

H. AĞCA

INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PREDICTORS OF
PERCEIVING WORKPLACE BEHAVIORS
AS COUNTERPRODUCTIVE

HANDE AĞCA

METU
2014

AUGUST 2014

INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PREDICTORS OF PERCEIVING
WORKPLACE BEHAVIORS AS COUNTERPRODUCTIVE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

HANDE AĞCA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

AUGUST 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assist. Prof. Yonca Toker
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Orhan Aydın (UU,PSY)

Assist. Prof. Yonca Toker (METU,PSY)

Assist. Prof. A. Başak Ok (KU,PSY)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Hande Ađca

Signature :

ABSTRACT

INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PREDICTORS OF PERCEIVING WORKPLACE BEHAVIORS AS COUNTERPRODUCTIVE

Ağca, Hande

M.S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Yonca Toker

August 2014, 92 pages

In the present study, the aim was to examine the predictors of perceived counterproductive work behaviors (PCWB) by employees. The proximal variables of personality characteristics and individual values and the distal organizational variables were included in the research to study the predictors of PCWB in a comprehensive fashion. Self-control, agreeableness and conscientiousness were hypothesized as the personality predictors, of universalism, benevolence, conformity and tradition under the frame of self-transcendence and conservation values were hypothesized as the individual values predictors, and organizational uncertainty avoidance (defined as clarity of organizational rules and procedures) and overall organizational justice climate were hypothesized as the organizational predictors of PCWB. Perceived counterproductive work behaviors were included the sub-dimensions of abuse, theft, withdrawal and sabotage. Analyses were conducted with 220 working adults. The results of regression analyses revealed that self-control, conscientiousness, self-transcendence values and organizational uncertainty avoidance significantly predicted all sub-dimensions and the PCWB composite,

whereas conservation values predicted the theft, withdrawal sub-dimensions together with the composite PCWB. On the other hand, agreeableness and overall organizational justice variables did not predict any of the criteria. In addition to regression analyses, dominance analyses were conducted to reveal the relative contributions of individual values. The findings and implications of the study were discussed.

Keywords: Counterproductive Work Behaviors, Personality, Individual Values, Organizational Predictors, Workplace Behaviors

ÖZ

ÜRETİM-KARŞITI İŞ YERİ DAVRANIŞLARI ALGILANIŞININ BİREYSEL VE ÖRGÜTSEL YORDAYICILARI

Ağca, Hande

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yonca Toker

Ağustos 2014, 92 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı, çalışanlar tarafından algılanan üretim-karşıtı iş yeri davranışlarının yordayıcılarını açıklamaktır. Üretim-karşıtı iş davranışları algılanışının yordayıcılarını kapsamlı bir çalışmayla incelemek amacı ile çalışmaya kişilik özellikleri ve bireysel değerlerin yakınsal değişkenleri ve uzaksak değişkenler dahil edilmiştir. Öz-denetim, uyumluluk ve sorumluluk bilinci kişilik özellikleri yordayıcıları olarak dahil edilmiştir. Bireysel değerler ise, öz-aşkılık ve muhafazacılık değerleri çerçevesinde, evrenselcilik, iyilikseverlik, uyma ve geleneksellik değerlerini içermektedir. Örgütsel yordayıcılar olarak, örgütsel belirsizlikten kaçınma (çalışmada örgütsel kural ve prosedürlerin açıklığı olarak tanımlanan) ve genel örgütsel adalet iklimi incelenmiştir. Üretim karşıtı iş yeri davranışları algılanışı, kötüye kullanma, çalma, geri çekilme, sabote etme olmak üzere dört alt boyut içermektedir. Analizler, 220 çalışan ile yürütülmüştür. Regresyon analizlerinin sonuçlarına göre, öz-denetim, sorumluluk bilinci, öz-aşkılık değerleri ve örgütsel belirsizlikten kaçınma değişkenleri, üretim karşıtı iş yeri

davranışları algılanışının tüm alt boyutlarını ve bir bütün olarak bu davranışları anlamlı olarak yordamaktadır. Muhafazacılık değerleri ise, çalma ve geri çekilme boyutlarıyla, genel üretim karşıtı iş yeri davranışları algılanışını yordamaktadır. Uyumluluk ve genel örgütsel adalet ikliminin kriterlerden hiç birini yordamadığı saptanmıştır. Regresyon analizlerinin yanı sıra, bireysel değerlerin özgün katkılarını açıklamak amacı ile bir göreceli önem analizi olan dominans analizi yürütülmüştür. Çalışmanın bulguları ve uygulanabilecek çözüm önerileri literatür temel alınarak tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Üretim Karşıtı İş Yeri Davranışları, Kişilik, Bireysel Değerler, Örgütsel Yordayıcılar

to my lovely parents...

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor Assist. Prof. Yonca Toker for her academic guidance, supervision, and encouraging support. She has been positively challenging to contribute to my professional and personal development, which I believe led to enhance my academic and personal skills. Also, she always has been shown endless patience and concern, I could not complete this thesis without her contribution. Secondly, I would like to thank my Examining Committee Members; Prof. Dr. Orhan Aydın, for sharing his valuable experiences and suggestions to the present work, and Assist. Prof. Başak Ok, for her suggestions and valuable comments. I would also thank to my dear Professors Canan Sümer and Reyhan Bilgiç for enlarging my point of view and their valuable contributions throughout my graduate education.

I would like to thank everybody who endlessly supported me, but, I want to dedicate my thesis to my dear family; to my mother Ayfer Ağca, my father Mustafa Ağca, my brother Cem Ağca and the last member our family, my brother's wife Berna Ağca. They always trust in me and encourage me to keep going on during this process and throughout all my life. I am so glad to have you.

This was a long and difficult process for me and everyone in my life provided support to me in one way or another. I would like to thank my dearest friends Selin Temizel (and my new homie after years of friendship), Ümran Yüce and Melikenaz Yalçın for being the witness both of the best and worst times of my life. You have proven that the long distances cannot break our friendship. Thank you for being “available always” and my “mıkıks”.

I would like to thank all of my colleagues, for their concern and understanding, but especially Yankı Süsen, Yeşim Üzümcüoğlu, Derya Karanfil and Gaye Solmazer for their efforts to help at my frustrating times, giving academic and morale support, and making me smile.

I would like to thank my dear “kereviz”, Seval Dönmez for the valuable and supportive sharings throughout our thesis writing process. I also owe special thanks to my dear friend Önder Ersen for his sensitive support in my hard times and giving me morale support always. I would like to thank Kerim Selvi for his

immediate responses whenever I asked. I also would like to thank my dear homie Cemregül Yargıç for sharing my sleepless nights as well as her immediate availability. I also would like to mention my dear friends Gizem Demirdöven and Dilan Yeşilyurt for their endless support and valuable friendship in my life.

I am really lucky to have Burak Ekici in my life and I would like to give my most special thanks to my dearest. I had really bad times while I was writing my thesis. He always supported and encouraged me... He made me believe that I succeed. He was always with me and never made any complaint about it. During the process, I shared all my sadness and happiness with him. Thank you so much being there whenever I need...

I would like to thank for the financial support of The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) throughout both my undergraduate and graduate education.

The last but not least, I would like to thank my friends who helped me in the data collection process for their valuable efforts. And I would like to thank all of my participants who voluntarily participated in the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Counterproductive Work Behaviors	2
1.3 Antecedents of Counterproductive Behavior	4
1.3.1 Individual Variables as Antecedents of CWB	5
1.3.2 Organizational Variables.....	11
1.4 The Current Study and Hypotheses	16
2. METHOD.....	17
2.1 Participants and Procedure	17
2.2 Measures	18
2.2.1 Self-Control Scale	18
2.2.2 The Big Five Inventory	18
2.2.3 Schwartz Value Survey	19
2.2.4 Uncertainty Avoidance Scale	20
2.3.5 Perceived Overall Justice Scale	20
2.3.6 Perceived Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale	21
2.3.7 Demographic Information Questionnaire	22
3. RESULTS	23
3.1 Data Screening, Cleaning, and Factor Analyses	23
3.2 Reliability Analyses	25
3.3 Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations.....	26

3.4 Hypothesis Testing	31
3.4.1 Prediction of Perceiving Abuse	31
3.4.2 Prediction of Perceiving Theft	32
3.4.3 Prediction of Perceiving Withdrawal	33
3.4.4 Prediction of Perceiving Sabotage	34
3.4.5 Prediction of Perceiving CWB	35
3.4.6 Dominance Analyses	40
3.4.7 Summary	42
4. DISCUSSION	43
4.1 Major Findings	43
4.2 Contributions and Implications of the Study.....	51
4.3 Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research.....	53
4.4 Conclusion.....	54
REFERENCES.....	55
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A. ÖZDENETİM ÖLÇEĞİ	63
APPENDIX B. BEŞ FAKTÖR ENVANTERİ.....	64
APPENDIX C. BİREYSEL DEĞERLER ÖLÇEĞİ.....	66
APPENDIX D. KÜLTÜR BOYUTLARI ÖLÇEĞİ	68
APPENDIX E. GENEL ADALET ALGISI ÖLÇEĞİ	69
APPENDIX F. ÜRETİM KARŞITI İŞ DAVRANIŞLARI ALGISI ÖLÇEĞİ.....	70
APPENDIX H. DOMINANCE ANALYSIS CALCULATION TABLES FOR THE PCWB FACTORS	73
APPENDIX I. EXTENDED TURKISH SUMMARY	78
APPENDIX J. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	92

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. Factor Loadings	24
Table 3.2. Descriptive statistics for all study variables	28
Table 3.3. Correlations between Study Variables	29
Table 3.4. Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Perceived Counterproductive Work Behaviors based on Personality Characteristics	37
Table 3.5. Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Perceived Counterproductive Work Behaviors based on Individual Values.....	38
Table 3.6. Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Perceived Counterproductive Work Behaviors based on Organizational Variables	39
Table 3.7. Dominance Analyses: Shared Variance with Criteria.....	42

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

In business life, counterproductive behaviors come up in various forms such as stealing, vandalism, bullying, absenteeism (Gruys, 1999; Sackett, 2002). Counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) are voluntary acts which harm organizations and organizational stakeholders (Spector & Fox, 2005).

The National Retail Security Survey indicated that retail shrinkage loss was at \$26 billion in 1998 when restaurants, bars and auto dealers were excluded (Hollinger, Lee, Kane, & Hayes, 1998). Association of Certified Fraud Examiners stated that American companies lost approximately \$400 billion annually due to forms of internal fraud, including employee theft (Wells, 1999). Moreover, Murphy (1993) indicated that organizational loss has been reported as between \$6 billion and \$200 billion each year due to employee deviance. The cost of employee theft for organizations can be seen directly. Besides theft, other forms of deviant behaviors cost indirectly to the organizations in the form of loss of productivity. Both organizations and individuals are affected negatively by these behaviors. Individuals are suffered from workplace aggression or harassment which brings psychological and physical health problems and poor job attitudes (Bowling, & Beehr, 2006).

Unfortunately, these deviant behaviors have been seen in organizations more than estimated or reported. Organizations and employees are affected in various degrees in terms of severity of these behaviors. In order to minimize or even prevent CWBs, organizations need to take action regarding both organizational policies and practices focusing on individuals. However, it is hard to capture counterproductive behaviors since mostly, they are not reported accurately. At this point, it is important to measure what employees perceive as counterproductive. Individuals engage in counterproductive behaviors easily, when they do not perceive them as deviant behaviors. Hence, examining the factors which affect individuals' perception of counterproductive behaviors is crucial.

Research on the antecedents of counterproductive behaviors has examined its relationship with personality especially in terms of Big Five personality traits. The results have supported that conscientiousness and agreeableness are consistently associated with counterproductive behaviors (Mount, Illies, & Johnson, 2006; Spector & Fox, 2005). Moreover, values that individuals hold could also be related to perceiving CWBs. Specifically, self-transcendence and conservation values are suggested as associated with ethical behaviors (Morris, 2012; Shaw, Grehan, Shiu, Hassan, & Thomson, 2005).

Organizational culture is also related to counterproductive behaviors (Enns & Rotundo, 2012). To illustrate, organizational values such as fairness and uncertainty avoidance are seen as (Chew & Putti, 1995; Li & Cropanzano, 2009) antecedents of these unethical behaviors. Therefore, the system affects employees' attitudes and behaviors towards organization either in a positive or negative way.

1.2 Counterproductive Work Behaviors

In the job performance research, it is proposed that counterproductive behavior is a significant dimension besides task and organizational citizenship performance (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Researchers have focused their attention on mostly organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) at first. Then, by the understanding of the impact of CWB on organizations and employees' well-being, more interest has been given in this topic (Hafidz, 2012).

In recent years, organizational research has focused on voluntary behaviors of employees. These behaviors contribute to organizations but at the same time, some of them may do harm to organizations. Intentional behaviors of employees which result in harming the organization and organization stakeholders such as coworkers and clients are called Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) (Spector & Fox, 2002). These deviant behaviors at the workplace has been examined with different terms which are organizational delinquency (Hogan & Hogan, 1989), workplace deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), organizational retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), and workplace aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1996).

By this time, researchers have studied counterproductivity from different theoretical frameworks with different labels. Behaviors such as deviance, physical and verbal aggression, and revenge can be classified as CWB since the set of behaviors coincide with each other (Spector & Fox, 2005). Moreover, theft, absenteeism, and fraud are other forms of CWB (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). In accordance with research, Marcus and Schuler (2004) stressed that counterproductive behaviors have different forms but the correlation between them are mostly positive in terms of both self-report and supervisory ratings. Therefore, mostly, researchers have studied this topic as a single unit without separating the construct into its specific forms of behaviors.

Studies in the literature that focused on how CWB can be categorized, mostly focused on deviant behaviors directed at organizations (e.g., Chen & Spector, 1992; Hollinger & Clark, 1982). However, the study of Robinson and Bennett (1995) showed that some deviant behaviors are directed at individuals. Specifically, CWB can be differentiated on the basis of whether the action is directed towards the organization or other people.

Counterproductive behaviors may be property based or production based. Specifically, behaviors such as theft and vandalism are property based deviances and reflect misappropriating the property of the organization or other employees. Hollinger and Clark (1983) conducted a study related to employee theft involving different industries. In this study, results showed that taking advantage of the employee discount privilege and getting store merchandise were the most common forms of theft for retail employees. On the other hand, receiving payment for extra hours that were not actually put in and taking materials were the forms of theft mostly seen among manufacturing employees. Production based deviances involve behaviors such as absenteeism and tardiness and refer to violation of organizational norms which have detrimental effects on the quality and quantity of work (Mikulay, Neuman, & Finkelstein, 2001). Hollinger and Clark (1983) also indicated extending breaks, arriving work late and leaving early, working slow intentionally and working under the influence of substance as counterproductive behaviors.

According to Lim, Cortina, and Magley (2008), forms of interpersonal deviance, such as harassment and incivility also have negative effects on individuals' mental and physical health. Verbal abuse can be included in interpersonal deviance type of behaviors (Hollinger & Clark, 1983). Moreover, Spector and Fox (2005) stated that abuse against other people, which can be in the forms of physical or psychological abuse and varied in terms of their severity, affect work satisfactions of employees negatively. Thus, harassment, incivility and abuse-type behaviors are considered another form of CWB.

In the meta-analysis of Kish-Gephart, Harrison and Trevino (2010), researchers claim that CWB is differentiated from unethical behaviors since CWBs refer to actions which violate organizational norms while unethical behaviors refer to actions which violate moral (societal) norms. Nevertheless, mostly, any action which harms others reflects violation of morality because moral principles lead individuals not to harm others (Haidt, 2007; Rai & Fiske, 2011; Rozin, 1999). Therefore, CWB can be examined through unethical behaviors besides violation of organizational norms.

To conclude, violating the organizational interests, and causing potential harm and loss for the organization or its members can be regarded as common characteristic of all counterproductive acts (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). In addition, the act must be intentional no matter what the outcomes of the behavior are. Also, the behavior does not have to end with obvious and undesirable outcomes; instead, so long the possibility of harm exists the behavior is categorized as CWB. Not all people may regard the same behavior as counterproductive, thus it is important to understand individual differences in perceiving and in engaging in CWBs.

1.3 Antecedents of Counterproductive Behavior

The answer of why employees engage in counterproductive behaviors has been discussed by researchers for many years. There are not only conflicts but also some overlaps between them regarding this topic. In general, employees act counterproductively due to economic factors, individual factors and organizational factors.

Economic factors can be considered as one of the factors which results in counterproductive behaviors. According to Boye and Jones (1997), dishonest employees may steal from their organizations and use economical factors as an excuse for their theft. Prices or interest rates can be involved in economical factors. Employees may act counterproductively due to desires of improving their living standard. However, Hollinger and Clark (1983) found that financial needs were not antecedents of CWB. Moretti (1986) stated that employees have a tendency to perform counterproductive behaviors when they adopt more tolerable attitudes toward these behaviors. Moreover, employees' attitudes toward such behaviors and how they perceive others' attitudes about CWB are influenced by their traits (Kamp & Brooks, 1991). The literature on individual differences and also organizational variables in relation to engaging in CWB or perceiving behaviors as CWB are presented in the following sections.

1.3.1 Individual Variables as Antecedents of CWB

Certain personality factors and values as individual differences variables have been implicated either in engaging in CWB or attitudes toward such behaviors.

1.3.1.1 Personality Variables

In the literature, researchers examined the link between personality variables and CWBs. Spector (2010) indicated that individuals' perceptions, attributions for causes of events and their tendency to behave aggressively or counterproductively can be affected by personality. The result of the study conducted by Kozako, Safin and Rahim (2013) showed that neuroticism ($\beta = .32, .26$) and openness to experience ($\beta = .13, .21$) were positively related to CWB directed both at the organization and individuals, whereas agreeableness ($\beta = -.41, -.46$) was negatively related. Also, extraversion ($\beta = -.19$) was found as negatively related to individually directed CWB. Among these personality traits, agreeableness was the most strongly associated one.

In the work psychology literature, personality measures based on the Five Factor model of personality, are employed in order to assess individual differences that predict specific work behaviors of interest. For example, to predict violence,

employee theft or dishonest behaviors of employees at work, specific personality scales were put together to form the criterion-focused occupational personality scale of integrity (COPS; Ones & Viswesvaran, 2001). The personality factors included in these tests were conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability. Such integrity tests show similarities with counterproductive behavior scales in terms of their purpose of use. Since, these tests are used to assess integrity and honesty of applicants; they enable prediction of theft and dishonest behaviors at work (Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 1995). The results of the study conducted by Ones, Viswesvaran, and Schmidt (1993) showed that integrity test validities for the overt and personality-based integrity tests are considerable while predicting broad counterproductive behaviors. The mean operational validities of integrity tests for both types of integrity tests were found to be moderate in size across situations (.30's). Moreover, in the study of Ones and Viswesvaran (1998), additional criteria, one of which was property damage, were examined to further support the criterion-related validities of these integrity tests. The operational validities indicated that property damage can be predicted with integrity tests with a large effect size (operational $r = .69$). In addition, other COPS developed to measure specific criteria like integrity scales were assessed in the study of Ones and Viswesvaran (2001). To illustrate, violence scales have .48 operational validity in the prediction of violent behaviors on the job while they have .46 operational validity in predicting other counterproductive work behaviors. These authors also found that conscientiousness itself had higher criterion-related validities than COPS in the prediction of counterproductive work behaviors ($r = .47$) (Ones & Viswesvaran, 2001).

In the study of Ones and Viswesvaran (2001), it was indicated that the COPS of integrity tests, drug and alcohol scales, and violence scales have consistent results. Specifically, the same Big Five personality dimensions can be utilized in these tests which are conscientiousness, agreeableness and emotional stability.

Mount, Illies, and Johnson (2006) also examined CWB in terms of its relation to personality traits by indicating that individuals choose such acts intentionally. In the meta-analysis by Salgado (2002), conscientiousness and agreeableness were found as valid predictors of a composite of deviant behavior which included

measures of theft, admissions, substance abuse, disciplinary problems, property damage and other irresponsible behaviors. The operational validity for conscientiousness and agreeableness were reported as .26 and .20, respectively. In the meta-analysis of Dalal (2005), it was found that conscientiousness is negatively related to CWB ($r = -.38$). Similarly, in more recent studies, agreeableness and conscientiousness were reported as negatively associated with CWB ($r = -.14$, $r = -.21$, respectively) (Hafidz, 2012) and with organizational and interpersonal deviance at .30s (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007). Smithikrai (2008) examined the relationship between personality and CWB within the framework of situational strength theory. Individuals' perceptions of group norms and performance monitoring was measured in the study to specify the situational strength. Two organizations were selected to represent organizations with strong and weak situations. Accordingly, agreeableness and conscientiousness related to CWB, with lower correlations in strong situations ($r = -0.31$, $r = -0.24$) and higher correlations in weak situations ($r = -0.49$, $r = -0.58$).

