



ارائه شده توسط:

سایت ترجمه فا

مرجع جدیدترین مقالات ترجمه شده

از نشریات معتبر

Teams Behaving Badly: Factors Associated With Anti-Citizenship Behavior in Teams

CRAIG L. PEARCE¹

*Peter F. Drucker Graduate
School of Management
Claremont Graduate University*

ROBERT A. GIACALONE

*Department of Management
University of North Carolina at Charlotte*

We examined anti-citizenship behavior at the team level of analysis in a sample of 71 change management teams. Data were collected using a questionnaire methodology and through examination of company records. Results indicate that team leader solecism, team commitment, and perceived organizational support, but not team size, are highly correlated ($p \leq .05$) with team anti-citizenship behavior (TAB). Multiple regression results suggest that team leader solecism accounts for more unique variance in TAB than the other three variables.

Team anti-citizenship behavior is a high-level construct that encompasses complaining, defiance, social loafing, and withdrawal. That is, *team anti-citizenship behavior* (TAB) is the extent to which a team engages in behaviors that impede effective team functioning and performance. The purpose of the present research is to examine the potential antecedents of anti-citizenship behavior at the team level of analysis.

This study builds on rich theoretical and empirical lines of inquiry. For example, Fisher and Locke (1992) examined several negative behavioral responses to job dissatisfaction, and Ball, Sims, and Trevino (1994), building on Fisher and Locke's work, identified positive citizenship and anti-citizenship as important outcome variables. Subsequently, Cox (1994) extended the examination of what he termed *negative citizenship* to the group level of analysis, and Cox and Sims (1996) conceptually developed a framework for examining group anti-citizenship behavior. Thus, we use the Cox and Sims framework for our investigation of possible antecedents of TAB.

In recent years, much attention has been given to the topic of positive citizenship behavior (e.g., Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman, 1993; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Organ & Lingl, 1995; Schnake, 1991; Skarlicki & Latham, 1996; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch 1994). In large

¹Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Craig L. Pearce, Peter F. Drucker Graduate School of Management, Claremont Graduate University, 1021 North Dartmouth Avenue, Claremont, CA 91711.

part, the conceptualization and testing of this construct have been conducted by examining factors that impact individual-level behavior and linking that behavior to the organizational level and its effective functioning (Organ, 1988).

Conversely, research on anti-citizenship behavior in organizations is historically newer and less developed. Recently, perhaps because yearly organizational losses amount to billions of dollars (Murphy, 1993), anti-citizenship behavior has been given closer attention by both scholars (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997; Mangione & Quinn, 1975) and practitioners (e.g., Caudron, 1998). Different terms, including *antisocial behavior* (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997), *delinquency* (Hogan & Hogan, 1989), and *deviance* (Robinson & Bennett, 1995) have been used to describe types of anti-citizenship behavior. Research on employee anti-citizenship behavior has found that it can take a wide ranging variety of forms, including sabotage (Giacalone, Rosenfeld, & Riordan, 1997), theft (Greenberg, 1997), whistleblowing (Miceli & Near, 1997), retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), litigation (Lind, 1997), aggression (Neuman & Baron, 1998), and even humor (Rodrigues & Collinson, 1995). However, the common thread that binds these terms and activities is that they describe behavior that is detrimental to an organization.

Although there is much research on organizational citizenship behavior with the individual as the target of examination (e.g., MacKenzie, Podaskoff, & Fetter, 1993; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Organ, 1994; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Williams & Anderson, 1991), little has been done at the team level of analysis. Many constructs, such as commitment (Mayer & Schoorman, 1992; Meyer & Allen, 1984; Munene, 1995; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986), individualism–collectivism (Earley, 1989; Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Wagner & Moch, 1986), and leadership (Ball, et al., 1994; Deluga, 1995; Schnake, Dumler, & Cochran, 1993; Wayne & Green, 1993) have been strongly associated with citizenship behavior at the individual level.

