
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2010

An Investigation Of Prosocial Rule Breaking Within The Casual Restaurant Industry

Catherine Curtis
University of Central Florida



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Curtis, Catherine, "An Investigation Of Prosocial Rule Breaking Within The Casual Restaurant Industry" (2010). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 4191.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/4191>



University of
Central
Florida

STARS
Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

**AN INVESTIGATION OF PROSOCIAL RULE BREAKING WITHIN THE
CASUAL RESTAURANT INDUSTRY**

by

CATHERINE R. CURTIS
MS University of Central Florida, 2005
BM Rider University, 1997

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the College of Education
at University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2010

Major Professors: Duncan Dickson and Stephen Sivo

© 2010 Catherine R. Curtis

ABSTRACT

In the hospitality industry, the role of the frontline employee is integral. These employees are the face of the organization and have a strong role in shaping and forming the opinions of consumers by way of their product and service delivery. Therefore, the decisions an employee makes during the product or service delivery is critical in maintaining the relationship with the customer. Employees may be faced with opportunities to better service a customer at the cost of breaking an organizational rule or procedure. When an employee is faced with this dilemma and decides to break the rule on the behalf of the customer knowing the risks involved, this is called prosocial rule breaking. One distinct difference between this concept and general rule breaking is that this is performed as a nonselfish gesture; the employee does not receive any personal benefit. To examine this further, this study investigated the overall propensity to participate in prosocial rule breaking and the impact of the Big Five personality dimensions on prosocial rule breaking.

To gain a better understanding of these constructs, a review of literature related to ethical decision making, prosocial behavior, and the five factor theory of personality was conducted. To investigate the research objectives, a purposive sample of frontline employees from a nationally branded restaurant chain completed a four part self-administered questionnaire by answering questions on the five factor personality dimensions through the Big Five Inventory (BFI), a restaurant based scenario followed by Morrison's (2006) prosocial rule breaking scale, a section

on demographic information, and an open ended section for qualitative comments. Overall, three-hundred and five (305) usable questionnaires were completed and interpreted.

The results demonstrated that this sample of restaurant employees revealed a moderate propensity for prosocial rule breaking. Moreover, the results revealed that the Agreeableness dimension is the most common personality dimension for this group of restaurant employees, but the Conscientiousness domain was the best predictor of one's propensity not to participate in prosocial rule breaking. The implications for managers from this study indicate a need for managers to recognize and encourage prosocial behaviors from their employees. They also need to understand which personality domains contribute to prosocial behavior, which can ultimately have implications for hiring, selection, and training.

To my children, Harlan and Sela.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the faculty at the Rosen College of Hospitality Management and the College of Education at the University of Central Florida. I was challenged and inspired to always do my best during the entire doctoral program.

I would like to acknowledge my dissertation committee beginning with my chairs, Duncan Dickson and Stephen Sivo. Duncan was a wonderful source of positive support through the process. Stephen Sivo taught me how to think about statistics. Robert Ford was a wonderful editor that pushed me to bring my best scholarly effort forward. Denver Severt, I thank you for working with me again. Chris Muller, for helping me get this project noticed, and finally Randall Upchurch. As my former chair, I want to thank you for all of your effort leading me to the proposal of the project, remaining on the committee, and seeing me through to the end of the journey. You have been my mentor through my graduate career and I hope that I can repay you someday by being half of the teacher and researcher you are with my future students.

I would also like to thank my friends from UCF: Pam Allison, for our collaborative writing efforts that began in our Master's program through the PhD, Katie Noland for taking care of my most prized possession, Jeannie Hahm, the best cube-mate in the world and for forming our own "mommy cohort." Emily Hummel for treating my data collection like it was your study too. I would also like to acknowledge Sarah Alvarez, our friendship began in the master's program and will be lifelong. My friends outside of UCF that supported me: Anna, Janice, Sherry, and Jen. I must also mention one person who taught me the true essence of the hospitality industry, Numero Uno, Tony Walsh.

I would also like to thank my family: my parents Edward and Prajakjit Johnson for their support, my brothers Paul and Bic, and Jackie, Tai, and Logan. I would especially like to mention Diane Curtis, who has been overwhelmingly supportive of my academic career and has always been like a mother to me.

Lastly, I would like to thank my children that arrived during the doctoral program, Harlan and Sela, and my husband Shane. I could not have done any of this without you. I love you three!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Need for the Study	3
Theoretical Framework.....	4
Prosocial Organizational Behavior	4
Prosocial Rule Breaking Behavior.....	5
Problem Statement	7
Purpose of Study	8
Research Questions.....	9
Definition of Terms.....	10
Limitations	11
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
Introduction.....	12
Behavioral Ethics	12
Individual Differences	13
Organizational Contexts.....	14
Ethical Decision Making.....	16
Philosophical Categories of Ethics	16
Ethical Decision Making Research.....	18
Prosocial Organizational Behavior	22
Prosocial Rule Breaking	30
Antecedents to Prosocial Rule Breaking.....	32
Workplace Deviance.....	35
Big Five Personality Dimensions.....	37
History of the Big Five Factors.....	38
Five Factor Inventories	41
Reliability and Validity.....	43
Study Model.....	44
Summary	45

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	47
Introduction.....	47
Research Design.....	47
Hypotheses	48
Sampling Frame	50
Questionnaire Instrument.....	50
Big Five Inventory	51
Scenario Method and Prosocial Rule Breaking	51
Data Collection Procedure	52
Data Analysis	53
Summary	56
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	57
Introduction.....	57
Data Collection	58
Profile of Respondents	59
Big Five Inventory	61
Prosocial Rule Breaking Questionnaire	62
Reliability Analysis.....	65
Testing of Hypotheses.....	66
Qualitative Results	82
Summary	85
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS.....	89
Introduction.....	89
Behavioral Ethics	89
Ethical Decision Making.....	91
Prosocial Behavior	91
Prosocial Rule Breaking Behavior.....	92
The Big Five Personality Dimensions	93
Research Questions and Hypotheses	94
Procedures.....	97
Findings.....	97
Discussion.....	103

Prosocial Rule Breaking	103
Big Five Personality Dimensions.....	106
The Big Five and Prosocial Rule Breaking.....	107
Demographic Variables and Prosocial Rule Breaking.....	108
Demographic Variables and the Big Five.....	109
Conclusions.....	110
Implications.....	111
Recommendations for Future Research	112
Limitations and Delimitations.....	113
APPENDIX A: IRB APPROVAL	114
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE.....	116
APPENDIX C: INDIVIDUAL SCALE SCORES (BFI).....	121
LIST OF REFERENCES	127

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Guidelines for interpreting (r) Cohen (1988)	67
--	----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:13 Prosocial Behaviors adapted from Brief & Motowidlo (1986)	24
Table 2: Morrison model (2006) of Prosocial Rule Breaking and Positive Deviance Spreitzer & Sonenshein (2003)	32
Table 3: Big Five Personality Dimensions	41
Table 4: Prosocial Rule Breaking Model.....	45
Table 5: Demographic Profile of Respondents.....	60
Table 6: Summary of responses for Big Five Personality Dimensions	61
Table 7: Summary of Responses Assessing Realism/Support.....	63
Table 8: Summary of Responses for Prosocial Rule Breaking.....	64
Table 9: Results of EFA of PSRB scale (Morrison, 2006).....	65
Table 10: Cronbach’s α of scales used in this study	66
Table 11: Pearson (r) of Prosocial Rule Breaking and Big Five Personality Dimensions	67
Table 12: Ranks of Prosocial Rule Breaking by Position.....	70
Table 13: Job Position Mean and Frequency	71
Table 14: Summary of BFI Scales and Gender	73
Table 15: Ranks of Conscientiousness by years in the industry.....	75
Table 16: Years in the industry Mean and Frequency	76
Table 17: Mean rankings of BFI scales by Job Position.....	77
Table 18: Summary of BFI Scales by Position.....	78
Table 19: Correlations of Prosocial Rule Breaking and Big Five Dimensions	79
Table 20: ANOVA	80
Table 21: Coefficients.....	81
Table 22: Qualitative Perspectives on Prosocial Rule Breaking	84
Table 23: Proposed Revised Model of Prosocial Rule Breaking.....	113
Table 24: BFI Extraversion Scale Score.....	122
Table 25: BFI Agreeableness Score.....	123
Table 26: BFI Conscientiousness Scale Score.....	124
Table 27: BFI Neuroticism Scale Score.....	125
Table 28: BFI Openness Scale Score.....	126

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The role of front-line hospitality workers' has been recognized as important in successful service operations and mentioned in numerous studies (Lundberg & Mossberg, 2008). These customer encounter employees are essential for increasing sales and generating repeat business (Berry, 1981); executing quality service encounters (Bitner, Booms, & Mohr, 1994), and forming positive impressions of the company on consumers (Bettencourt & Brown, 1997; Bitner, 1995; Schneider & Bowen, 1993). Hospitality jobs by nature are very service centered and require much personal interaction between the employee and guest. In many instances, some employees will choose to go above and beyond the ordinary service standard to serve a guest, which is also known as an extra-role behavior (Katz, 1964; Morrison, 1994; Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995) while others will only do what is required, also known as role prescribed behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). In order to better understand why some hospitality employees are more willing to go further, even breaking rules to serve guests, worker attitudes and personality must be studied. This is especially true for hospitality employees, as it is not uncommon for them to be unsupervised for long periods of time (Bowen & Lawler, 1995). This lack of constant guidance and supervision makes it possible for these employees to deviate from organization rules and patterns of expected behavior (Bennett & Robinson, 2000).

In the management literature, workplace deviance is described as behavior that goes beyond the norms of the organization (Applebaum, Iaconi, & Matousek, 2007). The consequences for the organization of this behavior may include: financial costs, obstruction of the decision making process, and influence of productivity, despite the intention (Applebaum et al., 2007). Robinson and Bennett (1995) offer a definition of workplace deviance as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in doing so threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both” (p.556). Employee deviance is considered voluntary because it is either the employee’s lack of motivation to conform to social norms, or on the other hand, the employee is motivated to violate these norms (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). On the other side, positive organizational behavior has been researched through such constructs as positive deviance (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2003) and prosocial organizational behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Positive deviance is defined as “behaviors with honorable intentions independent of outcomes,” (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004, p. 833). Brief & Motowidlo (1986) define prosocial behavior as:

behavior which is performed by a member of the organization, directed toward an individual, group, or organization with whom he or she interacts while carrying out his or her organizational role, and performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group or organization toward which it is directed. (p.711).

One area of study that has extended prosocial behavior and positive deviance was a construct labeled by Morrison (2006) as prosocial rule breaking. The basic premise of prosocial rule breaking is that an organizational rule is deliberately broken with positive intentions to benefit a stakeholder in the organization (Morrison, 2006).

A review of the hospitality literature concerning workplace behaviors found that negative behaviors such as deviance had been studied (Ghiselli & Ismail, 1998; Robinson, 2007; Wood, 1992). The positive workplace behaviors studied were: organizational citizenship behaviors (Kim, Ok, & Lee 2009; Raub, 2008; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2003) and prosocial behavior (Gill & Mathur, 2007). There are no current studies investigating prosocial rule breaking in the hospitality literature. Although a large number of factors could account for this behavior, one approach to better understanding why some employees engage in prosocial rule breaking behavior and some do not, is by investigating the role employee personality plays in determining who participates in prosocial rule breaking. In this study, personality was analyzed through the Big Five dimensions commonly known as: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991).

Need for the Study

According to Bitner et al, (1994) customer contact employees modify their behavior in response to the feedback they are receiving from customers. Due to their increased interactions with customers, these frontline employees have a better sense of what the customer desires from the company than the company itself (Bitner, et al, 1994). Thus in an effort to better serve customers, employees may be faced with the dilemma of breaking an organizational rule. The problem presented for employees is one of providing a benefit for a stakeholder while placing themselves at risk for disciplinary action. This is exactly what prosocial rule breaking is at a fundamental level. Although, this type of problem was studied by Eddleston, Kidder and Litzky,

(2002) in service and hospitality workers, there is little empirical research relating to the factors that affect an employee's decision to engage in prosocial rule breaking.

Theoretical Framework

There are two main bodies of research that have contributed to the theoretical framework of this study. First, the work of Brief and Motowidlo (1986) examined an area of positive organizational behavior known as prosocial behavior. The second area, a derivative of prosocial organizational behavior, was developed by Morrison (2006) and is the construct of prosocial rule breaking within organizations.

Prosocial Organizational Behavior

Prosocial organizational behavior is sometimes known as good citizenship behavior or extra-role behavior in the workplace (Baruch, O'Creevy, Hind, Vigoda-Gadot, 2004; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Organ, 1988). In a broad sense this behavior is considered to be socially desirable because it indicates a "correct" way to behave (Baruch, et al, 2004). These behaviors are performed with the intentions that there will be a benefit to the person, group, or organization to which the behavior is directed (George, 1990). Despite the fact that prosocial behaviors are derivative of positive organizational behavior (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003), prosocial behaviors can be classified as either functional or dysfunctional (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Prosocial behavior is functional when it contributes to the accomplishment of the organization mission or goals, and prosocial behavior is dysfunctional when it detracts from the organization's ability to attain goals.

Prosocial Rule Breaking Behavior

Morrison (2006) defined prosocial rule breaking as: “any instance where an employee intentionally violates a formal organizational policy, regulation, or prohibition with the primary intention of promoting the welfare of the organization or one of its stakeholders,” (p.6). It is different from employee rule breaking that is commonly associated with workplace deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). The difference between rule breaking in workplace deviance and that of prosocial rule breaking is that prosocial rule breaking is not done with any self-interest; there is no sought after benefit for the employee. It is important to note that Morrison (2006) emphasizes the term prosocial rule breaking as a “nonselfish” act that that employees willingly engage in causing an employee to violate an organizational rule in order to serve the best interests of the organization or stakeholder. Instances of prosocial rule breaking can include employees violating organizational policies to improve efficiency, to help a coworker, or better service a customer (Mayer, Caldwell, Ford, Uhl-Bien, & Gresock, 2007). Prosocial rule breaking is derived from prosocial behavior in the sense that the behavior is for the benefit of other persons and not the employee (Morrison, 2006).

To understand prosocial rule breaking, it is important to first define a rule and what constitutes rule breaking. According to Morrison (2006) a rule is organizational policy, regulation, or prohibition that is enforced by the organization for the execution of job tasks and duties by employees. Hence, the act of rule breaking requires that the actor knows that he/she is intentionally violating an organizational policy, regulation, or prohibition; rule breaking incidents are excluded when a rule is unenforced or the actor is unaware of the rule (Morrison,

2006). There is a distinct difference between rule breaking and breaking an organizational norm. Norms are behaviors, generally social behaviors, that a group finds acceptable or unacceptable, but are unenforceable; there is not any formal censure for violating a norm (Hackman, 1976; Morrison, 2006). Conversely, violating an organizational rule will usually have formal consequences unlike that of a norm because organizational rules are formally enforced from the top down and can result in disciplinary actions such as write-ups, suspension, and termination (Morrison, 2006; Ouchi, 1980).

To determine if an individual will participate in prosocial rule breaking, Morrison (2006) reviewed the positive deviance model of Spreitzer & Sonenshein (2003). Spreitzer & Sonenshein (2003) stated that five psychological states must be present for positive deviance: 1. meaning, 2. self-determination, 3. focus on others, 4. personal efficacy, and 5. courage. Morrison (2006) built upon that framework asserting that prosocial rule breaking is more likely to occur when the job provides both meaning and autonomy; and when the three individual dispositions of: 1. empathy, 2. proactive personality, and 3. risk taking dispositions are strong. Also, the decision to partake in prosocial rule breaking partially relies on the influence of co-worker's behaviors. Morrison (2006) found that proactive personality was not significant and suggested trying a broader range of individual differences.

In this study, a purposive restaurant industry sample was used to investigate prosocial rule breaking behavior. This study is an extension on Morrison's (2006) seminal study and differs in the fact that it is first study in prosocial rule breaking to utilize an industry sample. Empathy, proactive personality, and risk taking propensity, all individual dispositions that were

studied in Morrison's (2006) work were exchanged for the Big Five inventory. In this way, a certain disposition will not be studied, but a larger dimension of collective traits that may show a lack or propensity toward prosocial rule breaking.

Problem Statement

According to Gill & Mathur (2007) a lack of prosocial behavior in the hospitality employee can cause poor service delivery and negatively affect the bottom line. These issues can lead to internal organizational problems such as turnover, which is associated with high labor costs and service quality (Gill & Mathur, 2007). Furthermore, scholars have indicated that service employees' behaviors are directly related to perceived service quality (Bowen & Schneider, 1985; Kelley & Hoffman, 1997). The hospitality industry is a service centric business in which the level of perceived service quality may be the source of an organization's competitive advantage (O'Neill, 2001). Some employees are inclined to go the extra mile for service (Bolino & Turnley, 2003) and some are willing to break rules to service a customer (Morrison, 2006). The question that remains to be answered is whether there is a propensity for certain "personality types" to be more inclined to engage in prosocial rule breaking. Therefore, this study examined the Big Five personality dimensions to discover if they impact an employee's decision to engage in prosocial rule breaking. The present research will build upon Morrison's (2006) findings in three ways. First, prosocial rule breaking behavior is considered with the Big Five personality dimensions, which is an expansion from proactive personality that Morrison (2006) studied. Morrison (2006) did not have any significant results regarding proactive personality and attributed that to either the use of scenarios or the fact that more

individual differences needed to be captured. Second, employee assessments of prosocial rule breaking and the Big Five personality dimensions will be measured and analyzed. Finally, these relationships will be tested empirically using the following statistical procedures: descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analysis, correlations, reliability analysis, t-tests, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), Kruskal-Wallis tests, and multiple regression.

Purpose of Study

Based upon the need to determine if a propensity exists for certain “personality types” to engage in prosocial rule breaking, the primary purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship of prosocial rule breaking behavior with the Big Five personality dimensions within the hospitality industry. Morrison (2006) controlled for gender and work experience and found that gender was not evenly distributed across the individual difference variables and women were less likely to participate in prosocial rule breaking. Therefore, the secondary purpose is to examine any significant differences of prosocial rule breaking behavior by demographic variables such as gender, job type, job tenure, and education level. Thus it is anticipated that the antecedents of prosocial rule breaking will confirm the earlier work of Morrison (2006); and the personality dimensions that impact prosocial rule breaking will emerge. This in turn will contribute to both the body of management literature and to the hospitality literature adding managerial implications for hiring, selection, and training purposes. This is the first time prosocial rule breaking has been tested in industry and these results are expected to strengthen the theory of prosocial rule breaking.

Research Questions

The following research questions will be addressed in this study:

1. What are the basic underlying dimensions of prosocial rule breaking behavior in the hospitality industry?
2. What are the common personality profiles of prosocial rule breaking behavior using the Big Five Inventory?
3. What personality types show a propensity to predict prosocial rule breaking behavior?
4. What is the relationship between prosocial rule breaking behavior and the Big Five personality dimensions?
5. Are there significant differences in the mean scores for prosocial rule breaking when respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:
 - a. gender
 - b. race
 - c. education level
 - d. years in the current job
 - e. years in the industry
 - f. job position
6. Are there significant differences in the mean scores for the Big Five personality dimensions when respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:
 - a. gender
 - b. race
 - c. education level

- d. years in the current job
- e. years in the industry
- f. job position

Definition of Terms

Frontline employee: an employee in a hospitality organization whose job requires customer contact and interaction on a regular basis. This excludes hospitality workers that have an occasional customer interaction.

Norms: are behaviors that are acceptable or unacceptable according to a group, but are informal because there are not any formal repercussions (Hackman, 1976).

Prosocial behavior: According to Brief & Motowidlo (1986):

behavior which is performed by a member of the organization, directed toward an individual, group, or organization with whom he or she interacts while carrying out his or her organizational role, and performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group or organization toward which it is directed. (p.711).

Prosocial rule breaking: “Any instance where an employee intentionally violates a formal organizational policy, regulation, or prohibition with the primary intention of promoting the welfare of the organization or one of its stakeholders,” (Morrison, 2006, p.6).

Positive deviance: “behaviors with honorable intentions independent of outcomes,” (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004, p. 833).

Rule: a policy, regulation, or prohibition formally presented by an organization from the top down with regard to how the members of an organization are required to perform their jobs, and upon violation can result in disciplinary actions such as write-ups, suspension, and termination (Morrison, 2006; Ouchi, 1980).

Limitations

This study is not without limitations. One major limitation to this study is that the use of an industry category (i.e., restaurants), market segment within the category (i.e., casual dining), and population sample, limits the generalizability of these findings.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review is comprised of three main sections that contribute to the development of this study. The first segment of literature discusses behavioral ethics and the ethical decision making process. The second section investigates prosocial organizational behavior and the more specific area of prosocial rule breaking behavior. The foundation of the theory of prosocial behavior is discussed along with its pertinence in the workplace, and the development of the questionnaire used in this study that measures prosocial rule breaking behavior. The third area concentrates on personality and the development of the five factor taxonomy in personality commonly known as the Big Five, and the instrument used in this study that measures the Big Five personality traits.

