



5-2004

Organizational Correlates of Negative Workplace Behavior: A Field Study

Graeme K. Mitchell
University of Tennessee - Knoxville

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mitchell, Graeme K., "Organizational Correlates of Negative Workplace Behavior: A Field Study. " Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 2004.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/2373

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Graeme K. Mitchell entitled "Organizational Correlates of Negative Workplace Behavior: A Field Study." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Psychology.

Eric Sundstrom, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

John Lounsbury, Rich Saudargas

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Graeme K. Mitchell entitled "Organizational Correlates of Negative Workplace Behavior: A Field Study." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Psychology.

Eric Sundstrom
Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

John Lounsbury

Rich Saudargas

Accepted for the Council:

Anne Mayhew
Vice Chancellor and
Dean of Graduate Studies

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

ORGANIZATIONAL CORRELATES OF NEGATIVE WORKPLACE BEHAVIOR: A
FIELD STUDY

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Graeme K. Mitchell

May 2004

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank all those who helped me in completing my Master of Arts in Psychology, particularly my wife, Jann, and children Gabrielle and Jake who have been extremely patient, generous and supportive of my endeavors to learn a “bit more”, often at their own expense. I also want to express my thanks to Drs. Sundstrom and Lounsbury for their guidance and help throughout my research work and also to Dr Lucy Gibson and Mark Pierce for providing support at important moments in the whole process. Thanks must also go to Dr. Saudargas for serving in my committee.

Abstract

This was a field study conducted in the entertainment industry in eastern Tennessee designed to investigate the relationship of perceived supervisor support and perceived pay equity with negative workplace behavior. Participants consisted of 171 employees of an entertainment company who completed a questionnaire with four scales, including one developed in this study. Results showed a significant, inverse correlation of perceived supervisor support and negative workplace behavior ($r = -0.45, p < .01$) and a significant correlation of pay inequity and negative workplace behavior ($r = 0.33, p < .01$) that demonstrated the negative consequences of perceived inequity or maltreatment. The correlations of perceived supervisor support and organization citizenship behavior ($r = 0.48, p < .01$), and pay equity and organization citizenship behavior ($r = 0.23, p < .01$) suggested that perceived pay equity or supervisor support led to behaviors that helped the organization. No relationship was found between the type of negative workplace behavior people engaged in and perceived pay equity, however, perceived supervisor support was inversely correlated with “withdrawal” ($r = -0.31, p < .01$). Perceived supervisor support had a very strong relationship with the LBDQ-XII factor “consideration”. Previous research has suggested people engage in negative workplace behaviors because they see inequities in their compensation or treatment at work, and this behavior was an attempt to restore equity. Future research should consider whether specific organizational factors predict discrete types of negative workplace behavior, what the impact of senior leader decision-making is on workplace behavior, whether one or many factors precipitate workplace behavior and whether organizational citizenship behavior and negative workplace behaviors are opposing or independent constructs.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Related Research & Theory	1
Gap in Current Knowledge	13
Hypotheses	15
II. STUDY I – Development of Measures	16
Purpose	16
Method	16
Discussion	19
III. STUDY II – Empirical Test of Hypotheses	20
Purpose	20
Method	20
Results Study II	28
IV. DISCUSSION	32
Summary of Results	32
Contribution to Current Knowledge	33
Implications for Theory and Application	38
Limitations	46
Conclusion	48
REFERENCES	50
APPENDICES	59
Appendix 1 - Research Script	60
Appendix 2 – Study II Research Letter & Questionnaire	61
Appendix 3 - Study 1 Research Letter & Questionnaire	66
VITA	71

List of Tables

No.	Title	Page No.
1	Study I Principal Components Analysis of Negative Workplace Behaviors with Varimax Rotation	18
2	Study II Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations & Scale Reliabilities	29
3	Study II - Correlations, Standard Deviations, Means & Reliability Coefficients for NWB & OCB Factors	35
4	Study II - Gilford-Fruchter Calculation of Difference between Correlations	38

I. Introduction

Negative, hostile, difficult, hindrances, obstinate and contrary are some words that could be used to describe behaviors in the workplace that are designed to obstruct an organization or its employees in achieving their goals and objectives. In academia these behaviors might go by names such as antisocial, deviant, counterproductive, dysfunctional or aggressive; they have become of increasing interest to scholars and organizations in the past ten years with much effort being invested in understanding their breadth, frameworks that may help to explain and understand them and variables that may help to predict them. On the other hand discretionary employee behaviors such as helping, peacekeeping, sportsmanship and civic virtue, termed organization citizenship or prosocial behaviors, have also become a focal point of research. They have created interest because they are perceived as behaviors that reduce organizational friction and increase efficiency but will not be found in a formal role description.

The current study is designed to investigate workplace behavior in terms of pay equity which to date has only been studied in terms of workplace aggression, retaliation and theft, and perceived supervisor support which has not yet been linked to workplace behavior.

Related Research & Theory

Negative Workplace Behavior

Prior to 1990 research on this “darker side” of workplace behavior addressed issues such as theft, sabotage, fraud, sexual harassment, physical violence or vandalism (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998). The study of the more obscure and potentially damaging workplace behaviors (Baron & Neuman, 1996) really only began around 1990 (O’Leary,

Duffy and Griffin, 2000). Even though this research has been underway for over a decade work still appears quite disparate resulting in a lack of common terminology, common definitions (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998) and an overlap of actual behaviors from one construct to another. Indeed the emphasis of most negative workplace behavior research to date has been on clarifying constructs and developing frameworks (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998; O’Leary, Duffy & Griffin, 2000; Bennett & Robinson, 1995; Collins & Griffin, 1998; Griffin, O’Leary & Collins, 1998). Predictors of such behavior have been of secondary concern.

The term negative workplace behavior (NWB) is one used by Skarlicki and Folger (1997) in describing the set of behaviors (as described above) that emerged as a counterpart to organization citizenship behavior (OCB) – they are also referred to as anti-citizenship or negative workplace behaviors. For the sake of simplicity this study will use the term negative workplace behavior to reflect aspects of antisocial behavior, workplace deviance, employee retaliation, sabotage, aggression and counterproductive behavior.

Attempts to underpin models of negative workplace behavior using existing psychological theory has led researchers to develop predictors focused on the individual acting within an organizational context. Some theoretical positions as to why negative workplace behaviors occur include that they are learned and imitated (Giacalone, Riordan and Rosenfeld, 1997; O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin and Glew, 1996), are part of the human condition (Martinko & Zellars (1997), are a consequence of attribution following psychological discomfort (Martinko & Zellars (1997), are a consequence of goal achievement because of self-interest and/or are due to individual differences or

personality (Collins and Griffin, 1997). There is limited research that considers the organization as the origin of negative workplace behaviors.

In terms of categorizing negative behaviors, keynote researchers such as Robinson & Greenberg (1998), O'Leary, Duffy & Griffin (2000) have proposed that antisocial behaviors belong to specific behavioral domains or constructs such as workplace aggression, antisocial behavior, workplace deviance, workplace revenge, organizational misbehavior, organizational vice, organization-motivated aggression, non-compliant behavior, counterproductive behavior and organizational retaliatory behavior. They elaborated on these constructs through the creation of frameworks, processes, dimensions and definitions that encompass behaviors from the violent, observable and criminal at one extreme to the non-violent, covert and interpersonal at the other (Collins & Griffin, 1997).

Negative workplace behaviors have been categorized along the following dimensions - passive/indirect, verbal/physical and/or indirect/direct (Buss, 1961); violent/non-violent (Baron & Neuman, 1996); overt/covert (Collins & Griffin, 1997; Baron & Neuman, 1996); dispositional or environmental (O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin and Glew, 1996); intentional/unintentional (O'Leary-Kelly, Duffy & Griffin, 2000; Griffin, O'Leary-Kelly & Collins, 1998); targeted/random (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998); individual / social / organizational (Robinson & Greenberg (1998); harmful/beneficial (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998); attempted/completed (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994 in O'Leary-Kelly, Duffy & Griffin, 2000); criminal/non-criminal (Baron & Neuman, 1996) and functional/dysfunctional (Griffin, O'Leary-Kelly & Collins, 1998).

The definition of negative workplace behavior for the purpose of this study is “a response by an employee to an act by an organization, intended to harm it and/or its member(s) and violate organizational norms”.

This definition is founded on constructs referred to earlier that have common underlying themes. For example violating organizational norms is a feature of workplace deviance, organizational misbehavior and counterproductive job performance. Threatening harm (such as physical / psychological injury, criminal / non-criminal or destructive activity), negative consequences or well-being are common to workplace deviance, workplace aggression, organization-motivated aggression, organizational retaliatory behavior, counterproductive job performance and antisocial behavior. The perpetrators or targets of negative workplace behavior include current or former employees, stakeholders, the organization and/or the general public. In all but one definition (organizational vice) intention is a significant factor especially when there is an intention to punish (organizational retaliatory behavior). Finally, the motivation for negative workplace behavior is said to be a response to something in the organizational context such as perceived unfairness (Greenberg, 1990).

Antecedents to Negative Workplace Behavior

Identifying antecedents to antisocial workplace behaviors has been incidental to efforts of theory building in papers and research completed to date. As an example Robinson & Greenberg (1998) identified three determinants of workplace deviance i.e. individual factors (personality), social / interpersonal factors and organizational factors. Of the work that has been done, it has fallen one of two ways; that to do with the individual in an organizational context or setting and that originating from within the

organization. In relation to the individual, predictors have been either personality or cognitively based e.g. Collins & Griffin (1997) suggested variables such as self-control, extraversion and neuroticism, and cognitive abilities were useful predictors of counterproductive job performance. Giacalone, Riordan, & Rosenfeld (1997) suggested that triggers for sabotage could include modeling behavior and emotional state. O'Leary-Kelly (1996) suggested that they may include modeling, aversive treatment and incentive. Lee and Allen (2002) determined that affect (hostility) and job cognitions were equally important in predicting workplace deviance. Giacalone et al (1997) and O'Leary-Kelly (1996) recognized the importance of environmental cues and Boye and Jones (1997) considered the effects of economic circumstances such as prices and interest rates on counterproductive behavior.

Klein, Leong & Silva (1996) reviewed the role of organizational factors as they related to antisocial behavior - they suggested that job design, skill variety, task autonomy, equity, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and social informational processing were all possible explanations for sabotage in the workplace.

Other researchers considered the role of organizational justice in triggering antisocial workplace behavior. Lind (1997) proposed that relational justice (i.e. the relation the individual has with their organization) explained what motivated people to view their treatment as unfair. He said people made judgments based on the nuances of the interpersonal process they shared with the organization's leaders –specifically, status recognition, trust in benevolence (i.e. those in authority were well-intentioned and honest in the decision-making process) and neutrality (decisions were based on facts, not cronyism or personality). It is clear that other forms of organizational justice have been

linked to antisocial behavior as well – refer to the later discussion on “Pay Equity” in which procedural as well as distributive justice is discussed.

The literature review revealed several studies that identified specific organizationally-based predictors of negative workplace behaviors. The first was a case study by Landau (1993) who found that organizational change when related to self-identity was a predictor of sabotage; Lind (1997) also considered the issue of social self-identity to be important as a worker’s identity was attached to the organization they worked for.