However, individual-level analyses implicitly assume that citizenship behavior can be aggregated to some higher level group (e.g., the organization). Indeed, a team can be conceptualized as a specific type of organization that provides an opportunity to examine a concept such as positive citizenship or anti-citizenship behavior. But, for a few notable exceptions (Cox, 1994; Cox & Sims, 1996; George, 1990, 1991; George & Bettenhausen, 1990; George & Brief, 1992), the group-level study of citizenship-type behavior has largely ignored the less desirable anti-citizenship behaviors. Nonetheless, different forms of anti-citizenship behavior (e.g., sabotage, theft, aggression) have been studied both at the individual level and the group level of analysis (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997). In particular, the work of Leyman (1990) on mobbing provides compelling evidence that malicious efforts might be perpetrated (and studied) at the group level. In mobbing, a victim could be subjected to generally nonviolent, systematic psychological abuse, stigmatization, and encroachment of civil rights.

Recent work has systematically examined anti-citizenship-type behavior in two ways that serve as a further impetus for the current study. First, instead of focusing on one form of anti-citizenship behavior, such as theft, Robinson and Bennett (1995) and Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly (1998) focused on diverse forms of anti-citizenship behavior. Second, Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly focused on the relationship of group and individual anti-citizenship-type behavior. They found that group behavior significantly predicted individual anti-citizenship-type behavior, though this behavior was moderated by individual tenure in a work group.

Therefore, the approaches of Cox and Sims (1996), Robinson and Bennett (1995), Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly (1998), and Leyman (1990) provide a catalyst for examining multiple forms of anti-citizenship behavior at the group level. Our study examines the relative importance of four potential antecedent variables in predicting TAB: team leader solecism, team commitment, perceived organizational support, and team size. We will review the relevant literature and provide hypotheses regarding these potential antecedents.

Integration and Hypotheses

Consistent with George and Bettenhausen (1990), who concluded that group leadership, group practices, and group characteristics are three broad antecedent variables important to prosocial group behavior, we examined the relationship of these three variables to TAB. First, consistent with George and Bettenhausen's category of group leadership, we examined team leader solecism and its relationship to TAB. Second, conforming with their category of group practices, we examined team commitment and its relationship to TAB. Third, we examined group characteristics via team size and its relationship to TAB.

Additionally, we added a fourth dimension, perceived organizational support, that we hypothesize to be an important antecedent of TAB. We examined the perceived amount of support the team received from organizational management and tested its relationship to TAB. Though not included in George and Bettenhausen's (1990) framework, in the following sections we will develop a rationale and specific hypotheses for this dimension and its relationship to TAB.

Team Leader Solecism and Team Anti-Citizenship Behavior

The positive link between leadership and positive citizenship-type behavior has been demonstrated (e.g., Farh, Podaskoff, & Organ, 1990; Wayne & Green, 1993). For example, Farh et al. found that beyond satisfaction, leader fairness accounted for 9% of the variance in individual altruism. Research also shows that the quality of leader-member exchange (Wayne & Green, 1993), traditional leadership (Schnake et al., 1993), and charismatic leadership (Deluga, 1995) are sig-

Although the research is limited, group citizenship-type behavior also appears to be significantly impacted by the leader. For example, George and Bettenhausen (1990) found that the leader's positive mood was positively related to group prosocial behavior. Thus, leadership seems to have an impact on both individual and group displays of citizenship behavior.

Conversely, the literature on anti-citizenship behavior demonstrates that employees use offensive or abusive leader behavior to justify their antisocial behaviors (Dubois, 1979; Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1987). For example, Baron (1988) found that destructive criticism leads to greater anger, tension, resistance, avoidance, and lower performance goals. Ball et al. (1994) found harshness of discipline to be positively related to anti-citizenship. Similarly, the perception of exploitation or provocation has been linked to aggressiveness (Hollinger & Clark, 1983; Mantell, 1994; Torestad, 1990). Further, Ashforth (1994) proposed that petty tyranny would lead to increased frequency of complaining, defiance, withdrawal, and reduced productivity.

