study 1

Method

Participants and Procedure

Item Generation. First, we developed items for each CWB motive proposed above, based on both theoretical foundation and empirical results. It is recommended that at least twice as many items as those would be kept in the final scale should be generated (Hinkin, 1998). Therefore, we wrote at least 10 items per motive to make sure sufficient items remain with the aim of keeping 5 items per motive for the final scale. In addition, items from any existing and relevant measures, including the very limited number of self-report CWB motive items in previous research and measures of relevant motives, were consulted when writing items for CWB motives.

One of the motives, instrumentality, is unique because it is unclear whether these narrow motives would emerge as individual CWB motive factors or an overall stand-alone factor. Therefore, we examined them in an exploratory fashion. We started by generating as many items for each narrow motive as possible and then explored them in the factor structure of CWB motives.

After generating all items, we conducted a preliminary examination of the items. Hinkin's (1998) recommendations for item development were followed, such as using simple and short language and avoiding "double-barreled" items. This process resulted in 86 initial CWB motive items.

Sorting Task. After developing the preliminary set of items, they were reviewed by a panel of 12 subject matter experts. Industrial/Organizational (I/O) Psychology graduate students from the I/O graduate program at Florida Institute of Technology joined the study because of their expertise in the field of I/O Psychology.

In this task, participants judged the correspondence among items and motives and matched items to appropriate motives according to their judgment.

Items and the names and definitions for the five specific CWB motives were presented to participants. Participants were asked to sort the items into the motives. In addition, a "Can't decide" category was offered for those items that participants had difficulty sorting. Moreover, two forms of all items with different randomized orders were provided to avoid any ordering effect.

This sorting task aimed to ensure that sufficient interrater agreement of the appropriate motives for items is achieved. Items receiving agreement less than 75% was either revised or deleted on a case-by-case basis.

Survey Administration and Sample. A survey, made up of remaining items after the sorting task and demographic questions, was administered online. Generally speaking, adequate sample size should be achieved in order to conduct subsequent analyses appropriately, although recommendations regarding sample size vary. Mundfrom et al. (2005) conducted a series of simulations and found that the minimum sample size is related to the ratio of the number of variables to the number of factors and the level of communality. Minimum required sample sizes appear to be smaller if the level of communality is higher or the ratio of the number of variables to the number of factors is higher. In our research, each proposed CWB motive had at least seven items after the sorting task, so the ratio of the number of variables to the number of factors was at least seven; therefore, the minimum number of participants required could be on the smaller side. Given this, we anticipated that between 200 and 300 participants should be sufficient.

Participants were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). MTurk is a platform created by Amazon to allow individuals to complete computerized tasks for payment that has become a popular tool for researchers to collect data. Although concerns exist regarding the quality of data collected from MTurk samples, these samples are not substantially different from other convenience samples researchers often use (Landers & Behrend, 2015). Moreover, a number of studies support the idea that MTurk workers are reliable (Paolacci & Chandler, 2014). Methods to improve data quality have been discussed as well,

such as using MTurk workers with high approval ratings and using prescreening (Peer et al., 2014; Kan & Drummey, 2018). Therefore, these approaches were used in the current research, where high approval rating was required and attention check items were included in the survey.

Furthermore, for the current research, a screening survey was administrated before the main survey. The screening survey aimed to identify and exclude participants ineligible for the scale validation survey. To be eligible for our study, participants should have worked at least half-time (20 hours/week) during the past six months. The screening survey included some items irrelevant to CWB motives and demographic questions including their work experience, so that participants could not figure out the real focus of the screening survey.

For the scale validation survey, participants with an approval rating of at least 95% were recruited. In addition, attention check items were applied across the survey to detect insufficient effort responding. Response pattern and completion time were also examined for data cleaning. Specifically, first, participants who answered the survey too quickly were excluded from the dataset. Huang et al. (2012) pointed out that legitimately responding to one item in less than 2 seconds is unlikely and we followed this standard. Second, attention check items were utilized and participants who failed more than one item were excluded. Finally, the response pattern of participants was examined as well. For example, some participants answered all items with the same response. Any responses with a clear careless or random pattern were excluded from further analysis. Using these three criteria, 241 participants were removed from the data set (original $N = 452$, final $N = 211$).

In the final dataset ($N = 211$), participant demographics were as follows: 57% were male and 37% were female (6% did not respond); average age was 39.8 ($SD = 11.5$); most were White (84.3%), African American (4%), and Asian (3.1%); 57.4% had a bachelor's degree and 16.6% had a graduate or professional degree; and a wide range of occupations were reported with the biggest three job families

being computer and mathematical (11.7%), office and administrative support (11.2%), and business and financial operations (10.8%).

Measures

CWB Motives. Items surviving the sorting task (55 items; see Results section) were used to measure reasons to engage in CWBs. Item responses were obtained on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*Not at all important*) to 5 (*Extremely important*).

Demographics. Demographic questions help us describe our participants and determine participant eligibility as well. Participants' gender, race/ethnicity, age, working experience, educational attainment, and current job using the O*NET taxonomy of occupations (National Center for O*NET Development, 2021) were collected.

Analysis

For the sorting task, proportion of agreement for each item was calculated by the number of participants who sorted the item to a certain motive to the total number of participants.

Exploratory factor analyses were carried out to test the proposed factor structure of CWB motives. Principal axis factoring was applied to extract factors. The scree plot and parallel analysis results were considered in making decisions regarding the number of factors. To ensure items represent the content domain of the CWB motive constructs, items clearly loading on a single appropriate factor with a factor loading above .40 were kept (Hinkin, 1998).

Results

Item Sorting

An item sorting process was carried out after the initial item writing and revision to examine the content validity of all CWB motive items. A total of 12

Industrial/Organizational (I/O) Psychology graduate students from the I/O graduate program at Florida Institute of Technology participated in this process. These participants were given a brief explanation of the purpose of the sorting process, a list of the 86 initial CWB motive items, and definitions of the five categories of CWB motives I proposed. They were then asked to use their best judgment to sort items into the appropriate category of CWB motives. A cutoff of 75% agreement was set to represent sufficient interrater agreement, and 55 of the original 86 items passed the screening.

With one exception, all items were identified as belonging to the original category of CWB motives proposed during item writing[1]. To be consistent with the participants' judgment, the category of CWB motives of that one item was adjusted.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to examine the factor structure of the CWB motive items. However, the scree test and parallel analysis did not reveal a clear number of factors. Instead, both methods suggested a possible range for the number of factors that may reflect the factor structure of the CWB motive items. Given this, to remove possible noise from the dataset, one of the data screening criteria was slightly modified before proceeding with the EFA. Instead of keeping the participants who failed one attention check item, these participants were excluded before further analysis (resulting in $N = 148$). However, results from both the parallel analysis and the scree test were still inconclusive regarding the number of factors.