Behavioral Ethics

According to Treviño, Weaver, and Reynolds, (2006), “behavioral ethics refers to individual behavior that is subject to or judged according to generally accepted moral norms of behavior,” (p.952). Behavioral ethics research is largely focused on describing individual behaviors in larger social bases (Treviño et al., 2006). This body of research has three main areas of study: unethical behaviors, ethical behaviors that reach a minimal moral standard, and ethical behavior defined as behaviors that exceed a minimal moral standard. The difference in these three areas is that unethical behaviors deal primarily with lying, cheating or stealing

(Treviño et al., 2006). Ethical behaviors that meet a minimum moral standard are not considered unethical, examining honesty and compliance with laws. Lastly, ethical behavior that exceeds a minimum moral standard studies charitable giving and whistle-blowing (Treviño et al., 2006). Within these areas, individual differences and the organizational context of ethical behavior are examined for this study.

Individual Differences

The first of the individual difference variables to be examined is that of cognitive moral development. Reynolds (2006) claimed that an individual's cognitive predispositions had an impact on their attention to information. Kohlberg (1969) proposed three broad levels of moral development with each containing two stages. An individual can only progress through these stages based on their cognitive ability at each level. Level 1, Preconventional Morality, consists of two stages: 1.) obedience to authority and fear of punishment, and 2.) exchange in relationships (Kohlberg, 1969). These stages are called preconventional because this stage usually concerns children who view moral judgment as more of an external function; depending on what adults say they must do (Treviño et al., 2006). For example, in stage 1 punishment is the equivalent of wrongness, but in stage 2, there is an exchange of relationships (one hand washes another) (Treviño et al., 2006). Level 2, Conventional Morality, begins in the teen years and moral decisions are made based expectations of significant others in stage 3, or by rules or laws in stage 4 (Treviño, 1986). Level 3, Principled Morality, individuals determine what is right by universally held principles of justice and rights (Treviño, 1986). According to Kohlberg (1969)

less than 20% of American adults reach Principled Morality, most people are at the conventional level with heavy influence by significant others, rules, and laws (Treviño et al., 2006).

Locus of control is another individual difference variable that is associated with ethical behavior (Forte, 2005). Locus of control refers to the reasons or causes in which individuals ascribe to their personal failures and successes (Forte, 2005). Those individuals with a high internal locus of control believe that they are responsible for their own actions and behaviors (Treviño et al., 2006) whereas those with high external locus of control believed that events were beyond one's control (Forte, 2005).

Ego strength is also theoretically associated as an individual difference in moral behavior (Treviño et al., 2006; Treviño, 1986). Ego strength is one's strength of conviction (Treviño, 1986). Individuals with high ego strength are more likely to be able to resist impulses and adhere to their beliefs rather than those with low ego strength (Treviño, 1986). Those individuals that possess high ego strength are more likely to do what they believe is right (Treviño et al., 2006; Treviño, 1986).

Organizational Contexts

There are several different organizational contexts that influence ethical behavior (Treviño et al., 2006). This section will examine: on the job pressure, failure to meet goals, role conflict, ethical climate, culture, and co-worker behavior.

There may be explicit pressure on the job to act unethically (Robertson & Rymon, 2001). However, an individual may condone this behavior by separating the work self from the personal self, an ethical segregationist (Bommer, Gratto, Gravander, & Tuttle, 1987). When organizational goals are unmet, people are more likely to behave unethically whether there is a

financial incentive or not (Schweitzer, Ordóñez, & Douma, 2004). Role conflict is also a factor in unethical behavior in organizations (Treviño et al., 2006). Role conflict occurs when there is a difference in expectations between the employee and constituent (Chonko & Burnett, 1983). In a study by Chonko and Burnett (1983) it was found that one contributing factor for role conflict in salespeople are individual beliefs about sales situations. In an attempt to deal with role conflict, Grover (1997) reported that nurses would engage in unethical behavior such as lying.

Victor and Cullen (1988) describe an ethical work climate as one that consists of norms and practices with a measurable degree of consensus. The foundations for an ethical decision are based on the ethical principles egoism, benevolence, and principle on one of three categories for analysis, the individual, the local, and the cosmopolitan (Victor & Cullen, 1988). The individual level of analysis considers decisions from an internal locus of control, while the local is influenced by the work environment, and the cosmopolitan, by society at large (Victor & Cullen, 1988).

Ethical culture has been defined by Treviño (1990) as a portion of the overall culture of an organization that influences employees to behave ethically through the use formal and informal systems. In a study by Treviño, Butterfield, and McCabe (1998) it was found that in organizations that utilized an ethics code had the largest negative influence on unethical conduct. In organizations that did not use ethical code settings, a climate focused on self-interest influenced unethical behavior the most (Treviño et al., 1990).

Co-worker attitude and behavior also affects an individual's ethical behavior (Zey-Ferrell & Ferrell, 1982). The frequency and intensity of the interactions strengthen the influence (Ford & Richardson, 1994; Zey-Ferrell & Ferrell, 1982). Later studies went further to reveal that peer

influence positively influenced behavioral intentions (Beams, Brown, & Killough, 2003; Jones & Kavanaugh, 1996).

Ethical Decision Making

In order to gain a better understanding of the decision making process when considering prosocial rule breaking, it is important to consult the literature on ethical decision making. The act of breaking a rule requires a conscious decision that considers the personal morals and ethics of the individual faced with the dilemma (Victor & Cullen, 1988). According to Jones (1991) an ethical decision is “a decision that is both legally and morally acceptable to the larger community,” (p.367). This section discusses the philosophical categories of ethics and the literature concerning ethical decision making in organizations.

Philosophical Categories of Ethics

There are two distinct categories of ethical philosophy: teleological and deontological (Ferrell & Gresham, 1985). Teleological philosophies are concerned with the morality of the behavior based on the consequences of the behavior (Ferrell & Gresham, 1985). Deontological philosophies are focused upon the intentions and methods employed in a specific behavior (Ferrell & Gresham, 1985).

Utilitarianism is a type of teleological philosophy that does not consider the intention or motivations, but the morality in the consequences of the behavior (Ferrell & Gresham, 1985). In this philosophy, the act is considered ethical if the “utilities produced by the act is greater than the sum total of utilities produced by any other act,” (Ferrell & Gresham, 1985, p.89). In the

utilitarianism philosophy, it is unethical to select an act that does not utilize resources efficiently. Under this philosophy it is also considered unethical to partake in an act which leads to personal gain at society's expense (Ferrell, Gresham, & Fraedrich, 1989). The concept of value is a highly regarded utilitarian principle (Ferrell & Gresham, 1985). If the act is emphasized, in utilitarian philosophy it is known as act utilitarianism (Ferrell, Gresham, & Fraedrich, 1989; Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989; Ferrell & Gresham, 1985). The specific act is concerned about how the most good will be served to more people (Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989).

However, when the merit of rules is considered, this philosophy is known as rule deontology. The conformity to rules determines ethicalness in rule deontology (Fraedrich & Ferrell, 1992). Compliance with the rules is considered ethical behavior to rule deontologists and all decisions should be based on the rules (Fraedrich & Ferrell, 1992).

Kant's categorical imperative is an individual based deontological theory in which the actions are not judged by outcomes but one's "good will" (Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989). Within the concept of good will is the concept of duty (Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989). In this philosophy, to have moral worth, our actions must be derived from duty. It is through reason alone that we arrive at moral law (Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989). According to Kant's categorical imperative, we should act in a morally acceptable way and wish the maxim or principle of our action to become a universal law (Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989).

Rule utilitarianism is a theory that combined the premises of utilitarianism and Kant's categorical imperative (Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989). There are certain duties that an individual must perform. Therefore, any decision must be carefully considered with the duties concerned, and from the alternatives decide which is the most obligatory duty (Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989).

The best outcome is based on the most obligatory duty (Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989). According to Ross (1930) the most obligatory, prima facie duties are: fidelity, gratitude, justice, beneficence, self-improvement, and noninjury.

The theory of justice suggests that decisions should be guided by equity, fairness, and impartiality (Cavanagh, Moberg, & Velasquez, 1981). The two guiding principles in this theory are equal liberty and the difference principle (Cavanagh et al., 1981). The concept of equal liberty states that individuals should have equal application of the freedom as concurrent in the rights of the collective (Upchurch, 1993). The difference principle states that in the condition where application of the principles are not equitable, then the stipulations of the violation must be stated (Upchurch, 1993).

Egoism asserts that an act is ethical when it supports the individual's best long-term interests (Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989). The best ethical act is considered the best long term interest in lieu of other ethical acts which may generate more evil than good for the individual (Hunt & Vitell, 1986). There are two weaknesses of ethical egoism: 1.) ethical egoism does not take a stance against business practices (e.g. discrimination, pollution, unsafe products) and 2.) ethical egoism cannot settle disputes of ethical egoism among two individuals (Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989).

Ethical Decision Making Research

Ferrell and Gresham (1985) presented a contingency framework for ethical decision making. The framework suggests that an individual's decision making process will be

influenced by an individual's awareness of their own personal moral philosophy, significant others, differential association (which is learning from groups or roles), and opportunity.

Treviño (1986) proposed a situational-interactional model for ethical decision making. The model was comprised of the individual and situational variables. This model was based on Kohlberg's model of cognitive moral development (Treviño, 1986; Upchurch, 1993). The way in which a person reacts to an ethical situation is based on their personal cognitive moral development (Treviño, 1986). Personal cognitive moral development is how an individual perceives right and wrong, however, this is not enough to explain ethical behavior (Treviño, 1986). It is necessary to have individual and situational variables. The individual variables consist of: ego strength, field dependence, and locus of control (Treviño, 1986; Upchurch, 1993). These variables influence the individual's actions on right or wrong. The situational variables consist of: the immediate job context, organizational culture, and characteristics of the work (Treviño, 1986). These variables influence the cognitive/behavioral relationship (Treviño, 1986).

Bommer, Gratto, Gravander and Tuttle (1987) proposed a model for ethical decision making behavior for managers. The center of the model was the decision process in which information is acquired and processed, the individual's cognitive style, and the contemplation of perceived rewards and losses. The factors that can influence this process are: the social environment, the government and legal environment, professional environment, work environment, personal environment, and individual attributes (Bommer et al., 1987). The model also differentiates the perceived and actual degrees of influence.

Treviño and Youngblood (1990) designed a study to investigate moral reasoning and moral behavior in ethical decision making. This model was based on Treviño's (1986) earlier work which utilized a model of individual and organizational variables that influence ethical decision making. The authors assert that ethical decision-making behavior is comprised of two major components: a behavioral choice and a normative-affective component. They have attempted to capture both in this model.

The vicarious reward and vicarious punishment variables were predicted to influence ethical decision making behavior directly and indirectly (Treviño & Youngblood, 1990). They also predict that those persons with internal locus of control would have higher outcome expectancies and would behave more ethically than those with external locus of control. Finally, those individuals with higher stage of cognitive moral development were expected to behave more ethically (Treviño & Youngblood, 1990).

An investigation was performed by Vitell, Nwachukwu, and Barnes (1993) on the influence of culture on an individual's perceptions and ethical decision making in business. Culture was examined with the prior work of Hofstede (as cited by Vitell et al., 1993) which states that societies differ along four major cultural dimensions: power distance, individualism, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance. The authors modified an earlier business ethics model of Hunt & Vitell (1992). The factors of cultural environment, industry environment, organizational environment, personal characteristics and professional environment may influence ethical decision making process (Vitell et al., 1993). Propositions were presented that involve only the influence of culture.

Jones (1991) offered a model of issue contingency that contained a set of variables called moral intensity. Moral intensity is defined as a “construct that captures the extent of issue-related moral imperative in a situation,” (p. 372). It is comprised of six components: magnitude of consequences, social consensus, probability of effect, temporal immediacy, proximity, and concentration of effect. The model utilizes Rest’s (1986) four component model (recognizing moral issues, making moral judgments, establishing moral intents, and engaging in moral behavior). Organizational factors also have an impact on establishing moral intents and engaging in moral behavior (Jones, 1991).

Harrington (1997) attempted to understand two components of major ethical decision making models: moral judgment and moral intent. The model examines the strength of social consensus regarding an issue and its effects on moral judgment and intent. The model also examines levels of social consensus and the interaction of these levels with individual characteristics that influence moral judgment and intent (Harrington, 1997).

Upchurch (1998) offered a model of ethical decision making for the lodging industry. Upchurch (1998) asserts that ethical decision making is impacted by stakeholder’s ethical perceptions and the societal and workplace norms of managers and co-workers. This model also considered the loci of analysis, (local, individual, or cosmopolitan) in the application of ethical decision making (Upchurch, 1998).

Gaudine and Thorne (2001) investigated the role of emotions in ethical decision making. Their model concentrates on two dimensions of emotion: arousal and feeling state. The dimensions of emotion are utilized into an applied cognitive-developmental perspective on the process of ethical decision making. In this model, certain emotional states influence the

individual's likelihood in identifying ethical dilemmas, facilitating judgments at increased levels of moral development, and making ethical decision choices that coincide with the individual's prescriptive judgments (Gaudine & Thorne, 2001).

Paolillo & Vitell (2002) conducted an empirical investigation of ethical decision making in organizations. They continued the work of Jones (1991) on moral intensity, and found that moral intensity had a significant impact on the ethical decision making intentions of managers (Paolillo & Vitell, 2002). The researchers utilized two scenarios to measure ethical decision making intentions. It was found that moral intensity explained 37% and 53% of the variance in ethical decision making (Paolillo & Vitell, 2002).

This section discussed behavioral ethics and the philosophical categories and underpinnings of the ethical decision making process that occurs in workplace organizations. The two varying philosophies of teleology and deontology represent distinct choices in the ethical decision making process. Teleological philosophies focus on the outcomes of the ethical decision, and deontological philosophies focus on the intentions of the ethical decision making process.

Prosocial Organizational Behavior

In work organizations, behaviors such as helping, cooperating, sharing, and volunteering are known as prosocial behaviors; they are performed to create or preserve the well-being of others (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). These behaviors are also known as “extra-role behaviors” and are commonly thought of as socially desirable behaviors in which people are behaving in a “correct” manner (Baruch, O’Creevy, Hind, & Vigoda-Badot, 2004). An extra-

role prosocial behavior is generally an extension from a prescribed role, with minimal or at no cost to the organization (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004). For the purpose of this study, prosocial behavior will be defined as:

behavior which is performed by a member of the organization, directed toward an individual, group, or organization with whom he or she interacts while carrying out his or her organizational role, and performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group or organization toward which it is directed. (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986, p.711)

Despite the definition, prosocial behaviors can be characterized as functional or dysfunctional (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Prosocial behaviors are functional when they contribute to the accomplishment of the organization. They are classified as dysfunctional when they detract from the organization's ability to attain goals (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). An example of a prosocial behavior that is dysfunctional would be one that helps co-workers achieve personal goals or falsifying documents to protect other co-workers from censure (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). An example of a functional prosocial behavior would be assisting a co-worker with a job related matter (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Prosocial behaviors are also directed towards the organization or an individual (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). The individual can be an employee, co-worker, or customer. It is also important to note that prosocial behaviors are not role prescribed behaviors. Behavior that is role prescribed would be considered a formal part of an individual's job (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Prosocial behaviors are extra role behaviors that are performed voluntarily with much similarity to organizational citizenship behavior (Bolino & Turnley, 2000; Organ, 1988).

Table 1:13 Prosocial Behaviors adapted from Brief & Motowidlo (1986)

Prosocial Behavior	Direction	Capacity
1. Assisting co-workers with job related matters	Individuals	Functional
2. Assisting co-workers with personal matters	Individuals	Functional/Dysfunctional
3. Showing leniency in personnel decisions	Individuals/Organization	Dysfunctional
4. Providing services or products to consumers in organizationally consistent ways	Organization	Functional
5. Providing services or products to consumers in organizationally inconsistent ways	Individuals	Dysfunctional
6. Helping consumers with personal matters unrelated to organizational services or products	Individuals/Organization	Functional/Dysfunctional
7. Complying with organizational values, policies, and regulations	Organization	Functional
8. Suggesting procedural, administrative, or organizational improvements	Organization	Functional
9. Objecting to improper directives, procedures, or policies	Organization	Functional
10. Putting forth extra effort on the job	Organization	Functional
11. Volunteering for additional assignments	Organization	Functional
12. Staying with the organization despite temporary hardships	Organization	Functional
13. Representing the organization favorably to outsiders	Organization	Functional

To promote a better understanding of prosocial behavior Brief & Motowidlo (1986) compiled a list describing thirteen prosocial organizational behaviors (see Table 1). These behaviors are classified further as being organizationally functional or dysfunctional, role

prescribed or extra role, and the intent to which the behavior is directed, either to the organization or an individual. Although the direction may be toward either the organization or the individual, it may benefit both parties simultaneously (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). These prosocial behaviors have been described as:

1. *Assisting Co-workers with Job Related Matters:*

- Although it is helping an individual, this behavior can be described as organizationally functional.
- The types of tasks that may occur are “helping a co-worker that may have been absent,” “orienting an employee although it is not required,” “helping a co-worker with a heavier workload,” and “assisting a supervisor.”
- Although, this is seen as an extra role behavior, some organizations may have a specific person in a role that is formally required to orient new employees or provide support.
- These tasks align with Smith, Organ, and Near’s (1983) organizational citizenship behavior, altruism (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

2. *Assisting Co-workers with Personal Matters:*

- This is an extra role behavior that can be either organizationally functional or dysfunctional depending if the actions taken continuously align with the organization’s goals.
- An employee may attempt to assist with personal or family problems, or overlook disciplinary action if a rule has been broken (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

3. *Showing Leniency in Personnel Decisions:*

- This is another example of a behavior which can act as organizationally functional or dysfunctional because incompetent candidates may be promoted due to favoritism or a fair and accurate assessment has been made for the right person for the job (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

4. *Providing Services or Products to Consumers in Organizationally Consistent Ways:*

- This behavior can be classified as either role prescribed or extra role, organizationally functional or dysfunctional.
- Many different types of organizations provide goods and services to consumers in face-to-face transactions and have a chance to act more or less prosocial.
- When a member of the organization believes that the product or service can truly benefit the consumer, and is concerned for the customer's best interest, this is considered prosocial (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

5. *Providing Services or Products to Consumers in Organizationally Inconsistent Ways:*

- In this situation, the consumer may benefit, usually due to the rule breaking of the organizational member, which is the prosocial aspect for the individual. However, it is dysfunctional to the organization because of the inconsistency (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

From this point onward, all of the prosocial behaviors remaining are directed toward to the organization.

6. *Helping Consumers with Personal Matters Unrelated to Organizational Services or Products:*

- This extra role behavior can be classified as organizationally functional or dysfunctional.
- Workers who have consumer contact are more apt to be able to provide consumers directions, or listening to problems that have nothing to do with the organization, which is prosocial, especially if the consumer returns to transact business with the organization (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).
- However, if these acts interfere with a worker's prescribed job duties, they can prove to be dysfunctional (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

7. *Complying with Organizational Values, Policies, and Regulations:*

- This role prescribed behavior is considered to be an organizationally functional behavior with the exception being that a policy may be inappropriate for the organization (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).
- This behavior has roots in organizational commitment (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979) and organizational citizenship behavior (Smith, et al, 1983). In short, employees are expected to uphold an organization's rules, regulations, and procedures, even when no one observes or monitors compliance (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).
- The reason that this behavior is regarded as a form of prosocial or citizenship behavior is because although there is an expectation to adhere to an organization's rules and policies at all times, many employees choose not to when they are not monitored (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000).

8. *Suggesting Procedural, Administrative, or Organizational Improvements:*

- These extra role acts are considered to be organizationally functional because the intent of the suggestion is for the improvement of the organization (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

9. *Objecting to Improper Directives, Procedures, and Policies:*

- Most often this is considered a prosocial act when the intent is to help the organization, not damage the organization (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Whistle-blowing is included in this category.
- Whistle-blowing has been defined by Near & Miceli (1985) as, “the disclosure of illegal, immoral, or illegitimate practices under the control of their employers, to persons or organizations that may be able to effect action,” (p.4).
- However, whistle-blowing can be considered either a positive or negative behavior based on the motives or intentions of the whistle-blower (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).
- For instance, if the whistle-blower is revealing information to a third party regarding their organization’s illegal activities, this act would be considered positive deviance; however, if the whistle-blower’s intent is for personal financial gain or revenge, this would be considered negative deviance because of the self-serving nature of the motive (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004).