However, there is limited group-level research on the leader's effect on groups' anti-citizenship behavior. Nonetheless, Cox (1994) and Cox and Sims (1996) provided evidence for aversive leadership as a precursor to negative citizenship behavior at the group level of analysis. Building on their work, it seems likely that team leader solecism might lead to anti-citizenship behavior in groups. This is also consistent with Gouldner's (1960) norm of reciprocity research suggesting that people behave in accord with how they are treated. Therefore, the following is hypothesized:

Hypothesis 1. Team leader solecism will be associated positively with TAB.

Team Commitment and Team Anti-Citizenship Behavior

Prior research (e.g., Mayer & Schoorman, 1992; Meyer & Allen, 1984; Munene, 1995; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986) has found organizational commitment to have a strong association with organizational citizenship-type behavior. For example, Munene found that employees possessing affective commitment were more likely to display organizational citizenship behaviors than were those lacking affective commitment.

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) found "strong links between commitment based on internalization and identification and prosocial behaviors" (p. 497). Mayer and Schoorman (1992) found that value commitment has a stronger relationship than does continuance commitment with citizenship behavior, satisfaction, and performance. Therefore, organizational commitment appears to be strong predictor of citizenship-type behavior at the individual level of analysis.

Conversely, the study of team anti-citizenship behavior has received little attention. However, George (1990) found the affective tone of groups to be

related to voluntary turnover and found a lack of work group commitment to the organization to be related to anti-citizenship behavior. For example, research has shown that lack of commitment plays a powerful role in the level and type of theft (Hollinger & Clark, 1983; Horning, 1970; Mars, 1974), in the successfulness of theft (Mars, 1982), and in some forms of sabotage (Giacalone et al., 1997).

If team members are committed to their team goals and values, if they have emotional attachments to the team and its members, and if they are committed to achieving organizational goals, it is expected that they will be less likely to engage in anti-citizenship behaviors. We would expect to find an inverse relationship between team commitment and TAB. Therefore, the following is proposed:

Hypothesis 2. Team commitment will be associated inversely with TAB.

Perceived Organizational Support and Team Anti-Citizenship Behavior

Perceived organizational support is the extent to which teams perceive that management provides them with all of the tools (e.g., resources, training, an enabling management system) that they need to succeed (Sundstrom, 1999). We hypothesize that the extent of perceived support by a team will be related to the anti-citizenship behaviors that the team displays. For example, if teams perceive a lack of training needed to do their job effectively, they are less likely to fully understand and appreciate the importance of not engaging in TAB to team functioning. Likewise, if teams perceive that they have not been provided the needed resources to do their jobs, it is less likely that they would go out of their way to ensure the team's success.

Thus, it seems probable that if teams do not perceive that they have been provided with the means to do their jobs, they will not participate in behaviors that exceed their basic job descriptions. Conversely, it is likely that if teams perceive that they have been given every opportunity to succeed with the proper training, resources, and support from management, they are inclined to want their team to succeed and should be less likely to display TAB. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 3. Perceived organizational support will be associated inversely with TAB.

Team Size and Team Anti-Citizenship Behavior

Team size is considered an important issue in team research (e.g., Aldag & Fuller, 1993; Campion, Papper, & Medsker, 1996). Consistent findings show that members of larger groups are less satisfied, participate less, and cooperate

less than do members of smaller groups (Kerr, 1989; Pinto & Crow, 1982); and are more likely to experience absenteeism problems (Markham, Dansereau, & Alutto, 1982) and to have coordination, social loafing, and free-riding problems (Albanese & Van Fleet, 1985; Gooding & Wagner, 1985; Harkins & Szymanski, 1987; Shepperd, 1993).

Increases in team size can create a heightened sense of psychological distance among team members. But more importantly, the occurrence of anti-citizenship behavior can be influenced by how individuals feel in reference to each other. The literature on deindividuation provides a potential avenue in understanding how this might impact groups. In deindividuated situations, people feel that their actions cannot be individually identified in larger groups; essentially, they lose themselves in the group size (Taylor, O'Neal, Langley, & Butcher, 1991; Zimbardo, 1970). Presumably, when team members feel deindividuated and are less likely to "get caught," and this could free them to engage in more anti-citizenship activities. Thus, the following is hypothesized:

Hypothesis 4. Team size will be associated positively with TAB.

