

2004

Examining the relationships between motivational traits and counterproductive work behaviors

Kajal Rushikesh Mehta

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, kmehta1@lsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mehta, Kajal Rushikesh, "Examining the relationships between motivational traits and counterproductive work behaviors" (2004). *LSU Master's Theses*. 2974.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/2974

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MOTIVATIONAL TRAITS AND
COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIORS

A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

The Department of Psychology

by
Kajal R. Mehta
B.A., Emory University, 2000
May 2004

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my parents for always believing in me and for knowing exactly what I needed to hear to continue this journey when I was ready to give up. You have always been wonderful and I hope that you are as proud of me as I am of you both. Thanks also goes out to my brother who has given me so much guidance throughout the last few years. Every time I began to complain I remembered him telling me that time spent complaining is only time spent wasted. Jim, you have been the most wonderful advisor I could have ever asked for. I respect you and admire your intelligence and your accomplishments. I could have never done this without you. I feel proud to say that I worked with someone who I know will one day be one of the “famous people” at SIOP! Erin, Natalie, and Meredith, I am really going to miss you girls. Thanks for all of the help with everything. Your pep talks always inspired me to do my best. I look up to all of you and know you will go extremely far in life. Thank you for making my two years here so special. Finally, I also want to say thanks to the friends who had to listen to me whine! Tina, Shriti, Sonali, Nihar, and Paresh, thanks for always listening, for giving me hugs when I needed more strength, and most of all for being good friends when I needed you most.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....ii

List of Tables.....v

Abstract.....vi

Introduction.....1

Review of Literature.....2

 Counterproductive Work Behaviors.....2

 Dispositional Approaches to Understanding Motivation.....6

 Kanfer and Heggstad’s Motivational Trait Framework.....7

 BIS/BAS Framework.....10

Present Investigation.....13

 Avoidance Motivation and Counterproductive Work Behavior.....14

 Approach Motivation and Counterproductive Work Behavior.....15

 Other Criteria.....18

 Control Variables.....20

Method.....21

 Participants.....21

 Measures.....22

 Procedure.....24

Results and Discussion.....26

 Results.....26

 Tests of Counterproductive Work Behavior Hypotheses.....31

 Tests of OCB and Task Performance Hypotheses.....35

 Supplemental Analyses.....39

 Discussion.....40

 Counterproductive Work Behaviors.....41

 OCBs and Task Performance.....43

 The State of Motivational Traits.....44

Limitations and Future Research.....47

References.....50

Appendix A: Measure of Workplace Deviance Items.....55

Appendix B: Motivational Traits.....56

Appendix C: Organizational Citizenship Behavior Items.....58

Appendix D: In-Role Performance.....	59
Appendix E: Perceptions of Justice.....	60
Appendix F: Organizational Constraints Scale.....	61
Vita.....	62

List of Tables

1. Exploratory Factor Analysis of Motivational Trait Measures.....	26
2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients of All Variables.....	28
3. Regression Model Including All Variables.....	30

Abstract

This study examined the relationships between motivational traits and counterproductive work behaviors. Little evidence exists supporting a link between individual differences and counterproductive work behaviors in previous literature. This study tested for a link between individual differences in motivation and workplace deviance by using broad operationalizations of both constructs. In addition, the investigation controlled for the effects of situational factors on counterproductive work behaviors providing a stronger test of the role of dispositional motivation. In general, this study set out to show that both approach and avoidance motivation tendencies are related to counterproductive work behaviors, as well as organizational citizenship behaviors and task performance. The results confirmed this notion in that although Achievement Approach Motivation was negatively related to counterproductive work behaviors, General Approach Motivation and Avoidance Motivation were both positively related to the deviant behaviors. In addition, while only the approach traits (mostly the “achievement” traits) showed consistent relationships with the more traditional work behaviors, both approach and avoidance traits were linked to counterproductive behaviors to some degree.

Introduction

Rotundo and Sackett (2002) reported that three categories of job behaviors contribute to overall job performance: task, citizenship, and counterproductive behaviors. Of all of these areas, work on counterproductive behaviors has received the least attention. The research that has been done in this area has focused on the measurement and dimensionality of counterproductive work behaviors (Hollinger & Clark, 1982; Robinson & Bennett, 1995), and the development of screening tools to reduce the occurrence of counterproductive behaviors at work (Boye & Wasserman, 1996). Research has also examined the influences of organizational factors (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Kamp & Brooks, 1991), and, to a lesser extent, person variables (Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999; Giacalone & Knouse, 1990) on counterproductive work behaviors. The research on individual differences has tended to focus either on general personality traits (Salgado, 2002) and affectivity constructs (Aquino et al., 1999; Furnham, Forde, & Ferrari, 1999), or on less theoretically grounded predictors, such as honesty (Boye & Wasserman, 1996) or hostility (Giacalone & Knouse, 1990). What has not received much attention is the role that theory-based motivational traits might play in counterproductive work behaviors. The large body of research on motivational traits provides a theoretical structure for describing why some individuals choose to engage in deviant behaviors, whereas others do not. Further, examining the relationship between motivational traits and counterproductive work behaviors may enhance our understanding of the role dispositional motivation plays in a broader array of behaviors at work. This paper will first develop theoretical links between dispositional motivation and counterproductive work behaviors and then present a study designed to test these links.

Review of Literature

Counterproductive Work Behaviors

In general, counterproductive work behavior, also known as workplace deviance (e.g. Robinson & Bennett, 1995), has been defined as any behavior that violates organizational norms in a way that is harmful to either the organization itself, to the members of the organization, or to both (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Some of these behaviors include theft (Hollinger & Clark, 1983; Wimbush & Dalton, 1997), absenteeism (Johns, 1997), and various forms of aggression (Folger & Baron, 1996; Greenberg & Alge, 1998;). Robinson and Bennett (1995,1997) recently developed a taxonomy of deviant workplace behaviors, categorizing them into interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance. According to Robinson and Bennett (1995), organizational deviance includes forms of production deviance, behaviors that violate organizational norms regarding the minimal quantity and quality of work to be accomplished (e.g., leaving early, procrastinating, wasting resources), and types of property deviance, which are defined as “instances when employees acquire or damage the tangible property or assets of the work organization without authorization (p. 565),” (e.g., stealing from company, sabotaging equipment). Interpersonal deviance includes acts of political deviance, which are behaviors defined as “social interaction that puts other individuals at a personal or political disadvantage” (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, p.566) (e.g., competing non-beneficially or gossiping about coworkers), as well as the more severe acts of personal aggression, which are behaviors such as sexual harassment or verbal abuse, that are displayed in a hostile, violent, or aggressive manner (Robinson & Bennett, 1995).

Past theory and research have focused a great deal on situational influences on counterproductive work behaviors. For instance, Robinson and Bennett (1997) developed a

model of counterproductive work behaviors based on situational provocations at work. They argued that provocations (e.g., social or financial pressures, inequity or unfair treatment, poor work conditions, and other stressors in the workplace) often trigger reactions, which may include counterproductive behaviors. Robinson and Bennett's (1997) model provides detailed information regarding how organizational functions and features might precipitate deviant behaviors. In accordance, research has shown that situational variables, such as organizational climate (e.g., Kamp & Brooks, 1991), organizational justice (e.g., Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), hiring practices (e.g., Boye & Wasserman, 1996; Jones & Terris, 1985), informal sanctions, or socially-controlled norms, within organizations (e.g., Hollinger & Clark, 1982; Robinson & Bennett, 1997), and organizational constraints (e.g., Fox et al., 2001) predict counterproductive work behaviors. Of these situational influences, perceptions of justice and organizational constraints have been a focus of recent research efforts.

For instance, distributive justice (i.e., the extent to which outcomes/rewards are distributed fairly) has been found to be negatively related to both organizational deviance (Fox et al., 2001; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) and interpersonal deviance (Aquino et al., 1999; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Procedural justice (i.e., the extent to which the procedures used to determine one's outcomes are fair) has shown even stronger negative correlations with both organizational and interpersonal deviance (Fox et al., 2001). Fox et al. (2001) reported that organizational constraints (i.e., situational constraints that stem from rules and procedures, lack of resources, inadequate facilities, etc.) are positively correlated with counterproductive work behaviors, particularly of a retaliatory or vengeful nature.

These findings and others (e.g., Hollinger & Clark, 1982; Kamp & Brooks, 1991; Wimbush & Dalton, 1997) suggest that many deviant behaviors, particularly those that are

serious or intentional, may be primarily a reaction to situational factors. However, more mundane or minor deviant behaviors may be more a function of dispositional variables. Moberg (1997) suggested that many behaviors may not be intentionally deviant, but may still have negative effects on the organization or other individuals. That is, some behaviors are intentionally harmful (e.g., aggression, harassment, theft) whereas others are not intended to be harmful, but have negative effects (e.g., absenteeism, working slowly). For example, an employee may miss work, not because he/she is upset with the organization, but because he/she finds alternatives to work more attractive. Although the act of missing work may not have been intended to harm the organization or other employees, it may have such an effect and would be considered deviant. This type of deviant behavior may be more related to individual differences rather than situational provocations. For this reason, the role of the individual deserves more attention.

As a step in this direction, Robinson and Greenberg (1998) developed a model of the antecedents of deviant behavior that includes individual difference factors (i.e., personality, demographics) along with organizational factors (i.e., lack of leadership, poor rewards system) and social and interpersonal factors (i.e., norms of deviance, perceived injustice). Consistent with the individual difference component of this model, some research has examined personality traits (Boye & Wasserman, 1996; Giacalone & Knouse, 1990; Gibbs, 1991; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), demographic variables (Frank, 1989; Hollinger & Clark, 1983), and dispositional affect (Aquino et al, 1999; Furnham et al., 1999) as antecedents of counterproductive work behaviors. For example, research has shown that people who are low on self-control (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990) or have stunted moral development (Gibbs, 1991) tend to have higher rates of criminal activity and tend to be more prone to deviant behavior in general. Other

researchers have found that the personality traits of hostility (being easily frustrated; having an amoral orientation) (Giacalone & Knouse, 1990) and honesty (Boye & Wasserman, 1996) are predictors of sabotage justification (rationalizing acts of sabotage) and theft, respectively.

Research using demographic variables as predictors has shown that individuals who are young, have short tenure, are part-time workers, have low-paying jobs, and are of low organizational status tend to engage in counterproductive work behaviors (Hollinger & Clark, 1983; Frank, 1989). In addition, both Aquino et al. (1999) and Furnham and his colleagues (1999) found that negative affectivity was a positive predictor of both interpersonal and organizational deviance.

Although these findings are encouraging, Robinson and Greenberg (1998) concluded that the role of personality and demographics in predicting counterproductive work behaviors is fairly small. However, this conclusion may be premature. What has not been explored in past research is the role that individual differences in motivation might play in predicting counterproductive work behaviors. A criticism of past research is that some of the individual difference constructs examined have been largely atheoretical. That is, traits such as honesty and stunted moral development, and also demographic variables, may exhibit reasonable predictive utility, but do not advance our theoretical understanding of why counterproductive work behaviors occur. It may be the case that a trait like (dis)honesty predicts counterproductive work behaviors not because it is a causal agent of counterproductive work behaviors, but because it is essentially tapping the same underlying construct. On the other hand, motivational traits provide a theoretical structure that is useful for explaining why individuals engage in particular work behaviors (i.e., being drawn to the behavior; avoiding another behavior). Because of the strong theoretical foundation underlying motivational traits and the potential for greater explanatory power, it may be beneficial to examine motivational traits as predictors of workplace deviance.