10. *Putting Forth Extra Effort on the Job:*

- This extra role behavior also has roots in organizational commitment (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979) and in citizenship behavior (Smith, et al., 1983) in the sense the employee does not engage in taking extra breaks and exerts extra effort.
- However, because the organization benefits from the extra efforts of the employee, the employee may suffer personally (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

11. *Volunteering for Additional Assignments:*

- This extra role behavior is considered to be organizationally functional.
- Employees that volunteer for acts that may or may not be job related are doing so with the intent of helping the organization (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

12. *Staying with the Organization Despite Temporary Hardship:*

- This can also be described as a citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 2000) or another aspect of organizational commitment (Mowday et al., 1979).
- This is organizationally functional because the members of an organization are remaining loyal during tough times even though conditions are unfavorable or inconvenient (Podsakoff et al., 2000; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

13. *Representing the Organization Favorably to Outsiders:*

- This is considered to be organizationally functional.
- This extra role prosocial behavior is another extension of loyalty by speaking favorably of the organization and defending it to outsiders (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

- These acts can potentially improve the reputation of the company in the financial and investment community and potential labor market which in turn can lead to an enhanced pool of potential labor and increased chances for funding (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

Prosocial Rule Breaking

Morrison (2006) introduced the construct of prosocial rule breaking into management literature stating that it is derived from prosocial behavior in the sense that the behavior is enacted for the benefit of the organization, other persons, and specifically not the employee. Prosocial rule breaking has been defined by Morrison (2006) as “Any instance where an employee intentionally violates a formal organizational policy, regulation, or prohibition with the primary intention of promoting the welfare of the organization or one of its stakeholders” (p.6). Morrison (2006) makes the distinction with the term prosocial rule breaking as a “nonselfish” act and that employees willingly engage in breaking organizational rules in order to serve the best interests of the organization or stakeholder. For the purpose of this study, a rule shall be defined as a policy, regulation, or prohibition formally presented by an organization from the top down with regard to how the members of an organization are required to perform their jobs, and upon violation can result in disciplinary actions such as write-ups, suspension, and termination (Morrison, 2006; Ouchi, 1980).

Morrison’s (2006) study yielded three categories in which employees engage in prosocial rule breaking 1) efficiency, in which the act enables the actor to perform their job more efficiently; 2) helping out a subordinate/colleague; and (3) customer service, helping out a client

or customer. Morrison (2006) supported the three categories of prosocial rule breaking in three empirical studies. To determine the likelihood of an individual to participate in prosocial rule breaking, Morrison (2006) referred to the positive deviance model of Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2003). Morrison (2006) states that in order to understand prosocial rule breaking further, one must become familiar with the concept of positive deviance. Positive deviant behavior can be described as “behaviors with honorable intentions independent of outcomes,” (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004, p. 833). This type of behavior may include criticism of ineffective management, disregard of counterproductive instructions, and innovation (Applebaum, Iaconi, & Matousek, 2007). Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2004) assert that organizational citizenship behavior, whistle-blowing, and corporate social responsibility are all considered to be positive deviant behaviors. According to Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2003), five psychological states must be present for positive deviance: meaning, self-determination, focus on others, personal efficacy, and courage. Based on this premise, Morrison (2006) tested and found support that prosocial rule breaking is more likely to occur when the job provides autonomy; when risk taking (courage) dispositions are strong; and the influence of co-worker’s behaviors. Table 2 demonstrates Morrison’s (2006) application of the positive deviance model to prosocial rule breaking.

Table 2: Morrison model (2006) of Prosocial Rule Breaking and Positive Deviance Spreitzer & Sonenshein (2003)

Spreitzer & Sonenshein (2003)	Meaning	Self-determination	Focus on Others	Personal Efficacy	Courage
Morrison (2006)	Job Meaning and Autonomy	Co-worker Behavior	Empathy	Proactive Personality	Risk Taking

Antecedents to Prosocial Rule Breaking

Hackman and Oldham (1976) defined job meaning through their Job Characteristics Model as the experienced meaningfulness of the work. This is explained as the degree to which the individual feels that the job is meaningful, valuable, and worthwhile. Morrison (2006) tested for job meaning on the basis that individuals who possess a strong job meaning will be more diligent in performing their job and will be more willing to violate rules in order to perform their jobs, because those with a strong sense of job meaning will feel more inclined to make a difference at work (Morrison, 2006; Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2003). However, Morrison (2006) found that job meaning was unrelated to the likelihood of prosocial rule breaking.

Hackman and Oldham (1976) defined autonomy through their Job Characteristics Model as the experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work. This is explained as the degree to which the individual feels that the job provides freedom and independence, and the responsibility in choosing the procedures necessary to accomplish the job. Autonomy can give the individual a

perceived amount of control in the job (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Morrison (2006) asserted that employees will be more apt to participate in prosocial rule breaking because of the perceived control and discretion the individual feels from their job. Furthermore, Morrison (2006) found support for this position when employees had also heard that other co-workers had broken the rule.

Morrison (2006) compiled a definition of empathy based on the prior works of Batson, (1991) and McNeely and Meglino, (1994), “as the sensitivity to the emotional experiences of others and ability to take the perspective of others” (p. 16). Morrison (2006) proposed that those possessing a high degree of empathy will be more likely to participate in prosocial rule breaking, because those individuals will be motivated to help meet another person’s needs. However, in Morrison’s (2006) study, empathy was not significant and a possible reason could be that the individuals were responding to scenarios and not an actual situation, although they stated that they felt the scenario was realistic. There is support for this notion in the emotional contagion literature. The underlying principle in emotional contagion is that people “catch” emotions from others’ movements as well as their verbal and non-verbal cues (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1993; Doherty, Orimoto, Singelis, Hatfield, & Hebb, 1995). A scenario may not be able to convey the emotional contagion needed to create feelings of empathy.

Morrison (2006) felt it was necessary to also measure the aspect of proactive personality. The concept of proactive personality was introduced by Bateman and Crant (1993) which was defined as “one who is relatively unconstrained by situational forces and who effects environmental change” (p.105). People who possess this type of behavior generally look for

ways to take action to initiate change or solve problems (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Therefore, those individuals with these tendencies are presented with a rule that is conflicting to their purpose; they will be more likely to violate the rule (Morrison, 2006). This logic aligns itself with Spreitzer and Sonenshein's (2003) concept of personal efficacy in the sense that the motivation to enact change will enable the individual to take on challenges and enact positive deviance (Morrison, 2006).

Morrison (2006) felt that the construct of risk-taking propensity was also expected to be a factor in the likelihood of participating in prosocial rule breaking. Perspectives from past research from Brockhaus, (1980); Sitkin and Pablo, (1992) state that those individuals who possess high risk-taking propensity tend to enjoy taking risks but have a tendency to overestimate the likelihood of success associated with risky courses of action and underestimate the likelihood of failure. Kogan and Wallach (1964) assert that those individuals with low risk-taking propensity tend to overestimate the likelihood of a negative result and avoid risk taking activities. Depending upon an individual's predisposition to risk taking or risk avoidance, Morrison (2006) believes that those with a high propensity for risk taking are more likely to engage in prosocial rule breaking than those who avoid risk. Empirical support was found for individuals who were more apt to take risks would be more likely to participate in prosocial rule breaking (Morrison, 2006).

Morrison (2006) cites prior research by Dutton, Ashford, O'Neill, Hayes, and Wierba (1997) reporting that other employees search for indications on how potentially risky behavior will be accepted at their organization as a factor in their decision making. Hence, Morrison (2006) proposed that employees will be more likely to participate in prosocial rule breaking if

they heard other employees had broken the same rule. This notion was also supported empirically in Morrison's (2006) study.

Workplace Deviance

Prosocial rule breaking behavior, despite its honorable intentions, is a form of workplace deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). This is why it is important to understand traditional workplace deviance versus prosocial rule breaking. Deviance in the workplace has been classified throughout the literature as behavior that goes beyond the norms of the organization (Applebaum et al., 2007). When behaviors, despite the intention, exceed organizational norms, the consequences for the organization may be financial, interfere with decision making, and affect productivity (Applebaum et al., 2007). Robinson and Bennett (1995) define deviant behavior further as "voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in doing so threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both" (p.556). In general, negative deviant behavior in the workplace can include such infractions as: sexual harassment, tardiness, rumor spreading, tardiness, disrespect to co-workers, and theft (Applebaum et al., 2007).

Robinson and Bennett (1995) developed two dimensions of deviance: 1. the first dimension describes the type of infraction: minor vs. serious, and 2. the second dimension describes the intended direction of the action: interpersonal vs. organizational. Four categories of deviance were derived from the study; the first two constructs were based on prior research conducted by Hollinger and Clark (1982): 1. production deviance: which is a violation of the quantity or quality of the work performed; 2. property deviance: which is the acquisition or

damaging of property belonging to the organization; 3. political deviance: which is the engagement of a social interaction that puts others at a political/personal disadvantage; and 4. personal aggression: behaving in a hostile manner toward other individuals.

There are a variety of reasons that employees may choose to engage in deviant behavior such as feelings from perceived injustice, dissatisfaction, role modeling, and thrill seeking (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Also, management may treat the employees poorly (Greenberg, 1997). It is the managers' responsibility to keep an ethical climate where their actions and behaviors discourage deviant behaviors (Litzky, Eddleston, & Kidder, 2006). The six factors that influence the propensity to engage in deviant behavior are: 1. the compensation/reward structure, 2. social pressures to conform, 3. negative and untrusting attitudes, 4. ambiguity about job performance, 5. unfair treatment, and 6. violating employee trust (Litzky et al., 2006).

Employees who depend on commission or gratuities are more likely to participate in deviant behaviors because of the compensation/reward structure (Litzky et al., 2006). This is particularly the case when employees depend on some sort of compensation from the customer. The employee depends on the customer financially and may empathize with their position and will further justify any deviant acts under the guise of customer service (Litzky et al., 2006).

In the workplace, social pressures to conform may influence the person's needs for affiliation and acceptance. For instance, one particular group at work may have norms that may be deviant; such as hospitality service workers who may be in the practice of underreporting pooled tips (Litzky et al., 2006). Negative and untrusting attitudes by management can cause deviant behavior. Some employers feel as if they must control employees in order to get them to behave properly (Litzky et al., 2006). The result is similar to a self-fulfilling prophecy because

the negative behavior is expected. In some job types there can be ambiguity of job performance. Job roles such as salespeople, customer service representatives, accountants, management consultants, financial services, and insurance professionals cross over many boundaries which can lead to added stress and low job performance. These expanded boundaries can cause confusion and lead to all types of deviance (Litzky et al., 2006). Unfair treatment is also highly likely to incite incidents of deviance (Colbert et al., 2004). Employees may feel as if they can ignore rules if it interferes with them performing job tasks and are treated unfairly. Litzky et al., (2006) note that one hotel housekeeper lamented that stealing at a hotel is justified because managers are always asking for too much and customers always want something for nothing. The last factor that may cause employee workplace deviance is employee trust. Trust can be violated by a specific event or unjust treatment, such as reprimanding an employee publicly (Litzky et al., 2006). However, the deeper the relationship the employee has with the manager, the more damage the relationship will incur (Litzky et al., 2006).

The damage that deviant behavior can do to an organization is a result of various costs. The types of costs include lack of product consistency, higher production costs, loss of inventory control, inconsistent service quality, loss of profits, inconsistent pricing, poor service reputation, and lack of repeat business (Litzky et al., 2006).

Big Five Personality Dimensions

The Big Five personality dimensions do not represent a specific theoretical perspective, but personality described in a common framework composed of five factors (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). The five factors are known as: I: Extraversion, II: Agreeableness,

III: Conscientiousness, IV: Neuroticism, and V: Openness. This section describes the history of the Big Five dimensions, the development of the Big Five personality inventory (BFI), and finally, the use of the Big Five Inventory in this study.

History of the Big Five Factors

Following the pioneering works of Klages (1932) and Baumgarten (1933), Allport and Odbert (1936) created a seminal study in the lexical approach to personality terminology (John et al., 2008). This work produced over 18,000 terms to describe personality. Allport and Odbert (1936) developed four major categories for these personality descriptors: 1) personality traits, 2) temporary states, moods, and activities, 3) character evaluations, and 4) other person descriptors that are unable to be classified in the aforementioned categories (Chaplin, John, & Goldberg, 1988). Norman (1967) proposed placing these classifications of an individual's description into seven content categories: enduring traits (e.g. irascible), internal states that are experienced (e.g. furious), physical states endured (e.g. trembling), activities in which they engage (e.g. screaming), effects had on others (e.g. frightening), roles performed (e.g. murderer), and social evaluations of their conduct (e.g. bad, unacceptable) (John et al., 2008). Norman (1967) like Allport and Odbert (1936) classified these terms into mutually exclusive categories (John et al., 2008). Nevertheless, these boundaries can be unclear as there is overlap with some terminology (John et al., 2008). However, Chaplin et al., (1988) suggested a prototype conception where each category is defined by its absolute cases rather than its boundaries. These prototypes were addressed as states, traits, and activities. Prototypical traits were seen as attributes that are stable and long lasting, are caused internally and require multiple observations across many situations

before they can be attributed to an individual (Chaplin et al., 1988; John et al., 2008).

Prototypical states are temporary and caused externally (John et al., 2008).

Catell (1943) also utilized the Allport and Odbert (1936) study as a basis for the trait taxonomy. He reduced the trait variables to 4,500 terms and after performing various empirical clustering procedures and a review of the literature, he reduced the terms to 35 variables (John et al., 2008). Catell claimed that there were a dozen orthogonal factors; however, only five proved to be replicable (Goldberg, 1990). Catell's work initiated other researchers to look deeper into trait ratings, which then led to the discovery of the Big Five dimensions. Fiske (1949) formed simplified descriptions from 22 of Cattell's variables. This paved the way for the Big Five, "the factor structures derived from self-ratings, ratings by peers, and ratings by psychological staff members were highly similar and resembled what would be later known as the Big Five," (John et al., 2008, p.119).

Tupes and Christal (1961) also announced a strong presence of a five factor structure; however, it went largely unnoticed because it was published in an Air Force publication that was relatively unknown to the public (Digman, 1990). Norman (1963) replicated the Tupes and Christal study and presented the taxonomy in five dimensions as: Extraversion or Surgency, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Culture. These five factors of personality are generally referred to as the Big Five (Goldberg, 1981). Benet-Martínez and John (1998) assert that this does not state that personality is to be limited to five traits, but that five factors correspond to personality at an expanded level whereas much of the variance in the personality traits can be captured.

According to Barrick and Mount (1991) there is general agreement about the number of personality factors however, there is discord about their meanings. Factor one was named by Eysenck as Extraversion/Introversion. It is frequently referred to as Extraversion or Surgency. For the purpose of this study, factor one will be called Extraversion. Extraversion concentrates on an energetic approach to the social world and includes such traits as: assertive, talkative, and other types of positive emotions (Barrick & Mount, 1991; John et al., 2008). Factor two, Agreeableness, focuses on one's prosocial nature and includes the traits trust and modesty. Factor three, Conscientiousness, is best described by John et al., (2008) as, "socially prescribed impulse control that facilitates task and goal directed behavior,"(p. 120). Neuroticism, the fourth factor, is sometimes called Emotional Stability. It is also the second of Eysenck's original Big Two factors (Barrick & Mount, 1991) and most commonly agreed with by researchers along with Extraversion (Barrick & Mount, 1991; John et al., 2008). This factor contrasts emotional stability with negative emotionality amid feelings of anxiety or nervousness (John et al., 2008). Finally, the fifth factor, Openness, has also been called Openness to Experience (McCrae & Costa, 1985) and Culture (Norman, 1963). This factor has been the most difficult to identify (Barrick & Mount, 1991) and concerns the complexity of one's mental and experiential life (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998; John et al., 2008). The traits that are commonly associated with this factor are imaginative, intelligent, and artistically sensitive (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Table 3 highlights each factor with its prototypical description and traits commonly associated with each factor.

Table 3: Big Five Personality Dimensions

Factor	Prototypical Description	Traits
I. Extraversion	Talkative, assertive, energetic	Sociable, gregarious, active
II. Agreeableness	Good-natured, co-operative, trustful	Courteous, flexible, forgiving, tolerant
III. Conscientiousness	Orderly, responsible, dependable	Thorough, organized
IV. Neuroticism	Anxiety, nervousness	Depressed, angry, embarrassed
V. Openness	Intellectual, polished, independent-minded	Intelligent, imaginative, artistically sensitive

Five Factor Inventories

According to Eysenck (1991) the field of personality research has hundreds of inventories measuring thousands of traits. Almost all personality inventories measure the dimensions of Extraversion and Neuroticism in some form (John et al., 2008). This section discusses the development of the Big Five general constructs that compose most five factor inventories.

Costa and McCrae (1976) developed a study from Catell's early work. They started with cluster analyses of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, (16PF), (Catell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970) which produced the Extraversion and Neuroticism dimensions, and recognized that Openness was also an important dimension to include because of its appearance out of several of Catell's other factors (John et al., 2008). This led to the development of the NEO Personality Inventory; this was labeled NEO because it measures the three dimensions of Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Openness to experience (John et al., 2008; Costa & McCrae, 1985). However, a short time later, Costa and McCrae felt that their model closely resembled that of the Big Five dimensions and extended the model to include the dimensions of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Costa & McCrae (1992) revised the instrument to 240 item NEO-PI-R, (NEO Personality Inventory Revised). Due to the length of the instrument, Costa and McCrae (1989; 1992) also developed the NEO-FFI, (NEO-Five Factor Inventory), a 60 item measure that was derived from an item level factor analysis of their NEO-PI, consisting of 12 item scales (John et al., 2008).

Goldberg (1992) developed a five factor 100 item measure called the Trait Descriptive Adjective (TDA); Saucier (1994) developed a shortened 40 item version of the TDA reducing the measure to five 8 item scales. These are the most commonly used single adjective measures (John et al., 2008).

As the Big Five dimensions have emerged in many different studies, measures have differed from a lexical approach (Goldberg, 1981), a questionnaire approach (McCrae & Costa, 1985), and prototypical approach (John, 1990). One such instrument utilizing a prototypical approach is the Big Five Inventory (BFI) that was developed by John et al., (1990). The scale

was designed in such a manner that the five dimensions of personality are assessed without the need to measure each facet individually, and can be completed in a flexible and efficient manner (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). Factor analysis and a process of expert ratings defined the five prototypes for the measure (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). This scale does not rely on single adjectives as items like other measurements such as the NEO PI-R (McCrae & Costa, 1987). The reason for this is because research has stated that the use of single adjective measures are not answered as consistently as those that are expanded or elaborated (Goldberg & Kilkowski, 1985). Instead, the BFI was designed with one or two prototypical trait adjectives to serve as the core item and then descriptions were added on to clarify each item (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). The questionnaire was designed with forty-four items measured with a five point Likert-type scale in which respondents rank their responses as: disagree strongly=1, disagree a little=2, neither agree nor disagree=3, agree a little=4, and agree strongly=5.

Reliability and Validity

Of the three measures discussed, each has benefits and limitations. The NEO questionnaires are the most validated in the questionnaire type, the TDA versions are the most commonly used single adjective measures, and the BFI provides more context than a single adjective measure, but less than a complete sentence such as in the NEO, and the BFI items are easier to understand (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998).

John et al., (2008) reported a recent study that tested the reliability of the three instruments. At the University of California-Berkeley, 829 undergraduates completed the BFI, the 40 item version of the Goldberg TDA by Saucier (1994), and the NEO-PI-R (Costa &

McCrae, 1992). The means of the alphas for the internal consistency for all of the measures were similar with the BFI at .83, the TDA at .84, and the NEO-FFI at .81 (John et al., 2008). In this study, the dimensions of Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Conscientiousness were most reliable, measuring at .80 on all instruments, but the dimensions of Agreeableness and Openness were less reliable (John et al., 2008). The convergent validity across the three instruments revealed that the BFI converged better with the NEO-FFI and TDA than the TDA and NEO-FFI did with each other (John et al., 2008). However, this does not mean that the BFI falls in between a lexical or questionnaire based measure. This means that the convergence depends on each individual Big Five domain, as it is almost equivalent to the TDA in Extraversion, but closer to the NEO-FFI for Agreeableness, and equal with both for Conscientiousness (John et al., 2008). Discriminant correlations overall were low, with none reaching over .35 (John et al., 2008).

Study Model

The study's conceptual model of prosocial rule breaking behavior is presented in Table 4. The studies that support this model were discussed earlier in the chapter. The overall model was built upon from the five psychological states of the positive deviance model (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2003). The model used by Morrison (2006) states that prosocial rule breaking is more likely to occur when a job has both meaning and autonomy, behavior is influenced by co-workers, and the individual difference variables of empathy, proactive personality and risk taking are strong. This study's model states that prosocial rule breaking is more likely to occur when a job has both meaning and autonomy; behavior is influenced by co-workers, and substituted the Big Five Personality Dimensions instead of using the three individual difference variables. This

was used because the Big Five Inventory is able to capture a broad range of traits in a relatively short amount of time. This is the first study that measured prosocial rule breaking in industry and several demographic variables will be measured with prosocial rule breaking to confirm or disconfirm the findings from Morrison’s (2006) study. Certain demographics were added to the study because this was the first study investigated in industry, they were: education level, because Morrison’s (2006) sample consisted of MBA students and the industry would provide a more heterogeneous mixture of education levels; job type to see if the position worked would have an impact on prosocial rule breaking; race was added to see if that was also a factor, and years with the current job to see if any period of time made a significant impact.