Taken together, individuals higher on conscientiousness and agreeableness tend to engage less in CWB. Since engaging in CWB and attitudes towards such behaviors are related (Moretti, 1986), one can also expect that individuals higher on the same personality factors would be less tolerable of CWB and perceive such behaviors as more counterproductive.

According to Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), in the general theory of crime, individual difference variables, general theory of crime have accounted for all types of employee deviance. It is indicated that criminal acts have a tendency to be positively correlated with each other in a long period of time. This correlation between numerous behaviors can be called as versatility and the time period can be called as stability of crime. Authors inferred that a latent personality trait; which is self-control can account for the pattern of these acts which are quite stable over time. Self-control is defined as the ability to restrain one's own desires or actions with regard to reaching higher goals and avoiding acts which have negative consequences in the long run (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1994). Marcus and Schuler (2004) indicated that low self-control is strongly ($r = -.63$) related to counterproductive behaviors in

the workplace, and the strongest predictor among other variables. The reason is that, individuals with high self-control think about the long-term consequences of their acts and keep away from negative ones. Likewise, Zettler (2011) also found a negative correlation ($r = -.39$) between self-control and counterproductive behaviors.

1.3.1.2 Individual Values

In this study, human values will also be examined in terms of their relation to CWB. Even though, to the knowledge of the author, there is no research which directly examined the relationship between values and CWB, it could be argued that individual values that motivate and guide everyday behavior based on a set of adopted principles would also shape individuals' course of conduct at the workplace. Values that reflect individual differences in terms of evaluating what is good or bad and what is desired could potentially act as buffers against CWB.

Rokeach (1973) described values as trans-situational goals with varying degrees of importance which guide people in their lives. Similarly, Schwartz (1992) defined values as a set of principles which guide individuals in their lives. The nature of individual values was described by Hansson, Carey, and Kjartansson (2010). First, values are beliefs linked to emotions. Second, values signify desirable goals which motivate people. Third, values go beyond specific actions and situations. Fourth, values serve as standards or criteria for individuals while assessing actions, people, situations and events. Last, values vary in degrees of importance and they are ordered among them, relatively. Hence, values do not specify situations; rather across all situations, they bridge the gap between people's preferences and behaviors

Schwartz (1992) defined 10 universal human values and motivations across cultures based on the research carried out in different countries. These values are: 1) Self-direction; that refers to independence in thought and action, exploration, and creativity, 2) Hedonism, that reflects pleasure and striving to satisfy individual needs, 3) Stimulation, that refers to looking for novelty, excitement and challenge in life, 4) Achievement, that refers to seeking personal achievement by demonstrating competence consistent with social standards, 5) Power, that reflects social status and prestige, control and dominance over other people and resources, 6) Benevolence,

that refers to protecting the welfare of people whom one is in personal contact frequently, 7) Universalism, that indicates protecting the welfare of all people and nature, also signifies appreciation and tolerance for all people and nature, 8) Tradition, that means respecting and accepting the customs and ideas of one's culture or religion, 9) Conformity, that refers to restriction of actions, inclination, and impulses that distress or harm others and violate social expectations or norms, and finally 10) Security, that reflects harmony, stability of society and relationships, and national safety.

After Schwartz (1992, 2006) defined these values, he proposed that values are located in a circle which reflects their motivational continuum. In the circle, while similar motivational constructs are represented with the values next to each other, conflicting ones are represented on the opposite side. Besides, Schwartz grouped these values as two bipolar dimensions around the circle. The dimension of openness to change versus conservation reflects the opposition between a desire for change, independent actions and thoughts and self-restriction, preservation of stability. On the other hand, the dimension of self-enhancement versus self-transcendence reflects the opposition between promotion of the self and showing concern for the interests of others. Based on their definitions, conservation and self-transcendence values are natural candidates for predictors of sensitivity towards deviant behaviors in organizations. Specific self-transcendence values are universalism and benevolence, and specific conservation values are conformity and tradition.

Universalism values are about understanding, appreciating and protecting the welfare of all people and nature. It is expected that people who value universalism more will perceive deviant behaviors as more counterproductive, since these behaviors harm others and violate the norms in nature. Another value is benevolence which reflects preservation and enhancement of the people whom one is in personal contact. Thus, the relationship between perceived CWBs and benevolence values will be expected to be in a positive direction. These two values form the self-transcendence end of the second dimension of Schwartz reflecting a concern for the welfare of others. An indirect piece of support for associating self-transcendence to CWB comes from Morris (2012), in which self-transcendence values were found as

negatively related to cheating behavior of students. That is, as the self-transcendence value levels of students increased, they were less likely to cheat ($B = -.076$). Also, in a sample of psychology students self-transcendence values ($r = .32$) were found as positively related to moral sensitivity as indicated by their performance in identifying and resolving ethical problems (Myry & Helkama, 2002). Therefore, I expect that individuals who endorse the values of universalism and benevolence more so will also be more sensitive to potentially harmful behaviors at the workplace and will perceive more CWB.

Individuals with higher conformity values refrain from violating social expectations and norms and restrain their actions accordingly. Thus, the association between levels of conformity and sensitivity to CWB is also expected to be in the positive direction. Finally, tradition values suggest that individuals respect, commit and accept the ideas of their culture or religion. Traditional cultures and religious value on ethics and require being one's ethical person (Stajkovic, & Luthans, 1997). By this reason, these values will be positively related to perception of CWB; CWBs would be thought to violate the standards and ethics. Therefore, individuals who value tradition would avoid CWBs, unethical behaviors. An indirect piece of support for associating conservation values with CWB comes from the business ethics literature. Shafer, Fukukawa and Lee (2007) found that conservation values which are conformity and tradition were significantly related to importance factors of the Perceived Role of Ethics and also to the Social Responsibility scale which consists of two broad categories, stockholder view and stakeholder view. In the study, stockholder view refers to a limited view of corporate obligations which emphasize the importance of profitability. Stakeholder view refers to the importance of ethics and social responsibility for organizational survival and success (the importance factor) and the compatibility of profitability with ethics and social responsibility (the compatibility factor). Specifically, conformity values had significant positive correlations with the importance and compatibility factors, while tradition values were significantly but negatively correlated with the stockholder view and compatibility factors. However, the compatibility factor had only two items and it might be misleading to reach a conclusion as to its association with conservation

values. To sum up, conservation values of Schwartz indicate that these individuals do not engage in CWBs mostly and are more sensitive to ethical issues and social responsibility. In other words, these values will positively relate to PCWB.

1.3.2 Organizational Variables

In addition to individual variables as antecedents of CWB, the situations in which employees are operating have been implicated as CWB predictors. Skarlicki and Folger (1997) showed that counterproductive behavior, such as anger and outrage can arise due to perceived injustice in organizations. Moreover, organizational climate and measures taken to prevent CWB can trigger these behaviors unintentionally unless they discourage employees' deviant behaviors in organizations (Hollinger & Clark, 1983). Hence, the situation or perceived situation makes the negative consequences of these acts less visible and easier for employees to engage in counterproductive acts (Marcus & Schuler, 2004).

Behaviors such as abuse, aggression and production deviance are encouraged or inhibited by social norms and organizational culture (Spector et al., 2005). Still, work stressors, negative emotions and perceived organizational injustice are related to CWB as factors motivating an individual to deviate from the norms. Different situations can create different motives for individuals to engage in specific forms of CWB. Social controls in organizations, which are perceived management sanctions and coworker attitudes, were also proposed as predictors of employee theft (Hollinger & Clark, 1983). A climate either favoring honesty or not encouraging honesty in organizations is diffused around all levels of the organization. Kamp and Brooks' (1991) study came up with similar result in terms of a climate encouraging or discouraging counterproductivity at all organizational levels. As a result employee attitudes towards theft are consistent with how they perceived the management of organization.

Researchers have defined organizational climate as the shared perception of people regarding their work setting (Ostroff, 1993). Both the characteristics of the work environment and how employees perceive these organizational characteristics define climate.

The characteristics of the work environment are a matter of organizational values and culture. A framework for comparing and contrasting organizations' culture and values has been provided by Hofstede (1980). The model is based on six dimensions which are power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, masculinity, long-term orientation and indulgence versus restraint. In the present study, uncertainty avoidance will be examined in terms of its relationship with CWB.

According to Hofstede (1984), uncertainty avoidance is defined as the extent of the organization or society's tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty. It means that while trying to deal with uncertainty or ambiguity, in what degree members of the organization feel anxiety. This dimension reflects consistency, norms and rules. Individuals in the organization with this characteristic feel uncomfortable when faced with ambiguous situations and desire to avoid this uncertainty.

Hofstede (1984) stressed that societies with high uncertainty avoidance preserve certain beliefs and behaviors and they do not show tolerance towards deviant people and ideas. However, there is a more relaxed atmosphere in societies with low uncertainty avoidance and they tolerate deviance more easily. Even the meaning of time show differences among cultures to the extent of uncertainty avoidance. According to Hofstede (1984), time is seen as a scarce resource in high uncertainty avoidance society and herewith, precision and punctuality become more important. Also, cultures with high uncertainty avoidance are characterized as emotional, aggressive and more active. In Romania, which is characterized as a high uncertainty country, jobs are highly structured in the organizations and also, management requirements and instructions are clarified in detail (Marinescu, 2014). Uncertainty avoidance levels of countries influence organizational outcomes as well as organizations' rules and regulations. For example, Chew and Putti (1995) found that longer tenure and intentions to remain in the organization rather than quitting were observed for Singapore Chinese managers who are high on uncertainty avoidance.

Uncertainty avoidance can be seen by the clarity of plans, procedures and systems in organizations (Newman & Nollen, 1996). Organizations which have clear procedures, well-known strategies and well-understood rules provide work-setting

with less uncertainty for employees. Therefore, employees feel safe and less anxious when they encounter with unknown situations. Moreover, employment contracts are used more in organizations with higher uncertainty avoidance rather than in organizations with lower uncertainty avoidance (Raghuram, London, & Larsen, 2001). Newman and Nollen (1996) found that work units in cultures with higher uncertainty avoidance have better financial performance with employees reporting a more clear sense of direction or more clear organizational policies.

In the literature, the relationship between uncertainty avoidance and CWB has not directly been studied. CWBs are unethical behaviors and violate organizational norms and procedures. A study found that uncertainty avoidance was positively related to ethical policies of organizations (Scholtens & Dam, 2007). In the study of Davis and Ruhe (2003), it was found that uncertainty avoidance and corruption which is country's integrity performance, was correlated significantly ($r = .40$). Individuals high on uncertainty avoidance are not willing to take risks since they have fear of failure and are inclined towards taking responsibility (Chew & Putti, 1995). Therefore, these individuals look for security and probably avoid unethical behaviors which pose a risk regarding their status quo.

CWB threatens the status quo of the organization. According to Hofstede (1980), organizations with higher uncertainty avoidance are characterized by less risk-taking and an intolerance toward deviant ideas and behaviors. Therefore, it is expected that individuals in organizations embedded in a characterized by uncertainty avoidance would refrain from such behaviors and would perceive these deviant behaviors as CWBs.

Another factor that relates to the climate of an organization is justice and fairness perceptions. According to Li and Cropanzano (2009), justice climate is how employees perceive their organization in the judgment of fairness. In general, the literature has accumulated information on the association between justice climate and positive work behaviors, and only a few studies examined the association with negative work behaviors. According to such studies, employees tend to engage in negative work behaviors when they perceive an unfair climate (Enns & Rotundo, 2012). Several studies indicated that teamwork processes are influenced by unit-level

judgments of fairness (e.g., Chen, Sharma, Edinger, Shapiro, & Farh, 2011; Cropanzano, Li, & Benson, 2011). Specifically, communication, coordination, mutual support for members and cohesion which are called characteristics of team processes are influenced positively by fairness. Chen and colleagues (2011) emphasized that injustice climate in team processes causes decreases in teamwork behaviors since more self-serving behaviors occur. Priesemuth, Arnaud and Schminke (2013) supported this claim in their study by showing that there are positive relationship between overall injustice climate perceived at the group-level and interpersonal deviance ($\beta = .28$).

Studies showed that fairness is related to less counterproductive behavior in organizations, since unfairness is seen as a kind of job stressor (e.g., Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Like other job stressors, perceived injustice results in negative emotions and both the stressor variable and negative emotion were significantly related to CWB. According to Fox et al. (2001), distributive justice and organizational CWBs were significantly correlated ($r = -.17$). Also, procedural justice was found as significantly correlated with both organizational CWB ($r = -.26$) and personal CWB ($r = -.15$). Skarlicki, Folger and Tesluk (1999) showed that procedural ($r = -.51$), distributive ($r = -.40$), and interactional justice ($r = -.49$) were negatively associated with organizational retaliation.

The literature has evidence that fairness perceptions are related to engaging in CWB. One could also argue that perceiving a behavior as counterproductive for the organization would be shaped by how the individual perceives the organization in terms of its already existing climate, thus a positive association between sensitivity to perceiving behaviors as CWB and perceiving the organization as fair is expected.

In the organizational justice literature, there are different justice dimensions, such as distributive, procedural, and interactional justice which affects organizational outcomes (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). However, Colquitt and Shaw (2005) claimed that the measurement of perceived overall justice can bring more clear explanations about employee behaviors rather than distinct justice dimensions, since different justice dimensions may overlap or conflict with each other while measuring an organizational outcome. Therefore, validity of

measurement may not be provided due to contamination or deficiency. Moreover, if any researcher wants to capture individuals' overall justice perceptions in the organization, he/she falls behind by assessing different justice facets only (Colquitt & Shaw, 2005), since in general, individuals tend to make overall judgments about their environment in order to avoid uncertainty. Hence, individuals generate overall justice perceptions rather than justice facets. In the study of Ambrose and Schminke (2009), it has been shown that behaviors and attitudes of employees are better predicted with overall justice compared to specific justice facets. In short, in organizations, employees experience various justice cues and generate overall justice perceptions regarding these cues. As a result, employee behaviors are affected by these generated justice perceptions.

In the organizational behavior literature, the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) has frequently been used to predict human social behavior (Ajzen, 1991). In TPB, individuals perform a behavior depending on the strength of their intentions to perform or not to perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). According to Ajzen (1991), factors behind these intentions are attitudes, subjective norms and efficacy beliefs. Attitudes refer to evaluations of a behavior in terms of the favorability to act. Subjective norms refer to individuals' perception of social pressure while deciding to perform the behavior or not. Self-efficacy refers to the extent of individuals' belief about being able to perform a behavior successfully. In the present study, individuals' perceptions of CWB was measured with the assumption that individuals are more likely to perform a behavior when they judge that behavior as favorable (or as not unfavorable). Therefore, attitudes, which were shown to be linked with behaviors in the TPB literature (e.g., Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen 2011; Sheeran, Norman, & Orbell (1999) were of interest of the current study.

Kamp and Brooks (1991) indicated that due to social desirability, employees would not report the actual amount of their involvement with theft in the workplace. Therefore, employees reported their engagement with theft less than they reported for their coworkers. In fact, self-report measures tend to have responses which are socially desirable. However, social scientists mostly need to rely on individuals' self-reports while conducting study because of lack of other resources and the nature of

work itself. Hence, self-report measure will be used in this study. Nonetheless, by measuring perceived CWBs of employees, this study aims to find out their real intentions. Since if any employee who does not perceive deviant behavior as counterproductive, they engage in that behavior more easily.

1.4 The Current Study and Hypotheses

In the present study, the aim was to examine perceived CWB by employees and its relationship with personality, individual values and organizational variables. The purpose of including both the proximal variables of personality characteristics and individual values, and the distal organizational variables in the research were to study the predictors of perceived CWB in a comprehensive fashion as much as possible. Hypotheses of the present study are presented below.

Individuals who score higher scores on the three personality dimensions, four individual values, perceptions of organizational rule clarity (uncertainty avoidance), and perceptions of organizational justice were expected to be more sensitive in perceiving counterproductive work behaviors as such. Hence;

Hypothesis 1: Agreeableness and Conscientiousness will be significantly positively related to PCWBs.

Hypothesis 2: Self-control will be positively related to PCWBs.

Hypothesis 3: The self-transcendence values of Universalism and Benevolence will be significantly positively related to PCWBs.

Hypothesis 4: The conservation values of Conformity and Tradition will be significantly positively related to PCWBs.

Hypothesis 5: Employee perceptions of organizational uncertainty avoidance (defined as clarity of organizational rules and procedures) will be significantly positively related to PCWBs.

Hypothesis 6: Employee perceptions of overall organizational justice climate will be significantly positively related to PCWBs.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

2.1 Participants and Procedure

In the study, data were collected from 255 employees working in 13 different private organizations in Turkey, spanning 12 different jobs. Mostly, participants are selected from the defense industry in Ankara. The survey was distributed to 222 people in this industry and 187 of them were completed with a return rate of 84.23%. Also, questionnaires were delivered via the Internet on request. In the study, of the total participants, 187 (73.33%) took a paper-and-pencil test and 68 participants (26.67%) filled the questionnaires on the Internet. There were missing scales in 35 cases which were not included in the analysis, leaving a sample size of 220.

Of the participants, 65 were female (29.5%) and 155 were male (70.5%). The age ranged from 21 to 57 ($M = 30.34$, $SD = 6.46$). The education level of employees ranged from having a high school diploma to a graduate school diploma; 20 (9.1%) reported being a high school graduate, 15 (6.8%) reported having an associate degree, 101 participants (45.9%) reported having a bachelor's degree, 83 (37.7%) reported having a graduate degree, and one of them did not report the education level. The tenure of employees in the organization they were currently working in ranged from 1 month to 23 years ($M = 4.85$, $SD = 4.80$). Moreover, total tenure of participants ranged from 2 months to 36 years ($M = 7.69$, $SD = 6.91$).

Both the paper-and-pencil test and the Internet versions of the questionnaire was presented to participants with six sections, including The Brief Self-Control Scale, The Big Five Inventory (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness), Schwartz Value Survey (Universalism, Benevolence, Tradition, and Conformity), Uncertainty Avoidance Subscale of Dorfman and Howell's (1988) Cultural Scales, Perceived Overall Justice Scale, Perceived Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale, and the demographic information form. Ethical guidelines were followed by first obtaining approvals from the Ethics Committee for Research with Human Participants of the university the researcher

was affiliated with and the organization in which the paper-and-pencil version was distributed. All participants took part in the study on a voluntary basis upon providing their informed consent. Those who took the paper-and-pencil version were presented with the questionnaires in envelopes. They were informed about the overall purpose and duration of the study that the data collected would be used for a graduate study of the researcher, and that the data from all participants would be treated collectively for purposes of publication. Also, the participants were asked not to write their names or any other personal identifiers on the questionnaires to assure anonymity.

2.2 Measures

2.2.1 Self-Control Scale

The Self-Control Scale developed by Tangney, Baumeister, and Boone (2004) was used in the present study in order to measure dispositional self-control (see Appendix A). The original scale was constructed with 36 items, each scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale, from 1 (not at all like me) to 5 (very much like me) with higher scores reflecting higher self-control. In addition, Tangney et al. (2004) constructed a 13-item Brief Self-Control Scale which taps the same range of content with the Total Self-Control Scale. In their studies, this brief scale was found to be correlated in the .90s with the original scale. An example item is “I often act without thinking through all the alternatives”. The Brief Self-Control Scale was translated and adapted to Turkish by Coşkan (2010) who reported a .79 internal consistency reliability.

2.2.2 The Big Five Inventory

To measure the personality traits, the Big Five Inventory (BFI) one of the most common assessments, was administered to participants (see Appendix B) (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998), which includes items to assess the five personality dimensions of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Benet-Martínez and John (1998) showed that the BFI is a

reliable as well as a valid measure of the Big Five factors in their cross-cultural research. This inventory was translated and adapted to Turkish Language (Sümer & Sümer, 2002). The BFI items are rated on a scale from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly) for each item, with higher scores indicating higher endorsement of the factor. Nine items are used to assess each of the Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience dimensions and eight items are used to assess the Extraversion and Neuroticism dimensions. Cronbach's alpha reliabilities were found to be moderate ranging from .64 to .77 for the five factors assessed in the inventory (Sümer, Lajunen & Özkan, 2005). In the present study only the factors of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness were put to the test of hypotheses. Example items include "Is considerate and kind to almost everyone" for Agreeableness and "Perseveres until the task is finished" for Conscientiousness.

2.2.3 Schwartz Value Survey

Individual values were assessed with Schwartz Values Scale. The scale developed by Schwartz (1992) includes 57 items and ten dimensions. However, in the present study items of the hypothesized dimensions, 24-item as total, were used (see Appendix C). Specifically, nine items were included for universalism, six items for benevolence, six items for conformity and three items for tradition. Items in the scale are rated on a scale from 1 (not like me) to 6 (very much like me) for each item. The coefficient alphas for these dimensions were reported as .70 for benevolence, .74 for universalism, .72 for conformity, and .60 for tradition (Schwartz, 2005). The scale was translated and adapted to Turkish by Demirutku and Sümer (2010). Demirutku and Sümer reported test-retest reliability coefficients as .66 for benevolence, .72 for universalism, .75 for conformity, and .82 for tradition. Also, the internal consistency of the scale was reported as .91. Example items for each dimension include "He wants everyone to be treated justly, even people he doesn't know" for universalism, "Caring for the well-being of people he is close to is important to him" for benevolence, "It is important to him to follow rules even when no one is watching" for conformity, and "He strongly values the traditional practices

of his culture” for tradition. Participants are instructed to rate the degree to which they resemble the person depicted in each item.