These two attempts to determine the number of factors both offered a possible range of number of factors. Therefore, to thoroughly examine all possible solutions, several EFAs that extracted from two to seven factors were performed.

[1] The one exception was the item "To get things done." It was proposed in the category of "Power", but participants indicated it should belong to the "Instrumentality" category.

The quality of the EFA solutions was examined in terms of two criteria. First, the factors should be interpretable. Different EFA solutions generate different factors involving different items. Whether the factor is meaningful or is compatible with the context of CWB motives was taken into consideration. Second, whether the factors have problematic item loadings is another key point of consideration. For example, some items may have cross-loadings across factors and thus make the meaning of factors less clear. Furthermore, items may have low loadings; items with factor loadings greater than .4 were kept (Hinkin, 1998).

Both varimax and direct oblimin rotations were examined. In addition, each solution with a different number of factors was investigated iteratively by excluding problematic items and running the EFA again to explore whether the interpretability of the proposed factor structure had been improved.

This process suggested that a two-factor solution was the best. The two factors suggested by the EFA were interpretable and consistent with our proposed conceptualization of two general categories of CWB motives: self-care and self-interest. In addition, this solution had the fewest problematic item loadings. Therefore, we proceeded with this two-factor structure suggested by EFA (see Table 2).

Table 2: Study 1: Two-Factor Structure EFA

Items	Factor 1 loading	Factor 2 loading
To fit in with my workgroup.	.92	
To maintain friendships with my coworkers.	.89	
Because coworkers expect it.	.85	
To become part of the group.	.84	
To make coworkers accept me.	.83	
To assert my leadership role.	.82	
To make an impact on coworkers.	.82	
To enhance my status at work.	.81	
To bond with my coworkers.	.80	

To fit in with the culture at my job.	.78	
To establish my authority.	.78	
To gain power at work.	.77	
To make people listen to me.	.76	
Because my coworkers pressure me.	.75	
Because that is how things are done at my workplace.	.74	
To show others I am in charge.	.74	
Because the satisfaction of getting even with my coworkers would outweigh the risks of getting caught.	.68	
Because it is a good time.	.67	
Because it gets work done faster.	.66	
Because it is common at my job.	.64	
Because it improves work effectiveness.	.64	
To avoid rejection by my coworkers.	.63	
To gain monetary benefits.	.63	
Because my coworkers deserve it.	.60	
To get things done.	.59	
To follow suit.	.58	
To make my coworkers pay for what they did.	.58	
Because it would feel good to get back at my coworkers in some way.	.57	
Because I need the stuff.	.56	
Because others do the same thing.	.51	
To have fun.	.51	
To get even with the organization.		.73
Because the organization deserves it.		.73
To make the organization pay for what they did.		.73
To remedy unfairness I experienced.		.72
To deal with unreasonable work demands.		.67
Because it would feel good to get back at the organization in some way.		.65
To punish wrongdoing.		.64

To cope with my awful work environment.	.63
Because I am stressed out.	.62
To hurt the organization.	.60
Because the satisfaction of getting even with the organization would outweigh the risks of getting caught.	.60
To try to reduce my frustration.	.60
To get temporary relief from my job.	.58
To alleviate negative emotions.	.53
To manage unpleasant experiences at work.	.53
To restore justice.	.44
To help me deal with my current work environment.	.43

Note. Item loadings that are greater than .4 are shown. $N = 148$.

Discussion

The purpose of Study 1 was to explore the factor structure of CWB motive items and to compare the results with our initial conceptualization. Multiple EFAs were performed to determine the proper number of factors and the factor structure of items that passed the sorting task. Results suggested that the two-factor solution worked best. This solution had factors that were interpretable and the least number of problematic items.

In addition, the items that loaded on the two factors were consistent with our conceptualization of the two general categories of CWB motives: self-care and self-interest. Therefore, the results yielded some preliminary support for our proposed taxonomy of CWB motives. Specifically, these findings suggested that it is plausible to summarize reasons people engage in CWBs into two general dimensions: to protect or take care of feelings and to achieve personal goals or needs.

Although theory and empirical results from previous research suggested five possible subcategories of CWB motives, the five-factor model did not perform better than the two-factor model in this study. Thus, it may be that these five more-detailed motives are not distinct factors in the context of CWBs or at least participants do not think about their motives in these more nuanced ways. Alternatively, it may be that these concepts require further inquiries to develop a more thorough understanding of them, allowing for clearer articulation and measurement of these subcategories. Given that this study was a preliminary attempt to investigate these motives, it is possible that these are relevant and distinct factors but our items or definitions of the CWB motives may not capture their conceptual nature fully, and thus the two-factor model appeared to be more supported than the five-factor model in the EFAs.

Chapter 3 Study 2

Method

Participants and Procedure

A survey, made up of remaining items for CWB motives after Study 1 and several other measures (described below and found in the Appendix), was administered online. We followed the same sample size guideline as in Study 1. Participants were recruited using MTurk as well. In addition, a prescreening survey was also administered before the main survey as in the procedure for Study 1.

The same criteria used in Study 1 (completion time, attention check items, and response patterns) were used to screen out participants who demonstrated insufficient effort responding. Using these three criteria, 308 participants were removed from the dataset (original $N = 509$, final $N = 201$).

In the final dataset ($N = 201$), participant demographics were as follows: the percentage of male and female were both close to 50%; the mean age was 40.2 ($SD = 11.0$); 77% indicated their race as White, 8.4% as African American, and 7.9% as Asian; 48.5% attained a bachelor's degree and 21.3% had a graduate or professional degree; and a diverse range of occupations were reported (e.g., 12.4% were in the sales and related job family and 11.9% were in both Computer and Mathematical and Education, Training, and Library job family).

Measures

CWB Motives. The measure developed in Study 1 (49 remaining items) was used. Item responses were again obtained on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*Not at all important*) to 5 (*Extremely important*).

Counterproductive Work Behavior. CWBs were measured to examine motive-CWB relationships. We used Spector et al.'s (2006) 32-item Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C) to measure participants' CWBs. This measure consists of five subscales: abuse, production deviance,

sabotage, theft, and withdrawal. Each item is scored on a Likert-style scale ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Every day*). The coefficient alpha reliability for the overall scale was .90. The coefficient alpha reliability for each subscale was .85, .63, .55, .63, and .64 respectively.