Table 4: Prosocial Rule Breaking Model

Spreitzer & Sonenshein (2003)	Meaning	Self-determination	Focus on Others	Personal Efficacy	Courage
Morrison (2006)	Job Meaning and Autonomy	Co-worker Behavior	Empathy	Proactive Personality	Risk Taking
Curtis (2010)	Job Meaning and Autonomy	Co-worker Behavior	Big Five Personality Dimensions		

Summary

The Big Five Inventory (BFI) was chosen for this study because of the ability to measure the five dimensions of personality in a relatively short amount of time, (5 minutes). In Morrison’s (2006) study measured a specific aspect of personality,-proactiveness- with Bateman

& Crant's (1993) 17 item proactive personality scale. By using the BFI, more broadly based dimensions are available and may suggest certain personality dimensions may be more inclined to impact or not impact prosocial rule breaking.

Empirical support has been shown for the areas of prosocial behavior and the Big Five personality dimensions, however, prosocial rule breaking, a specialized aspect of prosocial behavior, has limited empirical work to date. By merging these areas of study together in the hospitality industry, this study will determine the influence of personality on an employee's decision process to participate in prosocial rule breaking.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology employed for this research. The primary purpose of this study was to determine if certain personality dimensions have an impact on the propensity to participate in prosocial rule breaking behavior. This was examined with a sample of frontline service personnel employees from the hospitality industry from the southeastern United States. In doing so, management of hospitality organizations will be able to recognize those types of persons that are more inclined to prosocial rule breaking behavior, thus implying an emphasis that can be placed in selection or training efforts to enhance organizational performance. This in turn would reduce conflict and/or a breakdown in service performance/expectations. The secondary purpose was to examine any significant differences of prosocial rule breaking behavior by demographic variables such as gender, job type, job tenure, and education level. This chapter discusses the research design, hypotheses, sampling frame, questionnaire instrument, data collection procedure, and data analysis utilized to accomplish the purpose of this study.

Research Design

This study investigated the relationship between the constructs of personality and prosocial rule breaking behavior by a correlational research method. The correlations will be made by using a questionnaire instrument composed of three sections to a sample of frontline hospitality workers. Frontline hospitality workers are defined as those positions within

hospitality organizations that are designed to be engaged with customer contact. The four parts of the questionnaire include: (a) the Big Five Inventory, (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991); (b) prosocial rule breaking behavior questionnaire, (Morrison, 2006); (c) demographic data collection, and (d) an open ended section for participants to place any comments referring to the study.

This study explored the empirical relationship of prosocial rule breaking behavior and personality by using descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analysis, correlations, reliability analysis, t-tests, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), Kruskal-Wallis tests, and multiple regression.

Hypotheses

In order to determine the relationship between prosocial rule breaking behavior and the Big Five personality dimensions of frontline hospitality workers, the following hypotheses were tested:

Ho₁. There is no significant correlation between prosocial rule breaking behavior and the personality types defined in the Big Five Inventory (John et al., 1991).

Ho₂. There is no significant difference in the mean responses for prosocial rule breaking behavior when the respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:

Ho₂ a. gender

Ho₂ b. race

Ho₂ c. education level

Ho₂ d. years in current job

Ho₂ e. years in the industry

Ho₂ f. job position

Ho₃. There is no significant difference in the mean responses for the Big Five personality when the respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:

Ho₂ a. gender

Ho₂ b. race

Ho₂ c. education level

Ho₂ d. years in current job

Ho₂ e. years in the industry

Ho₂ f. job position

Ho₄. There is no significant Big Five personality dimension that predicts prosocial rule breaking behavior.

The rationale for studying these demographic variables and prosocial rule breaking is to validate or refute Morrison's (2006) findings of a significant difference in gender that males are more likely to participate in prosocial rule breaking. Years in the industry and job type are used because this is the first study of prosocial rule breaking performed in industry, and education level was examined because Morrison's (2006) sample was homogenous, consisting of all MBA students and the varying levels of education were investigated to see if education level has an impact on the propensity to participate in prosocial rule breaking.

The rationale for studying these demographic variables and the Big Five personality dimensions was to validate or refute earlier studies in hospitality using five factor inventories (Kim, Shin, & Swanger, 2006; Kim, Shin, & Umbreit, 2007; Silva, 2006).

Sampling Frame

The sample for this study was a purposive sample consisting of frontline restaurant personnel employed in a casual restaurant chain located in the greater Orlando, FL area. These frontline positions include servers, bartenders, hostesses and greeters, and server assistants. Employees in these positions are instrumental to the service delivery process and are also formally trained in specific delivery skills which made them content experts in hospitality food service.

Questionnaire Instrument

The questionnaire instrument was comprised of four sections: 1.) forty-four questions on the Big Five personality dimensions from the Big Five Inventory (BFI), (John et al., 1990); 2.) a hospitality customer based prosocial rule breaking scenario, followed by five questions on the scenario's realism and intention of rule breaking benefit, six items on prosocial rule breaking behavior (Morrison, 2006); 3.) a section assessing demographic information of gender, age, race, education level, job type and years with current job, and years in the industry and 4.) an open ended section for qualitative comments. The questionnaire was constructed to collect information to answer the research questions. The scenario and prosocial rule breaking scale

questions were designed to be answered in a five-point Likert scale, the personality scale in a self-rated five point scale, and the demographic information was collected via multiple choice or categorical variable. The qualitative section was open for written comments provided by participants.

Big Five Inventory

The Big Five Inventory was developed by John et al., (1991) to measure the five dimensions of personality. In this scale, the five dimensions of personality are measured in a flexible and efficient manner (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). By taking this approach, the researchers eliminated the need for differentiated measures for each factor (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). The items were developed by the definitions of the five prototypes going through a process of expert ratings and factor analysis (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). This scale does not rely on single adjectives as items, but utilizes one or two prototypical trait adjectives to serve as the core item and then more clarifying descriptions were added (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). The questionnaire was designed using a five point Likert-type scale in which respondents ranked their responses as: disagree strongly=1, disagree a little=2, neither agree nor disagree=3, agree a little=4, and agree strongly=5.

Scenario Method and Prosocial Rule Breaking

In order to measure prosocial rule breaking, each respondent was presented with one customer oriented scenario adapted from Morrison's (2006) study of prosocial rule breaking.

This was modified to fit a hospitality organization, but the context matched that of the original scenarios. The scenario was developed with input from experts in the industry and academia. Several scenarios related to prosocial rule breaking were presented to this panel of industry and academic experts. The panel commented on which scenario contained the most realism and applicability to industry. After the scenario was chosen, by a majority vote, it was pretested with fourteen industry workers for realistic application in the hospitality industry. The final scenario that was used contained a situation in which an employee has to decide if they should break an organizational rule on behalf of a customer, with three manipulated conditions. The conditions manipulated were 1) job autonomy-the freedom to make decisions on the job or not, 2) job meaning-if the job meant much to the respondent or not, and 3) co-worker behavior-whether the employee had heard if another had broken the rule or not. These conditions were the same conditions that were manipulated in Morrison's (2006) study. This provided eight different scenarios that were randomly distributed. After the scenario section, respondents answered three questions that assessed the perceived realism of the scenario and two questions that assessed the potential rule breaking as prosocial rather than self-interested. Then, the participants responded to six questions that measured the likelihood of breaking the rule in the proposed situation. The scenario along with the full questionnaire is located in Appendix B.

Data Collection Procedure

The questionnaires were administered during a six week period on various days during the week dependent on the management's permission to visit the site. The respondents were front

of the house restaurant employees (servers, bartenders, hostess/greeters, and server assistants) located in the greater Orlando, FL area.

As each questionnaire was distributed, the researcher explained the directions for completing each questionnaire adding that the respondents' identity would be kept confidential using a numerical coding system, and that all participation was voluntary. The protocol of the University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board was followed.

Data Analysis

The collected data was entered and analyzed using SPSS version 17.0. The results sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the basic underlying dimensions of prosocial rule breaking behavior in the hospitality industry?
2. What are the common personality profiles of prosocial rule breaking behavior using the Big Five Inventory?
3. What personality types show a propensity to predict prosocial rule breaking behavior?
4. What is the relationship between prosocial rule breaking behavior and the Big Five personality dimensions?
5. Are there significant differences in the mean scores for prosocial rule breaking when respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:
 - a. gender
 - b. race
 - c. education level

d. years in the current job

e. years in the industry

f. job position

6. Are there significant differences in the mean scores for the Big Five personality dimensions when respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:

a. gender

b. race

c. education level

d. years in the current job

e. years in the industry

f. job position

The analyses of data taken for the BFI, prosocial rule breaking questionnaire, and demographic variables were measured using descriptive statistics. The statistics reported consisted of: mean, standard deviations, and frequency distributions. Reliability analyses were conducted to investigate the alpha levels of each individual scale within the survey. To create the dependent variable prosocial rule breaking, exploratory factor analysis was utilized to create an overall factor score. To analyze the best predictor of prosocial rule breaking by Big Five personality dimension, multiple regression was deemed an appropriate procedure. The strength of multiple regression as a procedure is that it can reveal which variable in a set of variables is the best predictor of an outcome (Pallant, 2003).

To answer research question four, correlational analysis was used. Correlational analysis was utilized to express the strength and direction, (positive or negative), of any linear relationship between two variables (Pallant, 2003).

To investigate statistically significant differences in the mean scores between prosocial rule breaking and the demographic variables gender, years in the industry, education, and job position, the independent samples t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used or when the assumptions of ANOVA were violated, the Kruskal-Wallis procedure was utilized. The independent samples t-tests were used to test gender and prosocial rule breaking as gender is a two group variable, male or female. To investigate differences in mean responses by years in the industry and education level, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was deemed a suitable procedure for these data. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) compares the mean scores of more than two groups; one independent variable with different levels (Pallant, 2003). If the assumptions of ANOVA were violated, the non-parametric alternative test Kruskal-Wallis was used. The difference with this procedure is that scores are converted to ranks and the mean rank is compared (Pallant, 2003).

To investigate and statistically significant differences in the mean scores between the Big Five personality dimensions and the demographic variables gender, years in the industry, education, and job position, the independent samples t-test, multivariate analysis of variance, (MANOVA), was used or when the assumptions of MANOVA were violated, the Kruskal-Wallis procedure was utilized. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is used to compare the mean scores of more than one dependent variable (Pallant, 2003).

The independent samples t-tests were used to test gender and the Big Five personality dimensions as gender is a two group variable, male or female. To investigate differences in mean responses by years in the industry and job position, the Kruskal-Wallis procedure was used as the assumptions of MANOVA were violated. To test education and the Big Five personality dimensions, MANOVA was used.

Summary

The research design of this study employed the correlational research design to test the relationship between prosocial rule breaking and the Big Five personality dimensions. The study utilized a purposive sample of restaurant employees from the greater Orlando, FL area. To test H_{01} , to determine if there is no significant correlation between prosocial rule breaking behavior and the and the big Five personality dimensions, correlational analysis was used. To test H_{02} , to determine if there is no significant difference in the mean responses for prosocial rule breaking behavior when the respondents are classified by the demographic variables, independent samples t-tests, ANOVA, or Kruskal-Wallis statistical procedures were utilized. To test H_{03} , to determine if there is no significant difference in the mean responses for the Big Five personality dimensions when the respondents are classified by the demographic variables, independent samples t-tests, MANOVA, or Kruskal-Wallis statistical procedures were utilized. To test H_{04} , to determine there is no significant personality type that predicts prosocial rule breaking behavior, multiple regression was used.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study is to determine if certain personality dimensions have an impact on the propensity to participate in prosocial rule breaking behavior. This was examined with a sample of frontline service personnel employees from the hospitality industry derived from the southeastern United States. In doing so, management in hospitality organizations will be able to recognize those types of persons that are more inclined to prosocial rule breaking behavior, thus implying an emphasis that can be placed in selection or training efforts so as to enhance organizational performance, which would thereby reduce conflict and/or a breakdown in service performance/expectations. The secondary purpose was to examine any significant differences of prosocial rule breaking behavior by demographic variables such as gender, race, education level, years with the current job, years in the industry, and job position.

This section contains the following: a.) reporting of the descriptive statistics which profile demographic data, the Big Five personality dimensions, and prosocial rule breaking characteristics, b.) reporting of the exploratory factor analysis procedure as applied to the prosocial rule breaking characteristics, c.) reporting of the relationship between the Big Five personality dimensions and prosocial characteristics (H_{01}), d.) reporting of statistical findings via the ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis test procedures (H_{02}), which tested if a significant difference existed in the mean responses for prosocial rule breaking when respondents were classified by gender, race, education level, years in current job, years in the industry and job position, and e.)

reporting of statistical findings from ANOVA, MANOVA, and Kruskal-Wallis test procedures (Ho₃), which tested if a significant difference existed in the mean responses for the Big Five personality dimensions when respondents were classified by gender, years in the industry, education level, and job position, f.) results for the multiple regression procedure which examined predictors for prosocial rule breaking by personality dimension and g.) a summary of the qualitative open ended comments that were provided by the respondents.

Data Collection

The data was collected over a six-week period from thirteen stores of a single brand of a national restaurant chain. The questionnaire was administered in person by the primary researcher or by one of three professionally trained and compensated assistants. As permission was granted to the researcher by the restaurant company executives, data collection agents would be seated within the restaurant and management would inform employees of the researcher's presence and employees were given the option to participate in the study. To prevent distraction or interference with dinner operations, the questionnaires were administered to employees during the late afternoon well before each restaurant's nightly dinner rush. The intent was to ensure the staff would not be distracted from performing their duties. After a participant agreed to take a questionnaire, they were given a pen as an incentive. Data was collected over a three to four day period for each store within the brand. Three hundred and twenty-one (321) questionnaires were collected for this study. However, during the data coding phase it was determined that 16 questionnaires were missing substantially large amounts of data and were deemed unusable.

Therefore, the total number of usable questionnaires was three hundred and five (305). The total population of frontline employees in all 13 stores was not disclosed to the researcher.

Profile of Respondents

The descriptive statistics of the respondents are shown in Table 5. The respondents' characteristics were collected in the third segment of the questionnaire. The sample of respondents consisted of a higher female percentage (61.6%). The majority of the respondents were white (64.3%), followed by Hispanics (15.1%). Over half of the respondents were age 21-30 (54.4%). Approximately 40% had attended 1-2 years of college, (43.9%) had been with this particular restaurant company for a period of 1-3 years, and almost twenty five percent (24.9%) had been with the company for 3-6 years. Regarding their tenure in the restaurant industry, almost thirty-three percent (32.5%) reported that they had worked in the industry for 3-6 years. The position that most of this sample held in the restaurant was server, (73.4%).

Table 5: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Characteristics		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Female	188	61.6
	Male	117	38.4
Age*	18-20	44	14.4
	21-30	166	54.4
	31-40	47	15.4
	41-50	35	11.5
	51+	9	3.0
Race*	African-American	36	11.8
	Asian	6	2.0
	Hispanic	46	15.1
	White	196	64.3
	Other	19	6.2
Highest Education*	GED	9	3.0
	High School	78	25.6
	1-2 years past high	122	40.0
	4 year college program	59	19.3
	Master's degree	11	3.6
	Other	20	6.6
Years in current job*	Less than one year	51	16.7
	1-3 years	134	43.9
	3-6 years	76	24.9
	6-9 years	14	4.6
	More than 9 years	27	8.9
Years in industry*	Less than one year	17	5.6
	1-3 years	78	25.6
	3-6 years	99	32.5
	6-9 years	38	12.5
	More than 9 years	69	22.6
Job Position*	Server	224	73.4
	Bartender	33	10.8
	Hostess/greeter	37	12.1
	Server assistant	9	3.0

*Note: due to missing values, not all categories will add up to 100%.

Big Five Inventory

The first section of the questionnaire instrument used in this study was the Big Five Inventory (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). This inventory is composed of five scales and was measured on a five point Likert scale. The scale ranged from 1 to 5 with 1=disagree strongly, 2=disagree a little, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree a little, and 5=agree strongly. The reason for utilizing this scale was to determine current restaurant national chain employees' perceptions of their own personality. In this sample, the highest mean reported scale was the Agreeableness scale. The frequencies and descriptive statistics for the individual scales of the Big Five: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness for the respondents are shown in Appendix C. Table 6 contains the frequencies, means, and standard deviations for each scale of the Big Five Inventory.

Table 6: Summary of responses for Big Five Personality Dimensions

Scale	n	M	SD
Agreeableness	305	4.27	.5460
Conscientiousness	305	4.15	.5625
Extraversion	305	4.04	.7509
Openness	305	3.80	.5416
Neuroticism	305	2.37	.7680

The results in Table 6 reveal that for this particular sample of front of the house restaurant workers, Agreeableness was the most prominent personality dimension with a mean of 4.27. The second most prominent personality dimension was Conscientiousness with a mean

rating of 4.15. Extraversion was perceived to have a mean rating of 4.04 and the personality dimension Openness had a mean rating of 3.80. Neuroticism was perceived to be the least prominent personality dimension with a mean rating of 2.37.

Prosocial Rule Breaking Questionnaire

The second section of the questionnaire measured the likelihood to participate in prosocial rule breaking. Before respondents were asked if they would participate in prosocial rule breaking, they were asked if they felt that the scenario presented to them was realistic. In response to the question, “How realistic is this scenario?” 78.7% of the participants responded “agree” or “strongly agree.” Also, in response to the statement: “I could easily imagine myself in a situation like this,” 77.4% of the participants responded “agree” or “strongly agree.” To gather support for the notion of prosocial rule breaking, 68.5% responded “agree” or “strongly agree,” to “Violating this policy would be good for the customer.” However, in this sample of restaurant employees there was less support for prosocial rule breaking on behalf of the company or their own personal careers. Only 37.7% responded “agree” or “strongly agree,” to “Violating this policy would be good for the company,” and 8.6% responded “agree” or “strongly agree,” to “Violating the policy would be good for my career.”

This scale was measured on a five point Likert scale. The scale ranged from 1 to 5 on the likelihood to participate in prosocial rule breaking 1=very unlikely to 5=very likely, on the item ‘probability to participate in prosocial rule breaking,’ the values ranged from 1=0%, 2=25%, 3=50%, 4=75%, and 5=100%. On the scale item ‘how would you feel about violating the policy and accepting the coupon,’ the values ranged from 1=very uncomfortable to 5=very comfortable.

The scale items ‘violating the policy in this situation would be wrong’ and ‘I would feel conflicted about violating the policy,’ were answered on a five point Likert scale with 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. The frequencies, means, and standard deviations of the realism assessment are listed in Table 7. A copy of the scale is located in Appendix B. Table 8 contains the frequencies, means, and standard deviations for each item of the prosocial rule breaking scale.

Table 7: Summary of Responses Assessing Realism/Support

Realism/Support for PSRB	n	M	SD
Scenario realistic	305	4.02	1.09
Imagine myself	305	3.95	1.09
Violating good for customer	305	3.91	1.10
Violating good for company	304	3.01	1.26
Violating good for career	304	2.37	1.00

The results in Table 7 reveal that for this particular sample of front of the house restaurant workers, the realism of the scenario was perceived to have a mean rating of 4.02. These restaurant workers felt that they could imagine themselves in that situation with a mean of 3.95. The restaurant employees felt that it would be good to violate on behalf of the customer with a mean rating of 3.91. These employees felt less certain that it would be good to violate on behalf of the company with a mean rating of 3.01 and less certain that it would be good for their career with a mean rating of 2.37.

Table 8: Summary of Responses for Prosocial Rule Breaking

Prosocial Rule Breaking Scale	n	M	SD
how likely to violate	305	3.19	1.42
violating would be wrong	304	3.03	1.29
feel conflicted about violating	305	3.03	1.25
probability to violate	305	2.98	1.43
how do you feel about violating	304	2.77	1.32
appropriate to violate	305	2.72	1.29

The results in Table 8 reveal that for this particular sample of front of the house restaurant workers that the overall likelihood to violate had a mean rating of 3.19, but the actual probability to violate had a mean rating of 2.98. The items ‘violating would be wrong’ and ‘feeling conflicted about violating’ had mean ratings of 3.03. When rating their ‘feelings about violation’, the results revealed a mean rating of 2.77; while the respondents revealed that ‘appropriate to violate’, had a mean rating of 2.72.