Baron and Neuman (1996, 1997) using the Buss (1961) model of aggression (physical/verbal, direct/indirect and passive/active dimensions) found that workplace aggression was manifested through verbal and passive behaviors when downsizing, pay cuts and diversity were the predictor variables, and that non-violent forms of aggression (verbal, indirect and passive) were more prevalent in the workplace than violent.

In a study of organizational justice Skarlicki and Folger (1997) made the case that if employees who deemed organizational decisions or managerial actions as being unfair, then they may try to elicit retribution. Their study found that retaliatory behavior in response to distributive injustice (inequity) was only undertaken in the absence of procedural and interactional justice i.e. when the organization didn’t discuss the reasons for the perceived unfairness and didn’t have procedures in place to deal with it then the employee may have been tempted to engage in retaliation.

Similarly, Greenberg (1990, 1996 & 1997) found that theft was related to workers’ perceptions of pay equity such that if the perception was one of inequity, then one response to this was to engage in theft to create balance between the employee and the

source of the inequity. Thus when an employee perceives imbalance or unfair treatment it can be expected that he/she will try to restore the situation to its previous state or make some sort of retaliatory response. To the extent that these reactions involve acts against the organization (or its representatives), pay equity and perceived supervisor support should be inversely related to negative workplace behaviors.

Hypothesis 1: Negative workplace behaviors correlate inversely with pay equity and perceived supervisor support.

Organization Citizenship Behavior

Barnard (1938) and later Katz (1964) recognized that organizations depended upon acts of cooperation to function effectively (LePine, Erez & Johnson, 2002). Organ (Organ, 1988; Organ, Smith & Near, 1983) labeled these acts as "organization citizenship behaviors" (OCB) comprising the behavioral dimensions of altruism, conscientiousness (generalized compliance), sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue. He noted that these acts were discretionary and seldom rewarded by the organization. Organ (1997) defined OCBs as "the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance". The explanation as to why people engaged in OCB was that it was a way of repaying benefits previously received from the organization (Soulén, 2003).

In 2002 Le Pine et al conducted a meta-analysis of OCBs and concluded that the Organ's five dimensions framework and the measures developed by Podsakoff based on this framework, have become the yardstick by which most OCB research has been conducted. Despite this, LePine's work drew into question whether Organ's five

dimensions were in fact separate constructs in themselves, or whether they reflected one latent construct. He concluded by saying that evidence existed that supported the latent definition of OCB, but researchers needed to be explicit in their definition of OCB to ensure that measurement was consistent with their definition.

To that end this study will use the definition and measurement scales from Podsakoff's 1997 research into OCB and work group performance. In this study, Podsakoff et al (1997) used three of Organ's five OCB dimensions, i.e. helping, civic virtue and sportsmanship. They defined helping as comprising altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy and some aspect of cheerleading (encouraging behavior); civic virtue was defined as behavior indicating that an employee participates in, and was concerned about, the life of the company; sportsmanship was seen as a "willingness on the part of the employee to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without "complaining" ... railing against real or imagined slights, and making federal cases out of small potatoes" (Podsakoff, pp263, 1997). Their view was that OCBs enhanced organizational performance because they lubricated the social machinery of the organization, reduced friction and increased efficiency.

Antecedents to Organization Citizenship Behavior

In their meta-analysis of OCB research, LePine at al's (2002) concluded that satisfaction, commitment, leader support, fairness and conscientiousness were the most often used predictors in research to date, and these had equivalently significant relationships with Organ's five OCB dimensions.

Aquino's (1995) research into OCBs (altruism and compliance) and pay inequity revealed that pay inequity induced people to withhold citizenship behavior in order to

balance the calculus of social exchange. However, Schnake et al (1995) experienced indifferent outcomes finding that it was only on the “civic virtue” dimension that perceived equity contributed a small amount of explained variance. The present study will re-visit the relationship between pay equity and OCBs using Podsakoff’s three dimension scale.

Another predictor of OCB that has attracted limited researched is supervisor behavior. Research to date has canvassed aspects of supervisor behavior such as fairness and feedback, and in one particular case, abusiveness (Zellars, Tepper & Duffy, 2002). Reis in his doctoral paper (2002) concluded that “specific supervisor behaviors can potentially influence employee behaviors and lead to desirable organizational outcomes”. He was referring to the finding that beneficial feedback was related to perceptions of supervisor fairness, and these perceptions in turn were related to the OCB dimension of altruism. In earlier research Deluga (1994) found that perceived fairness emerged as the supervisor trust building behavior most closely associated with OCB. One predictor not studied was the construct called perceived supervisor support, as referred to in Eisenberger’s (2002) research into perceived organization support.

To the extent that employees engage in organization citizenship behaviors as a means of repaying their employer, it could be expected that OCB would correlate positively with pay equity and with perceived supervisor support.

Hypothesis 2: Organization citizenship behaviors correlate positively with a) pay equity, and b) perceived supervisor support.

Pay Equity

Pay equity has been the subject of much research since Adams' 1965 paper on equity theory which stated that those who feel inequitably underpaid may respond by attempting to raise the level of their rewards. He also said that people do not just become dissatisfied with injustice but react in some way e.g. when someone was under-rewarded they would be motivated to rid themselves of that feeling, possibly through anger (Summers & DeNisi, 1990) or a desire to punish the harm-doer (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Martin & Peterson (1987) noted that perceptions of equitable pay played an important role in defining attitudes and behavior.

Greenberg (1990, 1996 and 1997) explained theft and aggression as responses to perceived unfairness due to inequitable underpayment (distributive justice). He proposed that employee theft was a form of equity restoration (i.e. adjusting the balance of valued resources between the worker and the specific source of the inequity). He also linked affect and pay inequity by interpreting theft as the consequence of feelings of resentment and frustration which in turn motivated the aggressive act of theft. He called these "acts of deviance" which had been encouraged by people's belief that their employer had defaulted on their obligation to them by reducing their pay. Greenberg suggested that his study (1990) raised questions about the different modes used to reduce inequity - theft was one, but there were others.

Skarlicki and Folger (1997) found that distributive, procedural, and interactional justice could predict organizational retaliation behavior i.e. adverse reactions to perceived unfairness by disgruntled employees toward their employer. Sabotage was found to be the most common response to injustice out of five sources suggested in a study by

Ambrose, Seabright and Schminke (2002). They defined sabotage as behavior that was intended to damage, disrupt or subvert an organization's operations for the personal purposes of the saboteur. When the source of injustice was distributive they found that the individual was more inclined to engage in sabotage to restore equity.

The literature has shown that the basis for engaging in negative workplace behavior has primarily been the desire for equity restoration. However, evidence has emerged that shows when pay inequity is involved it is likely that the act of equity restoration will also involve acts intended to cause harm. This has led to the third hypothesis that perceived pay inequity (PPE) will have a stronger, inverse relationship with acts involving intentional harm, than those that do not.

Hypothesis 3: The inverse relationship between behaviors involving intentional harm to people or property and perceived pay equity will be stronger than the inverse relationship between withdrawal behaviors and perceived pay equity.

Perceived Supervisor Support

Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002) in a review of the literature of perceived organizational support considered perceived supervisor support as one of three general forms of perceived favorable treatment from an organization. Perceived supervisor support (PSS) has been referred to as the degree to which a supervisor values an employee and cares about their well-being (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Kottke and Shafarinski (1988) developed the concept of perceived supervisor support and a scale to measure it; they reasoned that employees differentiated support from the organization in distinction to support from their supervisor - moreover employees valued feedback about their work from those closest to them viz. their supervisor. They developed general views

about the degree to which their supervisor valued their contribution and cared about their well-being, apart from the obvious influence that their supervisor had in helping form the organization's view of them (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

There is an absence of studies directly addressing a link between PSS and negative workplace behaviors. Most studies have concentrated on the positive effects of supervisor support as related to perceived organizational support and organizational commitment, while others have incidentally addressed the consequences of low PSS. One of these suggested that a behavior like turnover may positively relate to low PSS (Eisenberger et al, 2002), while another presented evidence that certain cases of high perceived organizational support are linked to lower levels of absenteeism (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson & Sowa, 1986). Given that absenteeism and turnover are examples of removal from an unsatisfactory work situation, it could be expected that withdrawal behaviors involving other acts in which individuals attempt to remove themselves from would be positively related to low perceived supervisor support.

Hypothesis 4: Negative workplace behaviors involving withdrawal behaviors correlate positively with low perceived supervisor support

“Consideration” and Perceived Supervisor Support

PSS addresses supervisor behavioral issues such as the care and well-being of his/her employees and whether their contribution is valued. This is similar to an aspect of leadership behavior sometimes referred to as “consideration” developed by the Ohio State Leadership studies in the 1950s (Schriesheim & Stogdill, 1975). The instrument they developed was called the LBDQ-XII and had four factors in it, one being called “consideration”; the items used to measure “consideration” were not too dissimilar to

those used to measure PSS (although configured somewhat differently). In a study about the effects of leader behavior and gender on perceptions of organizational support, Hutchinson, Valentino and Kirkner (1998) amongst other things found a significant relationship between “consideration” and organizational support. It makes some sense that PSS may be an aspect of leadership behavior. Therefore, another hypothesis will be included to test whether a relationship exists between these supervisor support and “consideration”.

Hypothesis 5: Perceived supervisor support correlates positively with “consideration”.

Gap in Current Knowledge

Research into negative workplace behaviors has covered a broad expanse from the violent to non-violent, criminal to non-criminal and overt to the more covert behaviors. Research (to date) into organizational factors as antecedents to negative workplace behaviors has been limited to organizational justice theory, Baron and Neuman’s (1996) studies on diversity and organizational change as predictors of workplace aggression and Greenberg’s work on pay equity and theft (1990, 1996 and 1997). There has been no direct research into whether perceived supervisor support is an antecedent to negative workplace behaviors.

There are numerous potential sources or catalysts originating from within any organization that could lead to negative behavior in the workplace. This study, however, will focus on two; pay inequity and perceived supervisor support. Its purpose being to test whether workers who perceive a lack of supervisor support, or experience pay inequity, react to their circumstances by acting out in antisocial ways.

On the other side of the coin, research into organizationally-based antecedents of OCB has been more extensive, but has not canvassed perceived supervisor support and has produced mixed results regarding pay equity. Thus a second objective of this study will be to examine the relationship between OCBs and pay equity and perceived supervisor support.

An opportunity that arises from this study is to investigate whether any specific categories of negative workplace activities correlate more with one predictor variable than the other. Based on Greenberg's comments about theft as an aggressive act designed to restore equity, Skarlicki and Folgers's view that distributive injustice could predict organizational retaliation and Ambrose *et al* (2002) findings that sabotage was also a response to distributive injustice, it could be expected that pay inequity may be more strongly related to acts initiated to cause intentional harm to people or property, than to retreating or removal type behaviors

Eisenberger (2002) suggested that low perceived supervisor support bears some relationship to withdrawal behaviors such as tardiness, turnover or absenteeism. It could be expected that low PSS may result in other passive behaviors such as lateness or removing oneself from the workplace.

As mentioned earlier the LBDQ-XII factor "*consideration*" on the surface appears to be similar to Eisenberger's PSS construct in this current study, but it is not a relationship that has been previously investigated therefore, a fifth hypothesis has been included to test whether such a relationship exists.