2.2.4 Uncertainty Avoidance Scale

In this study, Dorfman and Howell’s (1988) cultural values scale, which was developed to measure Hofstede’s cultural dimensions, was used to measure only the dimension of perceived uncertainty avoidance of the organization. Here, the aim was to measure clarity of organizational rules and procedures, and uncertainty avoidance in the study refers to this definition. The scale was differentiated from Hofstede’s scale since it did not measure social, religious and interpersonal rituals and ideas. Items in the present study were concerned about clarity of rules, regulations, and procedures in the organization (see Appendix D). This scale has 5 items, each rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (does not describe the organization I work at all) to 5 (describes the organization I work very well). The items are “It is important to have job requirements and instructions spelled out in detail so that employees always know what they are expected to do”; “Managers expect employees to closely follow instructions and procedures”; “Rules and regulations are important because they inform employees what the organization expects of them”; “Standard operating procedures are helpful to employees on the job” “Instructions for operations are important to employees on the job”. The reliability coefficient for uncertainty avoidance was found as .81 (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000). It is translated and adapted to Turkish by Albaş and Ergeneli (2011) who reported a .89 internal consistency reliability.

2.3.5 Perceived Overall Justice Scale

Overall justice perception was measured with six items adapted from the Perceived Overall Justice (POJ) scale by Ambrose and Schminke (2009) (see Appendix E). In this scale, individuals’ personal justice experiences are assessed with three items (an example item is “In general, the treatment I receive around here is fair.”) and the perceived fairness of the organization in general is assessed with three items (an example is “For the most part, this organization treats its employees

fairly.”). The higher ratings in the scale indicate greater perceptions of fairness. Items were rated on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) in this study. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability for overall justice was found as .93 (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009). The scale was translated to Turkish by the researcher and a bilingual speaker.

2.3.6 Perceived Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale

In order to assess employees’ perceptions of counterproductive work behaviors, the CWB Checklist developed by Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh, and Kessler (2006) was used (see Appendix F). The scale was at first developed to include 45 items; and later on was reduced to 32 items. The scale consists of five subscales which are production deviance, sabotage, theft, abuse towards others and withdrawal. Production deviance dimension is defined as purposely failing while performing job tasks. Sabotage is described as intentionally destroying something in the organization. Theft dimension measures the tendency to steal. Abuse was defined as incivility-type behaviors which are intended to harm others psychologically or physically such as nasty comments, threatening others, and ignoring a coworker. Withdrawal dimension includes refraining from work-related behaviors in the organization such as arriving at work late and taking longer breaks. Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities were reported as .61, .42, .58, .81 and .63, respectively for the sub-dimensions and .87 for the entire scale (Spector et al., 2006). Example items for each dimension include “Did something to make someone at work look bad” for abuse, “Took supplies or tools home without permission” for theft, “Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you weren’t” for withdrawal, and “Purposely wasted your employer’s materials/supplies” for sabotage.

The measure was translated and adapted to Turkish by Öcel (2010). The Cronbach’s alpha reliability was found as .97. Item-total-test correlation was reported between .53 and .92. Moreover, in order to acquire additional information, five items were added to the scale by the researcher. These items were derived from another CWB measure and were selected to offer information related to the sucker effect, sharing classified company-related information with third parties, excessive

usage of the Internet during work hours, neglecting orders of the supervisor, and using company resources for private needs (Algı, Aydın, Ağca, Selvi, & Yüce, 2010).

The scale was presented to participants with a different instruction. In the original version, participants were instructed with the question “How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?” However, in the current study, the aim was to measure the level of perceived counterproductive work behavior of individuals. Therefore, participants were instructed as “State to what extent you think each of the following behavioral examples is harmful to the organization or its employees.” A total of 37 items in this measure were rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 “not harmful at all” to 6 “very much harmful”.

2.3.7 Demographic Information Questionnaire

A demographic information questionnaire was administered to participants (see Appendix G). Age, gender, level of education, current tenure in the organization and total tenure were included as questions.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

In this chapter, firstly, data screening and cleaning procedures are described followed by factor analyses. Second, reliability analyses for the scales used in the study are examined. Third, descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations among study variables are presented. Last, the results of hypotheses testing are examined by treating the four sub-dimensions and the total perceived CWB (PCWB) as outcomes of the regression analyses.

3.1 Data Screening, Cleaning, and Factor Analyses

Missing values were examined. In the present study, they were detected as less than 5% of all participants on all variables. In this case, Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) stated that any procedure yield similar results while handling missing values. Therefore, mean substitution was used to handle missing values. After the mean substitution, data was checked for univariate and multivariate outliers once the variables were formed. Five of the cases were detected as univariate outliers by examining the scores above 3.29 and below -3.29. Also, one of these cases was detected as a multivariate outlier by examining the Mahalanobis distance ($\chi^2 > 34.53$, $p < .001$). Hence, these six outliers were excluded from further analysis and the data was analyzed with the remaining 214 participants. After that, normality and linearity were checked by screening the skewness, kurtosis values, scatter plots and P-P plots for the variables. Study variables were normally distributed and pairwise associations were linear.

The composite variable forming process was undertaken as follows. The BFI factors of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness were formed by averaging the item responses. Self-control was treated as a unitary dimension by taking the average of all 13 items since the brief version of the scale was used in this study (Tangney et al., 2004).

In the study, universalism and benevolence which are self-transcendence values, and also conformity and tradition which are conservation values were used. Hence, the factor structure was forced into a two-factor solution as well as a four-factor solution by using Principal Axis Factoring with Oblique rotation. It was found that the four-factor solution yielded the four value dimensions as expected whereas in the two factor solution several items did not load on the higher-order dimensions of self-transcendence and conservation in the expected way. As a result, for the variables of Schwartz values, four composites were generated, which are Universalism, Benevolence, Conformity and Tradition, as suggested in the literature (Schwartz, 2005). After that, due to higher correlation between these values (Table 3.3.), factor analysis was performed again by using Principal Axis Factoring with the Direct Oblimin rotation but it was run with the four composite variables. The results showed that two-factor structure would be appropriate as seen in the Table 3.1. As a result, two composites were generated for the higher-order values.

Table 3.1. Factor Loadings

Variables	Factor Loadings	
	1	2
Universalism	.823	
Benevolence	.722	
Conformity		.607
Tradition		.550

Note. 1 = Self-transcendence, 2 = Conservation

Perceived organizational uncertainty avoidance (i.e. clarity of organizational rules/regulations/expectations) and perceived overall organizational justice were each treated as one-dimensional constructs in the literature and therefore composites based one item averages were computed for each.

Lastly, in order to generate composites of perceived CWB, factor analysis was conducted by using Principal Axis Factoring with the Direct Oblimin rotation. During analysis, factor structure was forced to both four and five factors, since the

original scale yielded a five-factor structure (Spector et al., 2006), while the Turkish version of the scale has a four-factor structure (Öcel, 2010). Unfortunately, results did not yield interpretable outcomes. Therefore, it was decided to form variable composites that would reflect the factor structure found in the Turkish context with the factors of Abuse, Theft, Withdrawal, and Sabotage. Hence, 32 items were distributed to factors based on Öcel's study (2010). In addition, five-items, which were added for this study, were distributed to factors in accordance with theoretical expectations. The items which are "Underperforming when one thinks that his/her coworkers do not work enough", "Slacking off due to the use of internet at the workplace", and "Ignoring the practice of the supervisor's orders" were placed under the Withdrawal sub-dimension. The item of "Sharing classified workplace information or documents with parties outside the organization" was placed under the Sabotage sub-dimension whereas "Using workplace resources for personal needs" was placed under the Theft sub-dimension.

Independent *t*-test analysis was conducted in order to examine whether there was a difference between participants who took the paper-and-pencil test and the Internet-based version. Levene's test for homogeneity of variance was not significant for any of the study variables; therefore, equal variances were assumed. The result of independent *t*-test analyses for agreeableness, conscientiousness, self-control, self-transcendence, conservation, uncertainty avoidance, abuse, theft, withdrawal and sabotage were not significant. However, the result of perceived organizational justice was significant. That is, participants who took paper-and-pencil test ($M = 2.89$, $SD = .84$) and internet-based version ($M = 3.55$, $SD = .88$) differed in their perceived organizational justice scores significantly. Thus, the result of this variable should be interpreted carefully.

3.2 Reliability Analyses

After items were composited, reliability analysis was conducted for each scale. The alpha reliability values of each scale are shown in Table 3.2. The Cronbach's alpha level was found as .79 for Self-Control scale. The alpha reliabilities of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness were found as .65 and .77, respectively. The reliabilities of Schwartz's values were reported as .78 for

Universalism, .85 for Benevolence, .61 for Conformity, and .93 for Tradition. The alpha reliabilities of Uncertainty Avoidance and Organizational Justice scales were reported as .90 for each one. Cronbach's alpha levels of the sub-dimensions of PCWB were reported as .95 for Abuse, .80 for Theft, .89 for Withdrawal, and .65 for Sabotage. However, omitting the item "Purposely did your work incorrectly" under the Theft sub-dimension increased the alpha reliability to .82. Also, this item did not fit the Theft sub-dimension conceptually. As a result this item was omitted from the scale and not included in further analyses. In total, the alpha reliability of PCWB scale was reported as .96. Reliabilities are presented in Table 3.2.

3.3 Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations

Means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values of the study variables are presented in Table 3.2. The correlation matrix of the study variables is presented in Table 3.3.

As seen in the Table 3.3., for benevolence, tradition, uncertainty avoidance, abuse, theft and sabotage variables, the distribution was moderately skewed in a negative way, since values were between -1 and +1, whereas for other study variables, the distribution was approximately symmetric. When standard deviations were examined, variance was found as relatively higher for theft ($SD = .71$) and withdrawal ($SD = .76$) as compared to other PCWB variables. In these variables, the range was also reported as higher for theft and withdrawal, 3.20 and 3.50, respectively. It showed that larger variance was observed for these variables. Moreover, withdrawal had the lowest mean values among PCWB variables ($M = 4.67$ on a 6-point scale). That is, individuals may have difficulties while labeling the behaviors under this sub-dimension as counterproductive rather than other variables.

Bivariate correlations between study variables were examined and the results showed that almost all PCWB variables were significantly related to the predictors except perceived organizational justice. When the relationship among personality variables were examined, self-control was found as moderately related to agreeableness ($r = .31, p < .01$) and largely with conscientiousness ($r = .73, p < .01$). Moreover, agreeableness was moderately related to conscientiousness ($r = .31, p < .01$). Next, the relationship among individual values was examined. Universalism

had a large relation with benevolence ($r = .60, p < .01$), and conformity ($r = .48, p < .01$) and a smaller relation with tradition ($r = .22, p < .01$). Benevolence was positively related to conformity ($r = .46, p < .01$) and tradition ($r = .23, p < .01$). Besides, conformity was related to tradition ($r = .41, p < .01$).

Lastly, the relationship between predictors and criteria were examined. Self-control was positively related to perceiving abuse ($r = .28, p < .01$), theft ($r = .38, p < .01$), withdrawal ($r = .45, p < .01$), sabotage ($r = .27, p < .01$) and composite PCWB ($r = .39, p < .01$) as being counterproductive to the organization. Agreeableness was positively related to perceiving theft ($r = .19, p < .01$), withdrawal ($r = .22, p < .01$), sabotage ($r = .15, p < .05$) and composite PCWB ($r = .18, p < .01$), excepting abuse sub-dimension, as being counterproductive. Conscientiousness was positively related to perceiving abuse ($r = .19, p < .01$), theft ($r = .35, p < .01$), withdrawal ($r = .37, p < .01$), sabotage ($r = .23, p < .01$) and composite PCWB ($r = .31, p < .01$) as being counterproductive. All individual values, were positively and significantly related to perceiving all forms of PCWB and the composite as being counterproductive; with correlations for universalism ranging from .34 to .42, for benevolence ranging from .29 to .36, for conformity ranging from .25 to .50 with the highest correlation with the withdrawal factor, and finally for tradition ranging from .19 to .30. Uncertainty avoidance was positively related to perceiving abuse ($r = .20, p < .01$), theft ($r = .29, p < .01$), withdrawal ($r = .37, p < .01$), sabotage ($r = .26, p < .01$) and the composite PCWB ($r = .31, p < .01$). Perceived justice was not significantly associated with perceiving behaviors as counterproductive.

Table 3.2. Descriptive statistics for all study variables

Variable	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Skewness	# of items	Cronbach's alpha
1. Age	30.37	6.51	21.00	57.00	1.33		
2. Tenure in the current organization	4.90	4.81	.10	23.00	1.62		
3. Total tenure	7.78	6.92	.20	36.00	1.45		
4. Self-control	3.61	.59	1.77	5.00	-.18	13	.79
5. Agreeableness	3.87	.45	2.56	5.00	-.31	9	.65
6. Conscientiousness	3.88	.54	2.33	5.00	-.06	9	.77
7. Universalism	5.02	.51	3.56	6.00	-.06	9	.78
8. Benevolence	5.39	.51	3.83	6.00	-.63	6	.85
9. Conformity	4.59	.66	2.50	6.00	-.31	6	.61
10. Tradition	4.10	1.31	1.00	6.00	-.58	3	.93
11. Uncertainty avoidance	3.78	.89	1.20	5.00	-.54	5	.90
12. Perceived organizational justice	3.09	.90	1.00	5.00	-.14	6	.90
13. Abuse	5.34	.55	3.74	6.00	-.77	19	.95
14. Theft	5.09	.71	2.80	6.00	-.76	5	.82
15. Withdrawal	4.67	.76	2.50	6.00	-.28	8	.89
16. Sabotage	5.24	.55	3.25	6.00	-.65	4	.65
17. PCWB	5.16	.53	3.78	6.00	-.45	36	.96

Notes. Self-control, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Uncertainty Avoidance and Perceived Organizational Justice were rated on a 5-point scale; Universalism, Benevolence, Conformity, Tradition, Abuse, Theft, Withdrawal, Sabotage and PCWB were rated on a 6-point scale. Standard error for all variables is .166.

Table 3.3. Correlations between Study Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Gender	1											
2. Age	.06	1										
3. Education	-.03	-.06	1									
4. Current Tenure	.03	.76**	-.07	1								
5. Total Tenure	.07	.94**	-.20**	.78*	1							
6. Casual Leave	-.04	.01	-.02	-.07	-.02	1						
7. Self-Control	-.08	.11	-.01	.07	.15*	-.02	1					
8. Agreeableness	.01	.13	-.04	.08	.15*	.12	.31**	1				
9. Conscientiousness	-.01	.11	-.08	.06	.18**	-.04	.73**	.31**	1			
10. Universalism	-.10	.11	-.02	.02	.14*	.14*	.33**	.34**	.33**	1		
11. Benevolence	-.12	.00	.02	-.09	.02	.12	.27**	.34**	.25**	.60**	1	
12. Conformity	.01	.17*	-.11	.12	.21**	.14*	.33**	.38**	.31**	.48**	.46**	1
13. Tradition	.09	-.02	-.28**	-.01	.08	.11	.22**	.07	.20**	.22**	.23**	.41**
14. UA	-.06	.02	-.12	.06	.08	-.01	.21**	.07	.24**	.30**	.13	.20**
15. POJ	.04	-.14*	-.01	-.12	-.14*	-.04	.03	.05	.09	.02	-.11	-.01
16. Abuse	-.14*	.11	-.07	.03	.10	.04	.28**	.11	.19**	.34**	.31**	.25**
17. Theft	-.12	.13	-.15*	.04	.16*	.08	.38**	.19**	.35**	.39**	.34**	.37**
18. Withdrawal	-.08	.11	-.21**	-.02	.14*	.12	.45**	.22**	.37**	.38**	.31**	.50**
19. Sabotage	-.00	.15*	-.10	.06	.12	.07	.27**	.15*	.23**	.37**	.29**	.28**
20. PCWB	-.12	.14*	-.14*	.02	.14*	.08	.39**	.18**	.31**	.42**	.36**	.39**

Table 3.3. (continued)

Variable	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
13. Tradition	1							
14. UA	.30**	1						
15. POJ	.10	.36**	1					
16. Abuse	.19**	.20**	.02	1				
17. Theft	.31**	.29**	-.00	.68**	1			
18. Withdrawal	.37**	.37**	.01	.54**	.74**	1		
19. Sabotage	.19**	.26**	.02	.70**	.68**	.55**	1	
20. PCWB	.30**	.31**	.02	.92**	.86**	.80**	.80**	1

Notes. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$;

UA = Uncertainty avoidance; POJ = Perceived organizational justice; PCWB = Perceived counterproductive work behavior; Gender 1 = Female 2 = Male; Level of Education 1 = Primary School, 2 = High School, 3 = Associate's Degree, 4 = Bachelor's Degree, 5 = Master's Degree.

3.4 Hypothesis Testing

In order to test the hypotheses of the study, a number of hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. The predictors of personality, individual values, and organizational variables, were analyzed separately by taking PCWB and its sub-dimensions as the dependent variables. During the analyses, demographic variables, which were significantly correlated with dependent variables, were entered into the equation as control variables. Gender was controlled for the abuse sub-dimension, whereas education level and total tenure were controlled for the theft and withdrawal sub-dimensions. In addition, for the sabotage sub-dimension age was controlled. Age, education level, and total tenure were controlled for the composite PCWB. Results are presented for each outcome separately. Results are tabulated for the groups of personality, value, and organizational variables separately in Tables 3.4., 3.5., and 3.6.

3.4.1 Prediction of Perceiving Abuse

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to test the hypotheses regarding the abuse sub-dimension. Firstly, gender was entered in the first step as the control variable. Then, personality traits which are agreeableness and conscientiousness were entered in the second step and self-control was entered in the third step. The first step with the demographic variables was significant ($R^2 = .02$, $F_{(1,212)} = 3.91$, $p = .049$). Gender significantly predicted abuse ($\beta = -.14$, $t = -1.98$, $p < .05$). Agreeableness and conscientiousness were entered into the equation at the second step. The incremental variance added by these variables was also significant ($\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F_{(2,210)} = 4.46$, $p = .013$); however, only conscientiousness ($\beta = .17$, $t = 2.46$, $p = .015$) predicted abuse significantly. In the third step, self-control was entered into the equation. The incremental variance added by the variable over personality and demographic variables was significant ($\Delta R^2 = .03$, $\Delta F_{(1,209)} = 7.89$, $p = .005$). Self-control ($\beta = .27$, $t = 2.81$, $p = .005$) predicted abuse significantly. That is, people who score high in conscientiousness and self-control are more likely to perceive abuse as a form of deviant behavior that would harm the organization.

Therefore, hypothesis regarding the predictive role of personality was partially supported for the abuse sub-dimension.

Second regression analysis was conducted with individual values as predictors while controlling gender. Results showed that individual values added incremental variance in explaining the abuse sub-dimension ($\Delta R^2 = .14$, $\Delta F_{(2,210)} = 17.07$, $p < .001$). Nevertheless, only self-transcendence was significantly related to abuse ($\beta = .30$, $t = 4.21$, $p < .001$) which means individuals with self-transcendence values are more likely to perceive abuse as counterproductive to the organization. Hence, hypothesis regarding the predictive role of individual values was partially supported for the abuse sub-dimension.

Last analysis was conducted with organizational variables predicting abuse. After controlling for the effects of gender, organizational variables added incremental variance in explaining abuse ($\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F_{(2,210)} = 4.46$, $p = .013$). However, only uncertainty avoidance was related to abuse significantly ($\beta = .21$, $t = 2.96$, $p = .003$). The result shows that employees who perceive their organizations to have clear rules, procedures, and expectations perceive abuse-related behaviors to be more harmful. Thus, hypothesis regarding the predictive role of organizational variables was partially supported for the abuse sub-dimension.

3.4.2 Prediction of Perceiving Theft

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to test the hypotheses regarding the theft sub-dimension. In the first step, education level and total work tenure were entered into the equation as the control variables. The first step with the demographic variables was significant ($R^2 = .04$, $F_{(2,211)} = 4.56$, $p = .011$). However, only tenure significantly predicted theft ($\beta = .14$, $t = 1.99$, $p = .048$). It means that people who have higher tenure perceive theft as more counterproductive. Personality traits of agreeableness and conscientiousness were entered into the equation in the second step. These variables added incremental variance in explaining theft ($\Delta R^2 = .11$, $\Delta F_{(2,209)} = 13.10$, $p < .001$). However, only conscientiousness ($\beta = .30$, $t = 4.42$, $p < .001$) predicted theft significantly. In the third step, self-control was entered into the equation, which added significant incremental variance ($\Delta R^2 = .04$, $\Delta F_{(1,208)} =$

9.26, $p = .003$). Self-control ($\beta = .28$, $t = 3.04$, $p = .003$) predicted theft significantly. Hence, hypothesis regarding the predictive role of personality was partially supported for the theft sub-dimension.