Method

Participants

The data for this study came from a sample of 71 change management teams from one organization. *Change management teams* (CMTs) are teams that are responsible for identifying and implementing organizational changes with the purpose of positively impacting organizational effectiveness. The participants in the research are all members of CMTs. Team members were identified through examination of company records and interviews with team leaders. The participants in this study were reasonably homogeneous. The average age of participants was 49.56 years ($SD = 6.91$ years). Nearly all participants were male (97.5%), and most had long tenure with their organizations ($M = 24.57$ years, $SD = 8.16$ years) and with their respective teams ($M = 15.32$ months, $SD = 10.26$ months).

Participation in the study was voluntary. However, the data-collection process was intensely managed, with a researcher on site during the administration of all questionnaires. All participants were given token gifts (university pencils) as an inducement for participation. Also, a raffle, for those who participated, was used to distribute university T shirts, sweatshirts, and so forth as a further inducement. Of the 236 questionnaires that were distributed, 197 were returned with usable data, for an effective response rate of 83.5%.

The CMT is the unit of analysis in this research. However, the majority of the data for this research was collected from individual members of the teams. Therefore, we will provide appropriate justification for the aggregation of the data to the team level of analysis. First, to assess the within group agreement on

our multi-item scales, we will examine the $r_{WG(J)}$ coefficient (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984) for each of our constructs. This measure assesses the level of agreement within teams on the target variables. An $r_{WG(J)}$ score of greater than .70 is taken to represent a high level of agreement (George, 1990). Second, we will examine the eta squared (η^2) to ascertain the amount of variation that is present between teams, relative to the variation within teams. The greater the proportion of variance between teams, the more useful the construct is for analysis at the team level.

Measures

All measures, with the exception of team size, were collected on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*definitely not true*) to 5 (*definitely true*). We will review each of the measures used in this study, presenting the psychometric qualities of each variable and providing justification for aggregation of each variable to the team level of analysis (see Table 1 for definitions), sample items, and a summary of the psychometric properties of each of the variables used in this research.

Team leader solecism. We examined one component of team leader behavior: the extent of *team leader solecism*, which is a focus on errors and mistakes. The items for this scale were obtained from B. Avolio (personal communication, February 15, 1994). Team members rated team leader solecism on a 10-item scale. The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach, 1951) for the measure of team leader solecism was $\alpha = .70$, $r_{WG(J)} = .90$, $\eta^2 = .50$. Thus, this measure was deemed suitable for analysis at the team level.

Team commitment. Team commitment was assessed at the individual level of analysis and aggregated to the team level. We used a six-item scale adapted from Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) to assess individuals' aggregate level commitment to their respective teams. For the measure of commitment, $\alpha = .89$, $r_{WG(J)} = .95$, $\eta^2 = .51$. Thus, this measure was deemed suitable for use at the team level.

Perceived organizational support. This measure was used to assess how well the team thought management supported it. Perceived organizational support was measured at the team level of analysis with a four-item scale. For the measure of perceived organizational support, $\alpha = .79$, $r_{WG(J)} = .86$, $\eta^2 = .56$. Thus, this measure was deemed suitable for use at the team level.

Team size. Team size was a measure of the number of individuals on each team. This measure was obtained from company records and confirmed with team leaders.

Team anti-citizenship behavior. The measurement of team anti-citizenship behavior in this research was based on advances made by Cox (1994) and Cox and Sims (1996). The Cox instrument was based primarily on research conducted by Organ (1988); Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990); Ball,

Table 1

Summary of Study Variables

Variable	Definition	Sample items	α ($r_{WG(J)}$) [η^2]
Team leader solecism	Extent to which the team leader focuses on errors and mistakes	My team leader focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standard. My team leader closely monitors my performance for errors.	.70 (.90) [.50]
Team com- mitment	Extent to which members care about the success of the team	I am committed to this team's purpose. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this team.	.89 (.95) [.51]
Perceived organiza- tional support	Extent to which management pro- vides teams with the support they need to succeed	Management provides our team with all the resources we need to accomplish our goals. Management has ensured that our team has all of the skill we need to accomplish our goals.	.79 (.86) [.56]
Team size	Number of individ- uals on each team	Not applicable	Not applicable
Team anti- citizenship behaviors	Extent to which team members engage in behav- iors that impede effective team functioning and performance	Defiance: Team members resist the influence of the team leader Complaining: Team members consume a lot of time com- plaining about trivial matters Avoiding the job: Team members avoid their work by coming in late or leaving early Avoiding work: Team members try to look busy doing nothing	.90 (.93) [.38]