Prosocial rule breaking was the dependent variable measured in this study. It was measured with Morrison’s (2006) 6 item scale. Exploratory factor analysis with the maximum likelihood estimation procedure was used to extract the factors from the variable data, and completed this in four iterations. However, first to check the appropriateness of the procedure, the KMO and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity were evaluated. The KMO measured .898 and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant $p < .001$, which indicated that factor analysis was

indeed an appropriate procedure. Kaiser’s rule was used to determine which factors were most suitable for interpretation. Using this rule, one factor was extracted. This factor was capable of explaining roughly 68.1% of all the variable variances. Table 9 summarizes the results of the procedure.

Table 9: Results of EFA of PSRB scale (Morrison, 2006).

PSRB Item	Factor Loading	Communality	Eigenvalue	Variance (%)
			4.087	68.118
how likely to violate	.903	.816		
probability to violate	.901	.812		
how appropriate to violate	.836	.700		
how do you feel about violating	.868	.754		
feel conflicted about violating	-.388	.151		
violating would be wrong	-.746	.556		

Reliability Analysis

To evaluate the reliability of the six scales utilized in this study, a Cronbach’s α reliability coefficient was tested for each scale. A summary of results is presented in Table 10. The resulting coefficient α for the Extraversion scale was .625, the Agreeableness scale was .756, the Conscientiousness scale was .758, the Neuroticism scale was .813, and the Openness scale was .693. The figures are above the minimum value of 0.5 and are at, above or close to the acceptable level of 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978). In the first run of the Cronbach’s procedure for the prosocial rule breaking scale, an error appeared because of negative covariance with one of the

items. The item ‘violating’ would be wrong’ was re-coded and the procedure was run again resulting in a coefficient α of .792.

Table 10: Cronbach’s α of scales used in this study

Scale	Cronbach’s α
Extraversion	.625
Agreeableness	.756
Conscientiousness	.758
Neuroticism	.813
Openness	.693
Prosocial Rule Breaking	.792

Testing of Hypotheses

Ho₁. There is no significant correlation between prosocial rule breaking behavior and personality types defined in the Big Five Inventory (John et al., 1991).

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to describe the strength and the direction of the linear relationship between prosocial rule breaking and each of the Big Five Personality dimensions. The results are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Pearson (r) of Prosocial Rule Breaking and Big Five Personality Dimensions

		BFI-E	BFI-A	BFI- C	BFI-N	BFI-O
PSRB	Pearson Correlation	.005	-.049	-.129*	-.050	.029
	<i>p</i>	.934	.397	.025	.387	.615
	N	303	303	303	303	303

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The results indicate that there are two positive relationships and three negative relationships between prosocial rule breaking and the Big Five personality dimensions, (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness). In determining the strength of the relationship, the values of a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (*r*) can range from -1.00 to 1.00. The value of 0 reveals that there is no relationship, while the value 1.0 demonstrates a perfect positive, and -1.0, a perfect negative relationship (Pallant, 2003). The interpretation of these values has been based on a ratings scale composed by Cohen (1988). The ratings scale is as follows:

$r = .10$ to $.29$ or $r = -.10$ to $-.29$	Small
$r = .30$ to $.49$ or $r = -.30$ to $-.49$	Medium
$r = .50$ to 1.0 or $r = -.50$ to -1.0	Large

Figure 1: Guidelines for interpreting (*r*) Cohen (1988)

Table 11 reveals that most of the relationships between the prosocial rule breaking and the Big Five personality dimensions are not statistically significant with the exception of Conscientiousness, which revealed a small negative relationship ($r = -.129$, $n=303$).

Ho₂. There is no significant difference in the mean responses for prosocial rule breaking behavior when the respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:

Ho₂ a. gender

Ho₂ b. race

Ho₂ c. education level

Ho₂ d. years in current job

Ho₂ e. years in the industry

Ho₂ f. job position

To investigate differences in prosocial rule breaking mean responses by gender, an independent samples t-test was conducted. There was a significant difference in responses for males ($M=.3283$, $SD=.8849$), and females ($M=-.2037$, $SD=.9657$; $t(259.962)=4.910$), $p<.01$. The differences in the means was moderate (eta squared=.07).

To investigate differences in mean responses by race, it was concluded that ANOVA was an appropriate procedure for these data. However, a statistically significant difference among the group means was not found, suggesting that the assumption of the null hypothesis is true $F(4, 296) = 1.786$, $p = .554$.

To investigate differences in mean responses by education level, ANOVA was deemed a suitable procedure for these data. However, a statistically significant difference among the group means was not found, suggesting that the assumption of the null hypothesis is true $F(5, 291) = 1.786$, $p = .116$.

To investigate differences in mean responses by years in current job, ANOVA was deemed a suitable procedure for these data. There was a statistically significant difference among the group means was found which suggests that the data are unlikely, assuming that the null hypothesis is true $F(4, 295) = 270.161, p = .015$. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative which states that a difference exists among the group means in the population.

However, after an examination of the effect size ($R^2 = .041$), it was revealed that the model fit poorly and the statistical difference among the group means is trivial. Years in the industry only explains 4.1% of the variation prosocial rule breaking. Although the result is statistically significant, the difference is not strong enough to make a contribution to theory or practice. Consequently, the post hoc test results will not be interpreted.

To investigate differences in mean responses by years in the industry, ANOVA was deemed a suitable procedure for these data. There was a statistically significant difference among the group means was found which suggests that the data are unlikely, assuming that the null hypothesis is true $F(4, 294) = 34.427, p = .001$. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative which states that a difference exists among the group means in the population.

However, after an examination of the effect size ($R^2 = .063$), it was revealed that the model fit poorly and the statistical difference among the group means is trivial. Years in the industry only explains 6.3% of the variation prosocial rule breaking. Although the result is statistically significant, the difference is not strong enough to make a contribution to theory or practice. Therefore, the post hoc test results will not be interpreted.

To investigate differences in responses by position, a Kruskal-Wallis test was deemed a suitable procedure for these data. There was a statistically significant difference among the group medians was found which suggests that the data are unlikely, assuming that the null hypothesis is true $X^2(3, n=301) = 20.787, p < .001$. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative which states that a difference exists among the group means in the population. The proportion of variability in the ranked dependent variable accounted for by the prosocial rule breaking variable was .07, indicating a moderate relationship between prosocial rule breaking and position worked within the restaurant. Table 12 displays the mean rankings of prosocial rule breaking by position.

Table 12: Ranks of Prosocial Rule Breaking by Position

Current Position	N	Mean rank
Server	222	158.83
Bartender	33	169.03
Hostess/Greeter	37	91.46
Server Assistant	9	136.44
Total	301	

To examine the differences in medians further, follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the four groups (server, bartender, hostess/greeter, server assistant), controlling for Type I error across tests by using the Bonferroni approach. The results of these tests indicated there was no statistically significant difference between servers and bartenders, ($z = -.663, p = .507$). Servers had an average rank of 126.82, and bartenders had an

average rank of 135.94. There was a statistically significant difference between servers and hostess/greeters, ($z = -4.363, p < .01$). Servers had an average rank of 138.29, and hostess/greeters had an average rank of 80.26. The results of these tests indicated there was no statistically significant difference between servers and server assistants, ($z = -.817, p = .414$). Servers had an average rank of 116.72, and server assistants had an average rank of 98.17.

There was a statistically significant difference between bartenders and hostess/greeters, ($z = -3.566, p < .01$). Bartenders had an average rank of 44.68, and hostess/greeters had an average rank of 27.31. There was no statistically significant difference between bartenders and server assistants, ($z = -.920, p = .358$). Bartenders had an average rank of 22.41, and hostess/greeters had an average rank of 18.17.

There was no statistically significant difference between hostess/greeters and server assistants, ($z = -1.649, p = .099$). Hostess/greeters had an average rank of 21.89, and server assistants had an average rank of 30.11. It is useful to reference Table 13 in the interpretation of these results.

Table 13: Job Position Mean and Frequency

Current Position	N	Mean
Server	222	.0864631
Bartender	33	.1993520
Hostess/greeter	37	-.6914225
Server Assistant	9	-.1260185
Total	301	-.97120534

HO₃. There is no significant difference in the mean responses for personality when the respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:

HO₃ a. gender

HO₃ b. race

HO₃ c. education level

HO₃ d. years in current job

HO₃ e. years in the industry

HO₃ f. job position

To investigate differences in personality scale mean responses by gender, an independent samples t-test was conducted. There was a statistically significant difference in responses for the Neuroticism scale, males ($M=2.2199$, $SD=.74710$), and females ($M=-2.4608$, $SD=.9657$; $t(303)=-2.690$), $p=.008$. The differences in the means was small (eta squared=.023). There was a statistically significant difference in responses for the Openness scale, males ($M=3.8863$, $SD=.54881$), and females ($M=-3.7440$, $SD=.3131$; $t(303)=2.247$), $p=.025$. The differences in the means was small (eta squared=.016). A summary of the results of personality scale by gender are listed in Table 14.

Table 14: Summary of BFI Scales and Gender

BFI-Scale		Mean	SD	df	t	Sig.	Eta squared
Extraversion	males	4.0069	.69517	303	-.636	.525	.001
	females	4.0627	.78466				
Agreeableness	males	4.2327	.53843	303	-.996	.320	.003
	females	4.2967	.55058				
Conscientiousness	males	4.0893	.59303	303	-1.592	.112	.008
	females	4.1944	.54027				
Neuroticism	males	2.2199	.74710	303	-2.690	.008	.023
	females	2.4608	.76830				
Openness	males	3.8863	.54881	303	2.247	.025	.016
	females	3.7440	.53131				

To investigate differences in mean responses by race, MANOVA was deemed an appropriate procedure for these data. However, a statistically significant difference among the group means was not found, suggesting that the assumption of the null hypothesis is true.

To investigate differences in mean responses by education level, MANOVA was deemed a suitable procedure for these data. However, a statistically significant difference among the group means was not found, suggesting that the assumption of the null hypothesis is true with the exception of the Agreeableness scale, $F(5, 293) = 2.682, p = .022$.

However, after an examination of the effect size ($R^2 = .044$), it was revealed that the model fit poorly and the statistical difference among the group means is trivial. Education level only explains 4.4% of the variation in the Agreeableness score. Although the result is statistically

significant, the difference is not strong enough to make a contribution to theory or practice. As a result, the post hoc test results will not be interpreted.

To investigate differences in mean responses by years in the current job, MANOVA was deemed an appropriate procedure for these data. However, a statistically significant difference among the group means was not found, suggesting that the assumption of the null hypothesis is true.

To investigate differences in responses by years in the industry and personality dimension, a Kruskal-Wallis test was deemed a suitable procedure for these data as the assumptions for MANOVA were violated. There was a statistically significant difference among the group medians was found only for the Conscientiousness domain, which suggests that the data are unlikely for the personality dimension Conscientiousness and years in the industry, assuming that the null hypothesis is true $X^2(4, N=301) = 16.164, p = .003$. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative which states that a difference exists among the group means in the population. The proportion of variability in the ranked dependent variable accounted for by the Conscientiousness was .05, indicating a small to moderate relationship between the Conscientiousness dimension and years worked in the industry. Table 15 displays the mean rankings of Conscientiousness scale by years in the industry.

Table 15: Ranks of Conscientiousness by years in the industry

Years in the industry	N	Mean rank
Less than one year	17	127.71
1-3 years	78	135.20
3-6 years	99	141.38
6-9 years	38	155.88
More than 9 years	69	185.71
Total	301	

To examine the differences in medians further, follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the five groups of years worked in the industry (less than one year, 1-3 years, 3-6 years, 6-9 years, and more than 9 years) controlling for Type I error across tests by using the Bonferroni approach. The results of these tests indicated there was no statistically significant difference between all of the groups with the exception of those that worked less than one year and those who worked more than 9 years ($z = -2.356, p = .018$). Those that worked less than one year had an average rank of 30.76, and those that worked more than 9 years had an average rank of 46.64. It is useful to reference Table 16 in the interpretation of these results.

Table 16: Years in the industry Mean and Frequency

Years in the industry	N	Mean
Less than one year	17	3.9739
1-3 years	78	4.0670
3-6 years	99	4.0988
6-9 years	38	4.1579
More than 9 years	69	4.3623
Total	301	4.1513

To investigate differences in responses by job position, the Kruskal-Wallis was deemed a suitable procedure for these data as the assumptions for MANOVA were violated. There was a statistically significant difference among the group medians in the Agreeableness dimension which suggests that the data are unlikely, assuming that the null hypothesis is true $X^2(3, N=303) = 10.276, p \leq .016$. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative which states that a difference exists among the group means in the population. The proportion of variability in the ranked dependent variable accounted for by the Agreeableness scale score was .03, indicating a small relationship between the Agreeableness dimension and position worked within the restaurant. Table 17 displays the mean rankings of BFI scales by position.

Table 17: Mean rankings of BFI scales by Job Position

Current Position	N	Mean Rank
BFI Extraversion Server	224	156.61
Bartender	33	150.59
Hostess/Greeter	37	138.78
Server Assistant	9	96.72
Total	303	
BFI Agreeableness Server	224	152.56
Bartender	33	140.20
Hostess/Greeter	37	177.27
Server Assistant	9	77.33
Total	303	
BFI Conscientiousness Server	224	151.04
Bartender	33	146.24
Hostess/Greeter	37	176.77
Server Assistant	9	95.17
Total	303	
BFI Neuroticism Server	224	151.33
Bartender	33	145.76
Hostess/Greeter	37	144.69
Server Assistant	9	221.72
Total	303	
BFI Openness Server	224	154.21
Bartender	33	158.59
Hostess/Greeter	37	126.53
Server Assistant	9	177.50
Total	303	

To examine the differences in medians further, follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the four groups of positions (server, bartender, hostess/greeters, server assistants) controlling for Type I error across tests by using the Bonferroni approach. The results of these tests indicated there was no statistically significant

difference between all of the groups with the exception of hostess/greeters and server assistants ($z = -3.044, p = .002$). Hostess/Greeters had an average rank of 26.46, and server assistants had an average rank of 11.33. It is useful to reference Table 18 in the interpretation of these results.

Table 18: Summary of BFI Scales by Position

Current Position		BFI Extraversion	BFI Agreeableness	BFI Conscientiousness	BFI Neuroticism	BFI Openness
Server	N	224	224	224	224	224
	Mean	4.0515	4.2634	4.1563	2.3721	3.8097
Bartender	N	33	33	33	33	33
	Mean	4.1970	4.2391	4.0673	2.2841	3.8485
Hostess/Greeter	N	37	37	37	37	37
	Mean	3.9628	4.4384	4.3273	2.3041	3.6378
Server Assistant	N	9	9	9	9	9
	Mean	3.5972	3.8642	3.6667	2.9583	3.9556
Total	N	303	303	303	303	303
	Mean	4.0430	4.2703	4.1529	2.3716	3.7972

To examine what Big Five personality dimensions show a propensity to predict prosocial rule breaking behavior, and specifically answer research question 3, regression was deemed an appropriate procedure. Overall, the linear composite of the independent variables entered into the regression procedure predicted 3.8% of the variation in the dependent criterion $F(5, 297) = 2.37, p = .04$.

Table 19: Correlations of Prosocial Rule Breaking and Big Five Dimensions

	PSRB	BFI-E	BFI-A	BFI- C	BFI-N	BFI-O
Pearson Correlation						
PSRB	1.000	.005	-.049	-.129*	-.050	.029
BFI-E	.005	1.000	.138	.342	-.249	.250
BFI-A	-.049	.138	1.000	.479	-.520	.040
BFI-C	-.129	.342	.479	1.000	-.507	.167
BFI-N	-.050	-.249	-.520	-.507	1.000	-.129
BFI-O	.029	.250	.040	.167	-.129	1.000
<i>p</i>						
PSRB		.467	.199	.013	.193	.307
BFI-E	.467		.008	.000	.000	.000
BFI-A	.199	.008		.000	.000	.244
BFI-C	.013	.000	.000		.000	.002
BFI-N	.193	.000	.000	.000		.012
BFI-O	.307	.000	.244	.002	.012	
n		303	303	303	303	303

Table 20: ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Regression	10.88	5	2.176	2.368	.040
Residual	272.91	297	.919		
Total	283.79	302			

The confidence interval around the b weight obtained for independent variable #1 (BFI-Extraversion), independent variable #2 (BFI-Agreeableness), and independent variable #5 (BFI-Openness) did include zero as a probable value among other probable values; therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected. These results suggest that Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Openness should not be retained in the specified model. Closer inspection of the b weights for independent variable#3 suggested that with every increase in Conscientiousness, a -.361 increase was observable in the dependent criterion. Also, with every increase in Neuroticism, a -.207 increase was observable in the dependent criterion. The b weights for independent variable #1(BFI-Extraversion), independent variable #2 (BFI- Agreeableness), and independent variable #5 (BFI-Openness) were not examined because the results were not statistically significant.

The beta weights were consulted to reveal the relative effects of the independent variables on Y. The Beta weights revealed that a standardized unit change in Y with respect to Openness (Beta= .036) was higher than a standardized unit change in Y with respect to Extraversion (Beta = .032), Agreeableness (Beta = -.039), Neuroticism (Beta= -.164), or Conscientiousness (Beta= -.210).

Table 21: Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p	95% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Standard Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	1.871	.863		2.169	.031	.174	3.569		
BFI-E	.042	.081	.032	.515	.607	-.117	.200	.836	1.196
BFI-A	-.070	.124	-.039	-.564	.573	-.314	.174	.662	1.510
BFI-C	-.361	.123	-.210	-2.923	.004	-.604	-.118	.627	1.594
BFI-N	-.207	.090	-.164	-2.295	.022	-.384	-.029	.634	1.578
BFI-O	.065	.106	.036	.617	.538	-.143	.273	.926	1.080

Dependent Variable: Prosocial Rule breaking

Inspection of the variance inflation factor for each of the predictors suggested that multicollinearity is not problematic as the VIF for all five predictors < 10.00. The squared structure coefficients revealed that independent variable Conscientiousness accounted for 65.7% of the explained variance and independent variable Neuroticism accounted for 25.5% of the explained variance. Generally, these two independent variables explained a sizable portion of the R^2 . Inspection of the plot of the standardized residuals against the predicted values revealed no (1) nonlinear trends or (2) heteroscedasticity. Furthermore, the distribution of the standardized errors adequately approximated normality.

However, because three of the b weights turned out not to be statistically significant, the overall model is not supported. In a future study, with a different sample, the regression equation

should be fit to the data again. However, independent variables #1 (BFI-Extraversion), independent variable #2 (Agreeableness), and independent variable #5 (BFI-Openness) should be excluded, and the model should then be described as "re-specified".

Qualitative Results

The last section of the questionnaire asked respondents if they had any comments or suggestions to add to the survey. In order to maintain construct validity techniques of data triangulation and investigator triangulation were employed. Data triangulation was accomplished through the use of scholarly journals and comments provided by the participants from the questionnaire instrument utilized in this study, which later created a theoretical triangulation. To implement investigator triangulation process, the comments were collected and transferred to a document and distributed to the primary researcher, a scholarly expert, and an industry representative by email. Each person was asked to read the 18 statements and decide if the perspective was based on an individual, organization, or customer perspective.

These three perspectives were developed for this study by a theoretical triangulation process. First, from Victor & Cullen's (1988) study on ethical decision making, the locus of analysis was derived. In their study, they describe locus of analysis and break it into three categories: the individual, organization, and cosmopolitan. Victor & Cullen (1988) state that, "the loci of analysis generally identify the sources and/or limits of consideration in ethical analyses," (p. 106). The individual perspective will concern the consideration and preferences of the self; the organization level will take into consideration the organization's interests, and the

cosmopolitan will look at the overall larger social or economic system (Victor & Cullen, 1988). Morrison's (2006) study examined prosocial rule breaking from three perspectives: helping a subordinate, helping a colleague, or helping a customer. This study's focus centered on the latter. Therefore, three categories were created as perspectives on prosocial rule breaking: the perspective of the customer, the perspective of the individual, and the perspective of the organization. The comments are displayed in Table 22.