Revenge Motive. A general revenge motive scale was administered to examine the relationship with the CWB-specific revenge motive. Two subscales, hostile attribution and retribution, from the Explicit Aggressive Beliefs and Attitudes Scale were used to measure the tendency to see harmful intent in the actions of others and the tendency to confer logical priority to retaliation over reconciliation, respectively (Michel et al., 2014). We predicted that they would be positively related to the CWB revenge motive. Both subscales have 5 items. The responses are on a 7-point Likert-style format ranging from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*). The coefficient alpha reliability for hostile attribution and retribution were .86 and .92.

Coping Motive. We predicted that organizational justice to be negatively related to the coping motive, and we used the organizational justice measure, including three subscales, developed by Moorman (1991). The first subscale assesses distributive justice (the perception of being rewarded fairly by the organization) with 5 items. The second subscale assesses procedure justice (the perception of fairness of organizational procedures) with 7 items. And the last subscale assesses interactional justice (whether organizational procedures were enacted properly and fairly by supervisors) with 6 items. All items are scored on 5-point scale. Items both for distributive justice and procedure justice use a scale ranging from 1 (*Very unfair*) to 5 (*Very fair*). And the interactional justice measure uses a scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*). The coefficient alpha reliability for distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice were .95, .95, and .93.

Power Motive. We predicted that the general power motive to be positively related to the CWB power motive. Therefore, we toke the 18-item Need for Power

Scale (Moon et al., 2021) to measure the desire to influence others. The scale consists of two factors: nine items each for Personalized and Socialized Need for Power (nPower). The responses are on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 5 (*Extremely*). The coefficient alpha reliability for Personalized and Socialized nPower are .90 and .88.

Assimilation Motive. We predicted that the need to belong motive to be positively related to the CWB assimilation motive. So, we used the 10-item Need to Belong Scale (Leary et al., 2013) to measure the desire for interpersonal acceptance and belonging. The responses are on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 5 (*Extremely*). The coefficient alpha reliability for the scale exceeded .80.

Demographics. As in Study 1, demographic questions helped us both describe our participants and determine participant eligibility. Participants' gender, race/ethnicity, age, working experience, educational attainment, and current job using the O*NET taxonomy of occupations (National Center for O*NET Development, 2021) were collected.

Analysis

First, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was carried out for items measuring CWB motives to examine the factor structure. Fit indexes, factor loadings, and factor intercorrelations were examined.

In addition, regression and correlational analyses were applied to explore the relationships among the CWB motives and the proposed correlated variables.

Results

Confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted. Initially, the two-factor model identified in Study 1 was examined. However, this model did not meet the typical standards for satisfactory fit ($\chi 2 = 3002.88$, $df = 901$, $p < .01$, CFI = 0.75, TLI = 0.74, RMSEA = 0.11, SRMR = 0.09). Therefore, a different factor

solution, the five-factor model proposed originally, was explored as well. Results indicated improved but still less than ideal fit. Given these findings, we decided to exclude more participants and items to investigate whether a clearer structure would emerge. First, we excluded more participants by removing those who failed one attention check item (resulting in $N = 136$). Then, some items with interrater agreement lower than 80% were excluded in the original dataset ($N = 201$) as well. Unfortunately, both approaches did not yield satisfactory fit indexes. Specifically, results were as follows: the two-factor solution when excluding more participants ($\chi2 = 2704.23$, $df = 901$, $p < .01$, CFI = 0.70, TLI = 0.69, RMSEA = 0.12, SRMR = 0.10); the five-factor solution when excluding more participants ($\chi2 = 1976.55$, $df = 850$, $p < .01$, CFI = 0.80, TLI = 0.79, RMSEA = 0.10, SRMR = 0.09); the two-factor solution when excluding more items ($\chi2 = 2439.04$, $df = 739$, $p < .01$, CFI = 0.77, TLI = 0.76, RMSEA = 0.11, SRMR = 0.08); and the five-factor solution when excluding more items ($\chi2 = 1597.76$, $df = 692$, $p < .01$, CFI = 0.87, TLI = 0.86, RMSEA = 0.08, SRMR = 0.07).

Finally, modification indexes were utilized. Model specification was changed based on some of the larger modification indexes. However, these changes did not substantially improve model fit. Overall, these findings suggest that (a) none of the factor structures we proposed were firmly supported by empirical results but (b) the five-factor model is perhaps preferable. The five-factor model with some items excluded had the best fit among all models examined and Table 3 displays the factor loadings for this model.

Table 3: Study 2: Five-Factor Structure CFA Results

Items	Revenge	Coping	Assimilation	Power	Instrumentality
Because it would feel good to get back at the organization in some way.	.81				

To remedy unfairness I experienced.	.60		
Because the organization deserves it.	.83		
To hurt the organization.	.69		
To make the organization pay for what they did.	.91		
To punish wrongdoing.	.66		
Because the satisfaction of getting even with the organization would outweigh the risks of getting caught.	.86		
To get even with the organization.	.93		
To restore justice.	.76		
To help me deal with my current work environment.		.64	
To deal with unreasonable work demands.		.62	
To alleviate negative emotions.		.62	
To try to reduce my frustration.		.84	
To get temporary relief from my job.		.72	
To cope with my awful work environment.		.75	
Because I am stressed out.		.79	
To manage unpleasant experiences at work.		.68	
To avoid rejection by my coworkers.			.70
Because it is common at my job.			.73
To follow suit.			.82

To fit in with the culture at my job.	.85			
To bond with my coworkers.	.85			
To make coworkers accept me.	.89			
Because others do the same thing.	.73			
To maintain friendships with my coworkers.	.88			
Because coworkers expect it.	.88			
To become part of the group.	.90			
To fit in with my workgroup.	.93			
Because my coworkers pressure me.	.73			
Because that is how things are done at my workplace.	.80			
To enhance my status at work.		.80		
To gain power at work.		.85		
To establish my authority.		.91		
To make people listen to me.		.89		
To assert my leadership role.		.93		
Because it gets work done faster.			.57	
To gain monetary benefits.			.75	
To have fun.			.72	
Because I need the stuff.			.70	

Note. Item loadings that are greater than .4 are shown. $N = 201$.

Correlation and Regression

In order to proceed with the proposed correlational and regression analyses, we focused on the model that performed the best: the five-factor model in which some items were excluded and the sample consisted of 201 participants. Tables 4

and 5 provide descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliabilities. All measures demonstrated acceptable reliability coefficients (all were above .80). Note that the five CWB motive measures were positively correlated. Particularly high correlations were found for the CWB Power, Assimilation, and Instrumentality motives, suggesting these have some common characteristics.