Another possible reason for the lack of strong support for research on individual differences may be that the criteria (e.g., counterproductive work behaviors) have not been adequately measured. Specifically, research typically measures only one or two types of counterproductive work behaviors, rather than representing more of the construct space. Taking a broader approach in measuring these behaviors could enhance the predictor-criteria relationship. In addition, one might expect particular categories of counterproductive work behaviors to be more strongly related to motivational traits than others. For instance, minor deviant behaviors that occur without much deliberation may be better predicted by motivational traits, whereas more aggressive behaviors may not be a result of motivational traits but rather the situation, or even an antisocial personality disorder (Collins & Griffin, 1998). Determining how the various dimensions of counterproductive work behaviors relate to dispositional motivation can enhance our understanding of why deviant behavior occurs in organizations. The present study examined theoretically-based motivation constructs as predictors of a variety of counterproductive work behaviors. The following section will discuss recent conceptualizations of motivational traits in more detail, specifically focusing on two prominent approaches to measuring motivational traits.

Dispositional Approaches to Understanding Motivation

A large portion of the work motivation research over the past 25 years has emphasized situational influences on behavior. For example, expectancy theory relies on the individual's consideration of expectancies, valences, and instrumentalities based on certain situational cues (e.g., Van Eerde & Thierry, 2001), and goal setting theory emphasizes the impact of goal characteristics (i.e., goal specificity or difficulty) on performance (Locke & Latham, 1990). Although understanding these situational influences is useful for designing organizational

interventions, the role of the individual must also be taken into consideration. Over the past seven years, research on work motivation is beginning to refocus on the role of traits in motivated behavior (Austin & Klein, 1996; Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000; Vandewalle, 1997; Vandewalle, Brown, Cron, & Slocum, 1999). The following sections will review the development and research findings of two promising approaches to assessing motivational traits, the MTQ and the BIS/BAS scales.

Kanfer and Heggstad's Motivational Trait Framework

Kanfer and Heggstad (1997) took a broad approach to theorizing about and assessing motivational traits. In particular, these authors based their work on the general approach and avoidance distinction that serves as a foundation for much of the research on motivation (e.g., Elliot & Dweck, 1988; Gray, 1981; Vandewalle, 1997). In general, approach motivation is directed by the anticipation of positive or desirable outcomes, and avoidance motivation is directed by the anticipation of negative or undesirable outcomes (Elliot & Thrash, 2002). Based on this distinction, Kanfer and Heggstad (1997) developed a model of stable individual differences categorizing motivational traits into 2 broad classes: achievement and anxiety. Their idea of achievement motivation falls under an approach temperament of working toward tasks, whereas, anxiety is related to an avoidance orientation that moves away from expending effort on tasks. Kanfer and Heggstad (1999) developed the Motivational Trait Questionnaire (MTQ) to assess these motivational traits. This scale consists of 3 main dimensions, each tapped by two scales. The first dimension, Personal Mastery, consists of the *Desire to Learn* and *Mastery* scales, which both tap approach tendencies. The second dimension, Competitive Excellence, consists of the *Competitiveness* and *Other Referenced Goals* scales. Although the *Competitiveness* scale clearly has an approach orientation, the *Other Referenced Goals* trait

involves both approach and avoidance tendencies. This may be explained by the possibility of two different ways of comparing oneself to someone else. Individuals may compare themselves with others in order to evaluate whether they are performing better than others (an approach tendency); or they may compare their performance to other individuals in fear of performing worse than them (an avoidance tendency). The third dimension, Motivation Related to Anxiety, consists of the *Worry* and *Emotionality* scales, which tap avoidance motivation.

Empirical tests of this trait taxonomy have indicated clear distinctions between the dimensions. In particular, Kanfer and Ackerman (2000) found that the two scales within the Personal Mastery dimension tap the more common aspects of achievement motivation, such as the desire to do well on the job and to get along with coworkers. The Competitive Excellence scales seemed to tap less traditional achievement motivations, such as competing with others (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000). Kanfer and Ackerman's (2000) comparison of the MTQ with Tellegen's (1982) Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (MPQ) provides examples of these differential relationships between the approach scales of the MTQ and achievement-based variables. For instance, while Personal Mastery was found to have significant positive relationships with absorption (i.e., the extent to which an individual becomes absorbed in a task), and the *Mastery* scale was found to have a significant positive relationship with traditionalism (i.e., the internalization of traditional work ethic), the Competitive Excellence scales were unrelated to these variables. This finding makes sense in that, as Kanfer and Ackerman (2000) suggest, an individual who is absorbed in a task is unlikely to be comparing his/her performance with that of others. The Personal Mastery and Competitive Excellence scales were, however, all significantly and positively related to an aspect of extraversion called social potency. Kanfer and Ackerman (2000) also found that the Anxiety dimension of the MTQ was not related to either of

the two “achievement” traits of the MPQ, absorption and traditionalism. However, the *Worry and Emotionality* scales did have significant negative relationships with social potency, and the *Worry* scale was also significantly and negatively related to another aspect of extraversion, social closeness. The Anxiety dimension of the MTQ also had a significant positive relationship with the *Other Referenced Goals* scale, supporting the idea that the *Other Referenced Goals* scale has an avoidance aspect. The differential relationships of the various personality and achievement-based variables with not only the three broad dimensions, but with the scales within each dimension, verifies the discriminant validity of the individual scales and also gives an indication of the types of behaviors each might assess.

Although this classification of motivational traits has many noteworthy and valuable aspects, close inspection of the content covered in these scales suggests that the full spectrum of approach motivation may not be represented. In particular, there appears to be a strong emphasis on approach motivation in achievement contexts and little emphasis on more general, and possibly less “positive”, approach tendencies. For example, an individual may be drawn towards non-productive activities that waste time and resources but that he/she finds to be rewarding. Thus, a person may miss work not because he/she finds the activities to be aversive and threatening, but because he/she finds non-productive, off-task activities to be more pleasurable. In fact, studies outside of I/O psychology have found a link between approach motivation and such detrimental activities as substance use, (Scott, 2003) and alcohol abuse (Ostafin, Palfai, & Wechsler, 2003). In this research, the attraction toward the pleasurable effects of drugs and alcohol has a stronger effect than does the need to escape aversive stimuli. These non-achievement approach motives have often been ignored in I/O theory and may contribute to our understanding of why individuals engage in behaviors that do not have any clear achievement

outcomes (and may even be detrimental from the organization's perspective). Although the MTQ emphasizes approach motivation of the achievement variety, other more physiologically-based models of motivation (e.g., Gray, 1981, 1982) conceptualize more general approach tendencies.

BIS/BAS Framework

Gray (1981, 1982) posits that behavior and affect are outcomes of two general, physiologically-based motivational systems: the behavioral activation system (BAS), which serves as the appetitive, or approach system, and the behavioral inhibition system (BIS), which serves as the aversive, or avoidance system. In addition, the BAS is presumed to be related to positive affect and trait impulsivity, while the BIS is believed to be related to negative affect and trait anxiety. Over the years, several attempts have been made to develop measures of BIS and BAS motivations (see Cloninger, 1987; MacAndrew & Steele, 1991; Wilson, Barrett, & Gray, 1989). Carver and White (1994) reviewed and integrated much of the past research and developed a BIS/BAS measure aimed at overcoming the limitations of previous scales. Specifically, Carver and White's (1994) scales differ from other scales in that they do not measure how often individuals generally experience anxiety or impulsivity, but rather the individual's sensitivity to these traits during various experiences (i.e. how likely an individual is to display these traits in a particular situation), which they believe provides more precise assessments of an individual's systemic responses to reward and punishment (Gomez & Gomez, 2002). Through factor analysis, Carver and White (1994) derived one scale to measure BIS sensitivity and three subscales that measure BAS sensitivity. The BIS scale includes items assessing sensitivity to anxiety-inducing stimuli, whereas the three subscales for BAS, *Reward Responsiveness*, *Drive*, and *Fun Seeking*, differentially measure an individual's sensitivity

towards signals of reward and positive experience. Specifically, the *Reward Responsiveness* scale assesses the extent to which the individual responds positively after being rewarded; the *Drive* scale assesses one's persistence in pursuing desired goals; and the *Fun Seeking* scale reflects an individual's desire for new rewards and experiences and his/her willingness to approach novel experiences spontaneously. Carver and White (1994) demonstrated independence of the scales as well as theoretically consistent relationships between these scales and various personality and affective measures. For example, all of the BAS scales were positively correlated with extraversion, positive affectivity, and positive temperament.

In contrast to the approach dimensions of the MTQ, the approach-oriented scales of the BAS are not specific to achievement contexts. This distinction is important because not all approach tendencies are focused on achievement, and any complete picture of human motivation must take this into account. Diefendorff et al. (2002) recently provided some evidence that the approach traits of the BIS/BAS may be assessing something different than the approach traits of the MTQ. Specifically, they found that the BAS *Fun Seeking* scale was not significantly related to any of the MTQ approach scales, while the BAS *Reward Responsiveness* scale was significantly correlated with only the *Other Referenced Goals* scale. The BAS *Drive* scale exhibited significant relationships with all four of the MTQ approach-oriented scales. This finding makes sense given that, consistent with the MTQ approach scales, the *Drive* scale focuses primarily on achievement contexts. In terms of convergent validity, Diefendorff et al. (2002) found that the MTQ exhibited much stronger correlations with the goal orientation scales than did the BIS/BAS scales. This finding further supports the notion that the MTQ scales are focused more on the achievement aspect of approach motivation than are the BAS scales. On the other hand, Diefendorff et al. (2002) found that the avoidance-oriented scales of both the MTQ

and the BIS/BAS were highly intercorrelated and correlated with the goal orientation scales to roughly the same degree, suggesting that they are tapping similar traits. In an attempt to provide a broad assessment of motivational traits, both the MTQ and BIS/BAS measures were included in this investigation. It was expected that there would be one group of avoidance traits and three groups of approach traits corresponding to Personal Mastery, Competitive Excellence, and general non-achievement-based approach motivation. The present study examined the relationships of the MTQ and BIS/BAS scales with counterproductive work behaviors based on the relationships discussed above. The following section further develops hypotheses for these relationships.

Present Investigation

Because of the detrimental effects of counterproductive work behaviors on organizations and their employees (see Bennett & Robinson, 2000), it is important to better understand factors that influence these behaviors, including motivational traits. Unfortunately, there is little empirical or theoretical precedent for looking at the relationships between motivational traits and counterproductive work behaviors. However, examining the characteristics of counterproductive work behaviors and considering the various conceptualizations of dispositional motivation suggests some possible links. In addition, it is argued that because the dominant approaches to assessing motivational traits in I/O psychology (e.g., Kanfer & Heggestad, 1999) do not account for non-achievement related approach motives, a broader perspective is needed. Taking a broader approach may increase prediction in situations where individuals are drawn *toward* performing counterproductive behaviors, rather than engaging in them out of an avoidance motivation. Consistent with this idea, Kaplan (1975) refers to workplace deviance as voluntary acts that stem from either a lack of motivation to conform *or the existence of a motivation to violate normative expectations of behavior*. Although this idea of an approach motive driving deviant behavior was introduced almost three decades ago, the literature has ignored it for the most part. Because of the lack of research and theory related to these issues, many of the research questions detailed below may be considered exploratory.