Hypotheses

H1: *Negative workplace behaviors correlate inversely with a) pay equity and b) perceived supervisor support.*

H2: *Organization citizenship behaviors correlate positively with a) pay equity, and b) perceived supervisor support.*

H3: *The inverse relationship between behaviors involving intentional harm to people or property and perceived pay equity will be stronger than the inverse relationship between withdrawal behaviors and perceived pay equity.*

H4: *Negative workplace behaviors involving withdrawal behaviors correlate positively with low perceived supervisor support.*

H5: *Perceived supervisor support correlates positively with “consideration”.*

II. Study 1 – Development of Measures

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to develop items for a scale that would measure negative behaviors in the workplace. This required crystallizing the items and underlying factors from scales developed in earlier research to measure this construct (Folger & Skarlicki, 1997; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Baron & Neuman, 1996; Raelin, 1994; Landau, 1993; Collins & Griffin, 1997; Duffy, Ganster & Pagon, 2002; DiBattista, 1996; Neuman & Baron, 1997).

Method

This was a field study of currently enrolled full-time students at a tertiary institution using a 100-item questionnaire. The measured variable was negative workplace behavior and the questionnaire was designed to elicit participants' past observations of colleagues' behavior based on the participant's work experience.

One hundred and two (102) negative organization behaviors were identified from previous research into antisocial workplace behaviors. In order to substantiate that these behaviors were authentic in the workplace i.e. they had been observed or known to occur at work, ten business/human resource professionals who previously had people accountability were asked to verify that they at some time had observed these behaviors at work. Only two items were removed as a result of this process, bringing the total items for the study to 100.

Participants & Procedures

The revised negative organization behavior scale was administered to a population of 173 undergraduate students at a college in southeastern USA. Demographic information was not collected for this first study. For each behavior and based on their own prior work history, participants were asked the extent to which they had observed others engage in such behaviors (peer reporting). The purpose in asking for their

observations of negative workplace behaviors was to encourage participation without placing individuals in the difficult position of declaring that they had engaged in such behaviors themselves. This technique was used by Skarlicki & Folger (1997) as a reliable and valid measure of people's behavior (McEvoy and Buller, 1987). No identifying information was asked of participants thereby assuring their anonymity. A five point Likert scale was adapted from Robinson & Bennett's (1995) study on workplace deviance; the anchored points were changed to 1= never; 2=once a twice per month; 3= every month or two; 4=more than once a month; 5= daily. A coefficient alpha of .95 was recorded for the 100 item scale.

Results

Results were analyzed using principal components analysis with varimax rotation. Four underlying factors were identified that accounted for 54.43% of total explained variance. These factors have been called victimization (targeting of individuals), withdrawal (behaviors in which the individuals remove themselves from a work situation), sabotage (acts that damage/intend to damage property, equipment or processes) and targeting the organization (behaviors designed to harm the organization). Of the 100 items from the original scale 49 were removed due to low factor loading ($<.400$) or cross-loadings (loadings $>.400$ across two or more factors). A further 20 items were removed due to high within- factor correlations or because the item did not fit within the conceptual domain of that factor e.g. "accept kickbacks" was not consistent with Factor 1 which focused on behavior designed to victimize individuals. This left 31 items which are listed in Table 1 below along with their factor loadings. Alpha coefficients for each factor were "Victimization" - 0.92; "Withdrawal" - 0.89; "Sabotage" - 0.80 and "Targeting the Organization" - 0.80.

Table 1

Study I - Principal Components Analysis of Negative Workplace Behaviors with Varimax Rotation

Item (Note: participant's observation of this behavior)	Victimiza- tion	Withdr- awal	Sabotage	Targeting Org'n
Let another employee know they don't like them, or something about them	.779			
Give a coworker the silent treatment	.753			
Undermine a coworker's effort to be successful in his/her job	.731			
Talk down to a coworker or act in a condescending way	.721			
Purposefully leave a work area when a certain coworker enters	.705			
Fail to defend another employee when people speak poorly of him/her	.656			
Blame coworkers for mistakes	.610			
Criticize the way another employee handles things in a way that is not helpful	.606			
Delay work to other employees to make them look bad or slow them down	.577			
Play a mean prank on someone at work	.501			
Take extended breaks		.753		
Spend time on personal matters while at work		.739		
Talk with coworkers instead of working		.657		
Spend too much time daydreaming instead of working.		.640		
Come in late to work, or leave early, without permission		.629		
Leave his/her work for someone else to finish		.619		
Take time off from work without just cause		.581		
Self create "down time"		.506		
Endanger coworkers by reckless behavior			.729	
Intentionally damage equipment or work process			.705	
Steal or destroy the property of another employee			.689	
Fail to take steps that would protect another's welfare or safety			.634	
Damage someone else's work			.621	
Intentionally make errors			.600	
Allow defective parts to pass inspection			.593	
Call up the union to intervene				.817
Call the OSHA representative as a scare tactic				.741
Reveal secret information to competitors				.735
Falsify/alter information on company records				.630
Set up the foreperson/manager to get him/her into trouble				.445
Eigenvalue	18.988	3.289	2.838	2.644
Percentage of variance	37.231	6.449	5.565	5.185
Cumulative percentage of variance	37.231	43.680	49.245	54.430

Note: A coefficient alpha of .93 was recorded for the complete scale

Discussion

This study was designed to develop a measure of negative behaviors in the workplace. The results that four factors accounted for the total explained variance, reaffirmed earlier research that negative workplace behaviors, amongst other things, involved the intention to cause harm to an organization and/or its people. It also showed that withdrawal from working (whilst still at work) was an additional action that could be taken to redress perceived inequity or maltreatment. These results were sufficient to justify construction of a scale of negative workplace behaviors to be used in the ensuing study designed to test the hypotheses outlined in Chapter 1.

III. Study II – Empirical Test of Hypotheses

Purpose

The purpose of this field study was to test four hypotheses about the relationship between workplace behavior and two predictors viz. perceived pay equity and perceived supervisor support. An additional hypothesis was to be tested regarding the relationship between perceived supervisor support and the “consideration” factor from the LBDQ-XII.

Method

Research Design

This was a field study of currently employed workers from one organization, an entertainment business, using a questionnaire incorporating measures of negative workplace behaviors, organization citizenship behaviors, perceived supervisor support and perceived pay equity.

Participants

The population for this field study comprised 171 non-management employees working for a company in the entertainment industry based in East Tennessee. Participants typically worked in blue-collar maintenance jobs, ticket booth or games jobs, customer relations, crafts or entertainment. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 78 with a mean age of 53.3 years. There was a preponderance of retired people either locally based or itinerants who did this work to supplement their retirement income, or to continue to engage in meaningful work within their community. Of the 167 who completed gender information, 39.5% were male and 60.5% female. The average company tenure was 5.4 years (for both seasonal and permanent employees) and ranged from a few months to 22 years.

Setting

The nature of this Company's business was providing entertainment with a distinctly local flavor to it. It was located on over 100 acres in an important tourist destination in the eastern USA. The clientele comprised both local residents and itinerants but was aimed at attracting tourists from over all the USA. The workforce was essentially seasonal with the core or permanent workforce numbering around 350 (mainly in maintenance, administration, sales or managerial roles). During "season" (e.g. spring, summer, fall or the Thanksgiving to Christmas period) this number would be inflated to 2,000 people. At the time of data collection it was approximately 1,600. In this study 17% were permanent employees and 83% were seasonal.

Discussions held with the Personnel Director identified the optimum time to speak to employees as being at shift change. The Company made an outside area available in which the researcher approached employees to participate in the research. (see Appendix 1 for Script).

Procedures

The company advertised the research in their monthly magazine, which was distributed to all employees on the Friday before the data collection began the following week. Participation was gained by approaching employees about the research as they were entering the workplace to commence work and/or when they left the premises upon completing work. Those willing to participate were provided with the option of completing the questionnaire at that time or completing it later in the day or overnight (in which case they returned it the next day). All completed questionnaires were placed in a secured box either where the researcher was working or in the Personnel Office. Data

was collected over two periods of two days, ten days apart. All completed questionnaires were collected in a two week period from commencement of the data collection process. A preliminary report based on descriptive statistics was provided to the Company within two weeks of data collection and a second report based on a full statistical analysis was presented within three months of the first. Given the random and anonymous nature of the data collection method, individual feedback was not possible. The Company reserved the right to provide aggregated feedback.

Participants were provided with an incentive to participate in the form of a draw for a cash prize or an Australian hat. They filled their name in on a separate slip after handing in their completed questionnaire. The draw was conducted by the Personnel Department. Of 553 questionnaires that were handed out, 171 completed questionnaires were returned, providing a return rate of 30.5%.

Measures

Four scales were used in this questionnaire to measure levels of negative workplace and organization citizenship behavior, perceived supervisor support and pay equity. The negative workplace behavior scale was developed within this study while the organization citizenship behavior, perceived supervisor support and pay equity scales were adapted from existing measures. For purposes of consistency and ease of understanding, all scales were constructed as five point Likert scales with “1” equating to the strongest negative response moving to “5” which equated to the strongest positive response. Furthermore, some items were reworded for consistency thereby ensuring overall coherence of the questionnaire for participants.

Negative Workplace Behavior Scale

As reported earlier this scale was developed based on earlier research into antisocial workplace behaviors – it resulted in one hundred negative workplace behaviors being identified and used in the first study. A coefficient alpha of .95 was reported from that study for all 100 items. Following factor analysis 31 items were left representing four factors - 30 were used in the final scale following a request by the Company to remove one. A coefficient alpha of .93 was reported for the 30 item scale based on the first study.

The revised scale was administered to all participants and the response format for this measure was a 5-point Likert scale (1= never; 2=once or twice per year; 3=every month or two; 4=more than once a month; 5=weekly). Sample items included:

“I have seen (or know) others at work who ...
 ...let another employee know they didn't like them, or something about them.
 ... take extended breaks
 ...endanger coworkers by reckless behavior
 ...allow defective parts to pass inspection”

Organization Citizenship Behavior Scale

The items in this scale were adapted from Podsakoff et al's (1997) organizational citizenship behavior scale – all 13 items have been included. Podsakoff reported Cronbach alpha reliabilities for the following factors in his scale - .95 for “helping”, .96 for “Civic Virtue” and .88 for “Sportsmanship”.

The revised scale was administered to all participants and the response format for this measure was a 5-point Likert scale (1= never; 2=once or twice per year; 3=every month or two; 4=more than once a month; 5=weekly). Sample items included:

“I have seen (or know) others at work who ...

- ...help out if someone falls behind in their work
- ...willingly share their expertise with coworkers.
- ...“touch base” with coworkers before initiating actions that might affect them.
- ... encourage others when they are down”.

Perceived Supervisor Support Scale

The perceived supervisor support scale was adapted from measures used in previous studies of perceived organizational / supervisor support. Specifically eight items used by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson and Sowa (1986), four of which were also used by Rhoades, Eisenberger and Armeli (2001), have been adopted for the current scale based on high factor loadings between 0.66 and 0.84. This scale has been demonstrated to be reliable with a coefficient alpha of .90 (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli & Lynch, 1997).

A further six items were adapted from the LBDQ-XII (Schriesheim & Stogdill, 1975) but were modified with “My supervisor” substituting for “He/she”. These items were from the “Consideration” factor and had factor loadings in the Schriesheim & Stogdill (1975) study of between 0.47 & 0.65. Kuder-Richardson 8 reliabilities were reported at .898 for “Consideration”.