Table 4: Study 2: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Coping motive	2.97	0.93
Power motive	2.34	1.22
Assimilation motive	2.50	1.10
Revenge motive	2.51	1.06
Instrumentality motive	2.65	1.01
Retribution bias	3.53	1.62
Hostile attribution bias	3.21	1.57
Distributive justice	3.24	0.99
Procedural justice	3.19	0.92
Interactional justice	3.73	0.97
Personalized need for power	2.22	0.93
Socialized need for power	3.51	0.86
Need to belong	2.86	0.75
CWB Total	1.67	0.77
Sabotage	1.56	0.90
Production deviance	1.71	0.90
Withdrawal	2.22	0.78
Theft	1.65	0.87
Abuse	1.56	0.80

Table 5: Study 2: Correlational Analysis

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Coping Motive	(.89)												
2. Power Motive	.49**	(.94)											
3. Assimilation Motive	.60**	.82**	(.96)										
4. Revenge Motive	.62**	.65**	.60**	(.94)									
5. Instrumentality Motive	.52**	.80**	.77**	.61**	(.77)								
6. Retribution bias	.29**	.36**	.34**	.49**	.33**	(.92)							
7. Hostile attribution bias	.34**	.45**	.41**	.47**	.41**	.63**	(.92)						
8. Distributive justice	.01	.29**	.32**	.02	.33**	.02	.05	(.92)					
9. Procedural justice	.14	.33**	.33**	.12	.31**	.03	.09	.80**	(.93)				
10. Interactional justice	.02	.11	.17*	-.04	.13	-.01	-.04	.66**	.73**	(.93)			
11. Personalized need for power	.41**	.75**	.67**	.57**	.61**	.48**	.57**	.23**	.26**	.04	(.91)		
12. Socialized need for power	.12	.19**	.19**	.02	.17*	-.04	.05	.15*	.30**	.26**	.24**	(.91)	
13. Need to belong	.16*	.27**	.35**	.14*	.21**	.07	.23**	-.01	.06	.02	.25**	.32**	(.83)

Note. Coefficient alphas are on the diagonal.

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

Results from most of the correlational analyses were consistent with the predictions. To be specific, we found that the hostile attribution bias and retribution bias were positively related to the Revenge motive, the Need for Power Scale, including two subscales (Personalized and Socialized Need for Power), were positively related to the Power motive, and need to belong was positively related to the Assimilation motive. However, one exception to this pattern is that the organizational justice measures were not significantly related to the Coping motive. We did not make any predictions regarding the CWB Instrumentality motive; the results demonstrate that it was positively related to all variables, except interactional justice.

Tables 6-9 provide regression analysis results. Findings from most of these analyses were also consistent with the predictions. Overall, these results supported the five-motive approach, though connections with organizational justice are less

clear. Specifically, although the correlational analysis indicated that none of the three organizational justice measures were significantly correlated with the CWB Coping motive, the regression analysis results demonstrated that distributive justice negatively predicted the Coping motive while procedural justice positively predicted the Coping motive. The positive relationship between procedural justice and the Coping motive was unexpected. It should also be noted that we did not predict a relationship between the two subscales of the Need for Power Scale and the CWB Power motive, but we found that these two subscales predicted the Power motive differently: Personalized Need for Power was found to positively predict the Power motive while Socialized Need for Power did not predict this motive.

Table 6: Coping Motive and Organizational Justice

	β	*b*	*SE*	*p*
Distributive justice	-0.27	-0.26	0.11	.021
Procedural justice	0.45	0.45	0.13	<.001
Interactional justice	-0.12	-0.12	0.10	.240

Note. DV is CWB Coping motive.

Table 7: Revenge Motive, Retribution Bias, and Hostile Attribution Bias

	β	*b*	*SE*	*p*
Retribution bias	0.31	0.20	0.05	<.001
Hostile attribution bias	0.28	0.19	0.05	<.001

Note. DV is CWB Revenge motive.

Table 8: Power Motive, Personalized Need for Power, and Socialized Need for Power

	β	*b*	*SE*	*p*
Personalized need for power	0.75	0.98	0.06	<.001
Socialized need for power	0.01	0.02	0.07	.823

Note. DV is CWB Power motive.

Table 9: Assimilation Motive and Need to Belong

	β	*b*	*SE*	*p*
Need to belong	0.35	0.51	0.10	<.001

Note. DV is CWB Assimilation motive.

We also explored the relationships between CWB motives and different types of CWBs and details can be found in Tables 10-16. All five CWB motives were found to be significantly correlated to the five types of CWBs and the CWBs in general. However, the multiple regression results demonstrated the CWB Revenge motive consistently predicted different types of CWBs, except withdrawal and Assimilation motive predicted all types of CWBs well, except theft. The CWB Coping and Instrumentality motive also contributed to unique variance of one type of CWB, which was theft.

Table 10: Correlations for CWB Motives and CWBs

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. CWB Total	(.98)					
2. Sabotage	.90**	(.89)				
3. Production deviance	.88**	.82**	(.83)			
4. Withdrawal	.76**	.66**	.68**	(.79)		

5.	Theft	.93**	.83**	.78**	.66**	(.91)	
6.	Abuse	.98**	.84**	.82**	.66**	.89**	(.97)
7.	Coping motive	.33**	.32**	.34**	.33**	.28**	.30**
8.	Power motive	.54**	.55**	.49**	.35**	.51**	.53**
9.	Revenge motive	.48**	.47**	.47**	.35**	.46**	.45**
10.	Assimilation motive	.56**	.55**	.51**	.43**	.51**	.54**
11.	Instrumentality motive	.53**	.51**	.42**	.40**	.54**	.51**

Note. Coefficient alphas are on the diagonal.

**$p < .01$.

Table 11: CWB Total and CWB Motives

	β	*b*	*SE*	*p*
Revenge motive	0.21	0.15	0.06	.013
Coping motive	-0.11	-0.09	0.07	.191
Power motive	0.08	0.05	0.08	.530
Assimilation motive	0.31	0.22	0.08	.006
Instrumentality motive	0.15	0.12	0.08	.134

Note. DV is CWB Total.

Table 12: Sabotage and CWB Motives

	β	*b*	*SE*	*p*
Revenge motive	0.21	0.18	0.07	.014
Coping motive	-0.10	-0.10	0.08	.214
Power motive	0.16	0.12	0.09	.191
Assimilation motive	0.29	0.24	0.09	.012
Instrumentality motive	0.08	0.07	0.09	.434

Note. DV is Sabotage.