For the present study counterproductive work behaviors were operationalized using Robinson and Bennett's (1995) typology of interpersonal versus organizational acts. This typology includes a broad spectrum of both minor and serious behaviors that take the form of organizational deviance (production and property deviance) and interpersonal deviance (political deviance and personal aggression). Taking this broad approach overcomes a problem of past

research that has focused on a narrow array of counterproductive work behaviors. In terms of motivation, both approach and avoidance motivations were examined as predictors using scales from the MTQ and BIS/BAS. Although avoidance motivation may play a more obvious role in influencing these negative work behaviors, approach motivation may also play a role. For example, less intentional deviant behaviors could be related to approach motivation because individuals doing these things may not necessarily intend harm, but may actually inflict harm because they are approaching more rewarding alternatives to work (e.g., relaxing, surfing the internet, staying home from work).

Avoidance Motivation and Counterproductive Work Behavior

Avoidance motivation, operationalized with the *Worry* and *Emotionality* scales of the MTQ and the BIS, form fairly clear links with counterproductive work behaviors. Kanfer and Ackerman (2000) described the *Worry* and *Emotionality* scales as being associated with apprehension of performance evaluation or the negative consequences of performance evaluation. Preoccupation with the consequences of a task could lead to counterproductive behaviors, such as procrastination or not completing assignments. In line with these conceptualizations, Carver and White (1994) refer to the BIS dimension as being sensitive to punishment cues. Theoretically, punishment cues and evaluation apprehension represent avoidance tendencies that can lead to behaviors that are not desired by the organization. Consistent with this idea, Diefendorff et al. (2002) found that these avoidance scales were positively correlated with measures of hesitation and preoccupation. Additionally, past research on counterproductivity has shown that negative affectivity, a close correlate of avoidance motivation, is positively related to both interpersonal and organizational counterproductive work behaviors (Aquino et al, 1999; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001). Anxiety and other negative

emotions have also been shown to have significant positive relationships with both organizational and interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors (Fox et al., 2001). Based on these ideas, the following hypotheses were formulated for the avoidance-related traits:

H1a: Avoidance Motivation (*Worry, Emotionality, and Behavioral Inhibition*) is positively related to organizationally-directed counterproductive work behaviors.

H1b: Avoidance Motivation (*Worry, Emotionality, and Behavioral Inhibition*) is positively related to interpersonally-directed counterproductive work behaviors.

Approach Motivation and Counterproductive Work Behavior

Achievement-related approach motivation is often times associated with high performance and the pursuit of positive activities and, as such, may be negatively related to counterproductive work behaviors. Conscientiousness, which has been shown to be associated with achievement tendencies (Colquitt & Simmering, 1998; Vermetten, Lodewijks, & Vermunt, 2001), has been shown to be negatively related to counterproductive work behaviors (Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996; Salgado, 2002). Because the Personal Mastery scales of the MTQ (*Desire to Learn and Mastery*) are highly achievement-oriented, they should be negatively related to counterproductive work behaviors. Based on these ideas the following hypotheses were predicted:

H2a: Personal Mastery (*Desire to Learn and Mastery*) is negatively related to organizationally-directed counterproductive work behaviors.

H2b: Personal Mastery (*Desire to Learn and Mastery*) is negatively related to interpersonally-directed counterproductive work behaviors.

As mentioned before, an intriguing aspect of approach motivation that is often overlooked in I/O psychology is that it can involve non-achievement behaviors. The implication

is that individuals can have approach tendencies for maladaptive activities. This idea suggests that some aspects of approach motivation may have positive relationships with some counterproductive work behaviors. In particular, non-achievement-related approach motivation and the competitive aspect of approach motivation may be *positive* predictors of counterproductive work behaviors.

The Competitive Excellence trait differs from the Personal Mastery trait in that its measures, *Other Referenced Goals* and *Competitiveness*, involve individuals comparing themselves to others. Kanfer and Ackerman (2000) explicitly state that the *Competitiveness* scale focuses on competition and performing better than others. In accordance with this focus, Collins and Griffin (1998) explain that many counterproductive acts are driven by self-interest. Therefore, it is possible that individuals high on these two traits may engage in work behaviors that fulfill a self-serving interest of their own at the expense of others. For instance, a member of a team could try to take charge of a project in order to be noticed by the boss, but in the process may harm team members. Similarly, workplace Machiavellianism has been viewed as the negative side of contextual performance (Collins & Griffin, 1998) and has been positively associated with antisocial behavior and alienation (McHoskey, 1999). In line with this idea, the self-serving interest and the need to perform better than others associated with individuals high on Competitive Excellence may lead them to engage in more interpersonal deviance. In other words, individuals may commit acts of political deviance (e.g., spreading rumors, blaming others for own mistakes) in order to meet their competitive needs. In addition, Kanfer and Ackerman (2000) found that the *Other Referenced Goals* scale showed a significant positive relationship with both the *Worry* and *Emotionality* scales, meaning that this scale has both approach and avoidance related tendencies. Individuals who are high in *Other Referenced Goals* may feel the

need to reduce anxiety by taking action towards the person whom they are comparing themselves against. This could lead to fear of failure and, subsequently, to minor interpersonal deviance such as, “competing non-beneficially” (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Based on this logic, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H3: Competitive Excellence (*Competitiveness* and *Other Referenced Goals*) is positively related to interpersonally-directed counterproductive work behaviors.

Because they do not focus solely on achievement-based motives, the BAS traits, *Reward Responsiveness*, *Fun-seeking*, and *Drive* may predict a variety of approach behaviors, including counterproductive work behaviors. For example, they may predict the occurrences of off-task behaviors that are not intentionally deviant but negatively impact production. Elliot and Thrash (2002) suggested a link between BAS dimensions and sensation seeking, which is defined as “the need for varied, novel, and complex situations and experiences and the willingness to take physical and social risks for the sake of such experiences” (Zuckerman, 1979, p. 10). Supporting this idea, Torrubia, Avila, Molto, and Caseras (2001) recently found a strong positive correlation between sensation seeking and BAS sensitivity. Sensation seeking hints at activities with approach tendencies for non-productive behaviors through its association with risk-taking at the expense of possible negative consequences. Along the same lines, approach motivation has been associated with alcohol and substance use (Acton, 2003; Ostafin et al., 2003). The relationships between approach motivation and the sensation seeking and impulsivity traits, which are associated with non-achievement based behaviors, offer evidence for the focus of the BAS scales on counterproductive work behaviors. Based on the broad focus on approach tendencies of the BAS scales, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H4a: General Approach Motivation (*Reward Responsiveness, Fun-seeking, and Drive*) is positively related to counterproductive work behaviors directed at the organization.

H4b: General Approach Motivation (*Reward Responsiveness, Fun-seeking, and Drive*) is positively related to interpersonally-directed counterproductive work behaviors.

Other Criteria

As mentioned previously, the job performance construct consists of three main types of behavior: in-role, or task, behaviors, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), and counterproductive work behaviors (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). In order to consider how motivational traits relate to the full spectrum of job-related behaviors and to examine the discriminant validity of the measures used in this study, relationships of the other two job performance criteria, task and citizenship performance, with the motivational trait constructs examined.

Task performance reflects how well individuals perform their assigned activities (Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, & Sager, 1993). This dimension of performance refers to the in-role, core aspects of one's job. Organizational citizenship behaviors are defined as *work-related* (as opposed to *work-specific*) behaviors that are not actually tied to the formal organizational reward system, but that positively influence an organization's functioning (Moorman, 1991). They differ from in-role task performance in that they are not directly related to the technical core of one's job, and they are more a function of individual discretion than in-role behaviors (Organ, 1997). Williams and Anderson (1991) distinguish between two categories of OCBs: (a) OCBOs-citizenship behaviors that directly benefit the organization (e.g., having good attendance, following informal organizational rules) and (b) OCBI-citizenship behaviors that benefit particular individuals within the organization and thereby indirectly benefit the

organization (e.g., helping a coworker with work), which mirrors Robinson and Bennett's (1995) distinction for CWBs. Both task performance and OCBs are examples of "positive" work behaviors and are depicted as being traditionally achievement-oriented and goal directed. In accordance, it was anticipated that Personal Mastery (*Desire to Learn and Mastery*) would be positively related to in-role performance and OCBs. However, as described earlier, the primary focus of the Competitive Excellence (*Other Referenced Goals and Competitiveness*) is on the extent to which individuals compare themselves with others. Because of this competitive orientation, individuals high on this trait may achieve high performance and engage in OCBs but may be less likely to engage in OCBI. On the other hand, because the BAS traits do not necessarily have an achievement focus, they were not expected to be significantly related to task performance or OCBs. Based on these reasons, the following hypotheses were examined:

H5a: Personal Mastery (*Desire to Learn and Mastery*) is positively related to OCBs and task performance.

H5b: Competitive Excellence (*Other Referenced Goals and Competitiveness*) is positively related to task performance.

H5c: Competitive Excellence (*Other Referenced Goals and Competitiveness*) is negatively related to OCBI.

Avoidance Motivation (*Worry, Emotionality, and Behavioral Inhibition*) is related to anxiety and off-task thought occurrence (Diefendorff et al, 2002), which suggests a negative relationship between these traits and positive behaviors at work. Thus, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H6: Avoidance Motivation (*Worry, Emotionality, and Behavioral Inhibition*) is negatively related to OCBs and task performance.

Control Variables

As stated previously, past research has emphasized situational influences on counterproductive work behaviors. To provide a stringent test of the relationships between motivational traits and counterproductive work behaviors, situational factors were controlled for in the analyses. If motivational traits are important, they should predict counterproductive work behaviors even after the effects of situational factors have been partialled out. As described earlier, past research on situational predictors of deviance has examined the influence of procedural and distributive justice on deviant behavior. Individuals' perceptions of injustice in these areas have been linked to the extent to which they engage in deviant behavior (e.g., Aquino et al., 1999; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). In addition, organizational constraints, such as restrictive rules and procedures, inadequate equipment, lack of necessary training or procedural information, have been linked to both organizational and interpersonal counterproductive behaviors (Fox et al., 2001; Spector & Jex, 1998). Controlling for these situational factors can rule out their influence in any obtained relationship between motivational traits and deviant behavior.

Method

Participants

Participants in this study were undergraduate students from a large, southeastern university who were employed at least 20 hours per week in any type of job. Students received extra credit in their psychology courses, and were also entered in a cash-prize drawing, in exchange for their participation. With the large number of measures used in this study, the goal was to obtain a minimum of 350 participants.

Data was collected on a total of 430 participants. Participants that were then excluded from the study were either missing responses on one or more scale (if only a few items were missing from a scale, missing data was replaced with the mean) or worked less than 20 hours per week. The remaining 395 participants were included in preliminary analyses in which the data set was screened for outliers. Three of the participants were identified as outliers and were dropped from any further analysis. The final sample consisted of 392 individuals.