The modified scale was administered to all participants and the response format for this measure was a 5-point Likert scale (1= never; 2=seldom; 3=occasionally; 4=often; 5=always). Sample items included:

1. My supervisor would forgive an honest mistake on my part.
2. Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem
3. My supervisor is friendly and approachable
4. My supervisor looks out for the personal welfare of group members.

Pay Equity Scale

The perceived pay equity scale comprised 12 items from scales previously used in the study of pay equity and pay satisfaction. Research into pay equity has addressed the referents used by people to make judgments about equity. For example, Summers & DeNisi (1990) found that some referents people used included themselves in terms of pay from their previous jobs, or others in the same company and also friends, neighbors, peers and other organizations. They reported a coefficient alpha of .87 for this scale.

Martin & Peterson's (1987) work gave similar results but were a little more specific i.e. comparison to people holding the same or different positions in their, or other organizations; how well their pay met their needs; current pay level relative to their pay history and the structural / administrative aspects of an organization's pay plan. They reported a coefficient alpha of .73 on this scale. The scale response format administered to all participants was 1 = too low; 2 = somewhat too low; 3 = about right; 4 = somewhat too high; 5 = too high. Sample items included:

1. How do you perceive the fairness of your pay compared to the pay of other people doing the same kind of work?
2. How do you perceive the fairness of your pay compared to others working in your department?
3. How do you perceive the fairness of your pay compared to others in your company?
4. How do you perceive the fairness of your pay compared to others in other companies?

A note should be made here that although this scale measured pay equity, based on Greenberg's measures of this variable in his study on employee theft (Greenberg, pp 566, 1990), this type of scale is dichotomous i.e. pay inequity is indicated at one extreme and

pay equity at the other. The wording used in this scale is similar to that in Greenberg's scale; e.g. "How fairly do you feel you are currently paid on your job?" and "How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to?" (Current study)

Variables

Negative Workplace Behavior was defined as a response by an employee to an act by an organization, intended to harm it and/or its member(s) and violated organizational norms. It was measured using the 30 item Negative Workplace Behavior scale developed within the study. The scale was demonstrated to be reliable with a coefficient alpha of .94. Responses were scored from 1 to 5, with a maximum averaged score of 5 representing the highest level of observed negative workplace behavior and a minimum averaged score of 1. Participants' scores ranged from 1.0 to 4.67 with a mean of 2.07.

Organization Citizenship Behavior was defined as discretionary behavior that promoted the effective functioning of the organization (Podsakoff, 1997). It was measured using Podsakoff's (1997) 13 item Organizational Citizenship Behavior scale. The scale was demonstrated to be reliable with a coefficient alpha of .78. Responses were scored from 1 to 5, with a maximum averaged score of 5 representing the highest level of observed positive workplace behavior and a minimum averaged score of 1. Participants' scores ranged from 1.38 to 5.0 with a mean of 3.37.

Perceived Supervisor support was defined as the degree to which a supervisor valued employees and cared about their well-being. It was measured using Eisenberger et al's (1986) 8-item Perceived Supervisor Support scale and 6 items from the "consideration" factor in the LBDQ-XII. The scale was demonstrated to be reliable with a coefficient

alpha of .96. Responses were scored from 1 to 5, with a maximum averaged score of 5 representing the highest level of perceived supervisor support and a minimum averaged score of 1. Participants' scores ranged from 1.29 to 5.0 with a mean of 3.93.

Pay Equity was defined as the perception that one was equitably paid or inequitably underpaid. It was measured using the combined Summers and DeNisi 9-item pay equity scale (1990) and the 3-item Martin and Peterson pay equity scale (1987). The scale was demonstrated to be reliable with a coefficient alpha of .95. Responses were scored from 1 to 5, with a maximum averaged score of 5 representing the highest level of observed pay inequity and a minimum averaged score of 1. Participants' scores ranged from 1.0 to 4.0 with a mean of 2.14.

Data Treatment

As part of the analysis several adjustments were made to the data to enable sound and coherent interpretation. These included:

1. Several items were reverse-scored in the PSS and OCB scales (see Appendix 2).
2. Missing values were replaced with the item mean in each scale, as long as the participant had answered 75% of the items in the relevant scale. This was applied to all variables.
3. Variable scores were calculated in order to obtain an overall mean for each participant on each scale.
4. On the NWB scale inter-item correlations were calculated to identify items that were possibly measuring the same element. Although six relationships were found above 0.6, it was decided to keep these items as they reinforced others in the scale.

5. Coefficient alpha for the fourth factor (targeting the organization) in the NWB scale in Study II was 0.63 compared to 0.80 in Study 1. The difference was believed to be partly due to dropping the item that measured Union contact.
6. Ten cases (out of 171) were dropped as they were identified on scatter plots as being outliers that had been biasing results. On investigating the raw data it was found that the responses for these cases were at extremes across all scales.
7. The variable “harm”, representing the intention to harm people or property, was created by adding together items from the “victim, sabotage and targeting the organization” factors.
8. To properly test Hypothesis 5 perceived supervisor support was measured using the items from Eisenberger’s 8-item scale (1986), as distinct from the scale used to measure PSS in the remainder of the study (the latter used both Eisenberger’s 8-item scale and 6 items representing the LBDQ-XII “consideration” factor).

Results Study II

Data Analysis

All measures were tested for internal consistency against the standard coefficient alpha of .70 (Nunnally, 1978). Hypotheses 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 4 and 5 were tested using Pearson’s r correlation coefficient. Results from both have been included in Table 2 along with means and standard deviations. Hypothesis 3 was also tested using the Gilford and Fruchter (1973) procedure for testing the difference between correlations to determine whether “harm” or “withdrawal” was the stronger predictor of perceived pay equity.

Hypothesis 1a proposed that negative workplace behavior correlated inversely with pay equity. This was supported ($r = -.36, p < .01$).

Table 2

Study II Means, Standard Deviations, Intercorrelations & Scale Reliabilities

Variables	Age	Tenure	Gender	Employment	PSS	PPE	NWB	OCB	Consideration	PSS (Eisen.)	Withdrawal	Harm
1. Age												
2. Tenure (yrs)	.16*											
3. Gender	-.15	.06										
4. Employment	-.14	.18	.03									
5. Perceived Supervisor Support	.04	-.07	.10	.06	(.96)							
6. Perceived Pay Equity	.05	.19	-.12	.11	.36	(.94)						
7. Negative Workplace Behavior	-.30**	.17*	.06	-.06	-.33**	-.36**	(.93)					
8. Organization Citizenship Behavior	-.05	.01	.01	.06	.48*	.23*	-.23*	(.75)				
9. Consideration.	.08	-.08	.10	.08	.97**	.36	-.35	.44*	(.92)			
10. PSS (Eisenberger)	.01	-.05	.10	.05	.98**	.33**	-.29**	.49**	.89**	(.75)		
11. Withdrawal	-.27**	.15	.04	-.09	-.31**	-.31**	.91**	-.17*	-.34**	-.26**	(.88)	
12. Harm	-.28**	.16*	.05	-.03	-.30**	-.36**	.95**	-.24**	-.32**	-.26**	.75**	(.90)
Mean Score	53.01	5.49	1.61	1.16	3.92	2.14	2.08	3.37	3.77	4.03	2.72	1.80
Standard Deviation	14.26	4.59	.49	.37	.91	.65	.66	.63	1.00	.89	1.01	.58

Note. * p<.05 (2-tailed) ** p<.01 (2-tailed). Alpha coefficients for each variable are indicated in brackets

Hypothesis 1b proposed that negative workplace behavior correlated inversely with perceived supervisor support. This was supported ($r = -0.33, p < .01$).

Hypothesis 2a proposed that organization citizenship behavior correlated positively with pay equity. This was supported ($r = 0.23, p < .01$).

Hypothesis 2b proposed that organization citizenship behavior correlated positively with perceived supervisor support. This was supported ($r = 0.48, p < .01$)

Hypothesis 3 proposed that negative workplace behaviors involving intentional harm to people or property had a negative and stronger relationship with pay equity than withdrawal behaviors. This was not supported (Harm $r = -.36, p < .01$; Withdrawal $r = -.31, p < .01$; Gilford-Fruchter statistic = .048).

Hypothesis 4 proposed that negative workplace behaviors involving “withdrawal” correlated positively with low levels of perceived supervisor support. This hypothesis was supported ($r = -.31, p < .01$).

Hypothesis 5 proposed that perceived supervisor support correlated positively with “*consideration*”. This was supported ($r = .89, p < .01$).

There were numerous other significant correlations between the variables used to test the above hypotheses (see Table 2). These included NWB & OCB which were inversely correlated ($r = -.23, p < .05$); NWB & Withdrawal were positively correlated ($r = .91, p < .01$); NWB & PSS (Eisenberger scale) were inversely correlated ($r = -.29, p < .01$); NWB & Harm were positively correlated ($r = .95, p < .01$); OCB & Consideration were positively correlated ($r = .44, p < .05$); OCB & PSS (Eisenberger) were positively correlated ($r = .49, p < .01$); OCB & Withdrawal were inversely correlated ($r = -.17, p < .05$); OCB & Harm were inversely correlated ($r = -.24, p < .01$); PSS & Consideration

were positively correlated ($r = .97, p < .01$); PSS & Harm were inversely correlated ($r = -.30, p < .01$); PSS & PSS (Eisenberger scale) were positively correlated ($r = .98, p < .01$); PSS (Eisenberger scale) & PPE were positively correlated ($r = .33, p < .01$); Withdrawal & Consideration were inversely correlated ($r = -.34, p < .01$); Withdrawal & PSS (Eisenberger) were inversely correlated ($r = -.26, p < .01$); Harm & Consideration were inversely correlated ($r = -.32, p < .01$); Harm & PSS (Eisenberger scale) were inversely correlated ($r = -.26, p < .01$); Harm & Withdrawal were positively correlated ($r = .75, p < .05$). Sportsmanship & PPE were positively correlated ($r = .32, p < .01$).

IV. Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to test whether workers who perceived a lack of supervisor support or experienced pay inequity reacted to their circumstances by acting out in antisocial ways at work. A second objective was to see whether those who perceived pay equity or supervisor support, engaged in organizational citizenship behaviors. It was also suggested that certain categories of negative workplace behaviors (intention to harm and withdrawal) were linked to specific predictors. Lastly it was proposed that perceived supervisor support was linked to the “consideration” factor in the LBDQ-XII.

Summary of Results

In summary the results supported hypotheses 1a, 1b, 2a 2b, 4 and 5. The study’s findings indicated that when there were high levels of perceived supervisor support and perceptions of pay equity, negative workplace behaviors were low and organization citizenship behaviors were high. The results did not fully support the contention that different types of negative workplace behaviors were associated with specific predictors, although, “withdrawal” was inversely related to perceived supervisor support. Perceived supervisor support was found to have a very strong relationship to the LBDQ-XII factor “consideration.

Descriptors

The mean PPE score of 2.14 indicated a perception of mild pay inequity i.e. participants perceived their pay overall to be “somewhat too low” and the mean NWB score of 2.08 indicated that participants observed coworkers once or twice a year engage

in negative behaviors. An interesting observation was that around half of participants had seen coworkers engage in "withdrawal" behaviors at least once a month, or more, and a third of participants had seen coworkers engage in behaviors designed to "harm" others in some way or other, at least once a month or more. Items that reflected sabotage or actions targeting the organization were infrequently observed.