Table 22: Qualitative Perspectives on Prosocial Rule Breaking

Customer	Individual	Organization
<p>“There is too much competition out there. One thing that leaves a bad taste in someone’s mouth about me or the company and people won’t be back. People, our guest appreciate favors in tough times. The company could lose their business forever over a stupid coupon.”</p>	<p>“The answers for the situation part do not reflect the whole situation. The answers are too general. I made my choices based on the firm belief that rules and laws are made for a reason whether safety of oneself or property or others. Thank you. Only under extreme conditions should they be broken. Again, thank you.”</p>	<p>“It concerns me that the company has a strict coupon policy. That is my deciding factor in not accepting the coupon. I would also consider the fact that the guests are “regulars” or not. I feel strongly that employees should be able to make decisions like this one on their own.”</p>
<p>“In the scenario, every hospitality job I’ve had I’ve always been told to do what the customer asks for. Including expired coupons & that the paperwork side will be figured out later.”</p>	<p>“My morals would keep me from using the coupon. But I wouldn’t have a problem using it. Either something is right or wrong. Just because you can do something doesn’t mean you should.”</p>	<p>“With the hypothetical situation it would be nice to be able to write in an answer also. If the manager is busy at the time then I could have easily told the customer the coupon has expired but get me a little time and when the manager is free I will ask if I can accept it.”</p>
<p>“I feel most hospitality positions, managers are more likely to side with a customer, so I don’t feel a manager would fire someone for accepting an expired coupon if it helps to keep that customer’s business.”</p>	<p>“I have a strong leadership background and answered the scenario with a part leader & part employee mindset.”</p>	<p>“The example mentioned is real we go through it all the time and for us as “<i>company’s name</i>” employees, we run the extra mile to make the guest happy and come back again.”</p>
<p>“About the coupon-I don’t like telling a guest “no” about anything. If I absolutely cannot use a coupon that had expired, I would take it, not use it, give them cash credit out of my money for it without telling the customer anything. I just want people to be happy and come back.”</p>	<p>“I think a deciding factor in this scenario is if the person is looking for advancement in the company or if they are doing this as just a job.”</p>	<p>“With the scenario-I would feel somewhat comfortable accepting the coupon because the corporation knows how many coupons they printed, and assuming it is a large, national chain, they have accounted for all the coupons they printed. Therefore it should be included in the budget. I would ask a manager first.”</p>
<p>“In the scenario, if no mgr could approve, I would have taken it & asked the manager later. If they said no, (which is not typical), I would have paid the coupon’s worth from my tips.”</p>	<p>“In the situation, last line, “job doesn’t have much personal meaning to you” this is untrue. You should let the survey taker decide how important the job is. Maybe this should be made into a question. How important personally is your job? My answer, strongly agree 5.”</p>	<p>“I would probably only end up doing it because I had been working there for 3 years and manager might trust my judgment.”</p>
<p>“As far as the scenario is concerned, the only unrealistic detail was the existence of a <u>strict</u> coupon policy. Generally the customer will win any argument in this vein.”</p>		<p>“This wouldn’t work at “<i>this restaurant</i>”, because we are able to take any coupons from “<i>this restaurant company</i>” expired or not.”</p>
<p>“Guest is always correct. Always accept any coupon when presented.”</p>		

The comments reveal just some of the origins of the decision making process for a small sample of 18 individuals from the current study that chose to expand their perceptions of prosocial rule breaking. The three categories were almost evenly distributed with the choice of perspectives. For those participants that leaned toward a customer focus, the underlying theme of these statements was a service oriented perspective in which a service employee would “go the extra mile” to service the guest. For those participants with an individual focus, a recurring theme was to look inward at this person’s outlook on the world when they made decisions. For those that took the organization’s perspective, they considered the overall climate and culture of their organization in their decision making process.

Summary

This chapter has presented the results of several analyses to determine the underlying dimensions of prosocial rule breaking behavior. The results of the hypotheses and research questions are summarized in this section.

Ho₁ stated there is no significant correlation between prosocial rule breaking behavior and Big Five personality types. The null hypothesis was not rejected for four of the personality dimensions. The small negative statistically significant relationship was between prosocial rule breaking and Conscientiousness.

Ho₂ stated there is no significant difference in the mean responses for prosocial rule breaking behavior when the respondents are classified by the demographic variables of: gender, race, education level, years in current job, years in the industry, and job position. To test gender,

an independent samples t-test was used and indicated a significant difference in the mean responses for males and females, which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis. To test for a difference with race, ANOVA was used and there was no statistical significance which failed to reject the null hypothesis. To test for a difference with education level, ANOVA was used and there was no statistical significance which failed to reject the null hypothesis. To test for a difference with years in the current job, ANOVA was used and there was no statistical significance which failed to reject the null hypothesis. To test for a difference with years in the industry, ANOVA was used. A statistically significant difference was revealed; therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. To test for differences by job position, the Kruskal-Wallis procedure was used as the assumptions for ANOVA were violated. This procedure found a difference in medians for the population, rejects the null hypothesis in favor of an alternative which states that there are differences in the group medians by position.

Ho₃ stated that there is no significant difference in the mean responses for the Big Five personality dimensions when the respondents are classified by the demographic variables of gender, race, education level, years in the current job, years in the industry, and job position. To test gender, an independent samples t-test was used and indicated a significant difference in the mean responses for gender and two of the personality dimensions of the Big Five: Neuroticism and Openness, which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

To investigate differences in mean responses by race, MANOVA was deemed a suitable procedure for these data. However, a statistically significant difference among the group means was not found, suggesting that the assumption of the null hypothesis is true.

To investigate differences in mean responses by education level, MANOVA was decided to be an appropriate procedure for these data. However, a statistically significant difference among the group means was not found, suggesting that the assumption of the null hypothesis is true with the exception of the Agreeableness scale which showed a statistically significant difference.

To investigate differences in mean responses by years in current job and personality dimension, MANOVA was deemed an appropriate procedure for these data. However, a statistically significant difference among the group means was not found; therefore, fail to reject the null hypothesis.

To investigate differences in responses by years in the industry and personality dimension, a Kruskal-Wallis test was deemed a suitable procedure for these data because the assumptions were violated for MANOVA. There was a statistically significant difference among the group medians was found only for the Conscientiousness domain, which suggests that the data are unlikely for the personality dimension Conscientiousness and years in the industry.

To investigate differences in responses by job position, a Kruskal-Wallis test was deemed a suitable procedure for these data as the assumptions for MANOVA were violated. There was a statistically significant difference among the group medians in the Agreeableness dimension which suggests that the data are unlikely, assuming that the null hypothesis is true.

To investigate which of the Big Five personality dimensions show a propensity to predict prosocial rule breaking behavior, regression was deemed an appropriate procedure. However, because three of the b weights turned out not to be statistically significant, the overall model was not supported.

The study examined comments made by participants on the questionnaire instrument and grouped them into three categories of perspectives based on the prior work of Victor & Cullen (1988) and Morrison (2006): customer, individual, and organization. These comments describe in a deeper sense the decision making process concerning prosocial rule breaking and where their decisions are based.

Conclusions, implications, and suggestions for future study are described in the following chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to investigate the concept of prosocial rule breaking within a hospitality organization and to examine if a role exists for any of the Big Five personality dimensions in the propensity to participate in prosocial rule breaking.

The literature review was comprised of three main areas that contributed to the theoretical underpinnings of this study: 1.) behavioral ethics and theories and philosophical foundations of ethical decision making, 2.) prosocial behavior in the workplace and the development of prosocial rule breaking behavior and measurement, and 3.) the five factor theory of personality, known as the Big Five.

Behavioral Ethics

Behavioral ethics research describes the behaviors of individuals in larger social bases (Treviño et al., 2006). Generally three main areas are studied: unethical behaviors, ethical behaviors that reach a minimal moral standard, and ethical behavior defined as behaviors that exceed a minimal moral standard. Within these areas, individual differences and the organizational context of ethical behavior are examined for this study.

The individual difference variables examined in this study focused on Kohlberg's (1969) three level model of moral development, locus of control (Forte, 2005; Treviño et al., 2006), and ego strength (Treviño et al., 2006; Treviño, 1986). Kohlberg's (1969) model asserted that an

individual can only progress through the stages of the model based on their cognitive ability at each level. Locus of control imparts the reasons or causes in which individuals credit to their personal failures and successes (Forte, 2005). Ego strength is concerns the strength of one's conviction (Treviño, 1986).

The organizational context variables mentioned in this study were: on the job pressure, failure to meet goals, role conflict, ethical climate, culture, and co-worker behavior. To describe each of these variables briefly, pressure may exist on the job to act unethically (Robertson & Rymon, 2001). People are more likely to behave unethically when organizational goals are unmet, regardless if a financial incentive exists (Schweitzer, Ordóñez, & Douma, 2004). Role conflict occurs when there is a difference in expectations between the employee and constituent (Chonko & Burnett, 1983) and can result in unethical behavior Treviño et al., 2006). An ethical work climate is one that consists of norms and practices with a measurable degree of consensus (Victor & Cullen, 1988). An ethical culture is a portion of the overall culture of an organization that influences employees to behave ethically through the use formal and informal systems (Treviño, 1990). Lastly, co-worker attitude and behavior is another factor influencing an individual's ethical behavior (Zey-Ferrell & Ferrell, 1982). The influence of the co-worker is strengthened by the frequency and intensity of the interactions (Ford & Richardson, 1994; Zey-Ferrell & Ferrell, 1982).

Ethical Decision Making

In the discussion of ethical philosophy, two distinct categories arise: teleological and deontological (Ferrell & Gresham, 1985). Teleological philosophies are described as focused on the morality of the behavior based on the consequences of that behavior (Ferrell & Gresham, 1985). Deontological philosophies are focused upon the intentions and methods employed in a specific behavior (Ferrell & Gresham, 1985).

There are two distinct ethical philosophies based on rules: rule deontology and rule utilitarianism. Rule deontology considers the merit of rules and rule deontologists believe they are behaving ethically when they are in compliance with the rules (Fraedrich & Ferrell, 1992). Rule utilitarianism is developed from utilitarianism philosophy which premise does not consider the intention or motivations, but the morality in the consequences of the behavior (Ferrell & Gresham, 1985). Therefore, rule utilitarianism states there are certain duties that an individual must perform. The best decision and outcome will be made after careful consideration of the duties concerned; a decision must be made from the alternatives to which is the most obligatory duty (Tsalikis & Fritsche, 1989).

Prosocial Behavior

Prosocial behavior in the workplace is sometimes known as good citizenship behavior or extra-role behavior (Baruch et al., 2004; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Organ, 1988). These behaviors consist of: helping, cooperating, sharing, and volunteering; their function is to create or preserve the well-being of others (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). According to Cameron et al., (2003) prosocial behaviors are an aspect of positive organizational behavior; however, these

behaviors can be considered functional or dysfunctional (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Functional prosocial behavior contributes to the accomplishment of the organization's mission or goals, and dysfunctional prosocial behavior diverts from the organization's ability to attain goals (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

Prosocial Rule Breaking Behavior

Morrison's (2006) study introduced the construct of prosocial rule breaking into the management literature. Morrison (2006) explains prosocial rule breaking as any situation in which an employee intentionally violates a formal organizational rule with the intent of benefitting the organization or stakeholders of the organization. The act is performed without consideration for the employee's own personal benefit (Morrison, 2006). Prosocial rule breaking does involve the violation of organizational rules, but is different from the employee rule breaking that is commonly associated with workplace deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). The main difference between rule breaking in workplace deviance and that of prosocial rule breaking is the intent; prosocial rule breaking is not done with any self-interest. Mayer et al., (2007) mention that some of the reasons prosocial rule breaking can occur is to improve efficiency, aid a coworker, or better service a customer. As prosocial rule breaking's intent is to benefit others, it is a form of prosocial behavior (Morrison, 2006).

To determine if an individual will participate in prosocial rule breaking, Morrison (2006) consulted the positive deviance model of Spreitzer & Sonenshein (2003). Spreitzer & Sonenshein (2003) state that five psychological states must be present for positive deviance: 1. meaning, 2. self-determination, 3. focus on others, 4. personal efficacy, and 5. courage.

Morrison (2006) built upon that framework asserting that prosocial rule breaking is more likely to occur when the job provides both meaning and autonomy; and when the three individual dispositions of: 1. empathy, 2. proactive personality, and 3. risk taking dispositions are strong. Also, the decision to partake in prosocial rule breaking partially relies on the influence of co-worker's behaviors. Morrison (2006) found that proactive personality was not significant and suggested trying a broader range of individual differences.

The Big Five Personality Dimensions

After decades of research in the field of personality psychology, a taxonomy was developed that introduced a five factor structure of personality traits commonly known as the Big Five (Goldberg, 1981; John et al., 2008). However, this is not designating personality to be limited to five traits, but that the five factors correspond to personality at an expanded level whereas much of the variance in the personality traits can be captured (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). This way an approach to studying personality can be taken by examining domains of personality characteristics that are related rather than trying to inspect the thousands of individual characteristics that make each person (John et al, 2008). The five factor structure of personality was introduced by Tupes & Christal (1961) however; it went largely unnoticed because it was published in an Air Force publication that was relatively unknown to the public (Digman, 1990). Norman (1963) replicated the study and presented the taxonomy in five dimensions as: Extraversion or Surgency, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Culture. Culture is more commonly known as Openness or Openness to Experience (Barrick &

Mount, 1991). These five factors of personality are generally referred to as the Big Five (Goldberg, 1981). The Big Five factors briefly described are: Extraversion, which concentrates on energy and sociability; Agreeableness, focuses on one's prosocial nature; Conscientiousness, which represents dependability or carefulness; Neuroticism, deals with emotional stability and traits such as anxiety or nervousness; and finally, Openness, which represents intelligence or curiosity (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Benet-Martínez & John, 1998).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship of prosocial rule breaking behavior with the Big Five personality dimensions within the hospitality industry. Therefore, the secondary purpose is to discern if there are any significant differences when the respondents are differentiated by specified demographic variables.

To address these research objectives the following research questions were developed for this study:

1. What are the basic underlying dimensions of prosocial rule breaking behavior in the hospitality industry?
2. What are the common personality profiles of prosocial rule breaking behavior using the Big Five Inventory?
3. What personality types show a propensity to predict prosocial rule breaking behavior?
4. What is the relationship between prosocial rule breaking behavior and the Big Five personality dimensions?

5. Are there significant differences in the mean scores for prosocial rule breaking when respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:

1. gender
2. race
3. education level
4. years in current job
5. years in the industry
6. job position

6. Are there significant differences in the mean scores for the Big Five personality dimensions when respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:

1. gender
2. race
3. education level
4. years in current job
5. years in the industry
6. job position

The following null hypotheses were developed to empirically test the research questions:

Ho₁. There is no significant correlation between prosocial rule breaking behavior and the personality types defined in the Big Five Inventory (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991).

Ho₂. There is no significant difference in the mean responses for prosocial rule breaking behavior when the respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:

Ho₂ a. gender

Ho₂ b. race

Ho₂ c. education level

Ho₂ d. years with the current job

Ho₂ e. years in the industry

Ho₂ f. job position

Ho₃. There is no significant difference in the mean responses for personality when the respondents are classified by the demographic variables of:

Ho₃ a. gender

Ho₃ b. race

Ho₃ c. education level

Ho₃ d. years in the current job

Ho₃ e. years in the industry

Ho₃ f. job position

Ho₄. There is no significant Big Five personality type that predicts prosocial rule breaking behavior.

The first null hypothesis tested research question four, the second null hypothesis tested research question five, the third null hypothesis tested research question six, and the fourth null hypothesis tested research question three. The first two research questions did not lead to specific null hypotheses and were discussed with descriptive statistics.

Procedures

The study employed a correlational research design. The research design included the distribution of a survey questionnaire that consisted of: the Big Five Inventory, a scenario based on prosocial rule breaking, a questionnaire measuring the realism of the scenario, a questionnaire measuring prosocial breaking, and a list of demographic variables.

Permission was granted to the researcher by the restaurant company executives to enter the stores within the chain and survey the employees. Data was collected over a three to four day period for each store within the brand. Three hundred and twenty-one (321) questionnaires were collected for this study. However, during the data coding phase it was determined that 16 questionnaires were missing substantially large amounts of data and were deemed unusable. Therefore, the total number of usable questionnaires was three hundred and five (305).

Findings

The findings for the first research question concerned the basic underlying dimensions of prosocial rule breaking in the hospitality industry. This was reported with descriptive statistics measuring the six items on the prosocial rule breaking scale. The variable 'likelihood to violate' had a mean rating of 3.19, but the actual 'probability to violate' had a lower mean rating of 2.98. This shows the actual conflict of violating the rule. The items 'violating would be wrong' and 'feeling conflicted about violating' had mean ratings of 3.03, which reinforced what the respondents reported in their probability rating. The variable 'feelings about violation' assessed the respondent's comfort level with breaking a rule and the results revealed a mean rating of

2.77. The respondents revealed that the variable ‘appropriate to violate’, had a mean rating of 2.72.

The findings for the second research question indicated that for these respondents Agreeableness was the most prominent personality dimension with a mean of 4.27. Conscientiousness was the second most prominent dimension with a mean rating of 4.15. Extraversion was perceived to have a mean rating of 4.04 and the personality dimension Openness had a mean rating of 3.80. Neuroticism was perceived to be the least prominent personality dimension with a mean rating of 2.37.

The third research question tested the Big Five personality dimensions to reveal if there was a best predictor for prosocial rule breaking. The multiple regression procedure revealed that two of the Big Five dimensions, Conscientiousness and Neuroticism could predict prosocial rule breaking. Conscientiousness had the most impact on prosocial rule breaking ($Beta = -.210$, $p = .004$) while Neuroticism also had an impact ($Beta = -.164$, $p = .022$), therefore the null hypothesis there is no significant personality type that predicts prosocial rule breaking behavior was rejected.

The findings for the fourth research question revealed one statistically significant relationship between prosocial rule breaking and one the Big Five personality dimensions, Conscientiousness, which revealed a small negative relationship ($r = -.129$, $n = 303$). This led to the rejection of the null hypothesis of no relationship.

The fifth research question tested for a significant difference in mean responses for prosocial rule breaking behavior when the participants were classified by the demographic variables: gender, race, education, years in current job, years in the industry, and job position.

An independent samples t-test was conducted to investigate differences in prosocial rule breaking mean responses by gender. There was a significant difference in responses for males ($M=.3283$, $SD=.8849$), and females ($M=-.2037$, $SD=.9657$; $t(259.962)=4.910$, $p<.01$). The differences in the means was moderate ($\eta^2=.07$), thus the null hypothesis was rejected.

The ANOVA procedure was used to investigate differences in mean responses by race. However, a statistically significant difference among the group means was not found, suggesting that the assumption of the null hypothesis is true true $F(4, 296) = 1.786$, $p = .554$.

The ANOVA procedure was used to investigate differences in mean responses by education level. However, a statistically significant difference among the group means was not found, suggesting that the assumption of the null hypothesis is true true $F(5, 291) = 1.786$, $p = .116$.

The ANOVA procedure was used to investigate differences in mean responses by years in current job. There was a statistically significant difference among the group means was found which suggests that the data are unlikely, assuming that the null hypothesis is true $F(4, 295) = 270.161$, $p = .015$. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative which states that a difference exists among the group means in the population.

The ANOVA procedure was used to investigate differences in mean responses by years in the industry. A statistically significant difference among the group mean responses was found $F(4, 294) = 34.427$, $p = .001$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. However, after an examination of the effect size ($R^2 = .063$), it was revealed that the model fit poorly and the statistical difference among the group means is trivial. Years in the industry only explains 6.3% of the variation prosocial rule breaking. Despite the fact that the result is statistically significant,

the difference is of no theoretical or practical importance. As a result, the post hoc test results were not interpreted.

The assumptions for the ANOVA procedure were violated, so to investigate the differences in responses by position, a Kruskal-Wallis test was deemed a suitable procedure for these data. A statistically significant difference among the group medians was found which suggests that the data are unlikely, assuming that the null hypothesis is true $X^2(3, n=301) = 20.787, p < .001$. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative which states that a difference exists among the group means in the population. The proportion of variability in the ranked dependent variable accounted for by the prosocial rule breaking variable was .07, indicating a moderate relationship between prosocial rule breaking and position worked within the restaurant.

To examine the differences in medians further, follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the four groups (server, bartender, hostess/greeter, server assistant), controlling for Type I error across tests by using the Bonferroni approach. The results of these tests indicated statistically significant differences between servers and hostess/greeters, ($z = -4.363, p < .01$). Servers had an average rank of 138.29, and hostess/greeters had an average rank of 80.26. There was a statistically significant difference between bartenders and hostess/greeters, ($z = -3.566, p < .01$). Bartenders had an average rank of 44.68, and hostess/greeters had an average rank of 27.31.

The fifth research question tested for a significant difference in mean responses for the Big Five personality dimensions when the participants were classified by the demographic variables: gender, years in the industry, education, and job position. An independent samples t-

test was conducted to investigate differences in Big Five personality dimensions mean responses by gender. Two of the scales showed statistical significance. There was a statistically significant difference in responses for the Neuroticism scale, males ($M=2.2199$, $SD=.74710$), and females ($M=-2.4608$, $SD=.9657$; $t(303)=-2.690$), $p=.008$. The differences in the means was small (eta squared=.023). There was a statistically significant difference in responses for the Openness scale, males ($M=3.8863$, $SD=.54881$), and females ($M=-3.7440$, $SD=.3131$; $t(303)=2.247$), $p=.025$. The differences in the means was small (eta squared=.016).

The MANOVA procedure was used to investigate differences in mean responses by race. There was no statistically significant difference found among the group means which failed to reject the null hypothesis.