Table 13: Production Deviance and CWB Motives

	β	*b*	*SE*	*p*
Revenge motive	0.26	0.22	0.08	.004
Coping motive	-0.04	-0.04	0.08	.653
Power motive	0.15	0.11	0.09	.234
Assimilation motive	0.30	0.25	0.10	.011
Instrumentality motive	-0.06	-0.06	0.10	.549

Note. DV is Production deviance.

Table 14: Withdrawal and CWB Motives

	β	*b*	*SE*	*p*
Revenge motive	0.12	0.09	0.07	.199
Coping motive	0.05	0.04	0.08	.601
Power motive	-0.18	-0.11	0.09	.184
Assimilation motive	0.32	0.23	0.09	.011
Instrumentality motive	0.19	0.15	0.09	.093

Note. DV is Withdrawal.

Table 15: Theft and CWB Motives

	β	*b*	*SE*	*p*
Revenge motive	0.24	0.20	0.07	.006
Coping motive	-0.16	-0.16	0.08	.045
Power motive	0.02	0.02	0.09	.847
Assimilation motive	0.22	0.17	0.09	.063
Instrumentality motive	0.29	0.25	0.09	.005

Note. DV is Theft.

Table 16: Abuse and CWB Motives

	β	*b*	*SE*	*p*
Revenge motive	0.19	0.14	0.07	.033
Coping motive	-0.12	-0.10	0.07	.143
Power motive	0.11	0.07	0.08	.378
Assimilation motive	0.31	0.22	0.08	.009
Instrumentality motive	0.14	0.11	0.08	.193

Note. DV is Abuse.

Discussion

The purpose of Study 2 was to confirm results from Study 1 and to explore the nomological network of CWB motives. CFAs were conducted to confirm the factor structure suggested by EFAs in Study 1. However, none of the models met the typical standards for satisfactory fit. Therefore, this study did not provide clear evidence regarding the factor structure of the CWB motive items. Among all the factor models examined, the five-factor model had the best fit. This finding suggests that the five CWB motives may have some merits but the results are inconclusive at this point. Future research is needed to explore this issue further including, for example, whether there are some other CWB motive factors yet to be discovered or whether the current items for the five CWB motives did not fully capture these factors.

The relationships between the CWB motives and related variables were found to be consistent with our predictions in most cases. One exception was organizational justice, as the pattern for these variables was not clear. In correlational analyses, all three organizational justice measures were not related to the CWB Coping motive. This was unexpected because unfairness in the workplace may stimulate employees to express their opinions or try to cope with their negative

emotions via some types of CWBs. In contrast, regression analyses indicated that distributive justice negatively predicted the Coping motive and procedural justice positively predicted the Coping motive. The latter result was somewhat surprising. These findings may not be substantively meaningful (e.g., participants may not have answered questions about organizational justice accurately) but it is possible this reflects a real pattern (e.g., perhaps under certain circumstances fairer processes can have a type of backfire effect, where people who are more consequentialist may lose patience with well-established and fair processes or consider such processes to be hypercritical).

We also found high correlations between CWB Power, CWB Assimilation, and CWB Instrumentality motives. These three motives fall under the same general category: self-interest. This may partially explain the high correlation coefficients among these motives, because CWBs could just be instrumental for achieving personal interests. Moreover, it is possible that participants did not distinguish the specific purposes of CWBs and thus interpreted these items in a similar fashion. This finding is also somewhat consistent with Study 1 results in that Study 1 suggested these items all load on one self-interest factor and this Study 2 result also suggested that these items/factors have a lot in common.

In addition, all five CWB motives were significantly related to the five types of CWBs, although only the CWB Revenge motive and CWB Assimilation motive consistently predicted unique variance in CWBs when all the motives were examined simultaneously. Results thus demonstrated that underlying motives to engage in CWBs and actual counterproductive behaviors go hand in hand. In addition, the revenge and assimilation motive appear to have some unique qualities in that they were the only motives to provide consistent incremental prediction over the other motives. It may be that these motives are particularly influential in terms of engaging in CWBs, an issue that could be examined in more detail in future studies.

Chapter 4 General Discussion

CWBs are a common and costly concern for organizations. Examining reasons why people engage in CWBs can inform us more about the underlying processes leading to CWBs and potentially result in better interventions for such behaviors in the workplace. However, little research investigating motives to engage in CWBs has been conducted. The purpose of the current research was to address this research gap by investigating CWB motives and developing a measure for them.

Findings and Implications

The findings demonstrated some empirical evidence for the proposed structure of CWB motives but further research is necessary to clarify these findings. In Study 1, EFAs indicated that a two-factor structure appeared to be the best model representing the underlying factors for the CWB motive items. After examining items loading on these two factors, we found that the pattern was consistent with our conceptualization that self-care and self-interest emerge as two overall factors in the structure of CWB motives. In Study 2, a five-factor model had the best fit in the CFAs although no model met the typical standards for satisfactory fit indexes.

Therefore, the conceptualization that the structure of CWB motives involves two general factors and five specific factors received some empirical support, although results were inconclusive in that Study 1 findings were more consistent with the former and Study 2 findings were more consistent with the latter. Although additional studies may be necessary, this preliminary evidence suggests that people may engage in CWBs based of five CWB motives: in response to perceived unfairness or harm, to manage perceived work stressors, to gain influence over the environment or other people, to be socially compatible with

other people in a group, and to achieve miscellaneous personal goals. These five motives could also be summarized into two general factors—self-care and self-interest—which is consistent with the "hot affective" and "cold cognitive" theories of CWB (Fox & Spector, 2010, p. 93). In other words, CWBs could be responses to emotion-arousing events or deliberate choices to achieve diverse personal goals.

Our study begins to address a research gap related to CWB motives and lays some foundation for further inquiries. To our knowledge, our study is the first to examine CWB motives comprehensively. Given this, the current work may have several implications for research. First, these studies have implications for the conceptualization of CWB motives. Although the current evidence was not strong enough to fully support our propositions, the idea of five specific and two general categories of CWB motives is plausible. This is a sound starting point for future studies of CWB motives. Our research also provided some support for previous theories related to CWBs, such as the "hot affective" and "cold cognitive" theories of CWB (Fox & Spector, 2010, p. 93) and the theory of reactive and initiated CWB (Cullen & Sackett, 2003).

Second, our research developed a measure for the CWB motives we proposed. This measure demonstrated some favorable psychometric properties (e.g., alpha coefficients greater than .80). Although some additional evidence related to the factor structure may be helpful, this measure may be a good starting point to study CWB motives and refine our knowledge regarding their conceptual nature.