The employees included in analyses were, on average, 21.08 years of age ($SD = 3.46$), of which 71.1% were female, 85.6 % were white, 8.4 % were African American, 2.3 % classified themselves as “Other”, 2.0 were Hispanic, and 1.8 % were Asian American. These employees worked an average of 24.19 hours/week ($SD = 5.90$), had been employed by their current organization an average of 21.27 months ($SD = 21.86$), and had held their current job position an average of 18.64 months ($SD = 22.65$). Participants in the study held sales and service positions (38.3 %), clerical/secretarial positions (18.1 %), teaching/childcare/healthcare occupations (12 %), and managerial/supervisory positions (8.7 %). The remaining participants fell into either a student worker category (11.7%) or into the “other” category (11.2%) which ranged anywhere

from construction or maintenance worker to photographer. The percentages presented here show that a wide array of jobs and occupations were represented in the sample for this study.

Measures

- Counterproductive Work Behaviors. The degree to which participants engaged in particular counterproductive work behaviors was assessed using Bennett and Robinson's (2000) measure (see Appendix A). This measure of workplace deviance separates organizational and interpersonal deviance. Bennett and Robinson's (2000) scales were developed in a multistep procedure where one group of employees listed deviant behaviors that they had engaged in at some point during their time at work. These behaviors were evaluated by another group of employees and narrowed down to identify and include the most common behaviors. Factor analysis was conducted on the remaining items to form the two scales. This measure consists of 12 items assessing organizational deviance ($\alpha = .81$) and 7 items assessing interpersonal deviance ($\alpha = .81$). Participants indicated the extent to which they participated in each item based on a 5-point Likert scale as follows: 1 = "never"; 2 = "once or twice a year"; 3 = "several times a year"; 4 = "once or twice a month"; 5 = "weekly."
- Motivational Traits Questionnaire. Motivational traits were measured using the short form of Kanfer and Heggstad's (1997) Motivational Traits Questionnaire (MTQ) (see Appendix B). The short form of the MTQ includes 48 items distributed across six of the original nine scales: (a) the 8-item *Desire to Learn* scale ($\alpha = .75$), (b) the 8-item *Mastery* scale ($\alpha = .79$), (c) the 7-item *Other Referenced Goals* scale ($\alpha = .82$), (d) the 6-item *Competitiveness* scale ($\alpha = .86$), (e) the 10-item *Worry* scale ($\alpha = .83$) and (f) the 9-item *Emotionality* scale ($\alpha = .78$). Participants responded to each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = "very untrue of me" to 5 = "very true of me".

- BIS/BAS Scales. Motivational traits were also measured using Carver and White's (1994) BIS/BAS scales (see Appendix B). The overall measure consists of 20 items distributed across four scales: (a) the 7-item BIS scale ($\alpha = .81$), (b) the 5-item BAS *Reward Responsiveness* scale ($\alpha = .73$), (c) the 4-item BAS *Drive* scale ($\alpha = .78$), and (d) the 4-item BAS *Fun Seeking* scale ($\alpha = .71$). Participants also responded to each item in this measure based on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = "very untrue of me" to 5 = "very true of me").
- Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. Participants' OCB ratings were gathered using the measure developed by Williams and Anderson (1991) (see Appendix C). This scale includes 7 items that measure OCBs directed at other individuals ($\alpha = .79$) and 7 items that measure OCBs directed at the organization ($\alpha = .63$). Participants indicated the extent to which they perform these behaviors on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree").
- Task Performance. Task performance was measured using Williams and Anderson's (1991) 7-item measure ($\alpha = .81$) of in-role behaviors (see Appendix D). Participants rated how well they believe they perform the activities required by their jobs based on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree").
- Justice Perceptions. Justice perceptions were assessed using measures of distributive and procedural justice. Distributive justice was measured using the Distributive Justice Index developed by Price and Mueller (1986) (see Appendix E). This scale consists of 6 items ($\alpha = .91$) assessing the extent to which employees feel that rewards are fairly distributed according to work inputs and will be reported on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = "very unfairly" to 5 = "very fairly").

Procedural justice was assessed using the procedural justice scales from Rupp and Cropanzano's (2002) investigation. The measure consists of items that assess both supervisory-focused and organizationally-focused perceived fairness of formal organizational procedures. For the purposes of this investigation, only the 4 organizationally-focused items ($\alpha = .83$) seemed to be relevant and were used to measure procedural justice (see Appendix E). Response choices for these scales range from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree".

- Organizational Constraints. The Organizational Constraints Scale (OCS) developed by Spector and Jex (1998) was used to assess the frequency with which participants' job performance is hindered by work constraints (see Appendix F). Examples of these constraints include, inadequate resources, interruptions, problems with coworkers, and constraints associated with the rules and procedures of the organization. This scale consists of 11 items ($\alpha = .83$) that were rated on a 5-point Likert scale of how often these constraints interfere with performance ranging from 1 = "less than once per month or never" to 5 = "several times per day."

Procedure

The data for this study was collected from employed students who voluntarily participated in the study. At the time of data collection, participants were informed that they would be completing questionnaires assessing their individual traits and perceptions of work-related situations, as well as the types of behaviors they had or had not participated in at work. To reduce the amount of response bias associated with survey questions on "negative" behaviors such as counterproductive work behaviors, the experimenter stressed the importance of the research and its dependence on the accuracy and honesty of the responses. The participants were also encouraged to discuss any concerns regarding the research or its purposes with the researcher. Participants first completed demographic information along with the MTQ,

BIS/BAS, justice perceptions, and organizational constraints questionnaires. Before continuing, they were asked to read an instruction page that again pointed out the importance of accurate and honest responses. Because of the nature of reporting “negative” counterproductive behaviors, the participants were assured of their anonymity at this time. The students then completed the counterproductive work behaviors, OCBs, and in-role performance questionnaires.

Results and Discussion

Results

To provide evidence that the conceptualization of the motivational traits set forth in the introduction is actually present in the data, Principal Axis factor analysis was conducted on the intercorrelations of the scales from the motivational trait measures. Four factors were extracted and rotated obliquely. The four factors, presented along with factor loadings in Table 1, correspond to the proposed conceptualizations of the motivational traits.

Table 1.
Exploratory Factor Analysis of Motivational Trait Measures

	Factor Loadings			
	Personal Mastery Motivation	Competitive Excellence	General Approach Motivation	Avoidance Motivation
Desire to Learn	0.71	-0.06	0.01	-0.08
Mastery	0.92	0.09	-0.08	-0.02
Other Referenced Goals	0.09	0.63	0.16	0.21
Competitiveness	-0.07	0.98	-0.08	-0.13
Reward Responsiveness	0.20	-0.01	0.53	0.29
Fun-seeking	-0.18	.00	0.72	-0.15
Drive	0.18	0.24	0.50	-0.07
Worry	-0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.88
Emotionality	-0.06	0.06	-0.06	0.87
Behavioral Inhibition	0.01	-0.10	0.01	0.78
Variance Explained	14.67%	26.41%	10.79%	26.21%

The first factor, Avoidance Motivation, consists of the *Worry* and *Emotionality* scales from Kanfer and Heggstad's MTQ short form (1999) and the *Behavioral Inhibition* scale adapted from Carver and White's BIS/BAS measure (1994). The second factor, Personal Mastery, corresponds with the Personal Mastery dimension measured by the MTQ and includes the *Desire to Learn* and *Mastery* scales. The third factor again includes MTQ traits and is labeled Competitive Excellence. This motivational construct consists of *Competitiveness* and *Other Referenced Goals*. The fourth factor is made up of the BAS traits, *Reward Responsiveness*, *Fun-seeking*, and *Drive*, and is labeled General Approach Motivation. It is also

important to note that the crossloadings of the traits are negligible, providing support for the distinctiveness of the four factors associated with the motivational traits. Now that the proposed grouping of the motivational traits has been demonstrated, the hypotheses will be tested.

Bivariate correlations, partial correlations, and multiple regression analyses were used to test the hypotheses. These three sets of analyses were used because each provides a different picture of the relationships between the variables, ranging from the least restrictive to the most restrictive. Bivariate correlations provide measures of the linear association between two variables. Partial correlations provide tests of the unique relationship between two variables after covariates (other variables that may be related to the dependent variables) are removed. In this study, the three covariates of distributive justice, procedural justice, and organizational constraints were included in the partial correlation analyses. Finally, multiple regression, in which these same control variables were entered in Step 1 and all of the motivational trait measures were entered in Step 2, was used to provide a more comprehensive test of the hypotheses. Essentially this analysis provides tests of the unique relationship of each motivational trait variable with a dependent variable, controlling for the covariates and the other motivational trait variables. This analysis is the most restrictive in that it tests the significance of the unique relationships of each motivational trait with the dependent variables, controlling for all of the other motivational traits. The results of all of these analyses are presented in three sections. The first section describes the tests of the counterproductive work behaviors hypotheses, while the second section does the same for the hypotheses related to citizenship behaviors and task performance. The third section discusses the results of some supplemental analyses conducted to gain a more comprehensive picture of the relationships between all of the independent and dependent variables.

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients of All Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Distributive Justice	3.68	.51	(.91)							
2. Procedural Justice	3.70	.55	.53**	(.83)						
3. Organizational Constraints	3.37	.68	-.38**	-.47**	(.83)					
4. Desire to Learn	3.03	.80	-.05	.01	-.05	(.75)				
5. Mastery	3.40	.64	.03	.07	-.08	.64**	(.79)			
6. Other Referenced Goals	3.23	.73	-.08	-.03	.11*	.17**	.25**	(.82)		
7. Competitiveness	3.53	.68	-.02	.00	.09	.05	.22**	.62**	(.86)	
8. Worry	4.24	.45	-.05	-.08	.09	.0	-.01	.20**	-.13**	(.83)
9. Emotionality	3.43	.67	-.08	-.11*	.11*	-.12*	-.06	.13**	-.08	.71**
10. Behavioral Inhibition	3.50	.69	-.08	-.07	.03	-.10	-.06	.10	-.22	.75**
11. BAS Reward Responsiveness	3.43	.93	.01	.07	.05	.17**	.24**	.37**	.09	.23**
12. BAS Drive	3.73	.80	.06	.09	.06	.18**	.32**	.39**	.38**	-.06
13. BAS Fun-seeking	1.85	.64	.08	.03	.06	.01	-.07	.19**	.18**	-.08
14. Counter. Work Behaviors-Org	2.08	.64	-.16**	-.22**	.34**	-.16**	-.20**	.15**	.08	.23**
15. Counter. Work Behaviors-Inter	2.01	.78	-.16**	-.13**	.33**	-.17**	-.13**	.19**	.18**	.10*
16. Org Citizenship Behaviors-Org	3.77	.54	.15**	.27**	-.20**	.19**	.22**	-.00	-.06	-.12*
17. Org Citizenship Behaviors-Inter	3.98	.55	.17**	.17**	-.02	.05	.10*	.01	-.08	.07
18. Task Performance	4.14	.52	.13**	.24**	-.20**	.23**	.31**	.04	-.09	-.09
<i>Partial Correlations: Predictor and Criteria Variables, Controlling for Distributive Justice, Organizational Procedural Justice, and Organizational Constraints</i>										
19. Counter. Work Behaviors-Org						-.15**	-.18**	.13*	.01	.21**
20. Counter. Work Behaviors-Inter						-.16**	.11*	.16**	.15**	.08
21. Org Citizenship Behaviors-Org						.19**	.21**	.01	-.06	-.10
22. Org Citizenship Behaviors Inter						.06	.10	.02	-.09	.09
23. Task Performance						.23**	.29**	.06	-.08	-.02