The mean NWB score of 2.08 indicated the presence of negative workplace behaviors by workers but only to the extent that they occurred once or twice a year (although the impact of any single act could have significant consequences for the company depending on what it was). The mean PSS score of 3.92 indicated a perception that supervisors consistently demonstrated they valued and cared about their workers.

The mean OCB score of 3.37 indicated that most participants had observed their coworkers carry out positive behaviors at least once a month, or more. The behaviors that coworkers seemed to engage in most frequently were "helping" ones (Mean = 3.67) i.e. volunteering their time and expertise. The results also showed that PSS was high and a mild level of perceived pay inequity existed.

Contribution to Current Knowledge

The correlational analysis showed significant relationships between negative workplace behaviors and both perceived pay equity and perceived supervisor support. The NWB-PPE relationship, measured at -0.36, was an inverse one such that as perceived pay inequity changed to equity, the frequency of NWBs decreased. This supported the study's objective of demonstrating that pay inequity could lead workers to act out in antisocial ways. This finding was consistent with earlier research that showed that antisocial behavior at work could be the outcome of organizationally based decisions and

actions. Greenberg (1990) demonstrated as much in his organizational justice and equity research when he found perceptions of pay inequity were linked to theft; similarly, Baron and Neuman (1996) concluded that organizational change was linked to workplace aggression.

A more in depth view of the NWB factors revealed that behaviors that victimized or targeted an individual ($r = -0.39, p < .01$), involved withdrawal from a situation ($r = -0.31, p < .01$) or sabotaged work processes/activities ($r = -0.21, p < .01$) had significant relationships with perceived pay equity. This finding adds to the literature by extending the known and tested range of behaviors that people engaged in when they perceived their pay to be unfair or inequitable.

The next relationship between NWB and perceived supervisor support was inverse ($r = -0.33$) and suggested that workers would be less likely to engage in negative workplace behaviors when they perceived their supervisor to repeatedly demonstrate he/she valued them and cared about their well-being. Correlational analyses also revealed that three of the four NWB factors (victimize, withdrawal and sabotage) had strong inverse relationships with PSS (see Table 3). This adds to the literature by establishing a link between workers' perceptions of supervisor support and the potential for those workers to engage in potentially damaging behavior.

The second objective was to show that the perception of pay equity or supervisor support was linked to the occurrence of organization citizenship behaviors. The results showed significant positive relationships between organization citizenship behavior and both perceived pay equity ($r = .23, p < .01$) and perceived supervisor support ($r = .48, p < .01$).

Table 3

Study II - Correlations, Standard Deviations, Means & Reliability Coefficients for NWB & OCB Factors

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Victimize	2.36	.94	(.89)						
2. Withdrawal	2.72	1.01	.75**	(.88)					
3. Sabotage	1.37	.47	.60**	.56**	(.65)				
4. Target Company	1.14	.31	.34**	.23**	.30**	(.37)			
5. Helping	3.67	.83	.09	.14	.002	-.01	(.81)		
6. Civic Virtue	3.30	.94	.15	.13	-.02	.07	.71	(.65)	
7. Sportsmanship	2.70	1.2	-.76**	-.68**	-.39**	-.20**	-.12	-.19**	(.85)

A significant, but moderate, positive relationship was found to exist between PPE and OCB such that as the perception of pay equity increased then so would the occurrence of organization citizenship behaviors. Of specific interest was that only the “sportsmanship” factor (of three OCB factors) had a significant relationship with perceived pay equity ($r = 0.32, p < .01$). This finding has extended previous research on OCB and perceived pay equity. Aquino (1995) found that inequity was moderately but inversely related to the OCB factor called “compliance”. Schnake *et al* (1995) found that pay equity contributed a small amount of explained variance on the civic virtue dimension of OCB. This study has demonstrated that perceived pay equity (or inequity) is correlated to “sportsmanship” type behaviors in the workplace e.g. when PPE was low, workers engaged in behaviors that focused on what was wrong in a work situation, complained about trivial matters and found fault with what other team members were doing. When PPE was high the expectation was that sportsmanship behaviors increased,

i.e. workers focused on the positives and were less inclined to complain and find fault in others.

The correlational analysis confirmed that when there was a high level of perceived supervisor support, it could be expected that workers would be more inclined to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors. The relationship between OCB and PSS was also a positive one ($r = 0.48$) and consequently has extended previous research on both organization citizenship behavior and perceived supervisor support. As discussed earlier, previous research focused on concepts such as fairness, feedback and abusiveness but not supervisor support. Eisenberger (2002) had shown that supervisors contributed to perceived organizational support and to job retention, but there has been no attempt to demonstrate a link between organization citizenship behavior and perceived supervisor support; a gap which this study now fills.

The next objective was to demonstrate that perceived pay inequity was more strongly related to acts involving intentional harm to people or property than to withdrawal behaviors. This was based on research that had shown perceived pay inequity to be related to theft, retaliation or sabotage behaviors (active) but there had been no research linking withdrawal to this factor. However, the results did not support these contentions.

The relationships between PPE and both “harm” ($r = -.36$) and “withdrawal” ($r = -0.31$) were inverse demonstrating that as workers began to experience pay inequity (from a position of equity) they would be more likely to engage in behaviors intended to cause harm (by targeting people or the company) or behaviors resulting in withdrawal from participation in work activities. However, on an initial observation of the two correlations

there did not appear to be a significant difference between the two and the Gilford and Fruchter (1973) procedure that tested the difference between correlations didn't show a significant difference either (see Table 4). This meant that if workers reacted against perceived pay inequity by engaging in NWBs, then, it would be difficult to predict what types of behaviors they may carry out.

However, this result was not necessarily a bad one – research by Greenberg (1990), Skarlicki and Folger (1997) and Ambrose *et al* (2002) linked harming behaviors to pay inequity. Greenberg also contemplated what other behaviors disaffected employees might engage in; he thought turnover and reduced output were alternative tactics they might use. Patchen (1960) in a study on non-supervisory oil workers found that perceived pay fairness was inversely correlated to absenteeism. Given these findings, this study has confirmed that withdrawal behaviors designed to reduce time on the job (whilst still at work) are another type of negative behavior workers could use. The next proposition was that low PSS would be related to “withdrawal” behaviors ($r = -.31$); it was found that when PSS was low there would be more instances of withdrawal behavior but when it was high, workers would be less likely to engage in those same withdrawal behaviors. This relationship hasn't been demonstrated to date in existing research.

The final objective was to test whether the factor called “consideration” from the LBDQ-XII was related to the perceived supervisor support construct. The analysis clearly showed this to be the case ($r = .89$) and the conclusion was that they were both pretty much measuring the same concept. This complimented and extended research conducted by Hutchinson, Valentino and Kirkner (1998) who found that employees perceived more

Table 4

Study II - Gilford-Fruchter Calculation of Difference between Correlations

Correlations	r	z-score transformation	Z –score Ratio Calculation
PPE-Harm	-0.36**	.375	
PPE/Withdrawal	-0.31**	.320	
			.0477

** p < .01

Significant if > + or – 1.96

support from their organization when their supervisors engaged in a high consideration-high initiating structure style.

Implications for Theory and Application

The purpose of the current study was to draw a line between workplace behavior and factors that might predict it. The study of workplace behavior has been associated with the early work on equity theory and organizational justice, particularly with regard to crimes at work such as theft. Much of this research activity occurred in the 1980s through the efforts of people such as Greenberg (1986), Bies (1986) and Folger (1986) to mention just a few. On the other hand the study of organization citizenship behavior grew out of the research of Barnard (1938) and Katz (1964). It was Bateman and Organ (1983) who were principally responsible for the sudden interest in this area when they labeled “discretionary work behavior” as organization citizenship behavior (Kelloway *et al*, 2002). Much of the study of both features of workplace behavior had focused on construct development but in more recent times attention has also been paid to antecedents, and to the consideration of whether both behaviors are in fact separate constructs (Kelloway *et al*, 2002) or opposite ends of the same continuum (Spector, 2003). In focusing on identification of further antecedents, this study took a different

path to that of earlier work by examining the effect that perceived supervisor support and pay equity had on both forms of workplace behavior.

Among the significant findings of this study was the strong relationship between perceived supervisor support and organizational citizenship behavior, a finding not replicated in current literature. An earlier study by Kaufman, Stamper and Tesluk (2001); had demonstrated that organizationally focused (OCBO) and individually focused (OCBI) organizational citizenship behavior were differentially related to perceived *organizational* support (POS). Complimenting that work were studies that established the relationship between POS and PSS (Eisenberger et al, 2002; Rhoades et al, 2001), however evidence of a relationship between PSS and OCB did not exist until now.

This result should not be surprising given the evidence that employees view actions by agents of an organization as extensions, or actions, of the organization itself (Eisenberger, 1986, 2002). According to Kottke & Shafarinski (1988) employees relied for information about their work more on their supervisor than on coworkers or the organization. The theoretical underpinning for perceived organizational support was social exchange theory which was based on Gouldner's (1960) "norm of reciprocity" that people should help those who have helped them. When applied to a work context the implication was that an employee who had been the receptor of increased benefits from the organization compensated the employer in ways that were valued by the organization (Soulén, 2003). However, that was dependent upon all people having the same "felt obligation" to the employer i.e. not everyone felt that they had to "return the favor". Applying that conclusion to this study's findings indicated that perceived supervisor support may predict organization citizenship behavior (and negative workplace behavior)

but may also be mediated by an individual's level of exchange ideology (Eisenberger et al, 1986).

As just stated, the evidence from this study made the case that perceived supervisor support, was an antecedent to organization citizenship behavior, but given the study's findings that the perceived supervisor support-negative workplace behavior relationship ($r = -.33, p < .01$) was also strong, low perceived supervisor support should be considered to be an antecedent to negative workplace behavior as well. The practical implication of this finding was that levels of perceived supervisor support could be an indicator of potential acting out in the workplace. The theoretical implication was that this result added another predictor to the growing list of organizational decisions/actions that could precipitate either wanted or unwanted behavior a work.

To date research has identified at least six categories of antecedents including personality or individual difference (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998), environmental cues (Giacalone et al, 1997; O'Leary-Kelly, 1996), social/interpersonal (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998), economic factors (Boye and Jones, 1997), cognition and affect (Lee and Allen, 2002) and organizational factors resulting from management actions/decisions (Robinson & Greenberg, 1998). Low perceived supervisor support, or in broader terms supervisor behavior, fitted into the organizational category and added to organizational injustice, organizational change and diversity as predictors of negative workplace behavior.

As with perceived supervisor support, the results regarding perceived pay equity were striking as perceived pay equity was negatively related to negative workplace behavior and possibly related to organization citizenship behavior. Research had

demonstrated the between perceived pay equity and negative workplace behavior (Adams, 1965; Greenberg, 1990; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). The underlying concept of equity theory was “the perceived fairness of the amounts of compensation employees receive” (McFarlin & Sweeney, pp626, 1992) compared to a referent e.g. another employee or a preferred standard of living. Violations of norms of distributive injustice (Adams, 1965) i.e. perceived unfairness are said to “increase the desire to punish and impose harmful consequences on a putative wrong-doer” (Skarlicki and Folger, pp435, 1997). The ways in which that might occur have been shown to include theft, sabotage and retaliation most of which would be characterized as active and overt behaviors. This study found a strong relationship between perceived unfairness of pay and withdrawal behaviors that eventually led to maximization of an individual’s time away from the task at hand. “Withdrawal”, a passive behavior, has not up to now been associated with perceived pay inequity.