Finally, prior research on CWBs mostly focused on the behaviors, whereas the current work examining CWB motives can reveal underlying processes leading to CWBs. Therefore, this research on CWB motives provides another perspective for understanding CWBs and sheds light on the usefulness of the functional approach to CWBs in particular. This additional perspective may allow us to develop more knowledge regarding the nature of CWBs and the reasons people engage in these behaviors. For example, investigating the motives underlying

CWBs may reveal more nuances of these behaviors that could lead to a better classification of them.

Our research may have practical implications as well. For instance, practitioners and employers may be able to develop better interventions for CWBs if they have a clearer understanding of the motives underlying these behaviors. That is, examining CWB motives helps us understand factors that may increase the occurrence of CWBs and the relationships between different reasons to engage in CWBs and different types of CWBs. With a deeper understanding of these issues, we may be able to reduce CWBs by building a better work environment for both employees and employers. This may also have financial benefits, as CWBs can be expensive for organizations (Porath & Pearson, 2013).

Furthermore, our findings may be beneficial for organizational development as our CWB motive taxonomy could serve as a framework to diagnose why employees engage in CWBs. Digging deeper into the reasons why CWBs occur may illustrate issues rooted in the microlevel, mesolevel, or macrolevel in organizations. By analyzing the reasons employees engage in CWBs, employers may begin to discover certain areas for improvement, such as poor communication or toxic organizational culture.

Limitations and Future Research

As with all research, this study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, our findings may not be generalizable because MTurk workers may not be representative of the population of employed individuals. However, research has pointed out that MTurk workers are not substantially different from other convenience samples researchers often use (Landers & Behrend, 2015).

Second, data quality was not ideal. The rate of careless or insufficient effort responding was surprisingly high compared to what previous research had suggested. Although we applied multiple data screening criteria, given the

surprisingly low rate of qualified data, it is possible that we did not identify and exclude all “bad apples” from the current dataset. In addition, participants may not have demonstrated signs of insufficient effort responding but it is still possible they did not answer all the questions accurately. Thus, some noise may still have been present in the data. However, it is worth noting that some noise is inevitable and we applied fairly strict screening in an attempt to minimize this issue as much as possible.

Third, given the global pandemic, the nature of the participants’ work may have changed and thus what participants indicated may not reflect typical face-to-face work environment behaviors. With the increase in remote work, many forms of CWBs may not be practical, such as taking office supplies. Moreover, the frequencies of engaging in certain types of CWBs may be affected. For example, people may have fewer chances to engage in aggressive behaviors towards coworkers because of decreased face-to-face work time with them. Therefore, the findings in this study may not fully apply to the pre-pandemic workplace we were familiar with.

However, considering that no clear timeline for the end of the pandemic is in sight, the shifts in work life due to COVID-19 could represent a new norm. As a result, it may be premature to conclude that the time period in which our study was conducted is a notable limitation. This is an open question and the answer will depend on future conditions. For example, some increase in remote work may be permanent for many organizations and thus the current findings may still be valuable, especially for those organizations with more flexible work arrangements.

When it comes to future research, researchers may want to first aim at a better understanding of the five proposed CWB motives. For example, it is possible that these motives are not as distinct as we thought, or other CWB motives may exist. Future researchers could use our conceptualization of CWB motives as a starting point and refine the current definitions for clearer articulation and measurement of these motives. In addition, the current CWB motive items should

be tested in other samples to examine their psychometric properties. Developing a more accurate measure will be beneficial for the study of CWB motives and CWBs.

Furthermore, researchers could investigate the nomological network of CWB motives in more depth. In the current research, we examined the relationships between CWB motives and several relevant constructs. Future studies could expand on the current findings by, first, examining the possible paths from CWB motives to different types of CWBs. For example, more detailed studies may reveal more nuanced patterns in terms of different motives predicting different types of CWBs. In addition, motives could be examined as mediators in relationships between individual differences and CWBs. Additionally, research could explore moderators that may strengthen or diminish the effects of CWB motives on CWBs. Second, it could be meaningful to examine the relationships between CWB motives and other variables that employers may be interested in, such as turnover rate and employee engagement. Understanding the reasons why people engage in CWBs in more detail could lead to insights regarding how to improve some key indicators, such as engagement, that are related to organizational performance.

References

Anglim, J., Lievens, F., Everton, L., Grant, S. L., & Marty, A. (2018). HEXACO personality predicts counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior in low-stakes and job applicant contexts. *Journal of Research in Personality, 77*, 11-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.09.003

Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2001). How employees respond to personal offense: The effects of blame attribution, victim status, and offender status on revenge and reconciliation in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 52–59.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 349-360.

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*(2), 410-424.

Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M., & Kramer, R. M. (1997). At the breaking point: Cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organizations. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 18–36). Sage.

Bolton, L. R., Harvey, R. D., Grawitch, M. J., & Barber, L. K. (2012). Counterproductive work behaviours in response to emotional exhaustion: A moderated mediational approach. *Stress and Health, 28*(3), 222-233.

Bruursema, K., Kessler, S. R., & Spector, P. E. (2011). Bored employees misbehaving: The relationship between boredom and counterproductive work behaviour. *Work & Stress, 25*(2), 93-107. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2011.596670

Campbell, A., Muncer, S., & Coyle, E. (1992). Social representation of aggression as an explanation of gender differences: A preliminary study. *Aggressive Behavior, 18*(2), 95–108.

Cullen, M. J., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Personality and counterproductive workplace behavior. In M. Barrick & A. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Personality and work* (pp. 150–182). Jossey-Bass Pfeiffer.

Dahling, J. J. (2017). Exhausted, mistreated, or indifferent? Explaining deviance from emotional display rules at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 26*(2), 171-182.

Emmons, R. A. (1993). The current status of the motive concept. In K. H. Craik, R. Hogan, & R. N. Wolfe (Eds.), *Fifty years of personality psychology* (pp. 187–196). Plenum.

Folger, R., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2005). Beyond counterproductive work behavior: Moral emotions and deontic retaliation versus reconciliation. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 83–106). American Psychological Association.

Forsyth, D. R., Banks, G. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (2012). A meta-analysis of the Dark Triad and work behavior: a social exchange perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*(3), 557-579.

Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (2010). Instrumental counterproductive work behavior and the theory of planned behavior: A "cold cognitive" approach to complement "hot affective" theories of CWB. In L. L. Neider & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *The "dark" side of management* (pp. 93–114). IAP Information Age Publishing.