*p<.05 **p<.01

NOTE. Alpha reliability values located on the diagonal

Table 2 continued

Variable	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Distributive Justice										
2. Procedural Justice										
3. Organizational Constraints										
4. Desire to Learn										
5. Mastery										
6. Other Referenced Goals										
7. Competitiveness										
8. Worry										
9. Emotionality	(.78)									
10. Behavioral Inhibition	.67**	(.81)								
11. BAS Reward Responsiveness	.16**	.30**	(.73)							
12. BAS Drive	-.05	-.10	.36**	(.78)						
13. BAS Fun-seeking	.09	-.14**	.30**	.44**	(.71)					
14. Counter. Work Behaviors-Org	.14**	.12*	.08	.12*	.24**	(.81)				
15. Counter. Work Behaviors-Inter	.08	.01	.11*	.23**	.26**	.48**	(.81)			
16. Org Citizenship Behaviors-Org	-.10*	-.04	.09	-.02	-.09	-.52**	-.22**	(.63)		
17. Org Citizenship Behaviors-Inter	.07	.14**	.20**	.04	.10	-.03	-.02	.33**	(.79)	
18. Task Performance	-.09	.01	.20**	.07	-.04	-.30**	-.19**	.52**	.41**	(.81)
<i>Partial Correlations: Predictor and Criteria Variables, Controlling for Distributive Justice, Organizational Procedural Justice, and Organizational Constraints</i>										
19. Counter. Work Behaviors-Org	.11*	.11*	.07	.11*	.24**					
20. Counter. Work Behaviors-Inter	.05	-.01	.10	.23**	.25**					
21. Org Citizenship Behaviors-Org	-.07	-.02	.08	-.02	-.11*					
22. Org Citizenship Behaviors Inter	.08	.16**	.19**	.02	.07					
23. Task Performance	-.06	.02	.20**	.07	-.05					

*p<.05 **p<.01

NOTE. Alpha reliability values located on the diagonal

Table 3.
Regression Model Including all Variables

	CWBO	CWBI	OCBO	OCBI	TASK
STEP 1					
Distributive Justice	-.01	-.07	-.01	.14**	-.01
Procedural Justice-Org.	-.07	.06	.24***	.14**	.19***
Organizational Constraints	.30***	.33***	-.09	.10*	-.11*
(R²)	(.12***)	(.11***)	(.08***)	(.05***)	(.07***)
STEP 2					
Desire to Learn	-.07	-.15**	.07	-.02	.03
Mastery	-.16**	-.10	.16**	.14**	.25***
Other Referenced Goals	.06	.04	.09	.01	.09
Competitiveness	.02	.06	-.13*	-.10	-.20***
Worry	.31***	.17**	-.22***	-.10	-.08
Emotionality	-.09	-.00	.00	.01	-.08
Behavioral Inhibition	-.04	-.12	.08	.18**	.04
Reward Responsiveness	-.04	.02	.08	.12**	.15***
Drive	.07	.18***	-.07	-.06	-.01
Fun-Seeking	.20***	.14**	-.09	.11*	-.06
(change R²)	(.14***)	(.13***)	(.17***)	(.07***)	(.14***)

* $p < .10$ ** $p < .05$ *** $p < .01$

Note. Df Step 1 (3, 388); Step 2 (10, 378). All R² values are unadjusted.

Tests of Counterproductive Work Behavior Hypotheses

As discussed previously, organizational and situational factors found to be relevant to counterproductive work behaviors in past research (Aquino et al., 1999; Fox et al., 2001; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) were used as controls in the partial correlation and regression analyses. Before reporting the specific results of each hypothesis, the results for these covariates are discussed.

Distributive justice, organizational procedural justice, and organizational constraints were all significantly correlated ($p < .01$) with CWBO at $r = -.16$, $r = -.22$, and $r = .34$, respectively. However, in the regression equation, only organizational constraints was found to be a significant predictor of CWBO ($\beta = .30$, $p < .01$), whereas distributive justice ($\beta = -.01$, $n.s.$) and procedural justice ($\beta = -.07$, $n.s.$) accounted for very little unique variance. The relationships with CWBI showed the same trend. Distributive justice, procedural justice, and organizational constraints were all significantly correlated ($p < .01$) with CWBI at $r = -.16$, $r = -.13$, and $r = .33$, respectively. Only organizational constraints was a significant predictor of CWBI ($\beta = .33$, $p < .01$), while distributive justice ($\beta = -.07$, $n.s.$) and procedural justice ($\beta = .06$, $n.s.$) did not show significant relationships in the regression analyses.

- Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 1 stated that positive relationships would exist between Avoidance Motivation (*Worry, Emotionality, and Behavioral Inhibition*) and organizationally-directed counterproductive work behaviors (H1a) and interpersonally-directed counterproductive work behaviors (H1b). The results for H1a will be discussed first, followed by those for H1b. The *Worry* scale was significantly related to CWBO in the correlation analysis ($r = .23$, $p < .01$), partial correlation analysis ($pr = .21$, $p < .01$), and regression analysis ($\beta = .31$, $p < .01$). These findings provide consistent support for *Worry* as a predictor of CWBO. *Emotionality* was

significantly correlated with CWBO ($r = .14, p < .01$) and remained significant in the partial correlation analysis ($pr = .11, p < .05$). However, the regression coefficient was nonsignificant ($\beta = -.09, n.s.$). The results for *Behavioral Inhibition* were similar to those for *Emotionality*. Again, although both the correlation coefficient ($r = .12, p < .05$) and partial correlation coefficient ($pr = .11, p < .05$) were significant, the beta weight from the regression analysis was nonsignificant ($\beta = -.04, n.s.$). Supplemental regression analyses revealed that both *Emotionality* and *Behavioral Inhibition* had significant beta-weights when *Worry* was excluded from the analysis, suggesting that the *Worry* scale was the dominant Avoidance motivation measure. This pattern of findings makes sense given the common foundation of these traits in avoidance motivation and their strong relationships with each other (Average $r = .71$; see Table 2). Overall, these results support Hypothesis 1a because all three measures of avoidance motivation are significantly correlated with CWBO, even after controlling for distributive justice, organizational procedural justice, and organizational constraints.

For Hypothesis 1b, only *Worry* displayed positive relationships with CWBI. The bivariate correlation ($r = .10, p < .05$) and regression coefficient ($\beta = .17, p < .05$) were significant, but the partial correlation ($pr = .08, n.s.$) was nonsignificant. The relationships between CWBI and *Emotionality* ($r = .08, n.s.$; $pr = .05, n.s.$; $\beta = -.00, n.s.$) and CWBI and *Behavioral Inhibition* ($r = .01, n.s.$; $pr = -.01, n.s.$; $\beta = -.12, n.s.$) were nonsignificant in all of the analyses. Based on these results, Hypothesis 1b was generally supported for *Worry* but not for *Emotionality* or *Behavioral Inhibition*.

- Hypothesis 2. Hypotheses 2a and 2b proposed negative relationships between Personal Mastery (*Desire to Learn* and *Mastery*) and CWBO and CWBI, respectively. The correlation coefficient and partial correlation coefficient both indicated a significant negative relationship

between *Desire to Learn* and CWBO ($r = -.16, p < .01$; $pr = -.15, p < .01$), but the regression coefficient was not significant ($\beta = -.07, n.s.$). The relationship between *Mastery* and CWBO was straightforward. All of the coefficients were significant and negative just as expected ($r = -.20, p < .01$; $pr = -.18, p < .01$; $\beta = -.16, p < .05$). Additional regression analyses showed that *Mastery* was primarily responsible for the nonsignificant relationship of *Desire to Learn* in the regression model, as this coefficient became significant when *Mastery* was removed from model. This finding is consistent with the high correlation between *Desire to Learn* and *Mastery* ($r = .64, p < .01$). Based on these results, Hypothesis 2a was largely supported.

For Hypothesis 2b, both *Desire to Learn* ($r = -.17, p < .01, pr = -.16, p < .01$; $\beta = -.15, p < .05$) and *Mastery* ($r = -.13, p < .01$; $pr = -.11, p < .05$) displayed the expected relationships with CWBI, excluding the beta-weight for *Mastery* ($\beta = -.10, n.s.$), which was not significant. Additional regression analyses displayed a significant regression coefficient for *Mastery* when *Desire to Learn* was removed from the analyses, again showing the effects of the high intercorrelation between the two predictors. Based on these results, Hypothesis 2b was largely supported for *Desire to Learn* and *Mastery*.

- Hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 3 stated that Competitive Excellence (*Other Referenced Goals* and *Competitiveness*) is positively related to CWBI. The bivariate correlation ($r = .19, p < .01$) and partial correlation ($pr = .16, p < .01$) coefficients for *Other Referenced Goals* supported this hypothesis. However, the regression coefficient was nonsignificant ($\beta = .04, n.s.$). *Competitiveness* displayed a similar relationship with CWBI as the correlation ($r = .18, p < .01$) and partial correlation ($pr = .15, p < .01$) coefficients were positive and significant, but the regression coefficient was nonsignificant ($\beta = .06, n.s.$). Further regression analyses showed that *Other Referenced Goals* became nonsignificant when the BAS approach traits (*Drive, Reward*

Responsiveness, and *Fun-seeking*) were included in the model, suggesting that the overlap between *Other Referenced Goals* and the BAS approach traits was responsible for the nonsignificant regression results. This could be a result of the *Other Referenced Goals* scale having a small, but salient loading on the same factor as the BAS traits (see Table 1). Additional regression analyses also showed that the beta-weight for *Competitiveness* became significant when *Other Referenced Goals* was not in the analysis. This revealed that the relationship between *Competitiveness* and CWBI may exist but was shared with *Other Referenced Goals*. These findings together indicated that Hypothesis 3 was partially supported for both *Other Referenced Goals* and *Competitiveness*.

- Hypothesis 4. Hypothesis 4 stated that General Approach Motivation (*Reward Responsiveness*, *Fun-seeking*, and *Drive*) is positively related to CWBO (H4a) and CWBI (H4b). *Reward Responsiveness* was not significantly related to CWBO in the correlation ($r = .08, n.s.$), the partial correlation ($pr = .07, n.s.$), and the regression analyses, ($\beta = -.04, n.s.$). *Fun-seeking* on the other hand displayed a consistent significant relationship with CWBO. All 3 of the analyses were positive and significant ($r = .26, p < .01$; $pr = .24, p < .01$; $\beta = .20, p < .01$), supporting the prediction of the hypothesis. *Drive* displayed significant and positive correlation and partial correlation coefficients ($r = .12, p < .05$; $pr = .11, p < .05$), however, the regression coefficient was nonsignificant ($\beta = .07, n.s.$). Additional regression analyses showed that *Drive* became significant when *Reward Responsiveness* was removed from the model. This could be an effect of the relatively high intercorrelation between the two predictors (see Table 2). These results show that although Hypothesis 4a was not supported for *Reward Responsiveness*, it was fully supported for *Fun-seeking* and largely supported for *Drive*.