Next regression analysis was conducted with individual values as predictors and same control variables. Results showed that individual values added incremental variance in explaining the theft ($\Delta R^2 = .20$, $\Delta F_{(2,209)} = 27.23$, $p < .001$). Both self-transcendence ($\beta = .31$, $t = 4.61$, $p < .001$) and conservation ($\beta = .23$, $t = 3.37$, $p \leq .001$) values were significantly related to perceiving theft as CWB. The hypothesis regarding the predictive role of individual values was supported for the theft sub-dimension.

Lastly, analysis was conducted with organizational variables predicting theft. Regarding the model, organizational variables added incremental variance in explaining the theft ($\Delta R^2 = .08$, $\Delta F_{(2,209)} = 9.64$, $p < .001$). However, only uncertainty avoidance predicted theft significantly ($\beta = .31$, $t = 4.39$, $p < .001$). The result shows that employees who perceive their organizations to have clear rules, procedures, and expectations perceive theft-related behaviors to be more harmful. Thus, hypothesis regarding the predictive role of organizational variables was partially supported for the theft sub-dimension.

3.5.3 Prediction of Perceiving Withdrawal

In the first step, education level and tenure were entered into the equation as the control variables. The first step with the demographic variables was significant ($R^2 = .06$, $F_{(2,211)} = 6.10$, $p = .003$). However, only education level significantly predicted withdrawal ($\beta = -.19$, $t = -2.75$, $p = .006$). It indicates that as individuals' education level decreased, their perception of withdrawal as a form of CWB increased. In the second step, personality traits, agreeableness and conscientiousness were entered into the equation and these variables added incremental variance in explaining perceptions of withdrawal ($\Delta R^2 = .13$, $\Delta F_{(2,209)} = 16.39$, $p < .001$). However, only conscientiousness ($\beta = .32$, $t = 4.76$, $p < .001$) predicted withdrawal significantly. In the third step the incremental variance added by self-control was also significant ($\Delta R^2 = .07$, $\Delta F_{(1,208)} = 19.29$, $p < .001$). Self-control ($\beta = .39$, $t = 4.39$,

$p < .001$) predicted withdrawal significantly. Therefore, the hypothesis regarding the predictive role of personality was partially supported for the withdrawal sub-dimension.

Another regression analysis was conducted with individual values as predictors by controlling the same demographic variables. Results showed that after controlling education level and tenure, individual values explained incremental variance in the withdrawal sub-dimension ($\Delta R^2 = .24$, $\Delta F_{(2,209)} = 34.88$, $p < .001$). Both self-transcendence ($\beta = .24$, $t = 3.80$, $p < .05$) and conservation ($\beta = .35$, $t = 5.24$, $p < .001$) values significantly predicted withdrawal. Thus, the hypothesis regarding the predictive role of individual values was supported for the withdrawal sub-dimension.

Last, analysis was conducted with organizational variables predicting withdrawal. Regarding the model, organizational variables added incremental variance in explaining withdrawal ($\Delta R^2 = .13$, $\Delta F_{(2,209)} = 16.06$, $p < .001$). However, only uncertainty avoidance predicted withdrawal significantly ($\beta = .38$, $t = 5.65$, $p < .001$). It shows that employees who perceive their organizations to have clear rules, procedures, and expectations perceive withdrawal-related behaviors to be more harmful. Therefore, hypothesis regarding the predictive role of organizational variables was partially supported for the withdrawal sub-dimension.

3.5.4 Prediction of Perceiving Sabotage

In the first step, age was entered into the equation as the control variable. The first step with the demographic variable was significant ($R^2 = .02$, $F_{(1,212)} = 4.82$, $p = .029$). As individuals' age increases, the perception of sabotage as CWB increases also ($\beta = .15$, $t = 2.20$, $p = .029$). In the second step, personality traits, agreeableness and conscientiousness were entered into the equation. These variables added incremental variance in explaining sabotage ($\Delta R^2 = .05$, $\Delta F_{(2,210)} = 5.82$, $p = .003$). However, regression coefficients showed that only conscientiousness ($\beta = .20$, $t = 2.82$, $p = .005$) predicted sabotage significantly. In the third step, self-control entered into the equation. The incremental variance added by the variable over personality traits was also significant ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $\Delta F_{(1,209)} = 4.08$, $p = .045$). Self-control ($\beta = .20$,

$t = 2.02, p = .045$) predicted sabotage significantly. The hypothesis regarding the predictive role of personality was partially supported for the sabotage sub-dimension.

Next regression analysis was conducted with individual values as predictors while controlling age. Individual values explained incremental variance on sabotage sub-dimension ($\Delta R^2 = .14, \Delta F_{(2,210)} = 17.88, p < .001$). However, only self-transcendence ($\beta = .31, t = 4.86, p < .001$) was related to sabotage significantly which means individuals with self-transcendence values are more likely to perceive sabotage as deviant behavior. Hence, hypothesis regarding the predictive role of individual values was partially supported for the sabotage sub-dimension.

Last, analysis was conducted with organizational variables predicting sabotage. Regarding the model, organizational variables added incremental variance in explaining sabotage perceptions ($\Delta R^2 = .07, \Delta F_{(2,210)} = 8.18, p < .001$). However, only uncertainty avoidance significantly predicted sabotage ($\beta = .28, t = 3.99, p < .001$). The result shows that employees who perceive their organizations to have clear rules, procedures, and expectations perceive sabotage-related behaviors to be more harmful. Therefore, hypothesis regarding the predictive role of organizational variables was partially supported for the sabotage sub-dimension.

3.5.5 Prediction of Perceiving CWB

In the first step, education level and total tenure were entered into the equation as the control variables. The first step with the demographic variables was significant ($R^2 = .03, F_{(2,211)} = 3.48, p = .033$). However, none of the control variables were significantly related to PCWB by itself. In other words, these variables just had an effect on the model together. In the second step, personality traits, agreeableness and conscientiousness, were entered into the equation. These variables added incremental variance in explaining PCWB ($\Delta R^2 = .09, \Delta F_{(2,209)} = 10.41, p < .001$). However, regression coefficients showed that only conscientiousness ($\beta = .26, t = 3.82, p < .001$) predicted PCWB significantly. In the third step, self-control entered into the equation. The incremental variance added by the variable over personality traits was also significant ($\Delta R^2 = .06, \Delta F_{(1,208)} = 14.57, p < .001$). Self-control ($\beta = .35, t = 3.82, p < .001$) predicted PCWB significantly. It means people who score

high in conscientiousness and self-control are more likely to have higher scores on PCWB. Therefore, hypothesis regarding the predictive role of personality was partially supported for PCWB.

Next regression analysis was conducted with individual values as predictors by controlling same demographic variables. After controlling education level and whole life tenure, individual values added incremental variance in explaining PCWB ($\Delta R^2 = .22$, $\Delta F_{(2,209)} = 30.74$, $p < .001$). Both self-transcendence ($\beta = .34$, $t = 5.23$, $p < .001$) and conservation ($\beta = .22$, $t = 3.20$, $p = .002$) values significantly predicted PCWB. That is, individuals with self-transcendence and conservation values are more likely to have higher scores on PCWB. Thus, hypothesis regarding the predictive role of individual values was supported for the PCWB.

Last, analysis was conducted with organizational variables predicting PCWB. Regarding the model, organizational variables added incremental variance in explaining PCWB ($\Delta R^2 = .09$, $\Delta F_{(2,209)} = 10.57$, $p < .001$). However, only uncertainty avoidance was significantly related to PCWB ($\beta = .32$, $t = 4.58$, $p < .001$). It shows that employees who perceive their organizations to have clear rules, procedures, and expectations perceive CWB behaviors to be more harmful. Therefore, the hypothesis regarding the predictive role of organizational variables was partially supported for the PCWB.

Table 3.4. Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Perceived Counterproductive Work Behaviors based on Personality Characteristics

Dependent Variable	Abuse	Theft	Withdrawal	Sabotage	PCWB
Step 1					
1. Gender	-.14*	-	-	-	-
2. Age	-	-	-	.15*	-
3. Education level	-	-.13	-.19**	-	-.12
4. Total tenure	-	.14*	.11	-	.12
<i>R</i> ²	.02	.04	.06	.02	.03
<i>F</i>	3.91*	4.56*	6.10**	4.82*	3.48*
<i>Df</i>	(1, 212)	(2, 211)	(2, 211)	(1, 212)	(2, 211)
Step 2					
5. Agreeableness	.06	.08	.11	.07	.09
6. Conscientiousness	.17*	.30***	.32***	.20**	.26***
<i>R</i> ² change	.04	.11	.13	.05	.09
<i>F</i> change	4.46*	13.07***	16.39***	5.82**	10.41***
<i>Df</i>	(2, 210)	(2, 209)	(2, 209)	(2, 210)	(2, 209)
Step 3					
7. Self-control	.27**	.28**	.39***	2.02*	.35***
<i>R</i> ² change	.03	.04	.07	.02	.06
<i>F</i> change	7.79**	9.26**	19.29***	4.08*	14.57***
<i>Df</i>	(1, 209)	(1, 208)	(1, 208)	(1, 209)	(1, 208)

Notes. Values in table are Beta weights, unless otherwise indicated. Percent of incremental variance is shown in bold type. PCWB: Perceived Counterproductive Work Behavior. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 3.5. Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Perceived Counterproductive Work Behaviors based on Individual Values

Dependent Variable	Abuse	Theft	Withdrawal	Sabotage	PCWB
Step 1					
1. Gender	-.14*	-	-	-	-
2. Age	-	-	-	.15*	-
3. Education level	-	-.13	-.19**	-	-.12
4. Total tenure	-	.14*	.11	-	.12
<i>R</i> ²	.02	.04	.06	.02	.03
<i>F</i>	3.91*	4.56*	6.10**	4.82*	3.48*
<i>Df</i>	(1, 212)	(2, 211)	(2, 211)	(1, 212)	(2, 211)
Step 2					
5. Self-transcendence	.30***	.31***	.24***	.31***	.34***
6. Conservation	.14	.23**	.35***	.13	.22**
<i>R</i> ² change	.14	.20	.24	.14	.22
<i>F</i> change	17.07**	27.23***	34.88***	17.88***	30.74***
<i>Df</i>	(2, 210)	(2, 209)	(2, 209)	(2, 210)	(2, 209)

Notes. Values in table are Beta weights, unless otherwise indicated. Percent of incremental variance is shown in bold type. PCWB: Perceived Counterproductive Work Behavior. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 3.6. Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Perceived Counterproductive Work Behaviors based on Organizational Variables

Dependent Variable	Abuse	Theft	Withdrawal	Sabotage	PCWB
Step 1					
1. Gender	-.14*	-	-	-	-
2. Age	-	-	-	.15*	-
3. Education level	-	-.13	-.19**	-	-.12
4. Total tenure	-	.14*	.11	-	.12
<i>R</i> ²	.02	.04	.06	.02	.03
<i>F</i>	3.91*	4.56*	6.10**	4.82*	3.48*
<i>Df</i>	(1, 212)	(2, 211)	(2, 211)	(1, 212)	(2, 211)
Step 2					
5. Uncertainty Avoidance	.21**	.31***	.38***	.28***	.32***
6. Organizational Justice	-.05	-.10	-.12	-.06	-.09
<i>R</i> ² change	.04	.08	.13	.07	.09
<i>F</i> change	4.46*	9.64***	16.06**	8.18***	10.57***
<i>Df</i>	(2, 210)	(2, 209)	(2, 209)	(2, 210)	(2, 209)

Notes. Values in table are Beta weights, unless otherwise indicated. Percent of incremental variance is shown in bold type. PCWB: Perceived Counterproductive Work Behavior. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

3.4.6 Dominance Analyses

In the main analyses, regression analyses were conducted with self-transcendence and conservation values. However, unique contribution of these values could not be explained. Dominance analysis was performed in order to examine the contribution of each value in predicting PCWB and sub-dimensions. In Table 3.7., the results concerning individual values are summarized.

At first, for each criterion, regression analyses were conducted for subsets of predictors. Therefore, for a four predictor analyses, 15 regression analyses were performed with each criterion. The percent of variance that each variable shares with the criterion was recorded ($k = 0$) followed by the per cent of variance that each subset of variables, that is two-predictor, three-predictor, and four-predictor combinations, shared with the criterion. Then, the additional contribution of each predictor over the other single predictors was calculated with an aid of dominance analysis calculation table ($k = 1$) (see Appendix H). It was followed by calculation of each predictor over the 2-predictor subsets ($k = 2$) and over the 3-predictor subsets ($k = 3$). At last, the overall average contribution of each predictor was calculated by averaging the subset contributions. These steps were followed for each criterion in the study.

The results in predicting perceiving abuse showed that of the 14% variance shared by the four values, universalism accounted for 43% of it, benevolence accounted for 30%, conformity accounted for 16%, and lastly, tradition accounted for 11% of that variance. In addition, dominance analysis showed that universalism (.062) dominated other predictors which are benevolence (.044), conformity (.023) and tradition (.016) by considering global dominance values. Therefore, universalism had the highest relative contribution for each subset.

Next, the results in predicting perceiving theft showed that universalism shared 33% of variance with criteria, benevolence shared 19% of variance with criteria, conformity shared 25% of variance with criteria, and lastly, tradition shared 23% of the 23% explained variance with criteria. In addition, by considering global dominance values, dominance analysis showed that universalism (.076) outperformed benevolence (.044), conformity (.058) and tradition (.052) on average.

Thus, universalism had the highest relative contribution for each subset as in the abuse.

In predicting perceiving withdrawal, the results showed that universalism shared 20% of variance with criteria, benevolence shared 11% of variance with criteria, conformity shared 47% of variance with criteria, and lastly, tradition shared 23% of the 30% explained variance with criteria. Besides, by considering global dominance values, dominance analysis showed that conformity (.143) dominated universalism (.061), benevolence (.032) and tradition (.070). Hence, conformity had the highest relative contribution for each subset.

In predicting perceiving sabotage, the results showed that universalism shared 50% of variance with criteria, benevolence shared 20% of variance with criteria, conformity shared 20% of variance with criteria, and lastly, tradition shared 9% of the 16% explained variance with criteria. Moreover, by considering global dominance values, dominance analysis showed that universalism (.080) outperformed benevolence (.033), conformity (.032) and tradition (.015) on average. Therefore, universalism had the highest relative contribution for each subset.

At last, the results in predicting PCWB showed that universalism shared 35% of variance with criteria, benevolence shared 21% of variance with criteria, conformity shared 27% of variance with criteria, and lastly, tradition shared 17% of the 25% explained variance with criteria. Furthermore, dominance analysis showed that universalism (.087) outperformed benevolence (.053), conformity (.069) and tradition (.042) on average by considering global dominance values. Therefore, universalism had the highest relative contribution for each subset.

In conclusion, universalism had the highest relative contribution for each subset regression model across the criteria except for the withdrawal sub-dimension (between 20% and 50%). All individual values had a relative contribution to PCWB and sub-dimensions with a range between 9% and 50%.

Table 3.7. Dominance Analyses: Shared Variance with Criteria

	Shared Variance				
	Abuse	Theft	Withdrawal	Sabotage	Composite CWB
Universalism	.06 (43%)	.08 (33%)	.06 (20%)	.08 (50%)	.09 (35%)
Benevolence	.04 (30%)	.04 (19%)	.03 (11%)	.03 (20%)	.05 (21%)
Conformity	.02 (16%)	.06 (25%)	.14 (47%)	.03 (20%)	.07 (27%)
Tradition	.02 (11%)	.05 (23%)	.07 (23%)	.02 (9%)	.04 (17%)
TOTAL	.14 (100%)	.23 (100%)	.30 (100%)	.16 (100%)	.25 (100%)

Notes. Values indicate each predictor's shared variance with the outcome variable. Percentages in parentheses are the relative contribution of each variable in relation to the remaining three variables in the model.

3.4.7 Summary

In the results of a number of hierarchical regression analyses, Hypothesis 1, regarding the predictive role of conscientiousness and agreeableness was partially supported, only for conscientiousness. Self-control was found as significantly related to PCWB and all its sub-dimensions. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was fully supported. Similarly, Hypothesis 3, regarding the predictive role of self-transcendence values, universalism and benevolence, was supported. On the other hand, Hypothesis 4, regarding the predictive role of conservation values, conformity and tradition, was partially supported since there was a significant relationship with PCWB and its some sub-dimensions, theft, and withdrawal. Next, uncertainty avoidance was found as significantly related to PCWB and all its sub-dimensions, thus Hypothesis 5 was supported. On the other hand, organizational justice did not predict PCWB and of the sub-dimensions, thus, Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The aim of the study was to examine the relationship between perceptions of counterproductive work behaviors and personality characteristics, individual values and the distal organizational variables. In the current study, individuals were instructed to state whether or not the presented CWBs are harmful to the organization, the employees and their performances. By this reason, positive relationships between study variables and CWB perceptions were expected as opposed to the negative relationships in the literature when the outcome was taken as actual CWB.

In this chapter, firstly the results of the hypotheses testing are discussed. Next, the contributions and implications of the study are presented followed by the limitations and suggestions for further research. Lastly, conclusion of the study is presented.

4.1 Major Findings

In the current study, hypotheses were tested in order to see whether individuals who score higher on the three personality dimensions, four individual values, perceptions of organizational rule clarity, and perceptions of organizational justice would have higher scores in perceiving counterproductive work behaviors as such. Perceptions of counterproductive work behaviors were measured in the study, since it was believed that individuals would give more honest responses when their perceptions were asked rather than their behavioral tendencies. Ultimately, it was assumed that individuals who do not perceive these counterproductive work behaviors as harmful to the organization would be more inclined to engage in such acts. Therefore, in the present study, positive relationships between predictors of the study and the criterion were expected. Readers should be reminded that individual differences variables (i.e., agreeableness, conscientiousness, and organizational

justice) were reported to have negative relationships when the criterion was engaging in CWB, and not attitudes towards such behaviors (e.g., Berry et al., 2007).

In the first hypothesis, personality traits of agreeableness and conscientiousness were suggested as predictors of PCWB. This hypothesis was partially supported. Only conscientiousness predicted the composite PCWB and all sub-dimensions of abuse, theft, withdrawal and sabotage. Although agreeableness was significantly correlated with the composite PCWB and its sub-dimensions except for abuse, regression analysis did not yield significant predictions. In the literature, studies reported agreeableness as a valid predictor of engaging in CWB (Berry et al., 2007; Hafidz, 2012; Salgado, 2002). Also, it was indicated that there was a direct relationship between agreeableness and CWB (Mount et al., 2006). Especially, studies showed that lower agreeableness was related to interpersonally-directed behaviors that fall under CWBs (Bolton, Backer, & Barber, 2010; Salgado, 2002). Since agreeableness refers to generosity, cooperativeness, trustworthiness and good-nature, individuals of high agreeableness are expected not to be directed to harm individuals or organizations (Peng, 2012). The finding of the present study fell short of being consistent with previous studies which yielded consistent relationships between agreeableness and CWB engagement. Although CWB perceptions of individuals were measured in the study, it was expected to obtain results in line with the CWB engagement literature. That is, I expected that if highly agreeable individuals had been found as avoiding CWBs, they would probably perceived these CWBs as harmful behaviors. Indeed, significant positive correlations between agreeableness and composite CWB and its sub-dimensions were obtained. However, they were small associations. Agreeableness was moderately correlated with conscientiousness, another personality variable in the study. Therefore, after entering these variables together in the regression analyses, agreeableness fell short of significantly predicting the outcomes as conscientiousness was a stronger associate of CWB perceptions. An interesting finding was that the only CWB sub-dimension that agreeableness was not significantly correlated with was abuse, which involves interpersonally-directed deviant behaviors. This finding especially was unexpected considering findings related to interpersonally-directed deviant behavior (e.g. Bolton

et al., 2010). As mentioned before, agreeable individuals are characterized as cooperative and trustful in general. Such individuals would be expected to engage in thoughtful behaviors with one another, as evidenced in the literature. When it comes to labelling behaviors as counterproductive, individuals in this sample appeared to be more sensitive about labelling theft, withdrawal, and sabotage, dimensions all prohibited by explicitly written organizational policies. Interpersonal deviance, which is the topic of psychological harassment, has not received sufficient emphasis in organizations in Turkey, as a form of behavior that would affect organizational effectiveness (see Tinaz, 2008 for a brief review on efforts to raise awareness on mobbing in Turkey in recent years). Thus, even agreeable individuals may not be thinking along the lines of following organizational rules, norms, and expectations when it comes to abuse-related incidents.