The MANOVA procedure was used to investigate differences in mean responses by education level. One statistically significant difference among the group means was found with the Agreeableness scale, $F(5, 293) = 2.682$, $p = .022$. However, after an examination of the effect size ($R^2 = .044$), it was revealed that the model fit poorly and the statistical difference among the group means is trivial. Education level only explains 4.4% of the variation in the Agreeableness score. Although the result is statistically significant, it does not contribute to theory or practice. As a result, the post hoc test results were not interpreted.

The MANOVA procedure was used to investigate differences in mean responses by years in the current job. There was no statistically significant difference found among the group means which failed to reject the null hypothesis.

To test for differences by years in the industry and the Big Five personality dimensions, the Kruskal-Wallis procedure was used as the assumptions for MANOVA were violated. There

was a statistically significant difference among the group medians was found only for the Conscientiousness domain $X^2(4, N= 301) = 16.164, p = .003$. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. The proportion of variability in the ranked dependent variable accounted for by the Conscientiousness was .05, indicating a small to moderate relationship between the Conscientiousness dimension and years worked in the industry.

Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the five groups of years worked in the industry (less than one year, 1-3 years, 3-6 years, 6-9 years, and more than 9 years) controlling for Type I error across tests by using the Bonferroni approach. The results of these tests indicated there was no statistically significant difference between all of the groups with the exception of those that worked less than one year and those who worked more than 9 years ($z = -2.356, p = .018$). Those that worked less than one year had an average rank of 30.76, and those that worked more than 9 years had an average rank of 46.64.

To investigate differences in responses by job position, the Kruskal-Wallis was deemed a suitable procedure for these data as the assumptions for MANOVA were violated. There was a statistically significant difference among the group medians in the Agreeableness dimension which suggests that the data are unlikely, assuming that the null hypothesis is true $X^2(3, n= 303) = 10.276, p \leq .016$. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative which states that a difference exists among the group means in the population. The proportion of variability in the ranked dependent variable accounted for by the Agreeableness scale score was .03, indicating a small relationship between the Agreeableness dimension and position worked within the restaurant.

To examine the differences in medians further, follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the four groups of positions (server, bartender, hostess/greeters, server assistants) controlling for Type I error across tests by using the Bonferroni approach. The results of these tests indicated there was no statistically significant difference between all of the groups with the exception of hostess/greeters and server assistants ($z = -3.044, p = .002$). Hostess/Greeters had an average rank of 26.46, and server assistants had an average rank of 11.33.

Discussion

Prosocial Rule Breaking

The findings for the first research question were built on the basic underlying dimensions of prosocial rule breaking in the hospitality industry. Initially, this was reported with descriptive statistics measuring the six items on the prosocial rule breaking scale, it was later expanded by the comments left by some of the respondents at the end of the questionnaire.

The respondents expressed that the variable ‘likelihood to violate’ had a mean rating of 3.19, but the actual ‘probability to violate’ had a lower mean rating of 2.98. The reasons for this discrepancy may be answered with the qualitative comments some of the respondents incorporated at the end of the questionnaire. For example, one respondent noted:

With the hypothetical situation it would be nice to be able to write in an answer also.

If the manager is busy at the time then I could have easily told the customer, “the coupon has expired but get me a little time and when the manager is free I will ask if I can accept it.

This particular person wants to serve the customer, but also wants to serve the organization by not breaking a rule without manager approval. This type of feeling conveyed by this respondent explains the discrepancy in the means 'likelihood to violate' and 'probability to violate.'

The item 'violating would be wrong' centered on an individual's perspective. One respondent conveyed their feelings on rule breaking as:

The answers for the situation part do not reflect the whole situation. The answers are too general. I made my choices based on the firm belief that rules and laws are made for a reason whether safety of oneself or property or others. Thank you. Only under extreme conditions should they be broken. Again, thank you.

The variable 'feelings about violation' assessed the respondent's comfort level with breaking a rule. One respondent expanded on this point by stating:

With the scenario-I would feel somewhat comfortable accepting the coupon because the corporation knows how many coupons they printed, and assuming it is a large, national chain, they have accounted for all the coupons they printed. Therefore it should be included in the budget. I would ask a manager first.

The respondents also had a chance to respond to the appropriateness to violate the rule which revealed a mean rating of 2.72. One respondent stated, "My morals would keep me from using the coupon. But I wouldn't have a problem using it. Either something is right or wrong. Just because you can do something doesn't mean you should."

One respondent also noted that the decision to participate in prosocial rule breaking may depend on one's feelings of commitment to the job and said: "I think a deciding factor in this

scenario is if the person is looking for advancement in the company or if they are doing this as just a job.”

However, those individuals that took a strong customer perspective conveyed a stronger sense of service to the customer. For example:

About the coupon-I don't like telling a guest “no” about anything. If I absolutely cannot use a coupon that had expired, I would take it, not use it; give them cash credit out of my money for it without telling the customer anything. I just want people to be happy and come back.

A plausible explanation for the variance in the responses is offered by Eddleston et al., (2002) who stated that workers in service exchanges had three psychological contracts. The first contract is between the customer-contact employee and the customer, the second between the customer-contact employee and management, and third, the customer-contact employee and the organization (Eddleston et al., 2002). A psychological contract is different than an employment contract in the sense that a psychological contract is personal and the two parties involved may have varying beliefs of their reciprocal obligations (Eddleston et al., 2002). Eddleston et al., (2002) stated that there are two types of psychological contracts that are prominent, those that are extremely transactional or those that are extremely relational. Transactional contracts are those with low expectations from both parties and are “motivated purely by self-interest, and usually involve quid pro quo exchanges” (Eddleston et al., 2002). Furthermore, extremely transactional contracts contain almost no trust and most likely occur in one-time only relationships (Eddleston et al., 2002). By definition, these types of relationships would not be present in prosocial rule breaking because of non-selfish nature of prosocial rule breaking. On the contrary, relational

contracts are more likely to occur with prosocial rule breaking. In relational contracts there is more of a personal relationship between the two parties because of the higher level of commitment to the relationship and is more likely to be flexible when evaluating the performance of the other party (Eddleston et al., 2002).

The type of contract that a customer-contact worker may have with customers and management can vary. They can be transactional only, relational only, or a combination of both. The type of contract that the employee has with management will influence employee attitude and behavior (Eddleston et al., 2002). Transactional contracts between employees and supervisors have minimal standards and low expectations; in contrast, relational contracts are characterized by higher commitment from employees if employees feel trust is reciprocal (Eddleston et al., 2002). Therefore, the type of contracts customer-contact employees have with the various stakeholders can influence the extent to which employees choose to satisfy customers.

Big Five Personality Dimensions

The finding that Agreeableness was the most common personality dimension in this sample of hospitality workers is consistent with existing literature. Studies using five factor inventories in samples of hotel workers (Kim, Shin, & Umbreit, 2007; Silva, 2006) and restaurant workers (Kim, Shin, & Swanger, 2009) are consistent with this study's findings that Agreeableness is the most prominent of the five factors of personality. Conscientiousness was the second most prominent dimension which was also consistent with the hospitality literature (Kim et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2007; Silva, 2006). Extraversion was the next most prominent of

the five personality dimensions, followed by Openness, and then Neuroticism, which was consistent with recent studies using five factor inventories (Kim et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2007).

The Big Five and Prosocial Rule Breaking

The finding that Conscientiousness had the most impact on prosocial rule breaking ($Beta = -.210, p = .004$). The negative direction of the relationship indicates that the more conscientious an individual is, the less likely it will be for that individual to participate in prosocial rule breaking. Conscientiousness has been shown to be a valid predictor in across many occupational groups for job performance and focuses on the accomplishment of tasks (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Individuals that convey traits from this dimension have a strong sense of purpose and obligation in their work and perform better than those that do not possess these qualities (Barrick & Mount). In this study's investigation of prosocial rule breaking, these individuals may possess a stronger sense of compliance to follow organizational procedures (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986).

The findings revealed one statistically significant but small negative relationship between prosocial rule breaking and Conscientiousness ($r = -.129, n = 303$). People that possess the qualities of conscientiousness exhibit traits that are important to the accomplishment of tasks in jobs such as perseverance, reliability, and thoroughness (Barrick & Mount, 1991). In general, the results suggest that if an individual is conscientious they will tend not to participate in prosocial rule breaking.

Demographic Variables and Prosocial Rule Breaking

Morrison's (2006) study revealed that gender had a significant difference with likelihood to participate in prosocial rule breaking; females were less likely to partake in prosocial rule breaking. Gender was tested using an independent samples t-test and revealed a significant difference in the means between males ($M=.3283$, $SD=.8849$), and females ($M=-.2037$, $SD=.9657$; $t(259.962)=4.910$), $p<.01$.

The variable years in the industry was explored as Morrison (2006) had investigated work experience in her study. This study found that years in the industry made a statistically significant difference, but the effect size revealed that the model fit poorly and the statistical significance was of no practical or theoretical importance. The statistical significance may have been detected due to the sample size (Pallant, 2003).

Further exploration was done with the demographic variable education level and prosocial rule breaking because Morrison's (2006) study used a convenience sample of MBA students, a homogeneous education sample. As this was the first industry tested sample of respondents, education levels would vary and were tested to see if there was significant difference. A statistically significant difference was not found.

The variable job position was used to test for any significant differences. As Morrison's (2006) study used a convenience sample of MBA students, the real industry positions were tested to investigate any statistically significant differences among the positions. The Kruskal-Wallis test was implemented as the assumptions for ANOVA had been violated. A moderate relationship was found between prosocial rule breaking and job position in the restaurant; therefore, follow up tests were conducted to examine the differences. Statistically significant

differences existed between servers and hostess/greeters and bartenders and hostess/greeters. An explanation for this difference may be explained by the amount of customer contact each position entails. Servers and bartenders alike have very high customer contact whereas hostess/greeters have much less by job design.

Demographic Variables and the Big Five

According to Benet-Martínez and John (1998) gender differences have been small in Big Five inventories and the factor structures replicate across gender equally with the exception of Neuroticism and Agreeableness, which is generally slightly higher in females. In this study, there was a statistically significant difference in Neuroticism, males ($M=2.2199$, $SD=.74710$), and females ($M=-2.4608$, $SD=.9657$; $t(303)=-2.690$, $p=.008$). The differences in the means was small ($\eta^2=.023$) which is consistent with the literature (Benet-Martínez and John, 1998). The difference that is not consistent with literature is the statistical significance with Openness, males ($M=3.8863$, $SD=.54881$), and females ($M=-3.7440$, $SD=.3131$; $t(303)=2.247$, $p=.025$). However, the differences in the means was small ($\eta^2=.016$).

The findings for years in the industry and Big Five personality dimension revealed one statistically significant relationship. The Kruskal-Wallis test was utilized for these data as the assumptions for MANOVA were violated. Conscientiousness and years in the industry, were statistically significant $X^2(4, n=301)=16.164$, $p=.003$. There was a small to moderate relationship (.05) accounted for by Conscientiousness. To examine this relationship further follow up tests were performed. The follow up tests revealed one statistically significant relationship between those that worked less than one year and those who worked more than 9

years ($z = -2.356, p = .018$). A possible explanation may be that those who have been in the industry for an extended period of time may have a better understanding of accomplishing the tasks on the job better than those who have worked less than one year.

There was a statistically significant finding with the Big Five personality dimension Agreeableness, $F(5, 293) = 2.682, p = .022$. and education level. $F(5, 293) = 2.682, p = .022$. This finding is inconsistent with literature that states Conscientiousness is usually the domain with a relationship to education (Barrick & Mount, 1991). However, the effect size ($R^2 = .044$) revealed a trivial difference without practical or theoretical importance.

The findings for job position and the Big Five revealed a statistically significant difference between the Agreeableness dimension $X^2(3, n = 303) = 10.276, p \leq .016$ and job position. Follow tests were conducted to investigate the differences further and the results indicated there was a statistically significant difference between hostess/greeters and server assistants ($z = -3.044, p = .002$). A possible explanation for this difference is the sample size, as server assistants $n = 9$ as compared to hostess/greeters $n = 37$.

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are limited to the sample of one restaurant chain located in the southeastern United States. Therefore, the results are not generalizable to other types of hospitality operations or other geographical locations. Therefore, these conclusions are limited to the findings and limitations of this study. The following conclusions are derived from this study:

- The respondents in this study indicated a moderate likelihood of prosocial rule breaking on the behalf of a customer.
- The most prominent of the Big Five personality dimensions is Agreeableness.
- The best predictor for not committing prosocial rule breaking is Conscientiousness.

Implications

This study has implications for researchers as well as managers in the industry. The results from this study suggest that it is important for restaurant managers to encourage prosocial behavior from their employees. However, managers must take caution and educate their employees so that a gesture that is beneficial and functional to the customer is not dysfunctional for all other parties. There may be certain positions where prosocial rule breaking behavior is desired, and other positions where it is not desired. However, if there is an organizational rule that is constantly being broken, managers should evaluate the worthiness of that rule.

The results of the Big Five personality dimensions have added another confirmation of the dimensions that are important to the hospitality industry. Research could be performed on the most successful employees and develop a profile for each position. This tool could be used in the hiring, selection, and training process.

Recommendations for Future Research

As the topic of prosocial rule breaking has limited empirical study to this date, there are several recommendations for future study in this area. One area that is suggested is exploring psychological contracts and the propensity for prosocial rule breaking. The three contract model of Eddleston et al., (2002) should be investigated: the customer-contact employee and customer, the customer-contact employee and management, and the customer-contact employee and the organization. The type of contract, either transactional or relational should be studied and provide interesting data to both the psychological contract literature and prosocial rule breaking literature.

Another recommendation based on the results of the present study it is input different individual variables to be tested with prosocial rule breaking. The ethical decision making process was a theme that emerged from the qualitative results and a possible model for testing could be derived from Spreitzer & Sonenshein's (2003) positive deviance model. Job meaning as an individual variable should be retained and tested; locus of control is similar to self-determination; ethical climate and ethical culture should also be investigated to determine the role of the organization's influence on prosocial rule breaking. One suggestion may be to test different districts or regions within one brand/company to see if the culture is consistent and supportive of prosocial rule breaking. Ego strength is substituted for courage because both constructs deal with a person's inner strength to resist impulses. The proposed model is shown in Table 23.

Table 23: Proposed Revised Model of Prosocial Rule Breaking

Proposed Model	Job Meaning	Locus of control	Ethical Climate	Ethical Culture	Ego Strength
Spreitzer & Sonenshein (2003)	Meaning	Self-determination	Focus on Others	Personal Efficacy	Courage
Morrison (2006)	Job Meaning and Autonomy	Co-worker Behavior	Empathy	Proactive Personality	Risk Taking
Curtis (2010)	Job Meaning and Autonomy	Co-worker Behavior	Big Five Personality Dimensions		

Limitations and Delimitations

There are limitations to this study which may possibly affect the findings. First, the use of an industry category (i.e., restaurants), and market segment within the category (i.e., casual dining), and population sample, limits the generalizability of these findings.

Secondly, reliability may also be affected due to socially desirable responses. Respondents may choose items that they feel are socially accepted behaviors rather than what they would actually perform (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

The delimitations that impact the study pertain to the fact that data collection was limited to thirteen stores of a nationally branded restaurant chain in the greater Orlando, FL area, thus limiting the generalizability of these findings to other cities or foreign countries.

APPENDIX A: IRB APPROVAL



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00001138**

To: **Catherine R. Curtis**

Date: **October 22, 2009**

Dear Researcher:

On 10/22/2009, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination
Project Title: An investigation of pro-social rule breaking in the hospitality industry
Investigator: Catherine R. Curtis
IRB Number: SBE-09-06502
Funding Agency:
Grant Title:
Research ID: N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Joseph Bielitzki, DVM, UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 10/22/2009 03:36:54 PM EDT

IRB Coordinator

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE

How I am in general

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who *likes to spend time with others*? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which **you agree or disagree with that statement.**

1	2	3	4	5
Disagree Strongly	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree strongly

I am someone who...

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. _____ Is talkative</p> <p>2. _____ Tends to find fault with others</p> <p>3. _____ Does a thorough job</p> <p>4. _____ Is depressed, blue</p> <p>5. _____ Is original, comes up with new ideas</p> <p>6. _____ Is reserved</p> <p>7. _____ Is helpful and unselfish with others</p> <p>8. _____ Can be somewhat careless</p> <p>9. _____ Is relaxed, handles stress well.</p> <p>10. _____ Is curious about many different things</p> <p>11. _____ Is full of energy</p> <p>12. _____ Starts quarrels with others</p> <p>13. _____ Is a reliable worker</p> <p>14. _____ Can be tense</p> <p>15. _____ Is ingenious, a deep thinker</p> <p>16. _____ Generates a lot of enthusiasm</p> <p>17. _____ Has a forgiving nature</p> <p>18. _____ Tends to be disorganized</p> <p>19. _____ Worries a lot</p> <p>20. _____ Has an active imagination</p> <p>21. _____ Tends to be quiet</p> <p>22. _____ Is generally trusting</p> <p>23. _____ Tends to be lazy</p> | <p>24. _____ Is emotionally stable, not easily upset</p> <p>25. _____ Is inventive</p> <p>26. _____ Has an assertive personality</p> <p>27. _____ Can be cold and aloof</p> <p>28. _____ Perseveres until the task is finished</p> <p>29. _____ Can be moody</p> <p>30. _____ Values artistic, aesthetic experiences</p> <p>31. _____ Is sometimes shy, inhibited</p> <p>32. _____ Is considerate and kind to almost everyone</p> <p>33. _____ Does things efficiently</p> <p>34. _____ Remains calm in tense situations</p> <p>35. _____ Prefers work that is routine</p> <p>36. _____ Is outgoing, sociable</p> <p>37. _____ Is sometimes rude to others</p> <p>38. _____ Makes plans and follows through with them</p> <p>39. _____ Gets nervous easily</p> <p>40. _____ Likes to reflect, play with ideas</p> <p>41. _____ Has few artistic interests</p> <p>42. _____ Likes to cooperate with others</p> <p>43. _____ Is easily distracted</p> <p>44. _____ Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature</p> |
|--|--|

Directions: Please read the following scenario, and then circle the answer choice that best reflects your opinion.

You are a server at a restaurant that is part of a nationally recognized brand. You have been with the company for 3 years. Your responsibilities include, among other things, taking orders from customers. You have just taken a dinner order from a customer, and the customer presented you with a coupon. Upon looking at the coupon, you realize that the coupon has expired. You know that there are strict policies in place for coupons. The policy of primary concern is that servers are not allowed to accept expired coupons without approval from their manager. Unfortunately your manager is busy helping another server with a large party so you cannot ask her whether or not you can accept the coupon. You are considering whether to accept the coupon without approval, even though this would mean violating the policy, and you could get in trouble for this. You are really torn. Although you have nothing personally to gain by accepting the coupon, it would be good for the customer and might also be good for the company.

*One of eight condition statements will be listed here.

1. This scenario is realistic.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>

2. I could easily imagine myself in a situation like this.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>

3. Violating this policy would be good for the customer.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>

4. Violating this policy would be good for the company.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>

5. Violating this policy would be good for my career.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>

Go on to the next page.

Please continue here.

6. In this situation, how likely would you be to violate the policy and accept the coupon without your manager's approval?

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Very Unlikely</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Neither Likely nor Unlikely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Very Likely</i>

7. What is the probability that you would violate the policy?

1	2	3	4	5
0%	25%	50%	75%	100%

8. How appropriate would it be for you to violate the policy and accept the coupon without approval?

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Very Inappropriate</i>	<i>Inappropriate</i>	<i>Neither Appropriate nor Inappropriate</i>	<i>Appropriate</i>	<i>Very Appropriate</i>

9. How would you feel about violating the policy and accepting the coupon without approval?

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Very Uncomfortable</i>	<i>Uncomfortable</i>	<i>Neither Comfortable nor Uncomfortable</i>	<i>Comfortable</i>	<i>Very Comfortable</i>

10. I think that violating the policy in this situation would be wrong.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>

11. I would feel conflicted about violating the policy.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>

This last section asks some general questions about you. This information will be kept in the strictest confidence and used for statistical purposes only.

12. Are you? Please X one.

- Female
- Male

13. Which of the following best describes your age? Please X one.

- 18-20
- 21-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- 51 and above

Please continue on the back

Please continue here.

14. Which best describes your race? Please X one.

- African-American
- Asian
- Hispanic
- White
- Other

15. What is your highest level of education completed? Please X one.

- GED
- High school diploma
- 1-2 years past high school
- 4-year college program
- Master's degree
- Other (describe: _____)

16. How long have you been at your current job? Please X one.

- Less than one year
- 1-3 years
- 3-6 years
- 6-9 years
- more than 9 years

17. How long have you been in this industry? Please X one.

- Less than one year
- 1-3 years
- 3-6 years
- 6-9 years
- more than 9 years

18. What is your full time job? Please X one.

- Server
- Bartender
- Hostess/Greeter
- Server Assistant
- Other _____

Thank you for your participation in this study.
Please feel free to enter any comments or suggestions in this box.