Heckhausen, H. (2018). *Motivation and action*. (J. Heckhausen, Ed.). Springer. (Original work published 1980). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65094-4_2

Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., LeBlanc, M.M., & Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 228-238.

Hinkin, T.R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*(1), 104-121. https://doi:10.1177/109442819800100106

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology, 50*(3), 337–421. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062

Ho, V. T. (2012). Interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors: Distinguishing between person-focused versus task-focused behaviors and their antecedents. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 27*(4), 467-482.

Huang, J. L., Curran, P. G., Keeney, J., Poposki, E.M., & DeShon, R. P. (2012). Detecting and deterring insufficient effort responding to surveys. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 27*(1), 99-114. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9231-8

Hung, T. K., Chi, N. W., & Lu, W. L. (2009). Exploring the relationships between perceived coworker loafing and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating role of a revenge motive. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 24*(3), 257-270.

Jacobson, R. P., Marchiondo, L. A., Jacobson, K. J., & Hood, J. N. (2020). The synergistic effect of descriptive and injunctive norm perceptions on counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *162*(1), 191-209. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3968-1

Jex, S. M., & Britt, T. W. (2014). *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach*. John Wiley & Sons.

Kan, I. P., & Drummey, A. B. (2018). Do imposters threaten data quality? An examination of worker misrepresentation and downstream consequences in Amazon's Mechanical Turk workforce. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *83*, 243-253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.02.005

Kelloway, E. K., Francis, L., Prosser, M., & Cameron, J. E. (2010). Counterproductive work behavior as protest. *Human Resource Management Review, 20*(1), 18-25.

Krischer, M. M., Penney, L. M., & Hunter, E. M. (2010). Can counterproductive work behaviors be productive? CWB as emotion-focused coping. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *15*(2), 154-166.

Landers, R. N., & Behrend, T. S. (2015). An inconvenient truth: Arbitrary distinctions between organizational, Mechanical Turk, and other convenience samples. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(2), 142-164. https://doi:10.1017/iop.2015.13

Lawrence, T. B., & Robinson, S. L. (2007). Ain't misbehavin: Workplace deviance as organizational resistance. *Journal of Management, 33*(3), 378-394.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer Publishing Company.

Leary, M. R., Kelly, K. M., Cottrell, C. A., & Schreindorfer, L. S. (2013). Construct validity of the need to belong scale: Mapping the nomological network. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 95*(6), 610-624. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2013.819511

Lee, Y., Berry, C. M., & Gonzalez-Mulé, E. (2019). The importance of being humble: A meta-analysis and incremental validity analysis of the relationship between honesty-humility and job performance. *Journal of*

Applied Psychology, *104*(12), 1535-1546. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000421

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370–396. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346

Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive behavior at work: A general perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 647–660.

Michel, J. S., Pace, V. L., Edun, A., Sawhney, E., & Thomas, J. (2014). Development and validation of an explicit aggressive beliefs and attitudes scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 96*(3), 327–338. https://doi:10.1080/00223891.2013.832260

Moon, B., Lee, N. M-H., & Bourdage, J. S. (2021). Personalized and socialized need for power: Distinct relations to employee traits and behaviors. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000279

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(6), 845–855. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.845

Mundfrom, D. J., Shaw, D. G., & Ke, T. L. (2005). Minimum sample size recommendations for conducting factor analyses. *International Journal of Testing, 5*(2), 159–168. https://doi:10.1207/s15327574ijt0502_4

National Center for O*NET Development. (2021, August 1). Find occupations. O*NET OnLine. https://www.onetonline.org/find/

National Retail Federation. (2017, June 22). *National retail security survey 2017*. NRF. https://cdn.nrf.com/sites/default/files/2018-10/NRSS-Industry-Research-Survey-2017.pdf

Ng, J. C. Y., Shao, I. Y. T., & Liu, Y. (2016). This is not what I wanted: The effect of avoidance coping strategy on non-work-related social media use at the workplace. *Employee Relations, 38*(4), 466-486.

Oh, I. S., Charlier, S. D., Mount, M. K., & Berry, C. M. (2014). The two faces of high self-monitors: Chameleonic moderating effects of self-monitoring on the relationships between personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*(1), 92-111. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1856

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books.

Paolacci, G., & Chandler, J. (2014). Inside the Turk: Understanding Mechanical Turk as a participant pool. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *23*(3), 184-188. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414531598

Peer, E., Vosgerau, J., & Acquisti, A. (2014). Reputation as a sufficient condition for data quality on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods*, *46*(4), 1023-1031. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0434-y

Pinder, C. C. (2008). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Psychology Press.

Pletzer, J., Oostrom, J., Bentvelzen, M., & de Vries, R. E. (2020). Comparing domain- and facet-level relations of the HEXACO personality model with workplace deviance: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 152*, 1-11.

Popovich, P. M., & Warren, M. A. (2010). The role of power in sexual harassment as a counterproductive behavior in organizations. *Human Resource Management Review, 20*(1), 45-53.

Porath, C & Pearson, C. (2013, February). The price of incivility. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2013/01/the-price-of-incivility

Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(6), 1306–1314.

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.

Robinson, S. L. (2008). Dysfunctional workplace behavior. In J. Barling. & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 141−159). Sage.

Runge, J. M., Lang, J. W., Zettler, I., & Lievens, F. (2020). Predicting counterproductive work behavior: Do implicit motives have incremental validity beyond explicit traits? *Journal of Research in Personality*, *89*, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2020.104019

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68–78. https://doi:10.1037/0003-066x.55.1.68

Shoss, M. K., Hunter, E. M., & Penney, L. M. (2016). Avoiding the issue: Disengagement coping style and the personality–CWB link. *Human Performance, 29*(2), 106–122. https://doi:10.1080/08959285.2016.1148036

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(3), 434-443.

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, *12*(2), 269-292. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00049-9

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector

(Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 151–174). American Psychological Association.

Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(3), 446–460. https://doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005

Șulea, C., Maricuțoiu, L., Pitariu, H. D., & Dumitru, C. Z. (2010). Predicting counterproductive work behaviors: A meta-analysis of their relationship with individual and situational factors. *Psihologia Resurselor Umane, 8*(1), 66–81. https://doi.org/10.24837/pru.v8i1.427

Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2009). *Getting even: The truth about workplace revenge--and how to stop it*. John Wiley & Sons.

Watkins, T., Fehr, R., & He, W. (2019). Whatever it takes: Leaders' perceptions of abusive supervision instrumentality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *30*(2), 260-272.