For Hypothesis 4b, *Reward Responsiveness* and CWBI were significantly correlated ($r = .11, p < .05$), but the partial correlation ($pr = .10, n.s.$) and regression coefficients ($\beta = .02, n.s.$) were not significant. Conversely, *Fun-seeking* ($r = .26, p < .01; pr = .25, p < .01; \beta = .14, p < .05$) and *Drive* ($r = .23, p < .01; pr = .23, p < .01; \beta = .18, p < .01$) displayed significant and stable relationships with CWBI. Thus, Hypothesis 4b was supported for *Fun-seeking* and *Drive* but was not supported for *Reward Responsiveness*.

All of the results reported in this section concerned counterproductive work behaviors directed at both the organization and other individuals. For these criteria, 12% of the variance in CWBO and 11% of the variance in CWBI was accounted for by the control variables at Step 1. The motivational traits at Step 2 accounted for an additional 14% of the variance in CWBO and 13% of the variance in CWBI.

Tests of OCB and Task Performance Hypotheses

Distributive justice, procedural justice, and organizational constraints were entered as covariates in the analyses for task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). As with the counterproductive behavior variables, all of the covariates were significantly correlated with OCBO, OCBI, and task performance (with the exception of the organizational constraints and OCBI relationship; see Table 2). However, when these variables were entered into the regression model, only procedural justice was a significant predictor ($\beta = .24, p < .01$) of OCBO, while distributive justice ($\beta = .00, n.s.$) and organizational constraints, ($\beta = -.09, n.s.$) accounted for little to no variance in the criterion. Although organizational constraints was not significantly correlated with OCBI, it was a significant predictor for OCBI ($\beta = .10, p < .10$) as was distributive justice ($\beta = .14, p < .05$) and procedural justice ($\beta = .14, p < .05$). The regression coefficients for task performance revealed significant relationships for procedural justice ($\beta =$

.19, $p < .01$) and organizational constraints ($\beta = -.11$, $p < .10$) but not for distributive justice ($\beta = .00$, *n.s.*).

- Hypothesis 5. Hypothesis 5a stated that Personal Mastery is positively related to OCBs and task performance. *Desire to Learn* was positively and significantly correlated with OCBO in both the bivariate ($r = .19$, $p < .01$) and partial correlation ($pr = .19$, $p < .01$) analyses. However, the regression coefficient was not significant ($\beta = .07$, *n.s.*). All three analyses generated significant positive relationships between *Mastery* and OCBO ($r = .22$, $p < .01$; $pr = .21$, $p < .01$; $\beta = .16$, $p < .05$). Additional regression analyses showed that *Mastery* was again responsible for the nonsignificant relationship of *Desire to Learn* in the regression model, as this coefficient became significant when *Mastery* was removed from the model. Again, the high correlation between these two variables indicates possible overlap in the variance accounted for by both in OCBO.

Regarding OCBI, *Desire to Learn* was not a significant predictor in any of the analyses ($r = .05$, *n.s.*; $pr = .06$, *n.s.*; $\beta = -.02$, *n.s.*). On the other hand, *Mastery* more closely supported this hypothesis. The bivariate and partial correlations both equal .10, but only the bivariate correlation was significant ($p < .05$). Although of the same magnitude as the correlation coefficient, the partial correlation was nonsignificant with the addition of the covariates in the relationship, probably because of the change in degrees of freedom. Supporting the significant relationship found in the bivariate correlation, the regression coefficient was significant ($\beta = .14$, $p < .05$).

The final criterion included in this hypothesis was task performance. The bivariate and partial correlation coefficients for *Desire to Learn* were both significant ($r = .23$, $p < .01$; $pr = .23$, $p < .01$), but the regression coefficient was nonsignificant ($\beta = .07$, *n.s.*). All three coefficients for *Mastery* and task performance were significant ($r = .31$, $p < .01$; $pr = .29$, $p < .01$; $\beta = .25$, $p < .01$).

As with the other criteria variables investigated thus far, *Mastery* was responsible for the nonsignificant relationship between *Desire to Learn* and OCBO, which was revealed through additional analyses that showed a significant relationship between the two variables once *Mastery* was removed from the model. These findings indicate that Hypothesis 5a was partially supported for *Desire to Learn* in that the correlations were significant for OCBO, and the correlations and regression coefficient were significant for task performance. Hypothesis 5a was largely supported for *Mastery*.

Hypothesis 5b stated that Competitive Excellence is positively related to task performance. None of the coefficients for *Other Referenced Goals* were significant ($r = .04, n.s.$; $pr = .06, n.s.$; $\beta = .09, n.s.$). The bivariate and partial relationships between *Competitiveness* and task performance were also nonsignificant ($r = -.09$; $pr = -.08$). Furthermore, the regression coefficient was significant, but in the opposite direction than expected ($\beta = -.20, p < .01$). Because of the opposite direction and significance levels of these findings, Hypothesis 5b was not supported.

Hypothesis 5c stated that Competitive Excellence is negatively related to OCBI. The coefficients associated with *Other Referenced Goals* were all nonsignificant ($r = .01, n.s.$; $pr = .02, n.s.$; $\beta = .00, n.s.$). Analyses with *Competitiveness* also showed nonsignificant relationships in each analysis. ($r = -.09, n.s.$; $pr = -.08, n.s.$; $\beta = -.10, n.s.$). These findings indicate that Hypothesis 5c was not supported.

- Hypothesis 6. The final hypothesis proposed relationships between the avoidance scales and the “positive” work behaviors. This hypothesis stated that Avoidance Motivation (*Worry*, *Emotionality*, and *Behavioral Inhibition*) is negatively related to OCBs and task performance. The first part of this hypothesis includes relationships involving OCBO. Bivariate and partial

correlations between *Worry* and OCBO revealed a negative relationship between the two constructs, although only the bivariate relationship was significant ($r = -.12, p < .05; pr = -.10, n.s.$). The regression coefficient was more consistent with the bivariate correlation in that it was also significant ($\beta = -.22, p < .01$). Results for *Emotionality* were less supportive. While the bivariate relationship was significant ($r = -.10, p < .05$), the partial correlation ($pr = .08, n.s.$) and regression coefficients ($\beta = .00, n.s.$) were nonsignificant. *Behavioral Inhibition* had nonsignificant results for all three analyses ($r = -.04, n.s.; pr = -.02, n.s.; \beta = .08, n.s.$).

The second portion of this hypothesis deals with relationships involving OCBI. The bivariate and partial correlation coefficients and regression coefficients were all nonsignificant for both *Worry* ($r = .07, n.s.; pr = .09, n.s.; \beta = -.10, n.s.$) and *Emotionality* ($r = .07, n.s.; pr = .08, n.s.; \beta = .01, n.s.$). *Behavioral Inhibition*, on the other hand, showed a significant relationship with OCBI across all analyses, but in the opposite direction than expected ($r = .14, p < .01; pr = .16, p < .01; \beta = .18, p < .01$).

Finally, the results for task performance complete the analyses for this hypothesis. All of the analyses were nonsignificant for *Worry* ($r = -.04, n.s.; pr = -.02, n.s.; \beta = -.08, n.s.$), *Emotionality* ($r = -.09, n.s.; pr = -.06, n.s.; \beta = -.08, n.s.$), and *Behavioral Inhibition* ($r = .01, n.s.; pr = .02, n.s.; \beta = .04, n.s.$). All of these results indicate that Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

This section presented the results for citizenship behaviors and task performance. For these criteria, the control variables accounted for 8% of the variance in OCBO, 5% of the variance in OCBI, and 7% of the variance in task performance. The motivational traits accounted for an additional 17% of the variance in OCBO, 7% of the variance in OCBI, and 14% of the variance in task performance.

Supplemental Analyses

One of the main goals of this paper was to investigate the effects of non-achievement-based motivational traits that have not been considered in past research in I/O psychology. It is instructive to compare these non-achievement-based traits to achievement-based traits to gain a more comprehensive view of the similarities and differences that exist between the two types of motivational traits. In accordance with this idea, the data gathered in this study can also provide information regarding differences between two separate frameworks for measuring motivation: MTQ and BIS/BAS. Finally, the data in this investigation can be used to examine how avoidance variables compare to approach variables in predicting work performance criteria.

In a regression analysis conducted for CWBO with the control variables and all of the approach variables entered (from both frameworks) first and the avoidance variables entered second, the avoidance variables as a group added 4% unique variance to CWBO. When the order was reversed, the approach variables contributed 10% of the unique variance in CWBO. In another regression analysis conducted on CWBO where the MTQ traits and control variables were entered at first and the BIS/BAS traits were entered second, the BIS/BAS traits accounted for 5% of the variance in CWBO. In a similar analysis with the MTQ traits entered at Step 3, 7% of the variance in CWBO was accounted for. Finally when comparing the unique variance accounted for by the different types of approach motivation, General Approach Motivation (*Reward Responsiveness, Fun-seeking, and Drive*) accounted for 4% of the variance in CWBO, Competitive Excellence (*Other Referenced Goals and Competitiveness*) accounted for 1% of the variance in CWBO, and Personal Mastery (*Desire to Learn and Mastery*) accounted for 4% of the variance in CWBO.

These same analyses were conducted for CWBI as well. The results showed that the avoidance motivation traits accounted for only 1% of the variance in CWBI while the approach motivation traits accounted for 12% of the variance. The BIS/BAS traits accounted for 7% of the variance in CWBI, whereas the MTQ traits accounted for 6% of the unique variance in the criterion variable. Finally General Approach Motivation accounted for 6% of the variance, Competitive Excellence did not account for a significant amount of variance ($\Delta R^2 = .01, n.s.$), and the Personal Mastery accounted for 4% of the variance in CWBI.

Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the relationships of dispositional motivation with counterproductive work behaviors. In examining this issue, the present investigation took a broad approach in assessing motivational traits by including a framework developed in the field of I/O psychology (Kanfer & Heggestad, 1997) and a framework grounded more in physiological psychology (Gray, 1981; Gray, 1982; Carver & White, 1994). The results of this study supported the idea that counterproductive work behaviors are related to dispositional motivation. Specifically, these findings revealed that CWBs might not only be a result of avoidance-based motivation but also approach-based tendencies. Thus, the notion in much of I/O psychology that approach motivation is wholly positive seems incomplete and in need of revision; people may engage in negative behaviors because of a drive to do so. Finally, the findings for OCBs and task performance provided support for the more traditional relationships discussed in this field which link approach motivation to achievement-based outcomes. In addition, relationships between the non-achievement-based motivational traits with OCBs and task performance provide more evidence for the differences in approach tendencies.