The nature of this study afforded the opportunity to investigate relationships between perceived pay equity and negative workplace behavior as well as organizational citizenship behaviors. Perceived pay equity’s relationship with organizational citizenship behaviors was that as the perception of equity increased from inequity, so did the occurrence of observed organizational citizenship behaviors.

Other theoretical implications of this study’s findings include the relationship between the OCB factor “sportsmanship” and perceived pay inequity. It was found that when perceived pay inequity existed “sportsmanship” behaviors would decrease i.e. workers would focus on the negatives at work, would be more inclined to find fault with

others and would complain about others. By implication, if a state of perceived pay equity existed then the reverse of these behaviors would have occurred.

Earlier in this section it was mentioned that recent research has considered whether OCB was an independent construct to counterproductive work behaviors (CPB), or opposite ends of the same spectrum (i.e. one construct). The significance of such a finding according to Kelloway *et al* (pp148, 2002) was that “a large body of knowledge rests on the notion that these are in fact distinct constructs, and increasingly these measures are being used in organizational surveys. Significant implications would emerge for the integrity of knowledge obtained on self-reported CPBs and OCBs if they merely reflected opposite ends of a single continuum reflecting role behavior”.

Negative workplace behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors had a moderately inverse relationship ($r = -.23, p < .01$). The low correlation is an indicator that these variables may be independent of one another which support Kelloway *et al*'s view, but this may also be situational. What can be said in this study is that as negative workplace behaviors increased, organizational citizenship behaviors decreased. In examining the correlations of the dependent variable factors (see Table 3), the strong relationships (inverse) were between “sportsmanship” (OCB) and the NWB factors “victimization” ($r = -0.76, p < .01$) and “withdrawal” ($r = -0.68, p < .01$).

“Victimization” is characterized by acts that target coworkers and “withdrawal” by attempts to remove oneself from the job whereas “sportsmanship” is characterized by a positive work focus and attitude and not being consumed by trivial matters. However, the way “sportsmanship” was measured may have had something to do with these high correlations. Three items made up this factor and all were reverse-scored. They did not

appeared dissimilar to items from the NWB scale in that they were negatively worded and focused on what was wrong in a situation, complaints about trivial matters and finding fault with others. These results are not sufficient to proclaim that negative workplace behavior and organization citizenship behavior are anything more than independent constructs. Further research is recommended to test this relationship.

Equity research (Greenberg, 1990; Ambrose *et al*, 2002; Eisenberger *et al*, 2002; Patchen, 1960; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) had suggested a relationship between harming behaviors (theft, retaliation and sabotage) and perceived pay inequity. However, this study did not discriminate between harming and withdrawal behaviors and inequity i.e. the correlations between PPE and both “withdrawal” and “harm” were very similar (see Table 2). What the study did do was to demonstrate that the range of behaviors that people could decide to engage in (viz. withdrawal behaviors specifically) when responding to perceived pay inequity or lack of supervisor support was extended beyond that of previous research.

Finally, this study did establish that the factor called “consideration” (LBDQ-XII) and perceived supervisor support appeared to measure the same concept. Although not surprising given that the wording of items from both scales is similar, it still has demonstrated the link between the two which up to now had not been done. The implications for the future is that if one were to measure perceived supervisor support, then Eisenberger’s 8-item scale (1997) would be sufficient to do this accurately.

There are several applications of this study’s findings for organizations. Probably the most important being that organizations understand that workplace behavior can be

influenced by a number of different factors, not the least of which is themselves. In this study it has been demonstrated that supervisor actions and decisions about pay were two aspects of organizational behavior and decision-making that could influence worker behavior. Organizations need to be cognizant of the impact of supervisor-worker relationships to overall functioning and profitability. The study demonstrated that employees' perceptions of their supervisors may affect their willingness to engage in behaviors that potentially benefit or damage the organization. With regard to the latter it was shown that perceptions of high supervisor support were inversely related to victimization behaviors, withdrawal behaviors and sabotage.

Second, the caliber of those supervisors needs to be such that they can be respected and trusted by employees to have the employees' interests at heart. The study has shown that high perceived supervisor support is more likely to lead to organizational citizenship behaviors that benefit the company and its employees, while reducing the risk of damaging antisocial behaviors.

Perceived pay inequity was also shown to have significant influence on worker behavior. It was found that as pay equity increased so did the occurrence of observed positive workplace behaviors, but of more concern was the finding that as workers began to experience pay inequity they were more likely to engage in behaviors intended to cause harm to others or absence from their work activities. Whilst, there was no investigation of what could mediate such behavior e.g. procedural and interactional justice, the study confirmed the sensitive nature of decisions with regard to compensation.

Future Research

One of the unanswered questions in this study was whether different types of negative workplace behaviors were linked to specific organizational predictors e.g. Greenberg (1990) showed that theft was a consequence of pay inequity. Does this imply that workers engage in “a fight fire with fire response” to perceived inequity or poor treatment? If so, the implication of a demonstrated relationship between workplace behavior and specific organizational decisions has significant ramifications for applied settings. This would seem to be fertile ground for future research.

The current study was designed to examine the effect of organizational decisions and actions, through perceived supervisor support and pay equity, on workplace behavior. An obvious path for future research would be to consider the impact of decisions made by organizational leaders found in the ranks of middle and senior management. The decisions made at a senior level have profound effects upon an organization and its employees, and many of them relate to the planning and implementation of organizational strategy and workplace policies and systems. It is suggested that future research efforts into negative workplace behavior focus on the impact of managerial decision-making.

On a different level, it was suggested earlier there are at least five additional factors that impact workplace behavior i.e. personality, social relations, environmental cues, economic circumstances and cognition and affect. However, these according to Bandura’s argument on reciprocal determinism (1977) don’t operate in isolation; behavior and personality are shaped by the interaction between cognitive factors and the environment, and people act to alter their environment which in turn affects behavior.

James (2002) pointed out no one single factor is responsible for workplace behavior, rather it is the interaction of many factors and to try to determine which is more important than another is futile. In view of these comments, future research could test the relationship of each factor with a specific antisocial or organizational citizenship behavior to determine how workplace behavior should be explained.

Lastly, further investigation is recommended of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and negative workplace behavior. This study, like that of Kelloway's *et al* (2002), found no evidence to suggest that these constructs are anything but independent. However, the results were not beyond question and further research may be necessary to arrive at a more definitive conclusion.

Limitations

Measures

This study used a mixture of self-report (perceived supervisor support, leader behavior and perceived pay equity) and reported observation measures (participants' observations of coworker behavior). Self-report measures are inherently subjective and the predictor variables in this study required participants to provide answers to fairly sensitive questions about perceptions of their immediate "boss" and their compensation. The pay equity questions in particular began with the words "how do you feel" which invited a subjective rather than objective response. In contrast, the anonymous response participants gave may have acted in the other direction i.e. allowed them to be somewhat objective in the knowledge that their answers could not work against them at some future time. The combination of these measures may have led to confusion in answering items. More specifically though, requiring participants to report on their observations of

coworker behavior was unusual and may not have elicited accurate information, as it relied on people's recall over the previous year which raises issues of accuracy.

Data Collection

The method of data collection was less than ideal, as there was very little time to explain the study or answer questions, as participants were in a hurry to get to, or leave, work. This resulted in employees giving limited time to thinking about their input.

Sample Size and Population

Generalization of the results is limited by the following:

1. The final population size of 161 was relatively small.
2. The proportion of seasonal to permanent workers was effectively more than 4:1.

This may be an issue because seasonal workers typically don't work during the winter months and there was no indication of the length of time they were employed during those seasons.

3. As discussed earlier this study's participants were an older population than one would normally find; this has implications for generalizability that are discussed below.

Age

An unusual feature was the age profile of the workforce from the sample population – the mean age of participants was 53.3 years, the mode was 55 years and the range was 18-78 years. Given that this workforce operates in the tourism sector of the service industry, a comparison to the age profile of the USA workforce (2002) was enlightening. Based on statistics produced by the Department of Labor (2002) the median worker age in 1998 was 38.7 years and for 2008 was projected to be 40.7. In their

statistical summary of US workforce demographics, the Department presented the ages of those working in the service sector across four categories i.e. 16-19, 19-24, 25-54, and 54 and over. In the 55 and over category, 15.7% of the service sector US workforce was represented compared to 52.2% in the current study. Conversely, in the 25-54 category, this study's participants were represented by 40.5% of the total whereas in the US workforce (service sector) it was 72 %. This is a significant difference in the age profile of both workforces. The conclusion being that this study's workforce was much older and not typical of the service sector which restricts the generalizability of the results, although this also suggests that having an older workforce may be advantageous.

Supervisor Support

The level of reported PSS seemed unusually high with a mean score of 3.93 (out of 5; i.e. 80th percentile). A check on other studies that have also measured PSS using a similar scale revealed mean PSS scores sitting at the 63rd and 77th percentile. (Rhoades, 2001; Eisenberger et al., 2002). The high PSS score may be a reflection of the age, nature and particularly values of the workforce.

Conclusion

This study was designed to investigate whether two organizational factors, perceived supervisor support and perceived pay equity, affected workplace behavior. In a population of mature workers engaged in an East Tennessee tourist enterprise, it was found that if employees perceived pay equity or supervisor support, then they were more inclined to participate in behaviors that helped the organization and fellow workers. However, if the opposite were the case, then they were inclined to engage in behaviors that either saw them withdraw from their work, or punished others or the organization.

The value of this finding is that it provided evidence to organizations that strong, positive relationships between supervisors and immediate employees may lead to discretionary behaviors that enhance organizational performance.

On the theoretical side, this study has extended the knowledge base on predictors of workplace behavior and the behaviors employees may engage in, in response to organizational decisions and behavior. It has also raised the importance of determining whether different types of negative workplace behaviors can be predicted by specific organizational factors, what the impact of senior leader decision-making is on workplace behavior, whether one or many factors precipitate workplace behavior and whether organizational citizenship behavior and negative workplace behaviors are opposing or independent constructs.

References

Aquino, K. (1995). Relationships Among Pay Inequity, Perceptions of Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal. Vol. 8, No.1

Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M.A. & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational in justice. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. 89, 947-965

Bandura, A. (1977). Self Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. Psychological Review. Vol. 84, 191-215.

Barnard, C. (1938). The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.

Baron, R.A. & Neuman, J.H. (1996) Workplace Violence & Workplace Aggression: Evidence of Their Relative Frequency and Potential Causes. Aggressive Behavior Vol. 22, 161-173

Bateman, T. S. & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job Satisfaction and the Good soldier: The Relationship Between Affect and Employee "Citizenship". Academy of Management Journal. Vol. 26, 587-595.

Bies, R. J. (1986). Identifying Principles of Interactional Justice: The Case of Corporate Recruiting. Symposium conducted at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management. Chicago, IL.

Buss, A.H. (1961). The Psychology of Aggression. New York. Wiley.

Collins, J.M. & Griffin, R.W. (1998) The psychology of counterproductive job performance. In (Eds.) Griffin, R. W., O'Leary-Kelly, A. & Collins, J. M. Dysfunctional

behavior in organizations: Violent and deviant behavior. Vol. 23, Parts A Stamford, CT.

JAI Press.

Deluga, R. J. (1994). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology. Dec; Vol. 67(4): 315-326.

DiBattista, R. A. (1996). Forecasting Sabotage Events in the Workplace. Public Personnel Management. Vol. 25, No. 1, Spring, 41-52.

Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C. & Pagon, M. (2002) Social Undermining in the Workplace. Academy of Management Journal. Vol. 45, No. 2, 331-351

Eisenberger, R. & Huntington, R. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 71, No. 3, 500-507

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J. Arneli, S. & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived Supervisor Support, Discretionary Treatment & Job Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 82, No. 5, 812-820

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I.L. & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived Supervisor Support Contributions to Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Retention. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 87, No. 3, 565-573

Giacalone, R. A., Riordan, C. A. & Rosenfeld, P. (1997). Employee Sabotage: Toward a Practitioner- Scholarly Understanding, in (Eds.) Giacalone, R.A. & Greenberg, J. Antisocial Behavior in Organizations. SAGE Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks, California.

Gilford, J. P. & Fruchter, B. (1973). Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. McGrath-Hill. New York.

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. American Sociological Review. Vol. 25, 161-178.

Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of Perceived Fairness of Performance Evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol.71, 340-342.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 75. No 5. 561-568.

Greenberg, J. (1996) Why do workers bite the hands that feed them? Employee theft as a social exchange process in Staw, Barry M. (Ed); Cummings, L. L. (Ed). (1996). Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews, Vol. 18. (pp. 111-156). Stamford, CT, US: JAI Press, Inc.

Greenberg, J. (1997) The STEAL Motive: Managing the social Determinants of Employee Theft, in (Eds.) Giacalone, R.A. & Greenberg, J. Antisocial Behavior in Organizations. SAGE Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks. California.

Griffin, R. W., O'Leary-Kelly, A. & Collins, J. M. (1998). Dysfunctional Work Behaviors in Organizations, in (Eds.) Cooper, C. L. & Rousseau, D. M. Trends in Organizational Behavior, Vol. 5. John Wiley & Sons. New York.

Hutchinson, S., Valentino, K. E. & Kirkner, S. L. (1998). What Works for the Gander Does Not Work as Well for the Goose: The effects of Leader Behavior. Journal of Applied Social Psychology. 28, 2, 171-182.

James L. R. & Mazerolle, M. D. (2002). Personality in Work Organizations. Foundations for Organizational Science. Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks. California.

Katz, D. (1964). The Motivational Basis of Organizational Behavior. Behavioral Science. Vol. 9, 131-146.

Kaufman, J.D., Stamper, C.L. & Tesluk, P.E. (2001). Do Supportive Organizations Make for Good Corporate Citizens? Journal of Managerial Issues. Vol. XIII Number 4. Winter. 436-449.

Kelloway, E.K., Loughlin, C., Barling, J. & Nault, A. (2002). Self-Reported Counterproductive Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Separate but Related Constructs. International Journal of selection & Assessment. Vol. 10, No.s 1-2.

Klein, R. L., Leong, G. B. & Silva, J. A. (1996). Employee Sabotage in the Workplace: A Biosocial Model. Journal of Forensic Sciences. Vol. 41, No. 1, 52-55.

Kottke, J. L. & Shafarinski, C. E. (1988) Measuring Perceived Supervisory and Organizational Support. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48.

Landau, J. (1993). Organizational Change and Barriers to Innovation: A Case Study in the Italian Public Sector. Human relations. Vol. 46, 12, 1411- 1426.

Lee, K & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Workplace Deviance: The Role of Affect and Cognitions. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 87. No.1. 131-142.

LePine, J.A., Erez, A. & Johnson, D.E. (2002). The Nature and Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior A Critical Review and Meta-Analysis. February. Vol.87, No. 1, 52-65.

Lind, A. E. (1997). Litigation and Claiming in Organizations. in (Eds.) Giacalone, R.A. & Greenberg, J. Antisocial Behavior in Organizations. SAGE Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks. California.

McEvoy, G. M. & Buller, P. (1987). User Acceptance of Peer appraisals in an Industrial Setting. Personnel Psychology. 40, 785-797.

McFarlin, D. B. & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive & Procedural Justice as Predictors of Satisfaction with Personal and Organizational Outcomes. Academy of Management Journal. Vol. 35, No.3, 626-637

Martin, J. E. & Peterson, M.M. (1987). Two-tier Wage Structures: Implications for Equity Theory. Academy of Management Journal. Vol. 30, No. 2, 297-315

Martinko, M. J. & Zellars, K. L. (1998). Toward a theory of workplace violence and aggression: A cognitive appraisal perspective, in (Eds.) Griffin, R. W., O'Leary-Kelly, A. Dysfunctional behavior in organizations: Violent and deviant behavior. Monographs in organizational behavior and industrial relations, Vol. 23, Parts A & B. (pp. 1-42). Stamford, CT, US: JAI Press,

Neuman, J. H. & Baron, R. A. (1997). Aggression in the Workplace, in (Eds.) Giacalone, R.A. & Greenberg, J. Antisocial Behavior in Organizations. SAGE Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks. California.

Nunnally, J.C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W. & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-Motivated Aggression. Academy of Management Review. Vol. 21, No. 1, 225-253

O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Duffy, M. K. & Griffin, R. W. (2000). Construct Confusion in the Study of Antisocial Behavior. Personnel & Human Resources Management. Vol. 18, 275-303.

Organ, D.W. (1988). Organizational Citizenship Behavior. The Good soldier Syndrome. Lexington, MA. Lexington Books.

Organ, D.W. (1997) Organization citizenship behaviors: Its construct clean-up time. Human Performance. 10. 85-97.

Patchen, M. (1960). Absence and Employee Feelings About Fair Treatment. Personnel Psychology. Vol. 13, 349-360.

Podsakoff, P.M., Ahearne, M. & MacKenzie, S.B. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and the Quantity and Quality of Work Group Performance. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 82, No.2, 262-270.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H. & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors & their effects on followers' trust in leader satisfaction & organization citizenship behaviors. Leadership Quarterly. 1, 107-142.

Raelin, J. A. (1994). Three Scales of Professional deviance Within Organizations. Journal of Organizational Behavior. Vol. 15, 483-501.

Reis, M. J. (2002). The effects of supervisor feedback behavior on employee organizational citizenship behaviors: The role of perceived supervisor fairness in the social exchange process. Dissertation. The Claremont Graduate University.

Rhoades, L. Eisenberger, R. & Arneli, S. (2001). Affective Commitment to the Organization: The Contribution of Perceived Organizational Support. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 86. No. 5. 825-836.

Rhoades, L. Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol.87., No. 4, 698-714

Robinson, S. L. & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. Academy of Management Journal. Vol. 38, No. 2, 555-572.

Robinson, S. L. & Greenberg, J. (1998). Employees Behaving Badly: Dimensions, Determinants and Dilemmas in the study of Workplace Deviance. In (Eds.) Cooper, C. L. & Rousseau, D. M. Trends in Organizational Behavior, Vol. 5. John Wiley & Sons. New York.

Schnake, M., Cochrane, D. & Dumler, M. (1995). Encouraging Organizational Citizenship: The Effects of Job Satisfaction, Perceived Equity and Leadership. Journal of Managerial Issues. Vol. VII No. 2 Summer. 209-221.

Schriesheim, C. A. & Stogdill, R. M. (1975). Differences in Factor structure Across Three Versions of the Ohio State Leadership Scales. Personnel Psychology. 28, 189-206.

Skarlicki, D. P. & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the Workplace: The Roles of Distributive, Procedural, and Interactional Justice. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 82, No. 3, 434-443

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W. Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol.68, No. 4, 653-663.

Soulen, S. K. (2003). Organizational Commitment, Perceived Supervisor Support, and Performance: A Field Study. Unpublished Masters Thesis. University of Tennessee. Knoxville.

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. Vol. 12(2): 269-292

Summers, T. P. & DeNisi, A. S. (1990). In Search of Adams' Other: Reexamination of Referents Used in the Evaluation of Pay. Human Relations, Vol. 43, No. 6, 497-511.

US Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2002) Working in the 21st Century.
[http:// www.bls.gov/opub/home.htm](http://www.bls.gov/opub/home.htm)

US Department of Labor (2002). Workforce Profile x Occupation.

<http://www.bls.gov/home.htm>

Zellars, K. L; Tepper, B. J; Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. Journal-of-Applied-Psychology. Dec; Vol 87(6): 1068-1076

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Research Script

“I am from the Psychology Department at the University of Tennessee conducting research into the topic of pay fairness and supervisor support. The research has been approved by the University and the Company and was advertised in this month’s company magazine (show copy).

The research involves asking you to complete a questionnaire with about 70 items in it and will take no more than 20 minutes to complete. All information you provide is anonymous – the only information provided to the Company is in aggregated form and can in no way identify an individual.

You can complete the questionnaire now or fill it out later today and return it to me or the Personnel Office if I have gone. A sealed, secure box has been provided for this purpose.

To provide some recompense for your time you can take part in a draw for a cash reward if you choose to participate in the study.

Would you like to complete this questionnaire?”

If the person indicated they would partake then he/she was handed the questionnaire and “Invitation to Participate” letter.

Appendix 2 – Study II Research Letter & Questionnaire

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE



College of Arts & Sciences
Department of Psychology
307 Austin Peay Building
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-0900
(865) 974-2531
FAX (865) 974-3330

Invitation to Participate in a Study about the Impact of
Pay Fairness & Supervisor Support in the Workplace

You are invited to take part in this study about workplace behavior. Attached to this note you will find a questionnaire titled “The Impact of Pay Fairness and Supervisor Support in the Workplace”. To participate please complete the questionnaire and return it to myself or the Personnel Department.

Please do not write your name on the questionnaire as participation is anonymous. By filling in and turning your completed questionnaire in you are agreeing to participate in the study. There are no known risks associated with completing this questionnaire and all answers are anonymous. Skip any questions you have a problem in answering. The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

When you return your questionnaire you can enter your name on a separate piece of paper for the “Australian Hat or \$75 cash” draw in which you have a 1 in 50 chance, or better, of winning.

Graeme Mitchell
Psychology Department
University of Tennessee



The Impact of Pay Fairness & Supervisor Support in the Workplace

This questionnaire is designed to find out what employees think about the fairness of their pay, the support they receive from their immediate supervisor and what the impact of both is at work. The following questionnaire has 69 items and should take no more than 20 minutes to complete. The first section deals with what you think about the support you get from your supervisor, the next section with what you think about the fairness of your pay and the last with aspects of how people behave at work. Again, skip any questions you have a problem in answering.

Before starting though, please tell us:

- Your age
- Years with this company
- Male or Female
- Seasonal employee permanent employee

Section 1 –Supervisor Support

This section is about supervisor support. It is designed to elicit information about what you think about the level and quality of support you receive from your immediate supervisor. For each question below please place a check in the space that best reflects your view where **1 = never; 2 = seldom; 3 = occasionally; 4 = often; 5 = always.**

	1	2	3	4	5
1. My supervisor would forgive an honest mistake on my part.					
2. My supervisor is willing to help me when I need a special favor					
3. If given the opportunity, my supervisor would take advantage of me *					
4. Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem					
5. My supervisor cares about my opinions.					
6. My supervisor really cares about my well-being.					
7. My supervisor strongly considers my goals and values					
8. My supervisor shows very little concern for me. *					
9. My supervisor treats all group members as his/her equal					
10. My supervisor is willing to make changes					
11. My supervisor does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.					
12. My supervisor is friendly and approachable.					
13. My supervisor puts suggestions made by our group into operation					
14. My supervisor looks out for the personal welfare of group members.					