Trevino, and Sims (1991); Ball et al. (1994); and Fisher and Locke (1992). Cox also extended previous research on anti-citizenship behavior to focus on behavior directed at individuals' immediate work groups.

While previous research has tried to dimensionalize fine-grained measures of anti-citizenship behavior, we instead focused on examining the overarching construct of TAB. Thus, TAB was assessed at the team level of analysis with a 17-item questionnaire. For the measure of team anti-citizenship behavior, $\alpha = .90$, $r_{WG(J)} = .93$, $\eta^2 = .38$. Thus, this measure was deemed acceptable for use at the team level.

Data Analysis

Two procedures were used to examine the hypotheses in this research. First, we examined zero-order correlations of each of the independent variables with team citizenship behavior.

Second, in order to provide a more conservative test of the hypothesized relationships, we conducted multiple regression analysis (MRA). We used MRA to do two things. First, we wanted to examine the adequacy of our overall model; that is, the nexus of our four hypothesized predictors of TAB. Second, we wanted to determine which of our four dimensions accounted for the most unique variance in TAB.

Results

Table 2 summarizes the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the study variables. Using zero-order correlations, three of our four hypotheses were supported ($p < .05$), ranging from $r = -.33$ to $r = .53$.

More specifically, Hypothesis 1, which stated that team leader solecism would be positively associated with TAB, was supported ($r = .53$, $p < .01$). Hypothesis 2, which predicted a negative relationship between team commitment and TAB, was found to be negative and significant ($r = -.33$, $p < .01$). A negative relationship was also found between perceived organizational support and TAB ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$), supporting Hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 4, which stated that team size would be positively associated with TAB, was not supported.

We next tested our hypotheses using multiple regression analysis, the results of which are summarized in Table 3. The squared multiple correlation (R^2) for our model was .35, $F(4, 65) = 8.87$, $p < .01$, thus indicating that our model provides a significant account of the display of TAB. While perceived organizational support ($\beta = -.08$) and team size ($\beta = .12$) were nonsignificant paths, team leader solecism ($\beta = .47$, $p < .01$) and team commitment ($\beta = -.21$, $p < .05$) were significant.

Discussion

Three of our four hypotheses received support with zero-order correlations. The only hypothesis that did not receive support was the one stating that team

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Team leader solecism	2.54	0.40	—							
2. Team commitment	3.93	0.45	-.23*	—						
3. Perceived organizational support	3.28	0.55	-.11	.34**	—					
4. Team size	7.24	2.73	.05	-.11	.02	—				
5. Team anti-citizenship behavior	2.21	0.35	.53**	-.33**	-.20*	-.11	—			
6. Defiance	2.23	0.42	.37**	-.01	-.04	-.03	.69**	—		
7. Complaining	2.47	0.42	.49**	-.23*	-.18†	.18†	.84**	.48**	—	
8. Avoiding the job	1.98	0.40	.38**	-.41**	-.28**	.03	.83**	.50**	.56**	—
9. Avoiding work	2.05	0.41	.48**	-.36**	-.18†	.09	.89	.52**	.61**	.74**

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

Table 3

Beta Weights for Independent Variables

Independent variable	Dependent variable				
	TAB	Defiance	Com- plaining	Avoid- ing the job	Avoid- ing work
Team leader solecism	.47**	.40**	.45**	.29**	.41**
Team commitment	-.21*	.09	-.12	-.30**	-.27*
Perceived organizational support	-.08	-.03	-.09	.15	-.05
Team size	.12	-.05	.18	.05	.10
Model R^2	.35**	.15*	.30**	.28**	.32**

Note. TAB = team-anti-citizenship behavior.