Counterproductive Work Behaviors

The results showed strong support for the idea that high Avoidance Motivation was associated with more organizationally-directed counterproductive behaviors, with all three avoidance motivation measures having significant relationships with CWBO. *Worry* was the prominent predictor of the three measures, suggesting that the content of the *Worry* scale may be more central to the avoidance construct than is the content of the *Emotionality* or *Behavioral Inhibition* scales. In fact, as the supplemental analyses suggested (both *Emotionality* and *Behavioral Inhibition* became significant predictors when *Worry* was removed from the analyses), *Worry* may encompass much of what is present in the other two scales to form a more global trait. The findings for CWBO are consistent with previous research showing a link between negative affectivity and counterproductive work behaviors (Aquino et al, 1999; Fox et al., 2001). The results for interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors were, however, not as consistent. While *Worry* displayed a positive relationship with these behaviors, the other two avoidance scales, *Emotionality* and *Behavioral Inhibition* were unrelated to interpersonal deviance. These findings are surprising considering that past research had shown similar relationships for CWBI and CWBO with negative emotionality (Fox et al., 2001). However, previous research may have used broader measures of negative affectivity (as *Worry* seems to be), therefore, showing a relationship with CWBI. The more specific or physiological negative tendencies tapped by *Emotionality* and *Behavioral Inhibition* may not be related to interpersonal counterproductive behaviors as they are with counterproductive behaviors directed at the organization.

The findings for CWBs and the different approach constructs offer a new perspective for I/O research. As mentioned previously, I/O psychology has primarily examined approach

motivation in achievement contexts as is exemplified in research with the MTQ (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000). In accordance with this research, Personal Mastery was, for the most part, negatively related to counterproductive work behaviors. This finding suggests that individuals who focus on mastery and learning are likely to engage in positive behaviors at work and to abide by the rules. However, the more intriguing findings are those associated with the Competitive Excellence and General Approach Motivation constructs. For the most part, Competitive Excellence was positively related to CWBI (except for in the regression analyses, which may be a result of multicollinearity among similar traits). This finding suggests that although these individuals are focused on achievement and goals, they are more responsive to their competitive sides, which may lead to negative behaviors directed at others in the organization. Thus, there may be something of a Machiavellian tendency for these individuals that is manifest in deviant behaviors directed at others. In fact, studies on Machiavellianism show that this tendency is related to antisocial behavior and alienation leading to negative contextual performance (McHoskey, 1999). In this case, an individual could insult or embarrass coworkers or even sabotage their work in order to come out on top.

General Approach Motivation (as operationalized by *Reward Responsiveness*, *Fun-seeking*, and *Drive*) displayed a positive relationship with counterproductive work behaviors. Relationships between the BAS scales and “sensation-seeking”, have been noted outside of I/O literature (Torrubia et al., 2001; Zuckerman, 1979). This study provides evidence that a more general approach motivation not biased toward positive, achievement situations is related to counterproductive work behaviors. This is the first study to discuss this issue in I/O psychology. This finding is interesting because it posits that approach motivation does not necessarily have to be achievement-based to show relationships with work-related behaviors. This relationship may

exist because individuals high on *Fun-seeking* and *Drive* have a propensity to get bored with what they are doing and turn to counterproductive behaviors as a means of excitement or release of energy.

OCBs and Task Performance

A surprising outcome of this study was that Avoidance Motivation was not significantly related to organizational citizenship behaviors or task performance. This means that the Avoidance Motivation traits do not necessarily lead to poor task performance or less citizenship performance. It might be that these motivational tendencies do not prevent people from engaging in prosocial behaviors (OCBs) or required behaviors (task performance), but they do heighten the possibility of engaging in negative behaviors (CWBs). This finding is consistent with the idea that approach and avoidance motivation are on separate dimensions. On the other hand, the nonsignificant relationship could be a measurement artifact in that both the traits and the criteria stem from same-source measures.

For the most part, Personal Mastery was positively related to the traditional achievement-based work behaviors, OCBs and task performance. As with the relationships for counterproductive work behaviors, these findings were consistent with previous research (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000). On the other hand, the finding that Competitive Excellence was not significantly related to either task performance or OCBI was rather surprising. Although these traits are not as highly correlated with traditional measures of achievement (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000), one would still expect them to be positively related to task performance in that the individuals would be motivated to achieve their goals in order to look good in comparison to others. The null relationships could mean that the positive and negative effects of these traits on OCBI and task performance canceled each other out. For some individuals, being high in

Competitive Excellence can lead to a focus on approaching success. For others, these traits may lead to an increased concentration on their performance compared to other individuals' performance, and in turn may result in a focus on avoiding failure. These competing tendencies may mask any consistent relationships between these variables.

It is important to note the differences in the predictability of the work behaviors. The more socially accepted behaviors, citizenship behaviors and task performance, only showed strong relationships with the approach motivation traits. In contrast, counterproductive work behaviors were related to both approach and avoidance traits. One might automatically assume that approach motivation traits only share positive links with achievement-based behaviors, but this study revealed links between approach traits and "negative" behaviors as well.

The State of Motivational Traits

Another purpose of this study was to develop a better understanding of the status of motivational traits in the current literature. An important question for I/O psychology is whether the predominant motivational trait measures are capturing the full range of dispositional motivation. Our review of the literature suggests that, although avoidance motivation appears to be adequately represented in popular scales, there may be a bias towards emphasizing achievement-based approach motivation over a more general approach motivation.

The findings for avoidance motivation in this study are consistent with the idea of a single, global avoidance tendency. Future research may examine whether a more parsimonious factor structure for avoidance motivation traits can be achieved.

Desire to Learn and *Mastery* did support the traditional achievement behaviors-approach motivation link that exists in I/O psychology. However, these traits also displayed relationships with negative behaviors. It may be useful to incorporate these measures in research involving

more antisocial behaviors to understand the full range of motivation being tapped by these scales. Evaluating achievement-based traits in accordance with negative behaviors may increase understanding of the relationships between the more positive and negative behaviors at work.

Reward Responsiveness, *Fun-seeking*, and *Drive* represented General Approach motivation because these traits are associated with being driven by excitement, spontaneity, and change of pace, and not necessarily with goal-directed and career-oriented positive behaviors. However, while the results for *Fun-seeking* and *Drive* revealed positive relationships with CWBs, the findings for *Reward Responsiveness* did not. It was thought that individuals high on *Reward Responsiveness* would approach any behavior that would lead to a reward, regardless of whether it was positive or negative. However, it seems as though *Reward Responsiveness* may not impact counterproductive work behaviors. Although not hypothesized, it is interesting to note that *Reward Responsiveness* was positively correlated with both OCBI and task performance. The relationship between task performance and *Reward Responsiveness* makes logical sense in that completing assigned tasks would most likely lead to an immediate feeling of accomplishment or recognized reward. However, a more perplexing issue is why a relationship would exist with OCBI and not with OCBO. One possibility is that individuals may feel that helping individuals versus helping the organization is more immediately rewarding. People likely respond favorably to the help whereas the organization may not acknowledge it. In addition, the relationships found between *Reward Responsiveness* and OCBI and task performance could be evidence that this motivational trait does in fact tap more positive work behaviors than was expected.

The findings of this study present relationships between dispositional motivation traits and work behaviors that have largely been ignored in I/O psychology research. It is interesting

that although approach motivation has not been associated with “negative” behaviors in the past, it, as a whole (all of the approach traits together), accounted for more unique variance in both CWBO and CWBI than did Avoidance Motivation. Among the approach dimensions specifically, General Approach Motivation (*Reward Responsiveness, Fun-seeking, and Drive*) accounted for more variance in CWBI than the other traits. Both General Approach Motivation and Personal Mastery accounted for the same amount of variance in CWBO, which was greater than that provided by Competitive Excellence. This is interesting in that, not only do these findings indicate a “negative” side to approach motivation, but they also show that approach motivation may have a greater influence on these behaviors than does avoidance motivation. Also, I/O psychologists may find it useful to include more general approach measures in their research in order to tap non-achievement based behaviors. Finally, although the BIS/BAS traits and MTQ traits as a whole did not vastly differ in the amount of variance that they accounted for in either of the primary criterion variables, it should be noted that both of the frameworks accounted for unique variance in CWBO and CWBI showing that the BIS/BAS traits and MTQ traits are tapping different aspects of dispositional motivation. This finding reinforces the importance of considering different frameworks in operationalizing motivational traits.

Limitations and Future Research

One potential limitation of this study was the sampling procedure and data collection method used. Self-report data can be biased and may not provide the most valid or accurate accounts of work behaviors. At the same time, it is uncertain whether supervisors or coworkers would be aware of whether or not an employee has engaged in the counterproductive or citizenship behaviors included as criteria measures. In addition, individuals may have been more likely to report the frequency of engaging in these behaviors accurately because no information was obtained regarding where or for whom the students were employed. Also, the use of undergraduate students has been questioned in previous research. However, because this study was exploratory, one advantage of this sampling procedure is that a wide array of jobs and job characteristics were evaluated, providing a broader basis for generalization of the results obtained in the study. The present study should be considered as a starting point for future investigations conducted in the workplace. Future field studies could provide tests of the given relationships to see if they actually exist in a work setting.

Another limitation of the study is the alpha reliability obtained for the OCBO scale. Because this value falls below the .70 cutoff associated with a reliable scale, the relationships between motivational traits and this variable must be interpreted carefully. Future research using an OCBO scale with a greater reliability should investigate these relationships again to test the validity of those acquired in the present study.

As mentioned briefly before, this study examined the state of the motivational traits in the literature today. Future research should view this study as a preliminary guide and look into developing a more parsimonious framework for investigating some of the given relationships. It could also be beneficial to view the relationships between motivational traits and many of the

different tests used for selection and hiring today. In addition, future research should also look into interactions between dispositional traits and situational factors to examine whether individuals high on certain motivational traits are more prone to being affected by organizational constraints and/or environments lacking in organizational justice. In Kanfer's (1990) discussion of distal and proximal motivational processes, she defines them as complementary approaches to understanding the motivational system. In this view, the traits measured in the study would be considered more distal in that they have indirect effects on action. In accordance with this idea, future research may also benefit from evaluating more proximal, goal-directed mechanisms, such as goal-setting theory, as mediators between these distal motivational measures and the workplace criteria. Including more proximal measures can also provide relevant information regarding the stability of the relationships between distal motivational traits and work behaviors once these relationships are mediated.

In conclusion, the relationships hypothesized in the present study were based more on characteristics and various conceptualizations of the variables under investigation, rather than on a strong empirical or theoretical precedent. For the most part, the goals of the present investigation were met and many of the relationships, although exploratory, were significant. This paper has introduced new ideas into I/O literature that can benefit researchers within and outside of an applied setting. Researchers can use the findings of this study as a basis for new research on the structure of motivational traits. From this standpoint, researchers may find it beneficial to examine more parsimonious frameworks of motivational traits that include both achievement-based and general approach tendencies. Applied psychologists can benefit from this research by considering incorporating there more theoretically grounded motivational traits

into personnel testing used for selection and hiring. Relationships between work behaviors and these traits may prove to be important measures of the future success of employees.