* Items reverse-scored

Section 2 – Pay Fairness

This part of the questionnaire is about pay fairness, or equity. It is designed to draw out information about whether you think you are being fairly paid at work. For each question below please place a check in the space that best reflects how you view your pay, where: 1 = too low; 2 = somewhat too low; 3 = about right; 4 = somewhat too high; 5 = too high

		1	2	3	4	5
1	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to the pay of other people doing the same kind of work?					
2	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to others working in your department?					
3	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to others in your company?					
4	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to others in other companies?					
5	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to your abilities, qualifications and experience?					
6	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to others you know with similar abilities and training?					
7	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to the amount of work you do?					
8	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to employees in less demanding jobs than yours?					
9	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to employees in more demanding jobs than yours?					
10	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to others in your job category at your company					
11	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to what pay you need to maintain your standard of living?					
12	How do you feel about the fairness of your pay compared to your pay for previous jobs?					

Section 3- Impact in the Workplace

In this section we are interested in finding out whether you have observed any of the following actions by coworkers in your current workplace. Please note that we are asking for your observation of others, not whether you have engaged in any of these activities yourself.

Please put a check in the space that best indicates the extent to which you have observed the following actions in other workers at your current job(s).

For example, in considering how you might answer “I have seen (or know) others at work who help out if someone falls behind in their work”, you should consider whether you have observed coworkers do this at all, and then how frequently it might have occurred. For our purposes it doesn’t matter whether that action was carried out by one person or many, or whether it was always the same person(s), or not. What we are interested in is whether it was something that occurred in the workplace at all, and if so, how often you observed it happening.

I have seen (or know) others at work who	Never	Once or twice per year	Every month or two	More than once a month	Daily
	1	2	3	4	5
1. ...let another employee know they didn't like them, or something about them.					
2. ... take extended breaks					
3. ...always focus on what is wrong with a situation, rather than the positive side*					
4. ...endanger coworkers by reckless behavior					
5. ...help out if someone falls behind in their work					
6. ...undermine a coworker's effort to be successful in his/her job					
7. ...spend time on personal matters while at work					
8. ...consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters*					
9. ...intentionally damage equipment or a work process					
10. ...call an OSHA representative as a scare tactic					
11. ...willingly share their expertise with coworkers.					
12. ...talk down to a coworker or act in a condescending way					
13. ...try to look busy while wasting time					
14. ...always find fault with what coworkers are doing*					
15. ...steal or destroy the property of another employee					
16. ... reveal secret information to competitors					
17. ...try to act like a peacemaker when others have disagreements					

* Items Reverse-scored

**Once
or
twice
per
year** **Every
month
or two** **More
than
once a
month** **Daily**

I have seen (or know) others at work who					
18. ...give a coworker the silent treatment					
19. ...talk with coworkers instead of working					
20. ...attend and actively participate in team meetings					
21. ...fail to take steps that would protect another's welfare or safety					
22. ...falsify/alter information on company records					
23. ...take steps to try to prevent problems with others					
24. ...purposefully leave a work area when a certain coworker enters					
25. ...spend too much time daydreaming instead of working					
26. ...damage someone else's work					
27. ...set up a foreperson/manager to get them into trouble					
28. ...willingly give of their time to help coworkers who have work-related problems					
29. ...fail to defend another employee when people speak poorly of them					
30. ...come in late to work, or leave early, without permission					
31. ...intentionally make errors					
32. ..."touch base" with coworkers before initiating actions that might affect them.					
33. ...blame coworkers for mistakes					
34. ...leave their work for someone else to finish					
35. ...allow defective parts to pass inspection					
36. ...encourage others when they are down					
37. ...criticize the way another employee handles things in a way that is not helpful					
38. ...take time off from work without just cause					
39. ...provide constructive suggestions about how to improve effectiveness.					
40. ...delay work to other employees to make them look bad or slow them down					
41. ...self create "down time"					
42. ...play a mean prank on someone at work					
43. ...are willing to risk disapproval to express their beliefs about what's best for coworkers					

Appendix 3 – Study 1 Research Letter & Questionnaire

Invitation to Participate in a Study of Negative Workplace Behaviors

You are invited to take part in this study about workplace behavior. In this pack you will find a questionnaire titled “Negative Workplace Behaviors”. To participate please complete the questionnaire and return to:

Graeme Mitchell
Room 303 or Mail Room
Austin Peay Building.
Psychology Department.
University of Tennessee.

Please do not write your name on the questionnaire as participation is anonymous. By filling in and turning your completed questionnaire in you are agreeing to participate in the study. There are no known risks associated with completing this questionnaire and all answers are anonymous. Skip any questions you have a problem in answering. The questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete, and for UT students who participate, it may qualify for extra credit in some introductory psychology courses.

Contact Details:

Graeme Mitchell
Phone Number : 974-6843 or 675 1289
Email: gmitche1@utk.edu

Negative Workplace Behaviors

This is a survey about negative behavior at work. It is designed to find out your observations of other people's work behaviors. Please put a check in the space that best indicates the extent to which you have observed the following behaviors in other workers at your current or most recent job(s). Skip any questions you have a problem answering.

For example, in weighing up how you might answer Item 1, "take extended breaks", you should consider whether you have observed that behavior in the workplace at all, and then how frequently it might have occurred. For purposes of this study it doesn't matter whether that behavior was carried out by one person or many, or whether it was always the same person(s), or not. What we are interested in is whether that behavior was something that occurred in the workplace at all, and if so, approximately how often you observed it happening.

	Once or twice per year	Every month or two	More than once a month	Daily
1. Take extended breaks				
2. Use an illegal drug or drink alcohol on the job				
3. Make negative or obscene gestures				
4. Hide in a back room to read newspapers				
5. Discuss confidential company information with an unauthorized person				
6. Make fun of, or publicly embarrass, someone at work				
7. Pull the fire alarm and/or make bomb threats				
8. Fail to transmit information needed by a coworker				
9. Accept kickbacks				
10. Squander or waste company material				
11. Intentionally damage equipment or work process				
12. Endanger himself/herself on the job				
13. Take supplies/property without permission				
14. Spend too much time daydreaming instead of working				
15. Damage someone else's work				
16. Misuse company expense account				
17. Turn on a machine and walk away knowing it will crash				
18. Drag out work in order to get overtime				
19. Physically attack a coworker				
20. Endanger coworkers by reckless behavior				
21. Leave his/her work for someone else to finish				

Never Once
 or
 twice
 per
 year Every
 month
 or two More
 than
 once a
 month Daily

	Never	Once or twice per year	Every month or two	More than once a month	Daily
22. Sexually harass another employee					
23. Talk with coworkers instead of working					
24. Take time off from work without just cause					
25. Fail to take steps that would protect another's welfare or safety					
26. Spend time on personal matters while at work					
27. Talk badly about a coworker behind their back					
28. Come in late to work, or leave early, without permission					
29. Alter or delete data stored in computer data bases					
30. Try to look busy while wasting time					
31. Put a coworker down when he/she questions work procedures					
32. Steal or destroy the property of another employee					
33. Fail to give a coworker the required instructions					
34. Say something hurtful to someone at work (includes cursing)					
35. Alter the time on the punch clock					
36. Talk down to a coworker or act in a condescending way					
37. Call in sick when not ill					
38. Spread rumors about coworkers					
39. Speak poorly about the company to others by gossip or rumours					
40. Neglect to follow the boss' instructions					
41. Allow defective parts to pass inspection					
42. Show up late for meetings					
43. "Talk back" to his or her boss					
44. Make a coworker feel incompetent					
45. Cover up mistakes					
46. Refuse to work weekends or overtime when asked					
47. Flaunt status or authority					
48. Give a coworker the silent treatment					
49. Act rudely toward someone or make an obscene comment at work					
50. Cause confusion at work					

	Never	Once or twice per year	Every month or two	More than once a month	Daily
51. Put down someone else's opinion(s) to others					
52. Undermine a coworker's effort to be successful in his/her job					
53. Talk to others in the company about things that are wrong there					
54. Make an ethnic, religious, or racial remark or joke at work					
55. Purposefully leave a work area when a certain coworker enters					
56. Reduce a coworker(s) opportunity to express him/herself					
57. Fail to defend another employee when people speak poorly of him/her					
58. Intentionally perform job below acceptable standards					
59. Engage in behaviors at work that are self-serving					
60. Unnecessarily or deliberately leave a mess					
61. Lie about hours worked					
62. Intentionally make errors					
63. Play a mean prank on someone at work					
64. Leave a job in progress					
65. Blame coworkers for mistakes					
66. Fail to return phone calls					
67. Cause others to delay action on matters of importance					
68. Intentionally work slower					
69. Don't give as much help as promised					
70. Let another employee know you don't like him/her, or something about him/her					
71. Unnecessarily use up resources needed by another employee					
72. Undermine new work systems to ensure their failure					
73. Delay work to other employees to make them look bad or slow them down					
74. Give misleading or incorrect information about a job					
75. Sabotage equipment					
76. Do "personal work" on company time with company supplies & telephone					
77. Write on company furniture and walls					
78. Flatten tires and scratch cars					
79. Steal to compensate for low pay and poor work conditions					

	Never	Once or twice per year	Every month or two	More than once a month	Daily
80. Self create "down time"					
81. Switch paperwork around the office					
82. Snip cables on word processors					
83. Pass on defective work and parts to the next station					
84. Call the OSHA representative as a scare tactic					
85. Criticize the way another employee handles things in a way that is not helpful					
86. Punch someone else's time card					
87. Gossip about his/her boss					
88. Call up the union to intervene					
89. Put little effort into his/her work					
90. Set up the foreperson/manager to get him/her into trouble					
91. Instruct others to engage in activities which could be harmful to the company					
92. Falsify/alter information on company records					
93. Reveal secret information to competitors					
94. Lower the quality of the product by purposely using lower quality parts					
95. Place a false order					
96. Compete in a non-beneficial way					
97. Wreck the office of an executive you don't like					
98. Intentionally lose important files and paper					
99. Lie to management about important data					
100. Interrupt mail so that it fails to get to people on time					

Vita

Graeme K. Mitchell was originally a resident of Sydney, Australia. His initial entrée to the world of work was through banking which took him to many different Australian regional and overseas locations. He completed his B.A. (Psych) in 1979 at Macquarie University in Sydney and followed this with a change in vocations to human resources, initially in the leisure industry before moving to a manufacturer of aluminum extrusions and building products. In that business he experienced the full range of human resource activities and supplemented this work with a post-degree diploma in employee relations at the University of Western Sydney.

In 1987 as a human resource manager, he became heavily involved in industrial relations negotiations at a time when Australia's labor systems were undergoing significant change designed to prepare Australia for participation in the global economy. In 1991 his role changed to that of a senior internal HR consultant which necessitated focusing on human resource initiatives that would effect business improvement. In 1996 he completed an MBA at the Macquarie Graduate School and later that year moved to a large mining house as a member of an internal consulting team designing executive training solutions. He continued his consulting work first with a Bank and then an agri-business company before expatriating with his family to Tennessee in 1999.

Graeme is an accredited Myers-Briggs trainer and in March, 2004 completed requirements for the MA in psychology with a concentration in industrial applied psychology and a 4.00 GPA. Graeme plans to pursue his interests in industrial and organizational psychology through consulting and teaching.