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

size would be positively related to TAB (Hypothesis 4). Thus, it would appear that given team leadership, dynamics, and support, team size does not appear to be positively related to the display of TAB. When we examined our hypotheses with multiple regression, partialing out the effects of our other variables, two of our hypotheses received statistically significant support (team leader solecism and team commitment). Thus, leader solecism and team commitment seem particularly important in TAB.

While our analyses to this point have focused on the overarching construct of TAB, we also wanted to examine the relationships between our independent variables and the submeasures of team anti-citizenship behavior. There were four submeasures of team anti-citizenship behavior: (a) *defiance*—resisting the authority of the team leader; (b) *complaining*—the disagreeableness of the team members; (c) *avoiding the job*—the extent to which team members escape from their jobs as a whole; and (d) *avoiding work*—the extent to which team members escape from their specific tasks. Sample items from each subscale appear in Table 1. For defiance (3 items), $\alpha = .56$, while $r_{WG(J)} = .91$ and $\eta^2 = .38$. For complaining (5 items), $\alpha = .75$, while $r_{WG(J)} = .86$ and $\eta^2 = .38$. For avoiding the job (3 items), $\alpha = .67$, while $r_{WG(J)} = .93$ and $\eta^2 = .43$. For avoiding work (6 items), $\alpha = .83$, while $r_{WG(J)} = .95$ and $\eta^2 = .40$. Generally, the submeasures demonstrated good psychometric properties. However, the reliability of defiance was a bit low. Nonetheless, all submeasures demonstrated a high amount of agreement within teams and relatively strong eta-squared coefficients.

From the zero-order correlation analysis, leader solecism was positively related to all four submeasures ($p < .01$); team commitment was negatively

related to all but complaining behavior ($p < .05$); perceived organizational support was negatively related to avoiding the job ($p < .01$) and avoiding work ($p < .10$); and team size was positively related to complaining behavior ($p < .10$). (See Table 2 for a summary of the zero-order correlation results.) The regression results are similar: Leader solecism was positively related to all four submeasures ($p < .01$); team commitment was negatively related to avoiding the job and avoiding work ($p < .05$); perceived organizational support was not significantly related to any of the submeasures; and team size was not significantly related to any of the submeasures (see Table 3 for a summary of the multiple regression results).

Thus, across all of our analyses, team leader solecism and team commitment seem to be important predictors of TAB, with leader solecism appearing to be the more important predictor. The particular strength of team leader solecism is consistent with literature that implicates offensive managerial behavior (Giacalone et al., 1997), tyrannical management (Ashforth, 1994, 1997), and abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000) to negative subordinate responses. Although there is clearly a need for further examination using multiple methods, the consistency of our results with previous data makes the use of our single methodology (self-reports) of less concern.

Because the study did not assess the complex impact that instigating factors such as perceived interactional justice (Bies & Moag, 1986) or procedural justice (Folger & Greenberg, 1985) might have on TAB, future work will need to elaborate on the role that such perceptions might have. Given the research finding that perceptions of unfair treatment and subsequent negative emotional responses are moderated by individual personality (Skarlicki, Folger, & Tesluk, 1999), it would also be fruitful to examine the potential impact of group-level personality variables on the display of TAB. Early work in this area seems to suggest that group-level personality variables should be related to the display of TAB. For example, George (1990) found the affective tones of groups to be related to prosocial behavior and voluntary turnover in a study of 26 work groups.

Many constructs that have been traditionally studied at the individual level of analysis have subsequently been fruitfully examined at the group level of analysis. For example, shared leadership, a dynamic, interactive leadership process between members of groups (Pearce & Conger, 2003; Pearce & Sims, 2002) is an emerging area of research with considerable promise for advancing the study of leadership to the group level of analysis. Similarly, this research examines anti-citizenship behavior—a construct traditionally studied at the individual level of analysis—at the group level of analysis. In so doing, we identified several potential antecedents of TAB and its subcomponents, with team leader solecism appearing to have a particularly important impact on the display of anti-citizenship behavior in teams. Our results are encouraging and point toward the importance of more team-level research on anti-citizenship behaviors.