References

- Acton, G. S. (2003). Measurement of impulsivity in a hierarchical model of personality traits: Implications for substance use. *Substance Use and Misuse, 38*(1), 67-83.
- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., & Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: A proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 1073-1091.
- Austin, J. T., & Klein, H. J. (1996). Work motivation and goal striving. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual differences and behavior in organizations* (pp. 209-257). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 349-360.
- Boye, M. W., & Wasserman, A. R. (1996). Predicting counterproductivity among drug store applicants. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 10*(3), 337-349.
- Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. In N. Schmitt & W. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 35-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(2), 319-333.
- Cloninger, C. R. (1987). A systematic method for clinical description and classification of personality variants. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 44*, 573-588.
- Collins, J. M., & Griffin, R. W. (1998). The psychology of counterproductive job performance. In R. W. Griffin, A. O'Leary-Kelly, & J. M. Collins (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organizations, Part B: Non-violent dysfunctional behavior* (pp. 219-242). Stamford, CT: JAI.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Simmering, M. J. (1998). Conscientiousness, goal orientation, and motivation to learn during the learning process: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(4), 654-665.
- Diefendorff, J. M., Gosserand, R. H., Hall, R. J., & Chang, D. (2002, April). Distinguishing action-state orientation from other motivational and self-regulatory traits. In J. M. Diefendorff (Chair), *New directions in research on motivational traits*. Symposium conducted at the 17th Annual Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology meeting, Toronto, Canada.

- Elliot, E. S., & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 5-12.
- Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: Approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(5), 804-818.
- Facteau, J. D., Dobbins, G. H., Russell, J. E. A., Ladd, R. T., & Kudisch, J. D. (1995). The influence of general perceptions of the training environment on pretraining motivation and perceived training transfer. *Journal of Management*, 21(1), 1-25.
- Folger, R., & Baron, R. A. (1996). Violence and hostility at work: A model of reactions to perceived injustice. In G. R. VandenBos & E. Q. Bulatao (Eds.), *Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions* (pp. 51-85). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 291-309.
- Frank, R. F. (1989). How passion pays: Finding opportunities in honesty. *Business and Society Review*, Summer, 20-28.
- Furnham, A., Forde, L., & Ferrari, K. (1999). Personality and work motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26, 1035-1043.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Knouse, S. B. (1990). Justifying wrongful employee behavior: The role of personality in organizational sabotage. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, 55-61.
- Gibbs, J. C. (1991). Sociomoral development delay and cognitive distortion: Implications for the treatment of antisocial youth. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (Vol. 3, 122-165). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gomez, A., & Gomez, R. (2002). Personality traits of the behavioural approach and inhibition systems: Associations with processing of emotional stimuli. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 1299-1316.
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gray, J. A. (1981). A critique of Eysenck's theory of personality. In H. J. Eysenck (Ed.), *A model for personality* (pp. 246-276). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Gray, J. A. (1982). *The neuropsychology of anxiety: an enquiry into the functions of the septo-hippocampal system*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Greenberg, J., & Alge, B. J. (1998). In R. W. Griffin, A. O'Leary Kelly, & J. Collins (Eds.), *Dysfunctional behavior in organizations, Part A: Violent behaviors in organizations*. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1982). Formal and informal social controls of employee deviance. *The Sociological Quarterly, 23*, 333-343.
- Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1983). *Theft by employees*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Health.
- Johns, G. (1997). Contemporary research on absence from work: Correlates, causes, and consequences. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 115-174). London: Wiley.
- Jones, J. W., & Terris, W. (1985). Screening employment applications for attitudes towards theft: Three quasi-experimental studies. *International Journal of Management, 2*(3), 62-75.
- Kamp, J., & Brooks, P. (1991). Perceived organizational climate and employee counterproductivity. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 5*(4), 447-458.
- Kanfer, R. (1990). Motivation theory and industrial and organizational psychology. In M. E. Dunnette & Leaetta M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. (pp. 75-170). 2nd Ed. Palo Alto: Counseling Psychologists Press.
- Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (2000). Individual differences in work motivation: Further explorations of a trait framework. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49*, 470-482.
- Kanfer, R., & Heggstad, E. D. (1997). Motivational traits and skills: A person-centered approach to work motivation. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 19, 1-56). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.
- Kanfer, R., & Heggstad, E. D. (1999). Individual differences in motivation: Traits and self-regulatory skills. In P. L. Ackerman, P. C. Kyllonen, & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *Learning and individual differences: Process, trait, and content determinants* (pp. 293-313). Washington D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Kaplan, H. B. (1975). *Self-attitudes and deviant behavior*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- MacAndrew, C., & Steele, T. (1991). Gray's behavioral inhibition system: A psychometric evaluation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*, 157-171.

- McHoskey, J. W. (1999). Machiavellianism, intrinsic versus extrinsic goals, and social interest: A self-determination theory analysis. *Motivation and Emotion, 23*(4), 267-283.
- Moberg, D. J. (1997). On employee vice. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 7*(4), 41-60.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 845-855.
- Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1996). A theory of conscientiousness at work. Paper presented at the 11th annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*, 85-97.
- Ostafin, B. D., Palfai, T. P., & Wechsler, C. E. (2003). The accessibility of motivational tendencies toward alcohol: Approach, avoidance, and disinhibited drinking. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology, 11*(4), 294-301.
- Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfield, MA: Pittman.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(2), 555-572.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1997). Workplace deviance: Its definition, its manifestations, and its causes. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations, 6*, 3-27.
- Robinson, S. L., & Greenberg, J. (1998). Employees behaving badly: Dimensions, determinants, and dilemmas in the study of workplace deviance. In C. L. Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior* (Vol. 5, 1-30). New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87* (1), 66-80.
- Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89*, 925-946.
- Salgado, J. F. (2002). The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*(1-2), 117-125.

- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(3), 434-443.
- Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3*, 356-367.
- Tellegen, A. (1982). *Brief manual for the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (MPQ)*. Minneapolis, MN: Author.
- Torrubia, R., Avila, C., Molto, J., & Caseras, X. (2001). The Sensitivity to Punishment and Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire (SPSRQ) as a measure of Gray's anxiety and impulsivity dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31*, 837-862.
- Van Eerde, W., & Thierry, H. (2001). VIE functions, self-set goals, and performance: An experiment. In M. Erez, U. Kleinbeck, H. Thierry (Eds.), *Work motivation in the context of globalizing economy*. (pp. 131-147). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- VandeWalle, D. (1997). Development of a work domain goal orientation instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57*, 995-1015.
- Vandewalle, D., Brown, S. P., Cron, W. L., & Slocum, J. W. (1999). The influence of goal orientation and self-regulation tactics on sales performance: A longitudinal field test. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 249-259.
- Vermetten, Y. J., Lodewijks, H. G., & Vermunt, J. D. (2001). The role of personality traits and goal orientations in strategy use. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26*, 149-170.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship behavior and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*, 601-617.
- Wilson, G. D., Barrett, P.T., & Gray, J. A. (1989). Human reactions to reward and punishment: A questionnaire examination of Gray's personality theory. *British Journal of Psychology, 80*, 509-515.
- Wimbush, J. C., & Dalton, D. R. (1997). Base rate for employee theft: Convergence of multiple methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(5), 756-763.

Appendix A
Measure of Workplace Deviance Items (Bennett & Robinson, 2000)

Organizational Deviance

1. Taken property from work without permission
2. Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working
3. Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses
4. Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace.
5. Come in late to work without permission
6. Littered your work environment
7. Neglected to follow your boss's instructions
8. Intentionally worked slower that you could have worked
9. Discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person
10. Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job
11. Put little effort into your work
12. Dragged out work in order to get overtime

Interpersonal Deviance

1. Made fun of someone at work
2. Said something hurtful to someone at work
3. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work
4. Cursed at someone at work
5. Played a mean prank on someone at work
6. Acted rudely toward someone at work
7. Publicly embarrassed someone at work

APPENDIX B
Motivational Trait Questionnaire

Pages 56 and 57 have been redacted for copyright purposes

LSU Graduate School

The Motivational Trait Questionnaire items are available from:

Dr. Ruth Kanfer
Professor of Psychology
Georgia Institute of Technology
Room 226, J.S. Coon Building
654 Cherry Street, MC 0170
Atlanta, GA 30332-0170 USA
Email: rk64@prism.gatech.edu <<mailto:rk64@prism.gatech.edu>>
Tel: 404.894.5674
FAX: 404.894.6904

This page intentionally blank.

Appendix C
Organizational Citizenship Behavior Items (Williams & Anderson, 1991)

Organizational OCB (OCBO)

1. Attendance at work is above the norm
2. Give advance notice when unable to come to work
3. Take undeserved work breaks (reverse-scored)
4. Great deal of time spent with personal phone conversations (reverse-scored)
5. Complain about insignificant things at work (reverse-scored)
6. Conserve and protect organizational property
7. Adhere to informal rules devised to maintain order

Individual OCB (OCBI)

1. Help others who have been absent
2. Help others who have heavy work loads
3. Assist supervisor with his or her work when not asked
4. Take time to listen to coworkers' problems and worries
5. Go out of my way to help new employees
6. Take personal interest in other employees
7. Pass along information to coworkers

Appendix D
In-role Performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991)

1. Adequately complete assigned duties
2. Fulfill responsibilities specified in job description
3. Perform tasks that are expected of you
4. Meet formal performance requirements of the job
5. Engage in activities that will directly affect your performance evaluation
6. Neglect aspects of the job you are obliged to perform (reverse-scored)
7. Fail to perform essential duties (reverse-scored)

Appendix E
Perceptions of Justice

Distributive Justice (Price & Mueller, 1986)

1. To what extent are you fairly rewarded considering the responsibilities that you have?
2. To what extent are you fairly rewarded taking into account the amount of education and training that you have had?
3. To what extent are you fairly rewarded in view of the amount of experience that you have?
4. To what extent are you fairly rewarded for the amount of effort that you put forth?
5. To what extent are you fairly rewarded for work that you have done well?
6. To what extent are you fairly rewarded for the stresses and strains of your job?

Procedural Justice (Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002)

1. The organization's procedures and guidelines are very fair
2. The procedures the organization uses to make decisions are not fair (reverse-scored)
3. I can count on the organization to have fair policies
4. We don't have any fair policies at the organization (reverse-scored)

Appendix F
Organizational Constraints Scale (OCS) (Spector & Jex, 1998)

How often do you find it difficult or impossible to do your job because of...?

1. Poor equipment or supplies
2. Organizational rules and procedures
3. Other employees
4. Your supervisor
5. Lack of equipment or supplies
6. Inadequate training
7. Interruptions by other people
8. Lack of necessary information about what to do or how to do it
9. Conflicting job demands
10. Inadequate help from others
11. Incorrect instructions

Vita

Kajal Mehta was born in Chicago, Illinois, from which her family soon moved to Andalusia, Alabama. However, the majority of her childhood and adolescence was spent in Laurel, Mississippi, where her parents, Dr. Rushi and Mrs. Geeta Mehta, still reside. Kajal also has an older brother, Shrujal Mehta, who currently works as a financial analyst for Intel Corporation in Phoenix, Arizona. Kajal attended West Jones High School in Laurel until she applied and was accepted to the Mississippi School for Mathematics and Science which she attended her junior and senior. years of high school. After graduating in May of 1996, Kajal moved to Atlanta, Georgia, where she attended Emory University and received her bachelor of arts degree in psychology in May of 2000. At this time, Kajal decided to take a year off to travel and to receive training in dance and music in Gujarat, India. She spent 5 months in her mother's hometown of Vadodara, Gujarat, and was trained in Kathak (a North Indian classical style dance) and North Indian classical vocal music. She then returned to the United States and began preparing for graduate school. Kajal began her graduate training at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, in the fall of 2001 and will receive her master of arts degree from this university in May 2004.