APPENDIX C: INDIVIDUAL SCALE SCORES (BFI)

Table 24: BFI Extraversion Scale Score

Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.63	1	.3	.3	.3
2.00	1	.3	.3	.7
2.25	2	.7	.7	1.3
2.38	2	.7	.7	2.0
2.50	2	.7	.7	2.6
2.63	4	1.3	1.3	3.9
2.75	4	1.3	1.3	5.2
2.88	5	1.6	1.6	6.9
3.00	10	3.3	3.3	10.2
3.13	6	2.0	2.0	12.1
3.25	8	2.6	2.6	14.8
3.38	16	5.2	5.2	20.0
3.50	9	3.0	3.0	23.0
3.57	1	.3	.3	23.3
3.63	14	4.6	4.6	27.9
3.75	20	6.6	6.6	34.4
3.88	12	3.9	3.9	38.4
4.00	25	8.2	8.2	46.6
4.13	18	5.9	5.9	52.5
4.14	1	.3	.3	52.8
4.25	20	6.6	6.6	59.3
4.38	25	8.2	8.2	67.5
4.50	27	8.9	8.9	76.4
4.57	1	.3	.3	76.7
4.63	29	9.5	9.5	86.2
4.75	16	5.2	5.2	91.5
4.88	13	4.3	4.3	95.7
5.00	12	3.9	3.9	99.7
10.38	1	.3	.3	100.0
Total	305	100.0	100.0	

Table 25: BFI Agreeableness Score

Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.89	1	.3	.3	.3
2.44	1	.3	.3	.7
2.67	1	.3	.3	1.0
2.78	4	1.3	1.3	2.3
2.89	2	.7	.7	3.0
3.00	1	.3	.3	3.3
3.11	1	.3	.3	3.6
3.22	4	1.3	1.3	4.9
3.33	6	2.0	2.0	6.9
3.44	6	2.0	2.0	8.9
3.56	10	3.3	3.3	12.1
3.67	10	3.3	3.3	15.4
3.78	12	3.9	3.9	19.3
3.89	14	4.6	4.6	23.9
4.00	17	5.6	5.6	29.5
4.11	28	9.2	9.2	38.7
4.22	17	5.6	5.6	44.3
4.33	18	5.9	5.9	50.2
4.44	30	9.8	9.8	60.0
4.56	29	9.5	9.5	69.5
4.67	25	8.2	8.2	77.7
4.78	25	8.2	8.2	85.9
4.89	18	5.9	5.9	91.8
5.00	25	8.2	8.2	100.0
Total	305	100.0	100.0	

Table 26: BFI Conscientiousness Scale Score

Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2.44	1	2	.7	.7
2.67	1	4	1.3	1.3
2.78	1	1	.3	.3
2.89	4	2	.7	.7
3.00	2	5	1.6	1.6
3.11	1	5	1.6	1.6
3.22	1	9	3.0	3.0
3.33	4	6	2.0	2.0
3.44	6	8	2.6	2.6
3.56	6	8	2.6	2.6
3.67	10	9	3.0	3.0
3.78	10	15	4.9	4.9
3.89	12	20	6.6	6.6
4.00	14	20	6.6	6.6
4.11	17	28	9.2	9.2
4.22	28	27	8.9	8.9
4.33	17	30	9.8	9.8
4.44	18	14	4.6	4.6
4.56	30	24	7.9	7.9
4.67	29	16	5.2	5.2
4.78	25	16	5.2	5.2
4.89	25	17	5.6	5.6
5.00	18	19	6.2	6.2
Total	25	305	100.0	100.0

Table 27: BFI Neuroticism Scale Score

Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.00	11	3.6	3.6	3.6
1.13	5	1.6	1.6	5.2
1.25	6	2.0	2.0	7.2
1.38	14	4.6	4.6	11.8
1.50	11	3.6	3.6	15.4
1.63	11	3.6	3.6	19.0
1.75	13	4.3	4.3	23.3
1.88	18	5.9	5.9	29.2
2.00	27	8.9	8.9	38.0
2.13	20	6.6	6.6	44.6
2.25	21	6.9	6.9	51.5
2.38	21	6.9	6.9	58.4
2.50	13	4.3	4.3	62.6
2.63	17	5.6	5.6	68.2
2.75	14	4.6	4.6	72.8
2.86	1	.3	.3	73.1
2.88	10	3.3	3.3	76.4
3.00	16	5.2	5.2	81.6
3.13	6	2.0	2.0	83.6
3.25	14	4.6	4.6	88.2
3.38	8	2.6	2.6	90.8
3.50	6	2.0	2.0	92.8
3.63	7	2.3	2.3	95.1
3.75	5	1.6	1.6	96.7
3.88	2	.7	.7	97.4
4.00	1	.3	.3	97.7
4.25	1	.3	.3	98.0
4.38	2	.7	.7	98.7
4.50	3	1.0	1.0	99.7
4.63	1	.3	.3	100.0
Total	305	100.0	100.0	

Table 28: BFI Openness Scale Score

Rating	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2.30	1	.3	.3	.3
2.40	1	.3	.3	.7
2.50	1	.3	.3	1.0
2.60	3	1.0	1.0	2.0
2.70	5	1.6	1.6	3.6
2.80	4	1.3	1.3	4.9
2.90	2	.7	.7	5.6
3.00	8	2.6	2.6	8.2
3.10	12	3.9	3.9	12.1
3.20	9	3.0	3.0	15.1
3.30	16	5.2	5.2	20.3
3.40	17	5.6	5.6	25.9
3.50	15	4.9	4.9	30.8
3.60	29	9.5	9.5	40.3
3.67	1	.3	.3	40.7
3.70	22	7.2	7.2	47.9
3.80	24	7.9	7.9	55.7
3.90	20	6.6	6.6	62.3
4.00	16	5.2	5.2	67.5
4.10	13	4.3	4.3	71.8
4.20	12	3.9	3.9	75.7
4.30	23	7.5	7.5	83.3
4.40	10	3.3	3.3	86.6
4.50	10	3.3	3.3	89.8
4.60	12	3.9	3.9	93.8
4.70	9	3.0	3.0	96.7
4.80	9	3.0	3.0	99.7
5.00	1	.3	.3	100.0
Total	305	100.0	100.0	

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Allport, G.W. & Odbert, H.S. (1936). Trait-name: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, 47 (211).
- Applebaum, S.H., Iaconi, J.D., & Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance*, 7 (5), 586-598.
- Babin, B.J., Boles, J. S. & Robin, D.P. (2000). Representing the perceived ethical work climate of marketing employees. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28 (3), 345-358.
- Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44 (1), 1-26.
- Baruch, Y., O'Creevy, M. F., Hind, P. & Vigoda-Badot, E. (2004). Pro-social behavior and job performance: Does the need for control and the need for achievement make a difference? *Social Behavior and Personality*, 32 (4), 399-412.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. 1993. The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14 (2), 103-118.
- Batson, C.D. (1991). *The altruism question: Toward a social psychological answer*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Baumgarten, F. (1933). *Die Charktereigenschaften* (The character traits). In *Beitraege zur Charakter und Persoenlichkeitsforschung* (Whole No. 1). Bern, Switzerland: A. Franckce.
- Beams, J. D., Brown, R. M., & Killough, L. N. (2003). An experiment testing the determinants of non-compliance with insider trading laws. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 45(4), 309-323.
- Benet-Martínez, V. & John, O.P. (1998). Los cinco grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish or English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75 (3), 729-750.
- Bennett, R.J. & Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85 (3), 349-360.
- Berry, L.L. (1981). The employee as customer. *Journal of Retail Banking*, 3 1, 33-40.
- Bettencourt, L.A. & Brown, S.W. (1997). Contact employees: Relationships among workplace fairness, job satisfaction, and prosocial service behaviors. *Journal of Retailing*, 73 1, 39-61.
- Bitner, M.J. (1995). Building service relationships: It's all about promises. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23 4, 246-251.
- Bitner, M.J., Booms, B.H. & Mohr, L.A. (1994). Critical service encounters: The employee's viewpoint. *The Journal of Marketing*, 58 4, 95-106.
- Bolino, M.C. & Turnley, W.H. (2003). Going the extra mile: Cultivating and managing organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17 (30), 60-71.

- Bommer, M., Gratto, C., Gravander, J. & Tuttle, M. (1987). A behavioral model of ethical and unethical decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 6 (4), 265-280.
- Bowen, D.E. & Lawler, E.E., (1995). Empowering service employees. *Sloan Management Review* 36, 73–84.
- Bowen, D.E. & Schneider, B. (1985). Boundary-spanning role employees and the service industry: Some guidelines for management and research. In J.A. Czepiel, M.R. Solomon and C.F. Surprenant (Eds), *The service encounter* (pp127-147). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Bowen, J.C. & Ford, R.C . (2002). Managing service organizations: Does having a “thing” make a difference? *Journal of Management*, 28 (3), 447-469.
- Brief, A. P. & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Pro-social organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11 (4), 710-725.
- Brockhaus, R.H. (1980). Risk taking propensity of entrepreneurs. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 23 (3), 509-520.
- Bryant, P.C., Davis, C.A., Hancock, J.I, & Vardaman, J.M. (2009). When rule makers become rule breakers: Employee level outcomes of managerial pro-social rule breaking. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, DOI 10.1007/s10672-009-9114-6.
- Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., & Quinn, R.E. (2003). Foundations of positive organizational scholarship. In K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton,& R.E. Quinn, *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

- Catell, R.B. (1943). The description of personality: Basic traits resolved into clusters. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology*, 38, 476-506.
- Catell, R.B. (1947). Confirmation and clarification of primary personality factors. *Psychometrika*, 12, 197-220.
- Catell, R.B., Eber, H.W., & Tatsuoka, M.M. (1970). *Handbook for the 16 personality factor questionnaire (16PF)*, Champaign, IL: IPAT.
- Cavanagh, G.F., Moberg, D.J. & Velasquez, M. (1981). The ethics of organizational politics. *The Academy of Management Review*, 6 (3), 363-374.
- Chaplin, W.F., John, O.P., & Goldberg, L.R. (1988). Conceptions of States and Traits: Dimensional Attributes with ideals as prototypes. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 54 (4), 541-557.
- Chonko, L.B. & Burnett, J.J. (1983). Measuring the source of ethical situations as a source of role conflict: A survey of salespeople, sales managers, and sales support personnel. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 3 (May), 41-47.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Colbert, A.E., Mount, M.K., Witt, J.K., Harter, L.A. & Barrick, M.R. (2004). *Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (4), 599-609.
- Costa, P.T. Jr. & McCrae, R.R. (1976). Age differences in personality structure: A cluster analytic approach. *Journal of Gerontology*, 31, 564-570.

- Costa, P.T. Jr. & McCrae, R.R. (1985). *The NEO personality inventory manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P.T. Jr. & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *NEO PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Digman, J.M. (1990). Personality structure: emergence of the five factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41 (1), 417-440.
- Doherty, R.W., Orimoto, L., Singelis, T.M., Hatfield, E. & Hebb, J. (1995). Emotional contagion: gender and occupational differences. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 19, 355-371.
- Eddleston, K. A., Kidder, D. L., & Litzky, B. E. 2002. Who's the boss? Contending with competing expectations from customers and management. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16: 85-95.
- Enz, C.A. (2001). What keeps you up at night? Key issues of concern for lodging managers. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42 (2), 38-45.
- Eysenck, H.J. (1991). Dimensions of personality: 16, 5 or 3-Criteria for a taxonomic paradigm. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 773-790.
- Ferrell, O.C. & Gresham, L.G. (1985). A contingency framework for understanding ethical decision making in marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 49 (3), 87-96.
- Ferrell, O.C., Gresham, L.G., & Fraedrich, (1989). A synthesis of ethical decision making models for marketing. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 9 (2), 55-64-.
- Fiske, D.W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of the personality ratings from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology*, 44, 329-344.

- Ford, R.C. & Richardson, W.D. (1994). Ethical decision making: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Business Ethics, 13* (3), 205-221.
- Forte, A. (2005). Locus of control and the moral reasoning of managers. *Journal of Business Ethics, 58* (1-3), 65-77.
- Fraedrich, J. & Ferrell, O.C. (1992). Cognitive consistency of marketing managers in ethical situations. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 20* (3), 245-252.
- Gaudine, A. & Thorne, L. (2001). Emotion and ethical decision-making in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 31* (2), 175-187.
- George, J.M. (1990). Personality, affect, and behavior in groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75* (2), 107-116.
- George, J.M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76* (2), 299-307.
- Ghiselli, R. & Ismail, J.A. (1998). Employee theft and efficacy of certain control procedures in commercial food service operations. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 22* (2), 174-187.
- Gill, A. S. & Mathur, N. (2007). Improving employee dedication and pro-social behavior. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 19* (4), 328-334.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L.Wheeler, *Review of personality and social psychology. Vol. 2*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative “description of personality”: The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59 (6), 1216-1229.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 26-42.
- Goldberg, L. R. & Kilkowski, J.M. (1985). The prediction of semantic consistency in self-descriptions: Characteristics of persons and of terms that affect the consistency of responses to synonym and antonym pairs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48 (1), 82-98.
- Greenberg, J. (1997). The steal motive: Managing the social determinants of employee theft. In R. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in organizations*, 85-108, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15: 250-279.
- Harrington, S.J. (1997). A test of a person: Issue contingent model of ethical decision making in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16 (4), 363-375.
- Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J.T., Rapson, R.L. (1993). Emotional contagion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 2 (3), 96-99.
- Hollinger, R.C. & Clark, J.P. (1982). Formal and informal social controls. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 23 (3), 333-343.
- Hunt, S.D. & Vitell, S.J. (1986). A general theory of marketing ethics. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 6 (Spring), 5-15.

- John, O.P. (1990). The “Big Five” factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and questionnaires. In L.A. Pervin (ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York: Guilford Press.
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M. & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The “Big Five” Inventory: Versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* , 114-158. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Jones, T.M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue-contingent model. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16 (2), 366-395.
- Jones, G. E., & Kavanagh, M. J. (1996). An experimental examination of the effects of individual and situational factors on unethical behavioral intentions in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15 (5), 511-523.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science* 9 (2), 131-146.
- Kelley, S.W. & Hoffman, K.D. (1997). An investigation of positive affect, prosocial behaviors and service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 73 (3), 407-427.

- Kim, H.J., Shin, K.H. & Swanger, N. (2009). Burnout and engagement: A comparative analysis using the Big Five personality dimensions, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28 (1), 96-104.
- Kim, H.J., Shin, K.H. & Umbreit, W.T. (2007). Hotel job burnout: The role of personality characteristics, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26 (2), 421-434.
- Kim, W., Ok, C., & Lee, M.J. (2009). Antecedents of service employees' organizational citizenship behaviors in full-service restaurants in Korea. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 50 (2), 180-197.
- Klages, L. (1932). *The science of character*. London:Allen & Unwin.
- Kogan, N.,&Wallach, M. A. (1964). *Risk taking: A study in cognition and personality*. NewYork: Rinehart&Winston..
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence. The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory* (347-480). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lashley, C. (1995). Towards an understanding of employee empowerment in hospitality services. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 7 (1), 27-32.
- Litzky, B.E., Eddleston, K.A., & Kidder, D.L. (2006). The good, the bad, and the misguided: How managers inadvertently encourage deviant behavior. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20 (1), 91-103.

- Lundberg, C. & Mossberg, L. (2008). Learning by sharing: Waiters' and bartenders' experiences of service encounters. *Journal of Foodservice, 19* (1), 44-52.
- Luria, G. & Yagil, D. (2008). Procedural justice, ethical climate, and service outcomes in restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 27* (2), 276-283.
- Mayer, D. M., Caldwell, J., Ford, R., Uhl-Bien, M., & Gresock, A. (2007). Should I serve my customer or my supervisor? A relational perspective on pro-social rule breaking. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Philadelphia.
- McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T. (1985). Updating Norman's adequate taxonomy: Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and in questionnaires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 710-721.
- McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52* (1), 81-90.
- McDoughall, W. (1932). Of the words character and personality. *Character Personality, 1*, 3-16.
- McNeely, B.L. & Meglino, B.M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79* (6), 836-844.

- Morrison, E.W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (6), 1543-1567.
- Morrison, E.W. (2006). Doing the job well: An investigation of pro-social rule breaking. *Journal of Management*, 32 (1), 5-28.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Near, J.P. & Miceli, M.P. (1985). Organizational dissidence: The case of whistle-blowing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 4 (1), 1-16.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology*, 66, 574-583.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Nunnally, J.C. & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- O'Neill, M. (2001). Measuring service quality and customer satisfaction. In J. Kandampully, C. Mok, & B. Sparks: *Service quality management in hospitality, tourism, and leisure*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Ouchi, W. (1981). *Theory z*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Pallant, J. (2003). *SPSS survival manual*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

- Paolillo, J.G. P. & Vitell, S. J. (2002). An empirical investigation of the influence of selected personal, organizational and moral intensity factors on ethical decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 35 (1), 65-74.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., & Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26 (3), 513-563.
- Raub, S. (2008). Does bureaucracy kill individual initiative? The impact of structure on organizational citizenship behavior in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27 (2), 179-186.
- Rest, J.R. (1986). *Moral development: Advances in Research and theory*. New York: Praeger.
- Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Moral awareness and ethical predispositions: Investigating the role of individual differences in the recognition of moral issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 233-243.
- Robinson, R.N.S. (2007). Revisiting hospitality's marginal worker thesis: A mono-occupational perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27 (3), 403-413.
- Robinson, S.L. & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multi-dimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (2), 555-572.
- Ross, W. D. (1930). *The right and the good*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Schneider, B. & Bowen, D.E. (1993). The service organization: Human resources management is crucial. *Organizational Dynamics*, 21 4, 39-52.
- Schweitzer, M. E., Ordóñez, L., & Douma, B. (2004). Goal setting as a motivator of unethical behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 422-432.
- Silva, P. (2006). Effects of disposition on hospitality employee job satisfaction and commitment, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18 (4), 317-328.
- Sitkin, S. B., & Pablo, A. L. (1992). Reconceptualizing the determinants of risk behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 17 (1), 9-38.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68 (4), 653–663.
- Spreitzer, G.M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (5), 1442-1465.
- Spreitzer, G. M. & Sonenshein, S. (2003). Positive deviance and extraordinary organizing. In K. Cameron, J. Dutton & R. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship*: 207-224. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Spreitzer, G.M. & Sonenshein, S. (2004). Toward the construct definition of positive deviance. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47 (6), 828-847.
- Stamper, C. & Van Dyne, L. (2003). Organizational citizenship: a comparison between part-time and full-time service employees. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 44 (1), 33-42.

- Treviño, L. K. (1986). Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. *The Academy of Management Review*, 11 (3), 601-617.
- Treviño, L.K. & Youngblood, S.A. (1990). Bad apples in bad barrels: A causal analysis of ethical decision-making behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75 (4), 378-385.
- Treviño, L. K., Butterfield, K., & McCabe, D. (1998). The ethical context in organizations: Influences on employee attitudes and behaviors. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 8 (3), 447-476.
- Treviño, L.K., Weaver, G. R. & Reynolds, S.J. (2006). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of Management*, 32 (6), 951-990.
- Tsalikis, J. & Fritsche, D. J. (1989). Business ethics: A literature review with a focus on marketing ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 8 (9), 695-743.
- Tupes, E.C. & Christal, R.E. (1961). Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings. (ASD-TR-61-97). Lackland Airforce Base, TX: Aeronautical Systems Division, Personnel Laboratory.
- Upchurch, R.S. (1993). *The relationship of ethical work climate types and leadership style in lodging operations* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Upchurch, R.S. (1998). A conceptual foundation for ethical decision making: A stakeholder perspective in the lodging industry (U.S.A.). *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17 (12), 1349-1361.

- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L.L. and Parks, J.M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 17, 215 – 285.
- Victor, B. & Cullen, J.B (1988). The organizational bases of ethical work climates. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33 (1), 101-125.
- Vitell, S.J., Nwachukwu, S.L. & Barnes, J.H. (1993). The effects of culture on ethical decision- making: An application of Hofstede's typology. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12 (100, 753-760.
- Walz, S.M. & Niehoff, B.P. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: Their relationship to organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 24 (3), 301-319.
- Weeks, W.A., Loe, T.W., Chonko, L.B., & Wakefield, K. (2004). The effect of perceived ethical climate on the search for sales force excellence. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 24 (3), 199–214.
- Wood, R.C. (1992). Deviants and misfits: Hotel and catering labour and the marginal worker thesis. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 11 (3), 179-182.
- Zey-Ferrell, M., & Ferrell, O. C. 1982. Role-set configuration and opportunity as predictors of unethical behavior in organizations. *Human Relations*, 35 (7), 587-604.