References

- Albanese, R., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1985). Rational behavior in groups: The free riding tendency. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*, 244-255.
- Aldag, R. J., & Fuller, S. R. (1993). Beyond fiasco: A reappraisal of the groupthink phenomenon and a new model of group decision processes. *Psychological Bulletin*, *113*, 533-552.
- Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations*, *47*, 755-778.
- Ashforth, B. (1997). Petty tyranny in organizations: A preliminary examination of antecedents and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, *14*, 126-140.
- Ball, G. A., Sims, H. P., & Trevino, L. K. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*, 299-322.
- Ball, G. A., Trevino, L. K., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1991). "Just" and "unjust" organizational punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, *3*, 307-333.
- Baron, R. A. (1988). Negative effects of destructive criticism: Impact on conflict, self-confidence, and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*, 199-207.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (pp. 45-53). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Campion, M. A., Papper, E. M., & Medsker, G. J. (1996). Relations between work team characteristics and effectiveness: A replication and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, *49*, 429-452.
- Caudron, S. (1998, August). Target: HR. *Workforce*, *77*, 44-51.
- Cox, J. F. (1994). *The effects of superleadership training on leader behavior, subordinate self-leader behavior, and subordinate citizenship behavior*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
- Cox, J. F., & Sims, H. P. (1996). Leadership and team citizenship behavior: A model and measures. In M. M. Beyerlein, D. A. Johnson, & S. T. Beyerlein (Eds.), *Advances in interdisciplinary studies of work teams* (Vol. 3, pp. 1-41). Stamford, CT: JAI.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*, 297-334.
- Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relationship between attributional charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *25*, 1652-1669.
- Dubois, P. (1979). *Sabotage in industry*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, UK: Pelican.

- Earley, P. C. (1989). Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 565-582.
- Farh, J. L., Podaskoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16, 705-721.
- Fisher, C. D., & Locke, E. A. (1992). A new look in job satisfaction research and theory. In C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, & E. F. Stone (Eds.), *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance* (pp. 165-194). New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management* (Vol. 3, pp. 141-183). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- George, J. M. (1990). Personality, affect, and behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 107-116.
- George, J. M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 299-307.
- George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 698-709.
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good—doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work—organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 310-329.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Anti-social behavior in organizations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Rosenfeld, P. (1987). Reasons for employee sabotage in the workplace. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 1, 367-378.
- Giacalone, R. A., Rosenfeld, P., & Riordan, C. A. (1997). Employee sabotage: Toward understanding its causes and preventing its recurrence. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Anti-social behavior in organizations* (pp. 109-129). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gooding, R. Z., & Wagner, J. A., III. (1985). A meta-analytic review of the relationship between size and performance: The productivity and efficiency of organizations and their subunits. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 462-481.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Greenburg, J. (1997). The STEAL motive: Managing the social determinants of employee theft. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Anti-social behavior in organizations* (pp. 85-108). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Harkins, S. G., & Szymanski, K. (1987). Social loafing and social facilitation: New wine in old bottles. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Review of personality and*

- social psychology: Group process and intergroup relations* (Vol. 9, pp. 167-188). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hogan, J., & Hogan, R. (1989). How to measure employee reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 273-279.
- Hollinger, R. D., & Clark, J. P. (1983). *Theft by employees*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Horning, D. N. (1970). Blue-collar theft: Conceptions of property, attitudes toward pilfering, and work group norms in a modern industrial plant. In E. O. Smigel & H. L. Ross (Eds.), *Crimes against bureaucracy* (pp. 46-64). New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 85-98.
- Kerr, N. L. (1989). Illusions of efficacy: The effects of group size on perceived efficacy in social dilemmas. *Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology*, 25, 287-313.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 656-669.
- Leyman, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims*, 5, 2-11.
- Lind, E. A. (1997). Litigation and claiming in organizations: Antisocial behavior or quest for justice. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Anti-social behavior in organizations* (pp. 150-171). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podaskoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 70-80.
- Mangione, T. W., & Quinn, R. P. (1975). Job satisfaction, counter productive behavior, and drug use at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 114-116.
- Mantell, M. (1994). *Ticking bombs: Defusing violence in the workplace*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.
- Markham, S. E., Dansereau, F., & Alutto, J. A. (1982). Group size and absenteeism rates: A longitudinal analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 921-927.
- Mars, G. (1974). Dock pilferage: A case study in occupational theft. In P. Rock & M. McIntosh (Eds.), *Deviance and social control* (pp. 209-228). London, UK: Tavistock.
- Mars, G. (1982). *Cheats at work: An anthropology of workplace crime*. London, UK: Allen & Unwin.
- Mayer, R. C., & Schoorman, F. D. (1992). Predicting participation and production outcomes through a two-dimensional model of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 671-684.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, J. N. (1984). Testing the "side-bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378.

- Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1997). Whistle-blowing as antisocial behavior. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Anti-social behavior in organizations* (pp. 130-149). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations, 46*, 759-776.
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism–collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*, 127-142.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 475-480.
- Munene, J. C. (1995). “Not-on-seat”: An investigation of some correlates of organizational citizenship behavior in Nigeria. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 44*, 111-122.
- Murphy, K. R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 527-556.
- Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of Management, 24*, 391-419.
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 492-499.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management, 20*, 465-478.
- Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*, 339-350.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775-802.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 6*, 172-197.
- Pinto, L. J., & Crow, K. E. (1982). The effects of congregations within the same denomination. *Journal of Scientific Study of Religion, 21*, 304-316.

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behavior and their effects on trust, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, *1*, 107-142.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *59*, 603-609.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 555-572.
- Robinson, S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*, 658-673.
- Rodrigues, S. B., & Collinson, D. L. (1995). "Having fun?" Humor as resistance in Brazil. *Organization Studies*, *16*, 739-769.
- Schnake, M. (1991). Organizational citizenship: A review, proposed model, and research agenda. *Human Relations*, *44*, 735-759.
- Schnake, M., Dumler, M. P., & Cochran, D. S. (1993). The relationship between "traditional" leadership, "super" leadership, and organizational behavior. *Group and Organization Management*, *18*, 352-365.
- Shepperd, J. A. (1993). Productivity loss in performance groups: A motivation analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *113*, 67-81.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*, 434-443.
- Skarlicki, D. P., Folger, R., & Tesluk, P. (1999). Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *42*, 100-108.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Latham, G. P. (1996). Increasing citizenship behavior within a labor union: A test of organizational justice theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 161-169.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*, 653-663.
- Sundstrom, E., & Associates. (1999). *Supporting work team effectiveness: Best management practices for fostering high performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, S. L., O'Neal, E. C., Langley, T., & Butcher, A. H. (1991). Anger arousal, deindividuation, and aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, *17*, 193-206.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*, 178-190.
- Torstad, B. (1990). What is anger provoking: A psychophysical study of perceived causes of anger. *Aggressive Behavior*, *16*, 9-26.

- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 765-802.
- Wagner, J. A., III, & Moch, M. K. (1986). Individualism-collectivism: Concept and measure. *Group and Organizational Studies*, 11, 280-304.
- Wayne, S. J., & Green, S. A. (1993). The effects of leader-member exchange on employee citizenship and impression management behavior. *Human Relations*, 46, 1431-1441.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617.
- Zimbardo, P. G. (1970). The human choice: Individuation, reason, and order versus deindividuation, impulse, and chaos. In W. J. Arnold & D. Levine (Eds.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (Vol. 17, pp. 237-307). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

این مقاله، از سری مقالات ترجمه شده رایگان سایت ترجمه فا میباشد که با فرمت PDF در اختیار شما عزیزان قرار گرفته است. در صورت تمایل میتوانید با کلیک بر روی دکمه های زیر از سایر مقالات نیز استفاده نمایید:

لیست مقالات ترجمه شده ✓

لیست مقالات ترجمه شده رایگان ✓

لیست جدیدترین مقالات انگلیسی ISI ✓

سایت ترجمه فا ؛ مرجع جدیدترین مقالات ترجمه شده از نشریات معتبر خارجی