Personality has been taken into hand as a predictor of CWB in many studies (Berry et al., 2007; Salgado, 2002). Indeed, the finding concerning conscientiousness as being significantly related to PCWB is consistent with the literature of CWB engagement. The literature suggested that conscientiousness was seen as a robust predictor of different aspects of job performance including productive or counterproductive work behavior (Barrick, & Mount, 1991; Fallon, Avis, Kudisch, Gornet, & Frost, 2000). A meta-analysis by Berry et al. (2007) indicated that conscientiousness was significantly associated with CWB. Similarly, Dalal (2005) showed the strong negative correlation between conscientiousness and CWBs in the meta-analysis. Conscientiousness includes self-discipline and cautiousness components as well as being responsible and hard-working (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Hastings & O'Neill, 2009). As a result, individuals who are high in conscientiousness have a tendency to avoid CWBs since these behaviors are seen as irresponsible and unethical behaviors (Spector, & Fox, 2002). Similarly, individuals with higher levels of conscientiousness are expected to perceive CWBs as harmful behaviors by getting higher scores on the newly instructed scale. That is, finding the positive association between conscientiousness and PCWB was in a similar trend with the negative relationship between conscientiousness and CWB. The reason behind this, individuals who perceive CWBs as harmful behaviors probably would

not engage in these behaviors. Therefore, the result went beyond classical measures of CWB since it differed from the literature of CWB engagement by assessing the perceptions of individuals regarding CWBs. Moreover, specifically, conscientiousness in predicting theft, withdrawal and sabotage which are organizationally-directed deviant behaviors was found as differentially higher in magnitude compared to abuse. This result regarding perceptions of individuals' shows a similar trend with previous studies suggesting that lower conscientiousness is related to higher theft, withdrawal and sabotage (Bolton et al., 2010). Individuals who are high in conscientiousness adhere to organizational norms and rules because they are achievement oriented and dependable (Mount et al., 2006).

In the second hypothesis, it was suggested that self-control would be positively related to PCWB. Self-control was analyzed at the last step of regression analysis with conscientiousness and agreeableness in the prior step since self-control was highly correlated with conscientiousness. Results showed that self-control significantly predicted composite PCWB and all sub-dimensions over and above conscientiousness. The finding is consistent with the CWB engagement literature as research showed that self-control significantly related to counterproductive behaviors of students (Zettler, 2011). Similarly, in the work setting, research revealed that self-control is an antecedent of CWB (Marcus, & Schuler, 2004; Villanueva, 2006). Marcus and Schuler (2004) stated that people who are high on self-control consider the consequences of their behavior in the long-run. Therefore, in the literature, self-control is seen as an inhibitory factor of CWB (Spector, 2011). Likewise, in the present study, individuals who are high in self-control were expected to perceive CWBs as harmful behaviors. Positive associations between self-control and CWB sub-dimensions supported this expectation. Results also indicated that for PCWB and its sub-dimensions, self-control had the highest predictive value among personality variables in the present study.

Third hypothesis suggested that self-transcendence values of universalism and benevolence would predict PCWB. However, due to high correlation between universalism and benevolence, they were generated as a single unit by averaging these two composites, and then analysis was conducted with this composite. In the

literature, there is no direct evidence of the relationship between self-transcendence values and CWB. However, personal values were suggested as associated with business ethics in some studies (Coye, 1986; Nonis & Swift, 2001). Also, in the study of Morris (2012), the relationship between self-transcendence values and cheating behavior of students were examined and negative relationship was reported. Because of the negative relationship with actual deviant behavior, in the current study positive relationship would be expected since individuals who value self-transcendence would perceive these deviant behaviors as harmful. Due to lack of direct research in the literature and indirect suggestions of literature, it was decided to study the relationship between self-transcendence values and PCWB. Findings of the study showed that self-transcendence predicted composite PCWB and all sub-dimensions of abuse, theft, withdrawal and sabotage. Moreover, dominance analysis results revealed that universalism accounted for most of the variance from (33% to 50%) explained in the PCWB factors of abuse, theft and sabotage by all individual values. However, for withdrawal sub-dimension, universalism came after conformity and tradition values. The possible explanation for this result may come from the definition of universalism. This value refers to protecting the welfare of all people and nature as well as appreciation and tolerance for all people and nature. Actually, it was not surprising to have highest scores on abuse, theft and sabotage sub-dimensions for this value since stating these sub-dimensions as not harmful would mean that hurting other people or organization would be acceptable. Specifically, abuse includes perceptions of behaviors directed interpersonally and sabotage includes perceptions of behaviors directed to organization while theft includes both of them considering items in the scale. On the other hand, withdrawal reflects behaviors such as absence, and lateness which refer to distancing/removing the self from work itself. Also, the mean of withdrawal was relatively low and the standard deviation relatively larger compared to other PCWB factors. This showed that participants were not in agreement with each other while assessing whether or not this variable was harmful to the organization, since it does not indicate harm directly. Therefore, withdrawal refers to avoiding behaviors and can be linked to

responsibility. This is the reason why individuals who value universalism might not perceive withdrawal behaviors as harmful as other PCWB factors.

Following universalism, benevolence accounted for most of the variance from (30%) explained in the PCWB factors of abuse by all individual values. However, for PCWB factors of theft and withdrawal, the explained variances by benevolence were lower, while benevolence explained equal variance with conformity for sabotage. Therefore, benevolence followed universalism in predicting abuse as would be expected since this value is defined as protecting the welfare of people whom one is in personal contact frequently. Individuals who value benevolence are expected to perceive hurting other people in the organization as harmful. That is, people who are in frequent one-to-one contact would be affected by their benevolent values when it comes to evaluating behaviors related to abuse. On the other hand, other PCWB factors, theft, withdrawal and sabotage, mostly include organizationally directed behaviors. Perceptions towards these factors might not be primarily affected by benevolence since these factors indicate organizations excepting individuals who is in personal contact. For example, in the case of theft, people whom the evaluator is in personal contact would not be impacted.

In the fourth hypothesis, it was suggested that conservation values of conformity and tradition would predict PCWB. Similar to previous hypothesis, the tradition and conformity values under the frame of conservation values were averaged. As in self-transcendence values, there is no direct evidence of the association between conservation values and CWB in the literature. A study provided support of the relationship between conservation values and dimensions of ethics scale which is indirect evidence for the current study (Shafer, Fukukawa, & Lee, 2007). The finding of the present study contributed to the literature of deviant behaviors by partially supporting the association between conservation values and PCWB. Conservation predicted theft, withdrawal and composite PCWB but not abuse and sabotage. Furthermore, dominance analysis results showed that conformity accounted for most of the variance (47%) explained in the PCWB factors of withdrawal followed by the factor of theft. That is, while universalism, of all values, shared the highest variance with all the sub-dimensions of PCWB except withdrawal,

conformity, of all values, shared the highest variance with withdrawal. Conformity refers to restriction of actions and impulses which harm others and violate social norms. Specifically, individuals who value conformity refrain from violating social expectations and norms. Therefore, the reason of this result can be that individuals who avoid the job itself by being absent or late to work would violate social expectations and norms since they are expected to be there on time. Even though behaviors related to withdrawal are not intended to harm other people, organizations are affected negatively by these behaviors due to workforce loss. As a result, perceptions of individuals regarding these behaviors would be arranged accordingly.

Moreover, conformity followed universalism instead of benevolence while predicting theft since both organization and third parties are affected by theft negatively. Tradition followed conformity while explaining variance in the PCWB factors of theft and withdrawal. However, for tradition as well as conformity, low variances were obtained in PCWB factors of abuse and sabotage since conservation values did not get significant results while explaining these factors. Tradition refers to respecting and accepting the customs and ideas of culture or religion which individuals belong to. Therefore, deviant behaviors of individuals would not be seen as tolerable in traditional cultures. Especially, theft is not just an unethical behavior, it also reflects a kind of crime such as taking money from anyone without permission.

Fifth hypothesis suggested that employee perceptions of organizational uncertainty avoidance (defined as clarity of organizational rules and procedures) would predict PCWBs. Findings of the study showed that uncertainty avoidance significantly predicted PCWB in all sub-dimensions, abuse, theft, withdrawal, sabotage and composite PCWB after conscientiousness. In the literature, there is no direct evidence of the relationship between uncertainty avoidance and CWB to support the idea of linking this variable to PCWB. However, uncertainty avoidance relation to ethics was suggested in some studies (Li, Moy, Lam, & Chu, 2008; Scholtens & Dam, 2007). Since high uncertainty individuals avoid risky and ambiguous situations, they do not tend to violate organizational norms and rules (Chew & Putti, 1995), which could also explain relationship between uncertainty

avoidance and PCWB. The literature has lack of direct evidence on this topic; therefore, the current study suggested a link between uncertainty avoidance and PCWB by supporting hypothesis. In the present study, specifically, the highest association was found between uncertainty avoidance and perceiving withdrawal as CWB. The possible explanation for this association can be that individuals show passive resistance towards organization due to ambiguous climate. Theft sub-dimension followed this association may cause due to lack of clear rules and regulations in the organization. The reason of this, in question of perceptions, individuals may not figure out what kind of stealing is acceptable or not in such an environment. For example, in case there is no clear rules related to use of paper and pencil, individuals may not be aware of whether it could be harmful. The lowest association was found for abuse sub-dimension. Thus, it can be inferred that uncertainty avoidance is related to organizationally-directed deviant behaviors.

In the last and the sixth hypothesis, it was suggested that employee perceptions of overall organizational justice climate would predict PCWBs of employees. However, Hypothesis 6 was not supported as opposed to literature. In the literature, there are studies which reported organizational justice as a predictor of CWB (Fox et al., 2001; Priesemuth et al., 2013). Also, organizational distributive justice and interactional justice were found as an antecedents of CWB (Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2014; Le Roy, Bastounis, & Poussard, 2012). The finding of the present study was contradictory to previous studies which stressed the consistent relationship between organizational justice and CWB engagement. Also, there was not significant correlation between organizational justice and composite PCWB, and its sub-dimensions. Possible explanation for the contradiction could be that individuals' perception of CWB was not affected by whether organizations have justice or not since it may be just a moderator between organizational justice and actual CWB. That is, even if they perceive these behaviors as harmful; they might tend to perform these behaviors depending on how just and fair employees perceive their organizations to be. Individuals may perceive their organization to be so unfair that they may be develop a tendency to behave counterproductively to cope with this unfair climate. Individuals may still perceive these deviant behaviors as harmful even

when they perceive an unfair climate, but may decide to retaliate against their organizations.

In addition, interactional justice may predict PCWB rather than overall organizational justice because of cultural characteristics of Turkey. Interactional justice reflects the perceptions of individuals regarding interpersonal treatment by authorities (Bies, 2005). Support for this idea comes from study of Jones (2009) which proposed that CWB might be predicted by interpersonal justice directed to supervisor by neglecting to follow instruction of supervisors, trying to get supervisor into trouble intentionally, and provoking coworkers to get back at supervisor. Therefore, different justice types in predicting PCWB should be examined in the further studies to extend the study. Besides, as opposed to proposed idea in the present study, individuals might overlook some specific cases while assessing overall organizational justice rather than certain justice types such as procedural, distributive or interactional justice. This is because individuals are directed to consider some certain cases concerning justice concept faced in their organization while assessing items regarding these different justice types.

4.2 Contributions and Implications of the Study

The current study contributed to the literature by showing the individual and organizational predictors of perceived counterproductive work behaviors. In general, it was believed that the study gathered more reliable data from participants by asking their perceptions of CWB in the scope of the CWB literature, since individuals are not willing to respond to questions honestly when they are asked whether they engage in CWB or not. In the study, individuals were instructed as to what extent each behavior is harmful to the organization or its employees. By asking in this way, it was shown that employees see these deviant behaviors as harmful to the organization and performance of them just like researchers do. Also, data were gathered from employees in the real work setting, and by this way valuable results were captured.

The next contribution of the study was the findings concerning conscientiousness and self-control as predictors of perceiving CWB. This finding

extends the literature on these variables' associations with engaging in CWB. The implication is that organizations can utilize personality measures which assess these variables during the recruitment process. The reason of this, individuals might have tendencies to behave in deviant way due to personal characteristics and organizations can use this assessment as a pre-employment tool.

Another contribution of the study was examining the relationship between self-transcendence and conservation values in relation to PCWB. It is a noteworthy contribution to the literature since the CWB literature lacks research regarding individual values. In the current study, revealing significant relationship between individual values and perceiving deviant behaviors as such would suggest that these variables also should be examined in the scope of actual CWB literature.

This study contributed to the literature by providing a link between uncertainty avoidance (clarity of organizational rules and regulations) and PCWB. Thus, employees with high perceptions of organizational uncertainty avoidance perceive counterproductive behaviors as harmful. This study can also suggest examining the association between uncertainty avoidance and CWB to extend the scope of CWB literature since it is a new organizational predictor of deviant behaviors. Therefore, organizations can take precautions regarding this predictor which is proposed in the study in order to avoid CWBs. For example, code of ethics can be practiced in the organization to clarify ethical norms and regulation which adopted by the organization. Also, organizations should be clear on what they expect from their employees to avoid confusing circumstances.

At last, organizations should arrange training programs to inform their employees about extensions of CWBs and how these behaviors harm both organizations and them. For instance, employees might not consider that incivility is a form of abuse and which behaviors are labeled as incivility should be indicated to them. Moreover, they might not seen behaviors under the withdrawal sub-dimension as counterproductive and these behaviors also cause a loss for organizations. Training programs regarding CWBs is essential to identify these behaviors and indicate how these behaviors harm organization and its employees.

4.3 Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research

The present study makes noteworthy contributions to the literature by examining the individual and organizational predictors of perceiving counterproductive work behaviors. However, the study has also some limitations.

The first limitation in the current study could arise because of gathering data with self-report measures. Participants might have given socially desirable responses to look favorable to others. In this study, to what extent each behavior is harmful to the organization was asked to measure participants' perceptions of CWBs; however, this instruction is prone to unintentional desirable responding.

The second limitation of the study could be the current tenure range of the participants since it ranged from 1 month to 23 years. Tenure of the participants might have an effect on their judgments regarding these organizational variables. For instance, if participants do not have enough time to internalize organizational rules and procedures, their judgment regarding these rules and procedures are mostly based on their individual background in perceiving CWB. However, in the present study, including individuals who work at least 6-month in the organization would be more appropriate.

Next limitation is that actual engagement in CWB was not assessed in the present study even though the underlying assumption was that CWB perceptions would be related to CWB engagement. After 3-5 months following data collection, the CWB Checklist could be given to participants in order to reveal if individuals who perceive counterproductive behaviors as harmful would really engage in these behaviors or not.

In the current study, participants were mostly white-collar workers. Also, demographics section did not include any questions related to participants' job title. Based on the knowledge of the researcher, the job titles mostly spanned engineer etc. Therefore, the group in the study was homogenous and a work-group comparison could not be performed. As a suggestion for future research, data should be collected by including a heterogeneous group of participants in terms of work-group.

Moreover, if the sample size for the groups from different companies would be equal or close, organizational groups could be compared in terms of their

perceptions of CWB. In other words, the effects of organizational differences regarding uncertainty avoidance and perceived organizational justice variables on PCWB could be compared organization by organization. Another limitation is the generalizability of results to different populations. Since all data were collected mostly in Ankara, it could be difficult to generalize findings to all working groups.

4.4 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to show individual and organizational predictors of PCWB since I considered that instructions directed to measure perceptions of individuals give more honest results rather than their actual behaviors. The current study showed that there was a positive relationship between conscientiousness and PCWB and its all sub-dimensions, abuse, theft, withdrawal and sabotage. This result indicates that high conscientiousness individuals perceived counterproductive behaviors as harmful. Similarly, a positive relationship was found between self-control and PCWB with all sub-dimensions. Next, self-transcendence values were found as positively related to PCWB and its all sub-dimensions which mean individuals who value universalism and benevolence perceive counterproductive behaviors as harmful. On the other hand, conservation values were positively related to total PCWB and theft, and withdrawal sub-dimensions.

Organizational predictors were also examined in the study. Uncertainty avoidance, which refers to clarity of organizational rules and procedures, predicted PCWB and its all sub-dimensions. In conclusion, individuals in the organizations which have clear norms and regulations perceive counterproductive behaviors as harmful to the organizations and performance.

Consequently, this study makes a theoretical contribution to the CWB literature by proposing new variables, which are individual values and uncertainty avoidance. Even if perceptions of individuals regarding these variables were measured in the study, further studies would be suggested to extend the study by assessing the relationship between these variables and CWB engagement.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
- Ajzen, I. (2011). The theory of planned behavior: Reactions and reflections. *Psychology & Health*, 26(9), 1113-1127.
- Albaş, S. E., & Ergeneli, A. (2011). Role of cultural variables in the relation between leader's empowering behaviour and employee's psychological empowerment perception. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 3(1), 149-159.
- Algı, E., Aydın, F., Ağca, H., Selvi, K., & Yüce, Ü. (2010). *Türk çalışanları için iş hayatında verimlilik karşıtı davranışlar ölçeğinin güvenilirlik ve geçerlik çalışması*. Unpublished manuscript, Middle East Technical University.
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22(3), 161-173.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1-26.
- Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O.P. (1998). Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: multitrait-multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(3), 729–750.
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 410-424.
- Bies, (2005). Are procedural justice and interactional justice conceptually distinct? In J. Greenberg & J. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 85-112). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bolton, Bolton, L. R.; Becker, L. K.; Barber, L. K. (2010). Big Five trait predictors of differential counterproductive work behavior dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(5), 537–541. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.03.047
- Bowling, N. A., & Beehr. T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 998-1012. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.998
- Boye, M. W., & Jones, J. W. (1997). Organizational culture and employee

- counterproductivity. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 172-184). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Chen, G., Sharma, P. N., Edinger, S. K., Shapiro, D. L., & Farh, J. L. (2011). Motivating and demotivating forces in team: Cross-level influences of empowering leadership and relationship conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(3), 541-557. doi:10.1037/a0021886
- Chen, P. Y., & Spector, P. E. (1992). Relationships of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft and substance use: An exploratory study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65*(3), 177-184. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1992.tb00495.x
- Chernyak-Hai, L., & Tziner, A. (2014). Relationships between counterproductive work behavior, perceived justice and climate, occupational status, and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 30*, 1-12.
- Chew, I. K. H., & Putti, J. (1995). Relationship on work-related values of Singaporean Japanese managers in Singapore. *Human Relations, 48*(10), 1149-1170. doi:10.1177/001872679504801003
- Clugston, M., Howell, J. P., & Dorfman, P. W. (2000). Does Cultural Socialization Predict Multiple Bases and Foci of Commitment? *Journal of Management, 26*(1), 5-30. doi:10.1177/014920630002600106
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 425-445. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425
- Colquitt, J. A., & Shaw, J. C. (2005). How should organizational justice be measured? In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 589-619). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Coşkan, C. (2010). *The effects of self-control and social influence on academic dishonesty: an experimental and correlational investigation*. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University.
- Coye, R. (1986). Individual values and business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics, 5*(1), 45-49.
- Cropanzano, R., Li, A., & Benson, L. III. (2011). Peer justice and teamwork process. *Group & Organization Management, 36*(5), 567-596. doi:10.1177/1059601111414561

- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 1241-1255.
- Demirutku, K., & Sümer, N. (2010). Temel değerlerin ölçümü: Portre değerler anketinin Türkçe uyarlaması, *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları, 25*, 17-25.
- Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. (1988). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited. *Advances in International Comparative Management, 3*, 127-150.
- Enns, J. R., & Rotundo, M. (2012). When competition turns ugly: Collective injustice, workgroup identification, and counterproductive work behavior. *Human Performance, 25*, 26-51. doi:10.1080/08959285.2011.631646
- Fallon, J. D., Avis, J. M., Kudisch, J. D., Gornet, T. P., & Frost, A. (2000). Conscientiousness as a predictor of productive and counterproductive behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 15*(2), 339-349.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- 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*, 291-309. doi:10.1006/jvbe.2001.1803
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gruys, M. L. (1999). The dimensionality of deviant employee performance in the workplace. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Hafidz, S. W. M. (2012). Individual differences as antecedents of counterproductive work behaviour. *Asian Social Science, 8*(13), 220-226. doi:10.5539/ass.v8n13p220
- Haidt, J. (2007). The new synthesis in moral psychology. *Science, 316*(5827), 998-1002. doi:10.1126/science.1137651
- Hansson, T., Carey, G., & Kjartansson, R. (2010). A multiple software approach to understanding values. *Journal of Beliefs & Values, 31*(3), 283-298. doi:10.1080/13617672.2010.521005
- Hastings, S. E., & O'Neill, T. A. (2009). Predicting workplace deviance using broad

- and narrow personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 289-293.
- Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. R. (1994). The generality of deviance. In T. Hirschi & M. R. Gottfredson (Eds.), *The generality of deviance* (pp. 1-22). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). Cultural dimensions in management and planning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 1(2), 81-99.
- Hogan, J., & Hogan, R. (1989). How to measure employee reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(2), 273-279. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.74.2.273
- Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1983). *Theft by employees*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Hollinger, R.C., Lee, G., Kane, J.L., Hayes, R. (1998). *1998 National Retail Security Survey: Executive Summary*. University of Florida Security Research Project, Gainesville, FL,
- Jex, S. M., & Britt, T. W. (Eds.). (2008). *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey.
- Jones, D. A. (2009). Getting even with one's supervisor and one's organization: relationships among types of injustice, desires for revenge, and counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(4), 525-542.
- Kamp, J., & Brooks, P. (1991). Perceived organizational climate and employee counterproductivity. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 5(4), 447-458.
- Kish-Gephart, J. J., Harrison, D. A. & Trevino, L. K. (2010). Bad apples, bad cases, and bad barrels: Meta-analytic evidence about sources of unethical decisions at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 1-31. doi:10.1037/a0017103
- Kozako, I. N. A. M. F., Safin, S. Z., & Rahim, A. R. A. (2013). The relationship of big five personality traits on counterproductive work behaviour among hotel employees: An exploratory study. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 7, 181-187. doi:10.1016/S2212-5671(13)00233-5
- Li, A., & Cropanzano, R. (2009). Fairness at the group level: Justice climate and intraunit Justice climate. *Journal of Management*, 35(3), 564-599. doi:10.1177/0149206308330557

- Li, J., Moy, J., Lam, K., & Chu, W. L. C. (2008). Institutional pillars and corruption at the societal level. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83, 327-339. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9622-y
- Marcus, B., & Schuler, H. (2004). Antecedents of counterproductive behavior at work: A general perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 647-660. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.647
- Marinescu, G. (2014). Uncertainty avoidance in Romanian organizational culture. *Journal of Business and Retail Management Research*, 8(2), 30-41.
- Mikulay, Neuman & Finkelstein, (2001). Counterproductive workplace behaviors. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 127(3), 279-300.
- Moretti, D. M. (1986). The prediction of employee counterproductivity through attitude assessment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1, 134-147.
- Morris, R. C. (2012). The relative influence of values and identities on academic dishonesty: A quantitative analysis. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 1-20.
- Mount, M., Illies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 591-622.
- Murphy, K. R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Myry, L., & Helkama, K. (2002). The role of values priorities and professional ethics training in moral sensitivity. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(1), 35-50.
- Newman, K. L., & Nollen, S. D. (1996). Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(4), 753-779.
- Nonis, S. & Swift, C. O. (2001). Personal value profiles and ethical business decisions. *Journal of Education for Business*, 76(5), 251-256.
- Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (2001). Integrity tests and other criterion-focused occupational personality scales (COPS) used in personnel selection. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1/2), 31-39.
- Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F. L. (1993). Comprehensive meta-analysis of integrity test validities: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 679-703.

- Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Schmidt, F. L. (1995). Integrity test: Overlooked facts, resolved issues, and remaining questions about predictive validity, construct validity, and in-house research. *American Psychologist*, 50(6), 456-457.
- Ostroff, C. (1993). The effects of climate and personal influences on individual behavior and attitudes in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 56(1), 56-90.
- Öcel, H. (2010). Üretim karşıtı iş davranışları ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 13(26), 18-26.
- Peng, H. (2012). Counterproductive work behavior among Chinese knowledge workers. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(2), 119-138.
- Priesemuth, M., Arnaud, A., & Schminke, M. (2013). Bad behavior in groups: The impact of overall justice climate and functional dependence on counterproductive work behavior in work units. *Group & Organization Management*, 38(2), 230-257. doi: 10.1177/1059601113479399
- Raghuram, S., London, M., & Larsen, H. H. (2001). Flexible employment practices in Europe: Country versus culture. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(5), 738-753.
- Rai, T. S., & Fiske, A. P. (2011). Moral psychology is relationship regulation: moral motives for unity, hierarchy, equality, and proportionality. *Psychological Review*, 118(1), 57-75. doi:10.1037/a0021867
- 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 nature and its causes. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & R. J. Bies (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 6, pp. 3-28). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Rokeach M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- 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.
- Rozin, P. (1999). The process of moralization. *Psychological Science*, 10(3), 218-221. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00139

- Sackett, P. R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1-2), 5-11.
- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 145-164). London: Sage.
- Salgado, J. F. (2002). The big five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1/2), 117-125.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2009). Basic human values. *Sociologie*, 42, 249-288.
- Shafer, W. E., Fukukawa, K., & Lee, G. M. (2007). Values and perceived importance of ethics and social responsibility: The U.S. versus China, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 70, 265-284. doi:10.1007/s10551-006-9110-9
- 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.
- Skarlicki, D., Folger, R., & Tesluk, P. (1999). Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 100-108.
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1997). Business ethics across cultures: A social cognitive model. *Journal of World Business*, 32(1), 17-34.
- Smithikrai, C. (2008). Moderating effect of situational strength on the relationship between personality traits and counterproductive work behaviour. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 11(4), 253-263. doi:10.1111/j.1467-839X.2008.00265.x
- Spector, P. E. (2011). The relationship of personality to counterproductive work behavior (CWB): An integration of perspectives. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(4), 342-352. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.10.002
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work

- behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 262-292.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). A model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive workplace behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 151–174). Washington, DC: APA.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 446-460. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005
- Sümer, N., & Sümer, H. C. (2002). Turkish translation and adaptation of the BFI. Unpublished manuscript. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 5th ed. Boston : Allyn and Bacon.
- Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality*, 72(2), 271–322.
- Tınaz, P. (2008). İşyerinde psikolojik taciz (Mobbing), 2th ed. İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.
- Villanueva, L. S. (2006). An examination of the role of self-control in the prediction of counterproductive work behaviors: Does cognition matter? Dissertation manuscript. University of Houston.
- Wells, J. T. (1999). A fistful of dollars. *Security Management*, 43(8), 70-75.
- Zettler, I. (2011). Self-control and academic performance: Two field studies on university citizenship behavior and counterproductive academic behavior. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21, 119-123. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2010.11.002

APPENDIX A. ÖZDENETİM ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıdaki cümlelerin her birinin sizin tipik özelliklerinizi ne kadar yansıttığını ölçekte işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

1 = Beni hiç yansıtmıyor

2 = Beni pek yansıtmıyor

3 = Beni ne yansıtıyor ne yansıtmıyor

4 = Beni biraz yansıtıyor

5 = Beni tamamen yansıtıyor

	Beni hiç yansıtmıyor	Beni pek yansıtmıyor	Beni ne yansıtıyor ne yansıtmıyor	Beni biraz yansıtıyor	Beni tamamen yansıtıyor
1. Baştan çıkarmalara/ayartmalara karşı direnmekte başarılıyım.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Kötü alışkanlıklarımın üstesinden gelmekte zorluk çekerim.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Tembelim.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Uygunsuz şeyler söylerim.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Kendim için kötü olan bazı şeyleri eğlenceli ise yaparım.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Kendim için kötü olan şeyleri reddederim.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Daha öz disiplinli olabilmeyi isterdim.	1	2	3	4	5
8. İnsanlar katı bir öz disipline sahip olduğumu söyler.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Keyif ve eğlence beni bazen işten alıkoyar.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Odaklanmakta (konsantrasyon sağlamakta) güçlük çekerim.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Uzun süreli hedeflere ulaşmak için etkin bir şekilde çaba gösteririm.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Bir şeyin yanlış olduğunu bilsem de bazen o şeyi yapmaktan kendimi alıkoyamam.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Sıklıkla tüm alternatifleri gözden geçirmeden harekete geçerim.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B. BEŞ FAKTÖR ENVANTERİ

Aşağıda sizi kısmen tanımlayan (ya da pek tanımlayamayan) bir takım özellikler sunulmaktadır. Örneğin, başkaları ile zaman geçirmekten hoşlanan birisi olduğunuzu düşünüyor musunuz? Lütfen aşağıda verilen özelliklerin sizi ne oranda yansıttığını ya da yansıtmadığını belirtmek için sizi en iyi tanımlayan rakamı her bir özelliğin **soluna** yazınız.

1 = Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

2 = Katılmıyorum

3 = Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum (Kararsızım)

4 = Katılıyorum

5 = Kesinlikle katılıyorum

'Kendimi biri olarak görüyorum.'

	Konuşkan		Tembel olma eğiliminde olan
	Başkalarında hata arayan		Duygusal olarak dengeli, kolayca keyfi kaçmayan
	İşini tam yapan		Keşfeden, icat eden
	Bunalımlı, melankolik		Atılgan bir kişiliğe sahip olan
	Orijinal, yeni görüşler ortaya koyan		Soğuk ve mesafeli olabilen
	Ketum / vakur		Görevi tamamlanıncaya kadar sebat edebilen
	Yardımsaver olan ve çıkarıcı olmayan		Dakikası dakikasına uymayan
	Biraz umursamaz		Sanata ve estetik değerlere önem veren
	Rahat, stresle kolay baş eden		Bazen utangaç, çekingen olan
	Çok değişik konuları merak eden		Hemen hemen herkese karşı saygılı ve nazik olan
	Enerji dolu		İşleri verimli yapan
	Başkalarıyla sürekli didişen		Gergin ortamlarda sakin kalabilen
	Güvenilir bir çalışan		Rutin işleri yapmayı tercih eden
	Gergin olabilen		Sosyal, girişken
	Maharetli, derin düşünen		Bazen başkalarına kaba davranabilen

	Heyecan yaratabilen		Planlar yapan ve bunları takip eden
	Affedici bir yapıya sahip olan		Kolayca sinirlenen
	Dağınık olma eğiliminde olan		Düşünmeyi seven, fikirler geliştirebilen
	Çok endişelenen		Sanata ilgisi çok az olan
	Hayal gücü yüksek olan		Başkalarıyla işbirliği yapmayı seven
	Sessiz bir yapıda olan		Kolaylıkla dikkati dağılan
	Genellikle başkalarına güvenen		Sanat, müzik ve edebiyatta çok bilgili olan

Lütfen kontrol ediniz: Bütün ifadelerin önüne bir rakam yazdınız mı?

APPENDIX C. BİREYSEL DEĞERLER ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda kısaca bazı insanlar tanımlanmıştır. Lütfen her tanımlamayı okuyun ve her bir insanın size ne kadar benzediğini veya benzemediğini düşünün. Sonra, her tanımlamanın sağında olan kutulardan birini X ile işaretleyerek bu kişinin size ne kadar benzediğini veya benzemediğini belirtin.

	BU KİŞİ SİZE NE KADAR BENZİYOR?					
	Bana hiç benze-miyor	Bana benze-miyor	Bana çok az benziyor	Bana biraz benziyor	Bana ben-ziyor	Bana çok benzi-yor
1. Başka insanları üzmemekten kaçınmak onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Toplumun güçsüz ve savunmasız üyelerini korumak onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Doğaya özen gösterilmesi gerektiğine çok inanır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Kendisine yakın olanlara sadık olmak onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Çeşitli gruplar arasında uyumu ve barışı arttırmak için çalışır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Otorite konumundaki insanların söylediklerini her zaman yapması gerektiğine inanır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Geleneksel değerleri ve inançları sürdürmek onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Doğal hayatı tehdit eden şeylere karşı çalışmak onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Başkaları için sinir bozucu biri olmamanın önemli olduğunu düşünür.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Sevdiği insanlara yardım etmek onun için çok önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Başkaları izlemiyorken bile kurallara uymak onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Dünyadaki herkesin hayatta eşit fırsatlara sahip olmasının önemli olduğunu düşünür.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Yakın olduğu insanların iyiliğini gözetmek onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Kendisinden farklı insanları dinlemek onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Ailesinin veya bir dinin geleneklerini sürdürmek onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Bütün yasalara uymak onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Güvenilir bir arkadaş olmak için elinden geleni yapar.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Kültürünün geleneksel uygulamalarına son derece değer verir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Doğal çevreyi yokolmaktan ve kirlilikten korumak onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

BU KİŞİ SİZE NE KADAR BENZİYOR?						
	Bana hiç benze-miyor	Bana benze-miyor	Bana çok az benziyor	Bana biraz benziyor	Bana ben-ziyor	Bana çok benzi-yor
20. Ailesinin ve arkadaşlarının ihtiyaçlarına her zaman cevap vermeye çalışır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Her zaman ince düşünceli olmaya ve başkalarını kızdırmamaya çalışır.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Herkesin, tanımadığı insanların bile, adil muamele görmesini ister.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Birlikte zaman geçirdiği insanların ona tamamen güvenebilmesini ister.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. İnsanlarla aynı fikirde olmasa bile, onları anlamak onun için önemlidir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX D. KÜLTÜR BOYUTLARI ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda organizasyondaki kültürel tutumlara ilişkin çeşitli ifadeler sunulmaktadır. **Lütfen çalışmakta olduğunuz kurumu düşünerek** aşağıda yer alan ifadelere ne kadar katıldığınızı ya da katılmadığınızı 5 basamaklı ölçek üzerinden belirtiniz;

- 1 = Çalıştığım kurumu **hiç iyi tanımlamıyorum**
2 = Çalıştığım kurumu **pek tanımlamıyorum**
3 = Çalıştığım kurumu **ne tanımlıyorum ne tanımlamıyorum**
4 = Çalıştığım kurumu **biraz tanımlıyorum**
5 = Çalıştığım kurumu **çok iyi tanımlıyorum**

Çalıştığım kurumda:	Hiç iyi tanımlamıyorum	Pek tanımlamıyorum	Ne tanımlıyorum ne tanımlamıyorum	Biraz tanımlıyorum	Çok iyi tanımlıyorum
1. Kurumda iş gerekleri ve talimatları ayrıntılı olarak belirtilmektedir.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Yöneticiler çalışanlarının talimat ve prosedürleri yakından takip etmelerini bekler.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Kural ve yönetmelikler çalışanları organizasyonun beklentileri hakkında yeterince bilgilendirmektedir.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Standart iş prosedürleri çalışanlarına işlerinde yardımcı olmaktadır.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Operasyon talimatları çalışanlara işlerinde yardımcı olmaktadır.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX E. GENEL ADALET ALGISI ÖLÇEĞİ

Lütfen cümleleri dikkatlice okuyarak söz konusu ifadeye ne ölçüde katıldığınızı, ilgili kutucuktaki rakamlardan size uygun olanı yuvarlak içine alarak belirtiniz. Rakamların anlamları şu şekildedir:

- 1 = Kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
2 = Katılmıyorum
3 = Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum (Kararsızım)
4 = Katılıyorum
5 = Kesinlikle katılıyorum

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1. Genel olarak, çalıştığım kurumda bana karşı adil davranılıyor.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Genellikle, bu şirketteki işleyiş adaletli değil.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Genel olarak, çalıştığım şirketin adaletli olduğuna güvenirim.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Genel olarak, burada bana karşı adaletli davranılıyor.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Bu şirket çalışanlarına çoğunlukla adaletli davranıyor.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Burada çalışanların çoğu onlara karşı adaletsiz davranıldığını söyleyecektir.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX F. ÜRETİM KARŞITI İŞ DAVRANIŞLARI ALGISI ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda, kurumlarda gözlemlenen iş davranışlarına yönelik bazı ifadeler yer almaktadır. Lütfen bu ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyunuz. Her bir davranışın kurumun veya çalışanların performansına ne derece **zarar verici** davranışlar olduğunu düşündüğünüzü belirtiniz. Cevaplarınızı verirken 6-basamaklı derecelendirme ölçeğini kullanınız. Uygun olan rakamı daire içine alınız. Rakamların anlamları şu şekildedir:

1 = Hiç zarar vermez

2 = Zarar vermez

3 = Pek zarar vermez

4 = Biraz zarar verir

5 = Zarar verir

6 = Çok zarar verir

	Hiç zarar vermez	Zarar vermez	Pek zarar vermez	Biraz zarar verir	Zarar verir	Çok zarar verir
1. İşverene ait araç/gereçleri kasıtlı bir şekilde boşa harcama	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. İş bilerek yanlış yapma	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. İzin almadan işe geç gelme	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Hasta olduğunuzu bahane ederek işe gelmeme	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Örgüt mallarına bilerek zarar verme	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Çalışma ortamınızı bilerek kirletme	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. İşverene ait olan bazı şeyleri izinsiz alıp götürme	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. İşyerine zarar verici söylentiler çıkarma	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Müşterilere ya da tüketicilere karşı kaba ya da çirkin davranma	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Yapılması gereken işler olduğunda bilerek yavaş çalışma	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Mola saatlerini izin verilenden daha uzun tutma	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Verilen yönergelere bilerek uymama	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Mesai bitiminden önce işten ayrılma	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. İşyerindekileri performanslarından dolayı aşağılama	1	2	3	4	5	6

15. İnsanların özel hayatlarıyla alay etme	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. İşyerine ait bazı araç-gereçleri izin almadan eve götürme	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Gerçekte çalışılıandan daha fazla saat için mesai ücreti almaya çalışma	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. İzin almadan işverene ait parayı alma	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. İşyerindeki diğer çalışanları yok sayma	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Kendisinin yaptığı bir hatadan dolayı bir başkasını suçlama	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. İşyerindeki insanlarla tartışma çıkarma	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. İşyerindeki birine ait bir şeyi izinsiz alma	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. İşyerindeki herhangi birini sözel olarak aşağılama	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. İşyerindeki birine uygunsuz el kol hareketleri yapma	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. İşyerindeki insanları itip kakarak korkutma	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. İşyerindeki insanları sözel olarak tehdit etme	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. İşyerindeki herhangi birine kendisini kötü hissettirecek açık saçık şeyler söyleme	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. İşyerindeki birinin kötü duruma düşmesine yol açacak bir şeyler yapma	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. İşyerindeki birine onu utandıracak sevimsiz şakalar yapma	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. İzin almadan herhangi birinin özel eşyalarını (mektup, çekmece) karıştırma	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. İşyerindeki birini itme ya da vurma	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. İşyerindeki biriyle dalga geçme ya da ona hakaret etme	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Çalışma arkadaşlarının az çalıştığı düşünüldüğü zamanlarda performansını düşürme	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. İşyerinin önemli bilgi ve belgelerini dışarıdan 3. kişilerle paylaşma	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. İşyerinde internet kullanımından dolayı işi aksatma	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. Amirin emirlerini uygulamayı ihmal etme	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. İş yerinin olanaklarını özel ihtiyaçlar için kullanma	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX G. DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU

Lütfen aşağıda yer alan bilgileri doldurunuz.

1. Cinsiyetiniz: Kadın
 Erkek

2. Yaşınız: _____

3. Eğitim durumunuz:

İlköğretim

Lise

Ön Lisans

Lisans

Lisans Üstü

4. Bulduğunuz kuruluşta çalışma süreniz: _____

5. Toplam iş tecrübeniz: _____

6. Son 6 ay içerisinde ortalama kaç saat mazeret izni kullandınız? _____

Teşekkür ederiz.

**APPENDIX H. DOMINANCE ANALYSIS CALCULATION TABLES FOR
THE PCWB FACTORS**

Table 4.1. Dominance analysis calculation for the abuse criterion

	rho²Y.X	X1	X2	X3	X4		
k=0 & Null	0	0,116	0,095	0,064	0,036		
	X1	0,116	-	0,017	0,010	0,014	
	X2	0,095	0,038	-	0,016	0,015	
	X3	0,064	0,062	0,047	-	0,009	
	X4	0,036	0,094	0,074	0,037	-	
k=1			0,065	0,046	0,021	0,013	
	X1X2	0,133	-	-	0,005	0,010	
	X1X3	0,126	-	0,012	-	0,008	
	X1X4	0,130	-	0,013	0,004	-	
	X2X3	0,111	0,027	-	-	0,007	
	X2X4	0,110	0,033	-	0,008	-	
	X3X4	0,073	0,061	0,045	-	-	
k=2			0,040	0,023	0,006	0,008	
	X1X2X3	0,138	-	-	-	0,007	
	X1X2X4	0,143	-	-	0,002	-	
	X1X3X4	0,134	-	0,011	-	-	
	X2X3X4	0,118	0,027	-	-	-	
k=3			0,027	0,011	0,002	0,007	
	X1X2X3X4	0,145	-	-	-	-	
Overall Average			0,062	0,044	0,023	0,016	0,145
Percentage			43%	30%	16%	11%	

Notes. X1 = Universalism; X2 = Benevolence; X3 = Conformity; X4 = Tradition; rho²Y.X = variance that the subset shared with the criterion (R²); k = 0 & Null shows the zero-order squared correlations between each predictor and criterion; k = 1 shows the contribution of each predictor over the other single predictor; k = 2 shows the contribution of each predictor over the 2-predictor subsets; k = 3 shows the contribution 2-predictor subset over the 3-predictor subsets.