Yan, M., Xie, Y. P., Zhao, J., Zhang, Y. J., Bashir, M., & Liu, Y. (2020). How ingratiation links to counterproductive work behaviors: The roles of emotional exhaustion and power distance orientation. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 2238. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02238

Zhou, Z. E., Meier, L. L., & Spector, P. E. (2014). The role of personality and job stressors in predicting counterproductive work behavior: A three-way

interaction. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *22*(3), 286-296.

Appendix

Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C) (32-item)

Each item is scored on a Likert-style scale ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Every day*).1 (*Never*), 2 (*Once or Twice*), 3 (*Once or Twice per month*), 4 (*Once or twice per week*), 5 (*Every day*).

How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?

1. Purposely wasted your employer's materials/supplies.
2. Purposely did your work incorrectly.
3. Came to work late without permission.
4. Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you weren't.
5. Purposely damaged a piece of equipment or property.
6. Purposely dirtied or littered your place of work.
7. Stolen something belonging to your employer.
8. Started or continued a damaging or harmful rumor at work.
9. Been nasty or rude to a client or customer.
10. Purposely worked slowly when things needed to get done.
11. Taken a longer break than you were allowed to take.
12. Purposely failed to follow instructions.
13. Left work earlier than you were allowed to.
14. Insulted someone about their job performance.
15. Made fun of someone's personal life.
16. Took supplies or tools home without permission.
17. Put in to be paid for more hours than you worked.
18. Took money from your employer without permission.
19. Ignored someone at work.
20. Blamed someone at work for error you made.

21. Started an argument with someone at work.
22. Stole something belonging to someone at work.
23. Verbally abused someone at work.
24. Made an obscene gesture (the finger) to someone at work.
25. Threatened someone at work with violence.
26. Threatened someone at work, but not physically.
27. Said something obscene to someone at work to make them feel bad.
28. Did something to make someone at work look bad.
29. Played a mean prank to embarrass someone at work.
30. Looked at someone at work's private mail/property without permission.
31. Hit or pushed someone at work.
32. Insulted or made fun of someone at work.

Explicit Aggressive Beliefs and Attitudes Scale (Partial)

The scale uses a 7-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 *(Strongly disagree) to* 7 *(Strongly agree).* 1 (*Strongly disagree*), 2 (*Disagree*), 3 (*Somewhat disagree*), 4 (*Neither agree nor disagree*), 5 (*Somewhat agree*), 6 (*Agree*), 7 *(Strongly agree)*.

Retribution bias items

1. Getting back at others makes me feel better.
2. If someone disrespects me, I feel the need to get even.
3. People have the right to get revenge.
4. Revenge is sweet.
5. If I am betrayed then I have the right to retaliate.

Hostile attribution bias items

6. People gain others' trust to betray them.
7. Friendliness is often a disguise for hostile intentions.
8. People are motivated by a desire to harm others.
9. People make friends in order to use them to get ahead in life.
10. People give bad advice for personal gain.

Organizational Justice

Both distributive justice and procedural justice use a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*Very unfair*) to 5 (*Very fair*). 1 (*Very unfair*), 2 (*Unfair*), 3 (*Neither unfair nor fair*) or 3 (*Moderately fair*), 4 (*Fair*), 5 (*Very fair*).

Interactional justice uses a 5-point scale ranging from 1 *(Strongly disagree) to* 5 *(Strongly agree).* 1 (*Strongly disagree*), 2 (*Disagree*), 3 (*Neither agree nor disagree*), 4 (*Agree*), 5 *(Strongly agree)*.

Please indicate your opinion of which each question/statement regarding your workplace.

Distributive justice

How fairly has the organization been rewarding you…

1. for the amount of effort you have put in?
2. for the responsibilities you have?
3. for the work that you have done well?
4. for the stresses and strains of your job?
5. for the amount of education and training you received?

Procedural justice

How fairly are the organization's procedures designed to…

1. provide useful feedback regarding a company's decision and its implementation?
2. hear the concerns of everyone affected by a company's decision?
3. allow for requests for clarifications or additional information about a company's decision?
4. have all parties affected by a decision included in the decision-making process?
5. help you to collect accurate information for decision-making?
6. generate standards so that decisions can be made with consistency?

7. provide opportunities to appeal against or challenge a company's decision?

Interactional justice

1. My supervisor shows concern for my rights as an employee.
2. My supervisor treats me with kindness and consideration.
3. My supervisor takes steps to deal with me in a truthful manner.
4. My supervisor is able to suppress personal bias.
5. My supervisor considers my viewpoint.
6. My supervisor provides me with timely feedback about decisions and their implications.

Need for Power Scale

The scale uses a 5-point scale (1 = *Not at all*, 2 = *Slightly*, 3 = *Moderately*, 4 = *Very*, 5 = *Extremely*).

Please indicate the degree to which each statement is true or characteristic of you.

Personalized Need for Power

1. I wouldn't care what I am doing as long as I can get ahead in my job.
2. I desire to go down in history as a famous and powerful individual.
3. I want to have authority over others so I can tell them what to do whether they like it or not.
4. If I need to make others unhappy to move forward in life, then so be it.
5. I'd be willing to switch companies or jobs at a moment's notice if it could enhance my own career and status.
6. It is important to me that people know when I am the source of successful initiatives or ideas.
7. To achieve my personal goals, it is necessary to take advantage of other people.
8. It doesn't matter why people listen to me, as long as they do.
9. People can either respect or fear me, as long as they do what I say.

Socialized Need for Power

1. It is important to me that my ideas and opinions have a positive impact on others.
2. I need to feel like I can have a positive impact on the lives of those around me.
3. I am motivated to one day use my influence on others for the greater good.
4. It is important to me that my decisions will have a positive impact on others.

5. I want to be able to have the power to help others succeed.
6. I feel it is important to make major influential decisions based on the opinion of all my peers.
7. I want to have the power to ensure justice and equality are maintained for all.
8. I strive to be an influential person who can impact the greater good.
9. I want to become successful while making those around me successful as well.

Need to Belong

The scale uses a 5-point scale (1 = *Not at all*, 2 = *Slightly*, 3 = *Moderately*, 4 = *Very*, 5 = *Extremely*).

Please indicate the degree to which each statement is true or characteristic of you.

1. If other people don't seem to accept me, I don't let it bother me.
2. I try hard not to do things that will make other people avoid or reject me.
3. I seldom worry about whether other people care about me.
4. I need to feel that there are people I can turn to in times of need.
5. I want other people to accept me.
6. I do not like being alone.
7. Being apart from my friends for long periods of time does not bother me.
8. I have a strong "need to belong".
9. It bothers me a great deal when I am not included in other people's plans.
10. My feelings are easily hurt when I feel that others do not accept me.