Table 4.2. Dominance analysis calculation for the theft criterion

	$\rho^2_{Y.X}$	X1	X2	X3	X4	
k=0 & Null	0	0,153	0,113	0,136	0,097	
	X1	0,153	-	0,016	0,043	0,053
	X2	0,113	0,056	-	0,058	0,058
	X3	0,136	0,060	0,035	-	0,032
	X4	0,097	0,109	0,074	0,071	-
k=1		0,075	0,042	0,057	0,048	
	X1X2	0,169	-	-	0,033	0,047
	X1X3	0,196	-	0,006	-	0,028
	X1X4	0,206	-	0,010	0,018	-
	X2X3	0,171	0,031	-	-	0,028
	X2X4	0,171	0,045	-	0,028	-
	X3X4	0,168	0,056	0,031	-	-
k=2		0,044	0,016	0,026	0,034	
	X1X2X3	0,202	-	-	-	0,028
	X1X2X4	0,216	-	-	0,014	-
	X1X3X4	0,224	-	0,006	-	-
	X2X3X4	0,199	0,031	-	-	-
k=3		0,031	0,006	0,014	0,028	
	X1X2X3X4	0,230	-	-	-	-
Overall Average		0,076	0,044	0,058	0,052	0,230
Percentage		33%	19%	25%	23%	

Notes. X1 = Universalism; X2 = Benevolence; X3 = Conformity; X4 = Tradition; $\rho^2_{Y.X}$ = variance that the subset shared with the criterion (R^2); k = 0 & Null shows the zero-order squared correlations between each predictor and criterion; k = 1 shows the contribution of each predictor over the other single predictor; k = 2 shows the contribution of each predictor over the 2-predictor subsets; k = 3 shows the contribution 2-predictor subset over the 3-predictor subsets.

Table 4.3. Dominance analysis calculation for the withdrawal criterion

	$\rho^2_{Y.X}$	X1	X2	X3	X4		
k=0 & Null	0	0,143	0,099	0,251	0,134		
	X1	0,143	-	0,012	0,133	0,085	
	X2	0,099	0,056	-	0,161	0,091	
	X3	0,251	0,025	0,009	-	0,032	
	X4	0,134	0,094	0,056	0,149	-	
k=1			0,058	0,026	0,148	0,069	
	X1X2	0,155	-	-	0,121	0,078	
	X1X3	0,276	-	0,000	-	0,030	
	X1X4	0,228	-	0,005	0,078	-	
	X2X3	0,260	0,016	-	-	0,030	
	X2X4	0,190	0,043	-	0,100	-	
	X3X4	0,283	0,023	0,007	-	-	
k=2			0,027	0,004	0,100	0,046	
	X1X2X3	0,276	-	-	-	0,030	
	X1X2X4	0,233	-	-	0,073	-	
	X1X3X4	0,306	-	0,000	-	-	
	X2X3X4	0,290	0,016	-	-	-	
k=3			0,016	0,000	0,073	0,030	
	X1X2X3X4	0,306	-	-	-	-	
Overall Average			0,061	0,032	0,143	0,070	0,306
Percentage			20%	11%	47%	23%	

Notes. X1 = Universalism; X2 = Benevolence; X3 = Conformity; X4 = Tradition; $\rho^2_{Y.X}$ = variance that the subset shared with the criterion (R^2); k = 0 & Null shows the zero-order squared correlations between each predictor and criterion; k = 1 shows the contribution of each predictor over the other single predictor; k = 2 shows the contribution of each predictor over the 2-predictor subsets; k = 3 shows the contribution 2-predictor subset over the 3-predictor subsets.

Table 4.4. Dominance analysis calculation for the sabotage criterion

	$\rho^2_{Y.X}$	X1	X2	X3	X4		
k=0 & Null	0	0,137	0,082	0,079	0,036		
	X1	0,137	-	0,007	0,014	0,012	
	X2	0,082	0,062	-	0,028	0,016	
	X3	0,079	0,072	0,031	-	0,007	
	X4	0,036	0,113	0,062	0,050	-	
k=1			0,082	0,033	0,031	0,012	
	X1X2	0,144	-	-	0,010	0,010	
	X1X3	0,151	-	0,003	-	0,006	
	X1X4	0,149	-	0,005	0,008	-	
	X2X3	0,110	0,044	-	-	0,006	
	X2X4	0,098	0,056	-	0,018	-	
	X3X4	0,086	0,071	0,030	-	-	
k=2			0,057	0,013	0,012	0,007	
	X1X2X3	0,154	-	-	-	0,005	
	X1X2X4	0,154	-	-	0,005	-	
	X1X3X4	0,157	-	0,002	-	-	
	X2X3X4	0,116	0,043	-	-	-	
k=3			0,043	0,002	0,005	0,005	
	X1X2X3X4	0,159	-	-	-	-	
Overall Average			0,080	0,033	0,032	0,015	0,159
Percentage			50%	20%	20%	9%	

Notes. X1 = Universalism; X2 = Benevolence; X3 = Conformity; X4 = Tradition; $\rho^2_{Y.X}$ = variance that the subset shared with the criterion (R^2); k = 0 & Null shows the zero-order squared correlations between each predictor and criterion; k = 1 shows the contribution of each predictor over the other single predictor; k = 2 shows the contribution of each predictor over the 2-predictor subsets; k = 3 shows the contribution 2-predictor subset over the 3-predictor subsets.

Table 4.5. Dominance analysis calculation for the composite PCWB criterion

	$\rho^2_{Y.X}$	X1	X2	X3	X4	
k=0 & Null	0	0,175	0,132	0,155	0,087	
	X1	0,175	-	0,020	0,049	0,043
	X2	0,132	0,063	-	0,065	0,047
	X3	0,155	0,069	0,042	-	0,022
	X4	0,087	0,131	0,092	0,090	-
k=1		0,088	0,051	0,068	0,037	
	X1X2	0,195	-	-	0,037	0,037
	X1X3	0,224	-	0,008	-	0,019
	X1X4	0,218	-	0,014	0,025	-
	X2X3	0,197	0,035	-	-	0,019
	X2X4	0,179	0,053	-	0,037	-
	X3X4	0,177	0,066	0,039	-	-
k=2		0,051	0,020	0,033	0,025	
	X1X2X3	0,232	-	-	-	0,018
	X1X2X4	0,232	-	-	0,018	-
	X1X3X4	0,243	-	0,007	-	-
	X2X3X4	0,216	0,034	-	-	-
k=3		0,034	0,007	0,018	0,018	
	X1X2X3X4	0,250	-	-	-	-
Overall Average		0,087	0,053	0,069	0,042	0,250
Percentage		35%	21%	27%	17%	

Notes. X1 = Universalism; X2 = Benevolence; X3 = Conformity; X4 = Tradition; $\rho^2_{Y.X}$ = variance that the subset shared with the criterion (R^2); k = 0 & Null shows the zero-order squared correlations between each predictor and criterion; k = 1 shows the contribution of each predictor over the other single predictor; k = 2 shows the contribution of each predictor over the 2-predictor subsets; k = 3 shows the contribution 2-predictor subset over the 3-predictor subsets.

APPENDIX I. EXTENDED TURKISH SUMMARY

TÜRKÇE ÖZET

1. GİRİŞ

Son yıllarda, örgütsel arařtırmalar alıřanların rol ötesi davranıřlarına odaklanmaktadır. Bu davranıřlar örgüte katkı sađladıđı gibi zarar da verebilir. Yazında, bireylerin örgüte veya örgütteki diđer insanlara zarar vermek amacıyla yaptıkları davranıřlar, üretim karřıtı iř davranıřları olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Spector ve Fox, 2002). Arařtırmacılar, bu davranıřları farklı bařlıklar altında alıřmıřtır; sapkınlık, fiziksel ve sözlü saldırganlık ve intikam (Spector ve Fox, 2005). Bu davranıřlar, örgüte yönelik olabildiđi gibi kiřilerarası sapkınlık olarak da gözlemlenebilir (Chen ve Spector, 1992; Robinson ve Bennett, 1995).

Arařtırmacılar, alıřanların üretim karřıtı iř davranıřlarında bulunmasının nedenlerini yıllardır tartıřmaktadırlar. Genel olarak bakıldıđında, alıřanlar bireysel ya da örgütsel etkenler nedeniyle bu davranıřlarda bulunmaktadırlar.

Spector (2010) bireylerin, algı, olaylara karřı tutum ve saldırganlık davranıřı eđilimlerinin kiřilikten etkilenebileceđini belirtmiřtir. Salgado (2002) ise meta analiz alıřmasında, sorumluluk bilinci ve uyumluluđun alma, disiplin sorunları, sorumsuz davranıřlar gibi sapkın davranıřların öncülü olduđunu saptamıřtır. Benzer olarak, bařka bir alıřmada da üretim karřıtı davranıřlar ile uyumluluk ($r = -.14$) ve sorumluluk bilincinin ($r = .21$) negatif yönlü iliřkisi bulunmuřtur.

Beř faktör kiřilik özelliklerinden olan uyumluluk ve sorumluluk bilincinin yanı sıra öz-denetimin de bireylerin üretim karřıtı iř davranıřlarını yordayacađı bulunmuřtur (Marcus ve Schuler, 2004). Özdenetim, kiřinin istek ve hareketlerini daha uzun vadeli amalara ulařmak için sınırlandırması ve uzun vadede olumsuz sonuçlar doğurabilecek durumlardan kaçınması olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Hirschi ve Gottfredson, 1994). Bu nedenle, özdenetimi yüksek olan bireylerin üretim karřıtı iř davranıřları gibi olumsuz sonuçlar getirebilecek davranıřlardan kaçınmaları beklenir.

Mevcut çalışmada ise, bu bireylerin üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarını, örgüte veya diğer insanlara zararlı olarak algılaması beklenmiştir.

Çalışmada, araştırmacının bilgisi dahilinde daha önce üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarıyla ilişkisi açıklanmamış olan bireysel değerler incelenmiştir. Bireysel değerler insanların yaşamlarına rehberlik eden ilkeler grubu olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Schwartz, 1992). Schwartz (1992) farklı ülkelerde yürüttüğü çalışmasından yola çıkarak bireylerin 10 evrensel değere sahip olduğunu belirtmiştir ve bu değerleri güdüsel altyapılarına göre gruplandırmıştır. Çalışmada, bu değerlerden dördü hipotezlere dahil edilmiştir: evrenselcilik, iyilikseverlik, uyma ve geleneksellik. Dahil edilen değerlerden evrenselcilik ve iyilikseverlik, yakın olunan başkaları ve diğer insanların refahını ifade eden özaşkinlik boyutunda yer almaktadır. Uyma ve geleneksellik ise, bireysel sınırlama ve istikrarın korunmasını ifade eden muhafazacılık boyutundadır. Çalışmada, bu değerlere sahip bireylerin üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarını örgüte ve diğer insanlara zararlı olarak algılaması beklenmiştir.

Bireysel değişkenler ile birlikte örgütsel değişkenler de bu çalışmada incelenmiştir. İlk olarak, Hofstede'nin (1980) belirsizlikten kaçınma boyutu çalışmada yer almaktadır. Hofstede (1984) belirsizlikten kaçınmayı örgütün veya toplumun belirsiz durumlara karşı toleransı olarak tanımlamaktadır. Newman ve Nollen (1996) ise, belirsizlikten kaçınmanın, örgütlerde plan, işlem ve sistemlerin açıklığı olarak görülebileceğini belirtmiştir. Yazında, araştırmacının bilgisi dahilinde, belirsizlikten kaçınma ve üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarını ilişkisi saptanmamıştır. Fakat belirsizlikten kaçınmanın, örgütlerin etik prensipleriyle ilişkili olduğu bulunmuştur (Scholtens ve Dom, 2007). Bu nedenle, belirsizlikten kaçınma ile karakterize edilmiş örgütlerde çalışan bireylerin üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarını örgüte zarar verici olarak algılaması beklenmiştir.

Son olarak, çalışmada örgütsel adalet ikliminin üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısıyla ilişkisi incelenmiştir. Li ve Cropanzano (2009), adalet iklimini, çalışanların buldukları örgüte yönelik adalet algısı olarak tanımlamıştır. Araştırmalara göre, çalışanların adaletsiz bir ortam algıladığında, negatif iş davranışlarına yönelmekte olduğu bulunmuştur (Enns ve Rotunda, 2012). Priesemuth ve arkadaşları (2013) grup düzeyinde adaletsiz bir ortam algılandığında, çalışanların sapkın davranışlara

yöneldiklerini bulmuştur. Yazındaki bulgulardan yola çıkarak, çalışmada, çalışanların adalet algısının üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısıyla ilişkili olması beklenmiştir.

Mevcut çalışmada, üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısının, kişilik özellikleri, bireysel değerler ve örgütsel değişkenlerle ilişkisinin incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Çalışanlar, sosyal istenirlik nedeniyle üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarında bulduklarını daha az rapor etme eğilimindedirler (Kamp ve Brooks, 1991). Bu nedenle, çalışmada, bireylerin bu davranışlara yönelik algısı ölçülerek, sosyal istenirlik eğilimini azaltmak istenmiştir. Böylece, çalışanlardan daha dürüst cevaplar almak amaçlanmıştır. Bu bilgiler ışığında, çalışmanın hipotezleri şunlardır:

H1: Uyumluluk ve Sorumluluk bilinci, üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısı ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir.

H2: Öz-denetim, üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısı ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir.

H3: Özaşkınlık değerleri olan Evrenselcilik ve İyilikseverlik, üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısı ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir.

H4: Muhafazacılık değerleri olan Uyma ve Geleneksellik üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısı ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir.

H5: Çalışanların örgütsel belirsizlikten kaçınma algısı (örgütsel kuralların ve işlemlerin açıklığı) üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısı ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir.

H6: Çalışanların genel örgütsel adalet algısı üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısı ile pozitif yönde ilişkilidir.

2. YÖNTEM

2.1 Katılımcılar ve İşlem

Araştırmanın örneklemini, Türkiye’de 13 farklı özel örgütte, 12 farklı iş kolunda görev yapan 255 çalışan bireyden oluşmaktadır. Anketler, 187 (% 73.33) katılımcıya kağıt-kalem-testi, 68 (% 26.67) katılımcıya ise internet üzerinden uygulanmıştır. 35 katılımcının verisi, eksik bırakılan ölçekler olduğu için analize dahil edilmemiştir. Bu yüzden çalışmanın analizi 220 katılımcı verisi üzerinde yapılmıştır. Yaşları 21 ile 57 (*Ort.* = 30.34, *SS* = 6.46) arasında değişen katılımcıların 65’i kadın, 155’i erkektir. Katılımcıların 20’si (% 9.1) lise mezunu, 15’i (% 6.8) önlisans mezunu, 101’i (% 45.9) lisans mezunu ve 83’ü (% 37.7) lisansüstü okul mezunudur. Katılımcıların halen buldukları örgütte çalışma süreleri 1 ay ile 23 yıl (*Ort.* = 4.85, *SS* = 4.80) arasında ve toplam çalışma süreleri 2 ay ile 36 yıl (*Ort.* = 7.69, *SS* = 6.91) arasında değişmektedir.

Anket seti altı bölümden oluşmaktadır: Öz-Denetim Ölçeği, Beş Faktör Kişilik Ölçeği, Schwartz Değerler Ölçeği, Belirsizlikten Kaçınma Alt-Boyut Ölçeği, Genel Adalet Algısı Ölçeği, Üretim Karşıtı İş Davranışları Algısı Ölçeği ve Demografik Bilgi Formu.

2.2 Veri Toplama Araçları

2.2.1 Öz-Denetim Ölçeği

Bu çalışmada, katılımcıların öz-denetimini ölçmek amacı ile Tangney, Baumeister ve Boone (2004) tarafından geliştirilen Öz-Denetim Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Orijinal ölçek 36 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Katılımcılardan, sunulan ifadelerin kendilerinin tipik özelliklerini ne kadar yansıttığını 5-basamaklı Likert tipi ölçek (1 = Beni hiç yansıtmıyor, 5 = Beni tamamen yansıtıyor) kullanarak belirtmeleri istenmiştir. Tangney ve arkadaşları (2004) tüm ölçek ile aynı içerik aralığını ölçen 13-maddelik Kısa Öz-Denetim Ölçeği oluşturmuşlar ve bu kısa ölçeğin orijinal ölçek ile .90’larda korelasyona sahip olduğunu bulmuşlardır. Ölçeğin

Türkçe'ye adaptasyonu Coşkan (2010) tarafından yapılmış ve iç tutarlılık katsayısı .79 olarak raporlanmıştır.

2.2.2 Beş Faktör Kişilik Ölçeği

Kişilik özelliklerini ölçmek amacı ile katılımcılara Benet-Martinez ve John (1998) tarafından geliştirilen Beş Faktör Kişilik Ölçeği (Nevrotizm, Dışadönüklük, Deneyime Açıklık, Uyumluluk ve Sorumluluk Bilinci) uygulanmıştır. 44 maddeden oluşan ölçeğin Türkçe'ye adaptasyonu Sümer ve Sümer (2002) tarafından yapılmıştır. Ölçekte katılımcılardan, verilen sıfatların kendilerini ne kadar tanımladığını 1'den 5'e kadar (1 = Hiç katılmıyorum, 5 = Tamamen katılıyorum) derecelendirerek belirtmeleri istenmiştir. Faktörlerin iç tutarlılık katsayıları Türkiye örneklemini için .64 - .77 aralığında bulunmuştur (Sümer, Lajunen ve Özkan, 2005). Bu çalışmada, hipotezleri test etmek amacı ile sadece Uyumluluk ve Sorumluluk Bilinci faktörleri kullanılmıştır.

2.2.3 Schwartz Değerler Ölçeği

Çalışmada bireysel değerlere ilişkin değişkenler Schwartz Değerler Ölçeği ile değerlendirilmiştir. 57 madde ve 10 boyuttan oluşan ölçek Schwartz (1992) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Fakat bu çalışmada, sadece hipotez edilen boyutlara dair maddeler, 24-madde, kullanılmıştır. Katılımcılardan ölçekteki maddelerin her birini altı basamaklı ölçekler üzerinde kendileri için uygun olan seçeneği işaretleyerek doldurmaları istenmiştir (1 = Bana hiç benzemiyor, 6 = Bana çok benziyor). Ölçeğin Türkçe'ye adaptasyonu Demirutku ve Sümer (2010) tarafından yapılmıştır. Faktörlerin test-yeniden test güvenilirlik katsayıları evrenselcilik için .72, iyilikseverlik için .66, uyma için .75 ve geleneksellik için .82 olarak bulunmuştur. Aynı zamanda, ölçeğin iç tutarlılığı .91 olarak raporlanmıştır (Demirutku ve Sümer, 2010).

2.2.4 Belirsizlikten Kaçınma Ölçeği

Bu çalışmada, örgütün belirsizlikten kaçınma algısı boyutunu ölçmek için Dorfman ve Howell (1988) tarafından Hofstede'nin kültürel boyutlarını ölçmek

amacı ile geliştirilen kültürel değerler ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada, belirsizlikten kaçınma, örgütün kural, düzenleme ve işlemlerinin açıklığı olarak tanımlanmıştır ve kullanılan ölçekteki maddeler bu kavramı ölçen ifadeler içermektedir. Ölçek, Hofstede'nin ölçeğindeki sosyal, dinsel ve kişilerarası ritüel ve inançları ölçmemektedir. Katılımcılardan, sunulan ifadelerin buldukları kurumun özelliklerini ne kadar yansıttığını 5-basamaklı Likert tipi ölçek (1 = Çalıştığım kurumu hiç iyi tanımlamıyor, 5 = Çalıştığım kurumu çok iyi tanımlıyor) kullanarak belirtmeleri istenmiştir. Belirsizlikten kaçınma ölçeğinin güvenilirlik katsayısı .81 olarak bulunmuştur (Clugston, Howell ve Dorfman, 2000). Ölçeğin Türkçe'ye adaptasyonu Albaş ve Ergeneli (2011) tarafından yapılmış ve iç tutarlılığı .89 olarak raporlanmıştır.

2.2.5 Genel Adalet Algısı Ölçeği

Çalışmada, genel adalet algısı değişkeni, Ambrose ve Schminke (2009) tarafından 6-madde ile geliştirilen Genel Adalet Algısı ölçeği ile ölçülmüştür. Bu ölçekte, 3 madde, bireylerin kişisel adalet deneyimlerine ilişkin ifadeler içermekte, diğer 3-madde ise genel olarak örgütün adalet algısına yönelik ifadeler içermektedir. Katılımcılardan, sunulan ifadelere ne derece katıldıklarını 5-basamaklı Likert tipi ölçek (1 = Kesinlikle katılmıyorum, 5 = Kesinlikle katılıyorum) kullanarak belirtmeleri istenmiştir. Ölçeğin Cronbach alfa güvenilirliği .93 olarak bulunmuştur (Ambrose ve Schminke, 2009). Ölçek, bu çalışma için araştırmacı ve ikidilli bir konuşmacı tarafından Türkçe'ye çevirilmiştir.

2.2.6 Üretim Karşıtı İş Davranışları Algısı Ölçeği

Çalışanların üretim-karşıtı iş davranışları algısını ölçmek amacı ile, Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh ve Kessler (2006) tarafından geliştirilen Üretim Karşıtı İş Davranışları Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. 32 maddeden oluşan ölçek üretimden sapma, sabote etme, çalma, kötüye kullanma ve geri çekilme olarak adlandırılan beş alt boyutu kapsamaktadır. Ölçeğin Cronbach alfa değerleri, üretimden sapma boyutu için .61, sabote etme boyutu için .42, çalma boyutu için .58, kötüye kullanma boyutu

için .81, geri çekilme boyutu için .63 ve ölçeğin tüm maddeleri için .87 olarak bulunmuştur (Spector ve ark., 2006).

Ölçeğin Türkçe'ye adaptasyonu Öcel (2010) tarafından yapılmıştır ve Cronbach alfa değeri ölçeğin tümü için .97 olarak rapor edilmiştir. Daha fazla bilgi edinmek amacı ile ölçekteki maddelere ek olarak araştırmacı tarafından ölçeğe beş madde eklenmiştir. Bu beş madde üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarını ölçen başka bir ölçekten elde edilmiştir: Çalışma arkadaşlarının az çalıştığı düşünüldüğü zamanlarda performansını düşürme, işyerinin önemli bilgi ve belgelerini üçüncü kişilerle paylaşma, işyerinde internet kullanımından dolayı işi aksatma, amirin emirlerini uygulamayı ihmal etme ve işyerinin olanaklarını özel ihtiyaçlar için kullanma (Algı, Aydın, Ağca, Selvi ve Yüce, 2010).

Bu çalışmada, ölçek katılımcılara farklı bir yönergeyle sunulmuştur. Ölçeğin orijinal sürümünde, katılımcılara *“Aşağıda sunulan her bir davranışı ne sıklıkla yapmaktasınız?”* sorusu yöneltilmektedir. Bu çalışmada ise, çalışanların üretim-karşıtı iş davranışları algısını ölçmek amaçlanmaktadır. Bu nedenle, katılımcılara *“Her bir davranışın kurumun veya çalışanların performansına ne derece zarar verici davranışlar olduğunu düşündüğünüzü belirtiniz.”* sorusu yöneltilmiştir. Katılımcılardan, sunulan 37 maddeyi 6-basamaklı Likert tipi (1 = Hiç zarar vermez, 6 = Çok zarar verir) ölçek kullanarak değerlendirmeleri istenmiştir.

2.2.7 Demografik Bilgi Formu

Katılımcılardan demografik bilgi formunu doldurmaları istenmiştir. Bu form, yaş, cinsiyet, eğitim düzeyi, halen çalışılmakta olan örgütteki görev süresi ve toplam çalışma süresi sorularını içermektedir.

3. BULGULAR

3.1 Faktör ve Güvenirlik Analizleri

Çalışmada, hipotezleri test etmek için sırası ile faktörler oluşturulmuştur. Öncelikle, Beş Faktör Kişilik ölçeğine ilişkin Uyumluluk ve Sorumluluk Bilinci faktörleri oluşturulmuştur. Çalışmada, Öz-Denetim değişkeni ölçeğin kısa formu

kullanıldığı için bir bütün olarak ele alınmıştır. Bireysel değerlere ilişkin değişkenler, yazında belirtildiği boyutlar; Evrenselcilik, İyilikseverlik, Uyma ve Geleneksellik temel alınarak oluşturulmuştur (Schwartz, 2005). Fakat değerler arasındaki yüksek korelasyonlar nedeni ile tekrar faktör analizi yapılmıştır ve sonuç bu dört değer için Özaşkınlık (Evrenselcilik ve İyilikseverlik) ve Muhafazacılık (Uyma ve Geleneksellik) olarak 2-faktör şeklinde gruplanmasını desteklemiştir. Belirsizlikten kaçınma algısı ve genel adalet algısı yazında tek boyut olarak ele alındığından çalışmada da bu şekilde kullanılmıştır. Son olarak, üretim karşıtı iş davranışları Öcel'in (2010) Türkçe ölçek çalışmasında olduğu gibi dört faktör şeklinde gruplanmıştır; Kötüye kullanma, Çalma, Geri çekilme ve Sabote etme.

Çalışmada kullanılan her ölçeğin Cronbach alfası Tablo 3.2'de sunulmaktadır. Öz-Denetim ölçeğinin Cronbach alfa değeri .79 olarak bulunmuştur. Uyumluluk ve Sorumluluk Bilinci'nin Cronbach değerleri ise sıralı olarak .65 ve .77 olarak bulunmuştur. Schwartz'ın değerlerine ait güvenilirlik sonuçları Evrenselcilik için .78, İyilikseverlik için .85, Uyma için .61 ve Geleneksellik için .93 olarak rapor edilmiştir. Belirsizlikten kaçınma ve Genel adalet algısı ölçeği için Cronbach alfa değeri .90 olarak bulunmuştur. Üretim-karşıtı iş davranışları algısı ölçeğinin alt boyutları için raporlanan Cronbach alfa değerleri şu şekildedir: Kötüye kullanma için .95, Çalma için .82, Geri çekilme için .89, Sabote etme için .65 ve ölçeğin tüm maddeleri için .96.

3.2. Araştırma Değişkenleri Arasındaki Korelasyonlar

Araştırma değişkenleri arasındaki korelasyonlar matrisi Tablo 3.3'te gösterilmektedir. Öz-denetim değişkeni, kötüye kullanma ($r = .28, p < .01$), çalma ($r = .38, p < .01$), geri çekilme ($r = .45, p < .01$), sabote etme ($r = .27, p < .01$) ve kompozit ölçek ile ($r = .39, p < .01$) pozitif yönde ilişkili bulunmuştur. Uyumluluk faktörü çalma ($r = .19, p < .01$), geri çekilme ($r = .22, p < .01$), sabote etme ($r = .15, p < .05$) ve kompozit ölçek ile ($r = .18, p < .01$) pozitif yönde ilişkili bulunmuştur. Sorumluluk bilinci faktörü kötüye kullanma ($r = .19, p < .01$), çalma ($r = .35, p < .01$), geri çekilme ($r = .37, p < .01$), sabote etme ($r = .23, p < .01$) ve kompozit ölçek ile ($r = .31, p < .01$) pozitif yönde ilişkili bulunmuştur. Bireysel değerlerin tümü ve

alt boyutların tümü arasında pozitif ve anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Bu korelasyonlar şu şekildedir: Evrenselcilik için .34 - .42 aralığında, İyilikseverlik için .29 - .36 aralığında, Uyma için .25 - .50 aralığında ve Geleneksellik için .19 - .30 aralığındadır. Belirsizlikten kaçınma faktörü, kötüye kullanma ($r = .20, p < .01$), çalma ($r = .29, p < .01$), geri çekilme ($r = .37, p < .01$), sabote etme ($r = .26, p < .01$) ve kompozit ölçek ile ($r = .31, p < .01$) pozitif yönde ilişkili bulunmuştur. Genel adalet algısı ve çalışma kriterleri arasında anlamlı bir korelasyon gözlenmemiştir.

3.3 Hipotez Testleri

Çalışmada yürütülen hiyerarşik regresyon analizleri sonuçları, Tablo 3.4, 3.5 ve 3.6'da özetlenmektedir. Tablo 3.4'e bakıldığında, uyumluluk ve sorumluluk bilincinin yordayıcılığına ilişkin Hipotez 1'in kısmen desteklendiği görülmektedir. Analizler sonucunda, sorumluluk bilinci değişkeninin üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısını ve tüm alt boyutlarını (kötüye kullanma, çalma, geri çekilme ve sabote etme) yordadığı saptanmıştır. Ayrıca, öz-denetim değişkeninin üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısını ve tüm alt boyutlarını (kötüye kullanma, çalma, geri çekilme ve sabote etme) kişilik özelliklerinin üstüne varyans ekleyerek yordadığı saptanmıştır. Bu bulgu ile Hipotez 2 tamamıyla desteklenmiştir.

Tablo 3.5'te görüldüğü gibi, özaşkinlık değerlerinin (Evrenselcilik ve İyilikseverlik) yordayıcılığına ilişkin Hipotez 3, analizler sonucunda desteklenmiştir. Buna karşın, muhafazacılık değerlerinin (Uyma ve Geleneksellik) yordayıcılığına ilişkin Hipotez 4, analizler sonucunda kısmen desteklenmiştir. Muhafazacılık değerlerinin üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısını, çalma ve geri çekilme boyutlarını yordadığı saptanmıştır.

Tablo 3.6'ya bakıldığında belirsizlikten kaçınma değişkeninin üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısını ve tüm alt boyutlarını (kötüye kullanma, çalma, geri çekilme ve sabote etme) yordadığı saptanmıştır. Bu sonuç doğrultusunda, Hipotez 5 tamamıyla desteklenmiştir. Diğer yandan, genel adalet algısı değişkeninin üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısını ve alt boyutlarını yordamadığı bulunmuştur. Bu nedenle Hipotez 6 desteklenmemiştir.

3.4 Dominans Analizi

Çalışmada, regresyon analizlerinin yanı sıra, dominans analizi yürütülmesine karar verilmiştir. Dominans analizini yapabilmek amacı ile her bir kriter için (kötüye kullanma, çalma, geri çekilme ve sabote etme) 15 ayrı regresyon analizi yürütülmüştür. Daha sonra, bireysel değerlerin özgün katkılarını açıklamak amacı ile bir göreceli önem analizi olan dominans analizi yürütülmüştür (Bkz. Appendix I). Bireysel değerlere ilişkin bu sonuçlar Tablo 3.7’de özetlenmektedir.

Sonuç olarak, evrenselciliğin, geri çekilme dışındaki tüm kriterlerde her bir regresyon altkütmesi modeline katkısı göreceli olarak en yüksek bulunmuştur (% 20 - % 50). Tüm bireysel değerlerin üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısına ve alt boyutlarına % 9 - % 50 aralığında göreceli katkısı olduğu saptanmıştır.

4. TARTIŞMA

Çalışmada, katılımcılardan daha dürüst yanıtlar almak amacıyla üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarına yönelik davranışsal eğilimlerinden ziyade algıları ölçülmüştür. Bunun nedeni, bireylerin üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarını zararlı olarak algılamadıkları zaman bu davranışlarda bulunmaya daha eğilimli olacağı varsayımdır. Değişkenler ile gerçekten üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarında bulunma arasındaki ilişki negatif yönde iken, çalışmada pozitif yönde bir ilişki beklenmesi bu durumdan kaynaklanmaktadır.

Yardımseverlik, güvenilirlik ve cömertlik ifadelerini içeren uyumluluğun birçok çalışmada üretim karşıtı iş davranışları ile anlamlı bir ilişkisi olduğu bulunmuştur (Berry ark., 2007; Hafidz, 2012; Salgado, 2002). Mevcut çalışmada ise, uyumluluk faktörü üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısı ile anlamlı korelasyona sahip olmasına rağmen, bu faktörün kriteri hiçbir şekilde yordamadığı bulunmuştur. Bu anlamlı korelasyonlar düşük düzeydedir ve aynı zamanda uyumluluk, sorumluluk bilinci ile orta derecede korelasyona sahiptir. Kişilik özellikleri olan bu değişkenler analiz denkleminde birlikte girildiğinde, güçlü bir değişken olan sorumluluk bilinci uyumluluğun yordayıcılığını etkilemiş olabilir. Çalışmanın ilgi çeken bir diğer bulgusu ise, uyumluluk faktörü ile en yüksek ilişkide olması beklenen kötüye kullanma boyutunun anlamlı bir korelasyona sahip olmadığı bulunması olmuştur

(örn., Bolton ark., 2010). Bunun nedeni ise, psikolojik tacizin bir konusu olan kişiler arası sapkınlığa¹ yonetsel acidan Türkiye'de yeterince değinilmemiş, önleyici mekanizmalar alınmamış olmasıdır (Tınaz, 2008).

Çalışmada ele alınan bir diğer kişilik özelliği olan sorumluluk bilincinin üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısını yordayarak bu davranışlarda bulunmaya ilişkin yazınla tutarlı olduğu gözlemlenmiştir (Barrick ve Mount, 1991; Fallon, Avis, Kudisch, Gornet ve Frost, 2000). Bu değişken öz-disiplin, sorumluluk ve çalışkanlık gibi kavramları içermektedir (Hastings ve O'Neill, 2009). Bu nedenle, sorumluluk bilinci yüksek olan bireylerin üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarını örgüt için zararlı olarak algılaması ve bu davranışlardan kaçınması beklenmektedir.

Çalışmada, öz-denetimin üretim karşıtı iş davranışları ile pozitif yönde ilişkili olduğu bulunmuştur. Bu değişkenin, kriteri sorumluluk bilincine ilaveten yordadığı bulunmuştur. Bulgular, öz-denetimin üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarında bulunmanın öncülü olarak ele alındığı yazınla tutarlıdır (Marcus ve Schuler, 2004; Villanueva, 2006). Öz-denetimi yüksek olan bireylerin davranışlarının uzun dönem sonuçlarını düşündüğü yazında belirtilmektedir (Marcus ve Schuler (2004). Bu nedenle, çalışmada bu bireylerin üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarını zararlı olarak algılaması beklenmiştir.

Çalışmada üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısını yordayacağı öne sürülen evrenselcilik ve iyilikseverlik değerleri, aralarındaki yüksek korelasyon nedeniyle özaşkınlık değeri çerçevesinde analizlere dahil edilmiştir. Yazında yeni bir değişken olarak alınan özaşkınlığın, üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısını ve tüm boyutlarını yordadığı bulunmuştur. Buna ek olarak yapılan dominans analizinde, evrenselciliğin kötüye kullanma, çalma ve sabote etme boyutlarını diğer değerlere kıyasla en çok varyansla açıkladığı görüşmüştür (% 33 - % 50). Fakat, bu değişken geri çekilme boyutunda uyma ve geleneksellikten sonra gelmektedir. Evrenselciliğin tüm insanları ve doğayı korumayı içeren bir değer olması nedeniyle, bu değere sahip bireylerin, insanlara ve örgüte zarar veren bu tür davranışları zarar vermez şeklinde ifade etmeleri beklenmemektedir. Geri çekilmenin ise, düşük ortalamaya ve göreceli olarak yüksek standart sapmaya sahip olması, katılımcıların bu boyutun zararlılığı hakkında fikir birliğinde olmadığını göstermektedir. İyilikseverlik değeri,

evrenselcilikten sonra kötüye kullanma boyutu için en yüksek varyansı (% 30) açıklamaktadır. Bunun nedeni, iyiliksever değerlere sahip insanlar, birebir iletişimde buldukları insanlar etkileneceği için kötüye kullanma boyutunu zararlı olarak değerlendirme eğiliminde olurlar. Öte yandan, diğer boyutlar örgüte yönelik davranışları içerdiği için birincil olarak bireyin bu değere sahip olup olmamasından etkilenmemektedir.

Uyma ve geleneksellik değerleri ise, aralarındaki yüksek korelasyon nedeniyle muhafazacılık değeri çerçevesinde analizere dahil edilmiştir. Muhafazacılık değeri, çalma, geri çekilme ve kompozit üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısı kompozitini yordamıştır. Dominans analizlerinde ise, değerler tüm boyutlar için varyans açıklamıştır. Uyma değeri, geri çekilme boyutunda diğer değerlere kıyasla en yüksek varyansı (% 47) açıklamaktadır. Uyma değeri, sosyal beklentiler ve kuralları kabul etmeyi içermektedir. Bu değere sahip kişiler, geri çekilme boyutunda yer alan, devamsızlık ya da işe geç gelme gibi sosyal beklentiler ile çelişen davranışları örgüte zararlı olarak adlandıracaklardır. Buna ek olarak, geleneksellik ise, kültür veya dinlerin geleneklerine saygı göstermeyi içermektedir. Geleneksellik değerine sahip kişilerin, çalmak gibi etik olmayan bir davranışı hoş görmesi beklenmemektedir.

Çalışmada örgütsel değişken olarak ele alınan belirsizlikten kaçınmanın, üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısını ve tüm alt boyutlarını yordadığı bulunmuştur. Üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarında bulunma yazınında bu değişken ile ilgili bir bulguya rastlanmamıştır. Chew ve Putti (1995), çalışmalarında yüksek belirsizlikten kaçınma düzeyine sahip olan bireylerin risk almaktan kaçındığını ve bu nedenle örgütsel kurallara karşı gelme eğiliminde olmadıklarını belirtmiştir. Ayrıca, bu değişken ile en yüksek ilişki geri çekilme boyutu arasında saptanmıştır. Bu bulgu, örgütte belirsizlik iklimi olduğu durumlarda, bireylerin daha çok pasif bir direniş benimseyebileceklerini göstermektedir.

Son olarak, genel adalet algısının üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısını hiç bir şekilde yordamadığı bulunmuştur. Bununla birlikte, bu değişkene ilişkin korelasyonların da anlamlı olmadığı görülmüştür. Yazında ise çalışanın adalet algısının tutarlı bir şekilde üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarında bulunma ile ilişkili

olduğu belirtilmektedir (Fox ark., 2001; Priesemuth ark., 2013). Bu durumun bir açıklaması, çalışanın üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarına ilişkin algısı, genel adalet algısı ve üretim karşıtı iş davranışları arasında sadece bir aracı değişken olabilir. Bu davranışlar zararlı olarak algılansa bile, çalışan örgütteki adalet algısına göre bu davranışları yapmaya karar verebilir. Buna ek olarak, Türklerin kültürel özelliklerinden ötürü, genel adalet algısından ziyade etkilileşimli adalet algısı bu kriteri yorduyor olabilir. Ayrıca, bireyler genel adalet algısını değerlendirirken bazı özel durumları gözden kaçırabilirler.

4.1. Çalışmanın Potansiyel Katkıları ve Doğurguları

Çalışmanın verileri gerçek iş ortamında toplanmıştır ve böylelikle değerli sonuçlar elde edilmiştir. Çalışmada sorumluluk bilinci ve öz-denetim değişkenlerinin üretim karşıtı iş davranışı algısını yordaması, örgütlerde işe alım süreçlerinde kişilik ölçümlerinden yararlanılmasını destekler niteliktedir. Çalışmanın bir diğer katkısı ise, özaşkınlık ve muhafazacılık değerleri ile üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısı arasındaki ilişkinin saptanmış olmasıdır. Çalışmada anlamlı bulunan bu ilişki, aynı zamanda üretim karşıtı iş davranışları yazınında da davranış sıklığına bakılarak incelenmelidir. Çalışma, yazında yeni bir değişken olan belirsizlikten kaçınma (örgütsel kural ve düzenlemelerin açıklığı) ve üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısı arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bularak yazına katkı sağlamıştır. Örgütler üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarından kaçınmak için kurum içerisinde kurallar ve düzenlemeleri açıklayan ahlaki yasalar oluşturarak bu değişkene ilişkin önlem alabilirler. Ayrıca, çalışanları üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarının boyutları hakkında bilgilendirmek amacıyla örgütlerde eğitim programları düzenlenmelidir. Böylelikle, bu davranışların örgüte ve kendilerine ne kadar zarar verici olduğu onlara gösterilebilir.

4.2. Çalışmanın Sınırlılıkları ve Öneriler

Çalışmanın ilk sınırlılığı verilerin özbildirim ölçekleri ile toplanmış olmasıdır. Bu durumda, katılımcılar sosyal istenirlik yönünde cevap vermiş olabilirler. İkinci bir sınırlılık ise, katılımcıların halen çalıştıkları örgütteki görev süreleri olarak düşünülmüştür. 1 ay – 23 yıl aralığında olan bu süre, katılımcıların

örgütsel deęişkenlere ilişkin yargılarını etkilemiş olabilir. Düşünölen üçüncü sınırlılık, çalışmada, üretim karşıtı iş davranışları algısı bu davranışlarda gerçekten bulunma durumuyla ilişkilendirilmesine rağmen bu durum ölçölmemiştir. Çalışmayı izleyen belirli bir zaman aralığında bu yönde veri toplanıp varsayımımızın doğrulanması sağlanabilirdi. Dördüncü sınırlılık, katılımcılar çoğunlukla beyaz-yaka ve mühendis unvanı ile çalışanlardı. Katılımcıların homojen bir grup olması nedeniyle çalışma grubu karşılaştırması yapılamamıştır. Son olarak, çalışma farklı örgütlerden benzer sayıda katılımcılar ile yapılsaydı, belirsizlikten kaçınma ve genel adalet algısı deęişkenlerine ilişkin örgütlere yönelik bir kıyaslama yapmak mümkün olabilirdi.

APPENDIX J. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü
- Enformatik Enstitüsü
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Ağca
Adı : Hande
Bölümü : Psikoloji

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : Individual and Organizational Predictors of Perceiving
Workplace Behaviors as Counterproductive

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: