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MOOD AND WORKPLACE BEHAVIOR IN A UNIVERSITY SAMPLE

Abstract

We examined the extent to which counterproductive workplace behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors were mood-contingent in a university sample. Sixty-four employees and thirty-nine students participated in online surveys measuring job-affective well-being, organizational constraints, internal locus of control, interpersonal conflict at work, mood, counterproductive workplace behaviors (CWBs), and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). Mood did not significantly predict OCBs, but students were more likely to engage in CWBs than were employees. The longer an individual was associated with the university, the more OCBs they exhibited, and organizational constraints significantly predicted CWBs. Factors potentially influencing these results are discussed.
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The Effects of Mood on Exhibiting and Experiencing Counterproductive Workplace Behaviors and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors from the Perspectives of Faculty, Staff, and Students

In recent years, industrial organizational psychologists have found it worthwhile to explore what makes the workplace more or less enjoyable for employees. Doing so has allowed them to observe meaningful relationships beyond the ever-popular construct of task performance. Task performance is essential to organizations, their managers, and CEOs, but there is more to the story of the workplace. The nature of the workplace setting undoubtedly plays an important catalyzing or inhibiting role in the way employees act and feel on the job (Fuller et al., 2003; George & Brief, 1992).

Organizational citizenship behaviors and counterproductive workplace behaviors strongly influence the way an employee perceives his or her job, and have many implications that influence an employee's job performance (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). If the environment of the workplace is an unfavorable one, it is likely that task performance will be negatively influenced by the display of unfavorable behaviors. The purpose of this study is to determine how university employees and students perceive the environment of the place in which they work. Analyzing this information can offer us insight on the possibilities of improvement and ways to foster ideal conditions for better task performance from the perspectives of students and employees.

Sackett and Devore (2001) characterize two types of workplace behaviors beyond task performance: organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and counterproductive workplace behaviors (CWBs). They describe OCBs as actions of kindness performed at
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work; OCBs focus on positive employee behaviors that contribute to organizational effectiveness, but do not reflect job tasks of utmost importance such as picking up trash in a co-workers work area or reloading the company printer with paper. Sackett and Devore (2001) describe CWBs as voluntary acts that are intentionally unkind or unfavorable. Behaviors such as these vary in severity, and their intent cannot usually be inferred simply by observing the overt behavior. CWBs have been classified into two different categories known as *interpersonal*, which are acts between or among coworkers, and *organizational*, which are behaviors plotted against the organization (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, 1997).

*Counterproductive Workplace Behaviors*

Bennett and Robinson (2000) expanded on their distinction between counterproductive workplace behaviors directed interpersonally and toward the organization itself. They found that the extent to which employees felt frustrated at work was associated with both interpersonal and organization-directed deviance. Perceived injustice in the workplace is poisonous; it incites behaviors such as theft and vandalism.

Diefendorff and Mehta (2007) offered another antecedent to deviant workplace behavior by integrating motivational traits. Approach motivation is defined as the desire to achieve, competitive excellence, and a behavioral activation system. Avoidance motivation is defined as a unitary construct of avoiding negative stimuli, and a behavioral inhibition system. They found that avoidance motivation, as opposed to approach motivation, is positively related to counterproductive workplace behaviors directed at the organization and interacted to predict interpersonal deviance. In addition, employees
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were more likely to engage in counterproductive workplace behavior when they were perceived constraints were high.

Spector and colleagues (2006) compiled data from their prior studies and used the data to develop five subscales of counterproductive workplace behaviors: abuse toward others, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal. Here, production deviance is considered passive aggressive behavior, a purposeful failure to complete job tasks. Sabotage is production deviance's opposite, as it is defined as actively defacing or destroying property. Withdrawal is considered any behavior that restricts the amount of time working to less than is required by the organization. Of the five subscales, behaviors can be distinguished as either hostile with intent to harm or instrumental with an additional goal beyond harm and having a distal motive. Among the prior studies compiled in this meta-analysis, they discovered that abuse tends to be more related with job-specific stressors than psychological strains produced by stressors unrelated to work. Not surprisingly, abuse was strongly related to upsetting emotions such as anger and furiousness and was correlated the most with interpersonal conflict. Production deviance correlated most with being fatigued, gloomy, and furious, whereas withdrawal correlated mostly with strains and was significantly and equally related to boredom and being upset.

Fox, Spector, and Miles (2001) took a closer look at counterproductive workplace behavior in response to job stressors and organizational justice. They stated that organizational constraints, interpersonal conflict, and perceived injustice all act as job stressors and that CWB is a behavioral strain response to these stressors. The researchers discussed how causality is multidimensional with background mood or emotional states predisposing people to perceive or not perceive stressors. For example, people
experiencing high levels of negative mood may be hyperactive to job stressors. This creates a vicious cycle: background mood predisposes a person to perceived stressors, they become more strained, and more negative mood ensues.

Fuller et al. (2003) found that affective events theory, which incorporates concern for transient affect such as mood, plays a role in the relationship between work events and work attitudes such as OCBs and CWBs. The researchers suggested that by the affective events theory, mood and emotions contribute to perceived job satisfaction. It is important to note that mood and emotions are not synonymous; moods are lingering and cannot always be tied to a specific event while emotions are more transient and are tied to a specific object or event (Fullet et al., 2013). Although these are different constructs, they both play a key role in the experience and actions of employees in the workplace. Fuller and colleagues also found that workplace stressors and certain personality traits act together to influence the employee, and consequently the workplace climate and culture, which has a major influence on task performance.

Bledow, Schmitt, Kühnel, and Frese (2011) designed an affective shift model using affective events theory that suggested that negative affect is positively related to work engagement if negative affect is followed by positive affect. While initially it may seem that positive affect is only indirectly responsible for work engagement, the authors suggest that the shift to positive affect brings about the motivating potential of negative affect, which would increase work engagement. Using experience sampling methodology to measure affective events, mood, and work engagement twice per day, the authors found that negative affect measured in the morning followed by positive affect in the afternoon significantly and positively predicted work engagement (Bledow, Schmitt,
Work engagement plays a role in whether employees exhibit CWBs or OCBs in that employees’ work engagement becomes disrupted when they experience negative affect, allowing the potential for counterproductive workplace behaviors to ensue. A resulting shift in positive affect, however, can better engage the employee. This shift to positive affect may not allow for OCBs to take place because the employee engaged in his or her work will be highly occupied, but it may therefore prevent CWBs from taking place as well. The authors conclude that fostering a positive work environment can cause employees to ameliorate their workplace, which does not allow for the occurrence of the types of behaviors CWBs encompass.

Bjorkvist, Osterman, and Lagerspetz (1994) produced one of few research studies that explored aggression among adults in the university setting. University employees in Sweden completed the Work Harassment Scale. Two subscales of rational-appearing aggression and social manipulation emerged from this scale, and sex differences were observed from the results of the scale. Respondents were asked to identify the sex of the perpetrator for each type of aggressive behavior on the scale. Social manipulation is defined as indirect aggression specifically targeting a specific person with the goal of remaining anonymous to avoid counterattack, whereas rational-appearing aggression can either be direct or indirect. Consistent with the social psychological literature on aggression, men exhibited more rational-appearing aggression than women, and women exhibited more social manipulation than did men. This study did not expand on the amount of psychological stress participants feel as a result of this aggression; rather, the authors focused on the two different forms present in this particular workplace.
The present study seeks to explore which constructs, if any, better predict the incidence of counterproductive workplace behavior and whether or not mood plays a role in the strength of the constructs’ predictive values. The current study will examine organizational constraints, job-affective well-being, locus of control, and interpersonal conflict at work and their potential relationship with higher or lower incidences of CWBs.

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviors**

Considering the aforementioned information, it may seem as if the industrial organizational psychology research is at a roadblock. How can we counter the detrimental influence of negative moods and emotions on workplace behavior? Ilies, Peng, Savani, and Dimotakis (2013) found that if employees were given feedback about their counterproductive workplace behaviors (i.e., told that their behavior was counternormative and undesirable) they would subsequently feel guilty and engage in compensatory, positive behaviors by exhibiting more organizational citizenship behaviors. While this particular study offers insight into battling high rates of CWBs, the induced feelings of guilt only played a significant role in the extent to which positive compensatory behaviors occurred in employees who exhibited a very high amount of counterproductive workplace behaviors. The researchers suggested that behaving immorally has a negative influence on employees’ self-worth, and they engage in positive compensatory behaviors in order to regain portions of their self-worth they perceive to be lost. Perhaps this explanation is consistent with Diefendorff and Mehta’s (2007) postulation of trait motivation theory; employees that exhibit higher amounts of CWBs embody avoidance motivation, and it is by the same mechanism that they exhibit the compensatory behavior. Thus, in order to avoid more detriments to self-worth, these
employees engage in compensatory organizational citizenship behaviors. For example, if an employee becomes worried about the negative attention they may have been attracting by exhibiting a high frequency of CWBs, he or she may opt to avoid more negative attention by demonstrating more altruistic and compliant workplace behaviors.

Akers (1973) suggested bonding theory as the mechanism through which employees are less inclined to engage in workplace deviance. Bonding theory postulates that people who feel bonded to a social environment will feel more positively about said environment, and therefore will be more likely to contribute beneficially rather than counterproductively. This research offers a clearer picture of the equation encompassing employees’ attitudes about their work environment and how the ways they choose to react to it.

George and Brief (1992) determined a relationship between feeling positively and acting in accordance with this positivity at work. In other words, feeling good is doing good in the workplace. The researchers operationalized a construct called organizational spontaneity, which encompasses the definition of organizational citizenship behavior: extra-role behaviors that are performed voluntarily and that contribute to organizational effectiveness. Organizational spontaneity is divided into five types: helping co-workers, protecting the organization, making constructive suggestions, developing oneself, and spreading goodwill. Based on a review of the previous literature, the researchers discovered that positive moods have been found to influence each facet of organizational spontaneity, thus increasing the levels of some organizational citizenship behavior at work.
Yet another paper divided organizational citizenship behavior into different categories. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) said that organizational citizenship behavior is made up of altruism and generalized compliance because they emerged as independent factors from the measure used. Altruism is defined as helping specific people, whereas generalized compliance is a more impersonal construct that involved exhibiting good behavior for the sake of the organization, and not for a specific person. The researchers found that altruism was influenced by positive mood, which in this study was defined by being highly satisfied with one’s job because higher job satisfaction suggests more frequent positive mood states. Generalized compliance was not predicted by positive mood, however, and was best predicted by one’s score on an extraversion/neuroticism scale. This particular study clearly demonstrates how organizational citizenship behaviors fit into a bigger picture. If employees are satisfied with their jobs, they will more frequently be in positive moods, thus leading to more organizational citizenship behavior.

*Experience Sampling Methodology and Online Data Collection*

The aforementioned studies by Fullet et al. (2003) and Bledow, Schmitt, Frese, and Kühnel (2011) are unique because they implemented experiencing sampling methodology (ESM) in hopes of capturing changes in mood that influence job satisfaction and workplace engagement. ESM is able to capture changes such as these because it requires participants to stop and reflect on their experiences anywhere from several times per day to once per day.

Negative workplace behaviors do not always lend themselves to be measured feasibly due to the unfavorable nature of admitting to these behaviors. It is important that they be measured carefully and in a way that allows the participant to comfortably
respond to these measures in an honest fashion. Nearly all studies exploring counterproductive workplace behaviors involve online data collection; this has been shown to reduce the likelihood that participants will misrepresent their actual behaviors, and will increase the likelihood that they will reveal sensitive personal information (Joinson, 1999, 2001; Joinson, Woodley, & Reips, 2007).

The Present Study

As outlined above, it is apparent that mood plays a major role in the behaviors that employees choose to exhibit at work. The current study takes the unique perspectives of not only university employees, but also students' perceptions of these behaviors when thinking about their roles as a student as a full time job. Similar to the framework of Fuller et al 2003, experience sampling methodology was used to assess both groups multiple times in order to capture a more powerful picture of how mood and emotion are capable of influencing the way students and employees experience the university setting.

In conjunction with mood, I assessed job-affective well-being, interpersonal conflict at work, organizational constraints, work locus of control, counterproductive workplace behaviors, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Based on the previous research discussed above, I expected to find that high levels of interpersonal conflict, organizational constraints and more negative moods would result in higher incidences of CWBs. I expected to find higher incidences of OCBs when more positive moods were combined with higher levels of job-affective well-being, low levels of organizational constraints, and higher levels of locus of control. I also expected that students would be more apt to experience and exhibit more CWBs because being a college student carries with it a more inconsistent lifestyle than employees, which may provide an obstacle for
involvement and thus incite more negative moods (Larson, Csikszentmihalyi, & Graef, 1980). When students are unable to become more involved, they may feel less socially bonded to their environment and may therefore be in more negative moods and exhibit more CWBs than employees (Akers, 1973). Taken together, I hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 1a:** Mood will be a negative predictor of counterproductive workplace behaviors.

**Hypothesis 1b:** University students will be more likely to experience and exhibit counterproductive workplace behaviors than faculty and staff.

**Hypothesis 2:** Job constraints will be a significant predictor of counterproductive workplace behaviors in both students and employees, but will not predict organizational citizenship behaviors.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants were immediately recruited following approval of the IRB. The opportunity for students to sign up to participate in the study was posted on Butler’s psychology research SONA web page, where student participants are be able to receive extra credit in a psychology course that allows extra credit points upon completion of the study. The web page consisted of a description of the study, the duration of the study, and a link to the study. Forty-four students participated in the initial survey. After reviewing the data for completeness, five data sets were removed leaving us with 39 participants. At the time of the ESM portion of the study, student participants were contacted each day via email, or through the SONA system. Participants were offered additional extra credit and opportunities to have their name in a drawing for a $50 Amazon gift card each time
they completed a daily survey. Sixteen students participated in the ESM portion of the study.

Sixty-four Butler community members consisting of both faculty and staff members were recruited via email from the psychology department and the Butler Connection. After reviewing the data for incomplete surveys, 3 participants were removed leaving us with 61 participants. Each participant received a $5 Starbucks gift card as an incentive for completing the initial survey. Because Butler community members cannot be reached through the SONA system, they were contacted each day via questionpro.com to complete the ESM portion of the study. They were also incentivized to complete each daily survey by having their name in the drawing equal to the amount of surveys they completed. 22 Butler community members participated in the daily survey. There were a few internet spam participants that may have been computer-animated or actual human internet spammers that did not give data, but harassed the researchers via email for the gift cards, and these “participants” were removed before data analysis.

The majority (84%) of participants were female and 16% were male. The average amount of time employees were associated with the university is 8.5 years, and the average student participant was in their second year.

Procedure

Two separate surveys were created in order to best capture the experiences of faculty, staff, and students. Each survey was identical with the exception of the modification of the counterproductive workplace behavior scale, which was piloted by organizational psychology lab members (n=12) in order to help discern which items most accurately pertained to student life, life of a Butler community member, or both. Initially,
participants read the virtual informed consent form, which was the first page of the
survey explaining the study. By clicking the Next button at the bottom of this page,
participants gave their consent and agreed to participate.

Immediately following the demographic questions, participants created a unique
identifier consisting of a combination of their favorite word of 4-6 letters and number.
The unique identifier was created in order to ensure complete anonymity and to link the
participants' data from the initial survey to their data from the ESM portion of the study.

After creating the unique identifier, participants were then lead to the focal survey
measures. As aforementioned, the scales were altered so that the student participants
encounter survey items pertaining to student experiences of their own behaviors and their
classmates' behaviors, and faculty and staff participants encounter survey items
pertaining to faculty and staff experiences of their own behaviors and of their coworkers'
behaviors. Students were instructed to keep the phrase, "being a college student is like
having a full-time job," in mind as they were responding to survey items.

About three weeks after participants completed the initial survey, they were sent
the link to the daily survey each day for one consecutive school week (5 days). Instead of
a mood measure like the initial survey contained, an alternative emotion scale was
implemented. Participants were prompted to report the extent to which they felt the listed
emotions over the course of their day. Next, participants responded to the same CWB and
OCB scales as the initial survey, but this time in regards to whether or not they had
exhibited certain behaviors that day. This portion of the study was much shorter than the
initial survey and was sent out around 2-3pm each day. Participants completed the survey
at their earliest convenience. While there was variation in both groups among times the
surveys were completed (most likely due to variation in class and work schedules),
participants always completed the survey before the next day. Those that did not
complete the survey prior to the next day often emailed the researchers to let them know
they had missed a day of the survey.

Measures

Demographics. Due to the sensitive nature of CWB data, minimal demographics
were included in order to protect participants' identity. Participants reported gender, and
the number of years they had been associated with the university (i.e., tenure). The survey
measures listed below can be found in the Appendix.

Multi-Dimensional Mood Questionnaire (MDMQ, Wilhelm & Schoebi, 2007).
The MDMQ is a 6-item mood scale that measures mood on a spectrum. The six items are
divided into categories: valence, energy, arousal, and calmness. Examples of items on the
MDMQ include, “tired-awake,” “content-discontent,” and “agitated-calm.” Participants
rated the extent to which they felt each mood on a 6-point scale, where 1 signified feeling
closer to the first word than the second, and 6 signified feeling closer to the second word
than the first. Scores were summed for each category, and higher scores indicated better
mood.

Job-Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS, Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, & Kelloway,
2000). The JAWS is a scale consisting of 30 items that measures how participants' jobs
make them feel. It lists emotions such as, “furious,” “gloomy,” “angry,” and “cheerful.”
Participants respond to the emotion items in regards to how often their job makes them
feel each way ranging from never to extremely often. The JAWS yields four categories:
High Pleasure High Arousal, High Pleasure Low Arousal, Low Pleasure High Arousal,
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and Low Pleasure Low Arousal. Each category has its own predictive factor in the kinds of workplace behaviors employees exhibit.

*Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale* (ICAWS, Spector & Jex, 1998). The ICAWS is a 4-item scale that measures the extent to which participants perceive interpersonal conflict at work. Examples from the scale include: “how often do you get into arguments at work?” and “how often are people rude to you at work?” Participants respond using a scale ranging from *Never* to *Very Often*.

*Organizational Constraints Scale* (OCS, Spector & Jex, 1998). The OCS is a scale that measures the extent to which participants feel that their job is difficult due to organizational difficulties. Participants respond using a time-based scale ranging from less than once per month or never to several times per day. Examples from the scale include, “poor equipment or supplies,” “incorrect instructions,” and “conflicting job demands.”

*Work Locus of Control Scale* (WLCS, Spector, 1988). The WLCS is a scale that measures the extent to which participants believe they are have control while on the job. Examples from the scale include “a job is what you make of it,” “promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job,” and “most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort.” Participants respond to these items using an agreement scale ranging from disagree very much to agree very much.

*Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale* The OCB scale is a compilation of 21 items from other OCB scales and newly generated items by Williams and Anderson (1991). These researchers drew items from other scales used by Bateman and Organ (1983), Graham (1986), O’Reilly and Chatman (1986), Organ (1988), and Smith, Organ,
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and Near (1983). Examples of the OCB scale items are, “adequately completes assigned duties,” “assists supervisor with his/her work,” and “takes time to listen to co-workers problems and worries.” In the initial survey, participants responded on a scale ranging from Never to Very Often. In the daily survey, participants were presented with this scale twice: they first checked boxes next to these behaviors if they experienced these behaviors in their social settings, and again if they themselves exhibited these behaviors.

Counterproductive Workplace Behavior Checklist. (CWB-C, Spector et al., 2006). The CWB-C is a 45-item checklist that measures aggression, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal at work. Examples of items on the CWB-C are, “Did something at work to make someone feel bad,” “Taken a longer break than you were allowed to take,” and, “Purposely wasted my employer’s materials.”

Results

Hypotheses were tested via linear regression, and all variables were tested to see which best predicted CWBs and OCBs. I hypothesized that mood would be a negative predictor of CWBs and that university students in negative moods would be more likely to exhibit CWBs. Contrary to this hypothesis (1a), I found that mood did not significantly predict either type of CWB, \( \beta = -.30, t = -2.82, p > .05 \), and \( \beta = -.04, t = -0.37, p > .05 \).

Interestingly, role (being an employee or a student) was significant only for interpersonal CWBs, \( \beta = .27, t = -.37, p < .05 \), meaning that students were more likely to exhibit interpersonal CWBs than employees. Hypothesis 1b stated that students would be more likely to engage in CWBs than would employees; thus Hypothesis 1b is partially supported because students were more likely to engage in only interpersonal CWBs. No significant differences were found between Butler community members and students in
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regards to organization-directed or interpersonal CWBs exhibited when both groups were in negative moods, $\beta = -.18, t = -1.69, p > .05$.

Role did predict OCBs when regressed with the amount of time one was associated with the university in that the longer an employee was associated with the university, the more OCBs they exhibited, $\beta = -.30, t = -2.82, p < .05$.

Organizational constraints significantly predicted counterproductive workplace behaviors directed at the organization, $\beta = .55, t = 6.35, p < .001$, and significantly predicted both types of CWBs regardless of role in support of Hypothesis 2, $\beta = .53, t = 5.82, p < .001$, which stated that organizational constraints will significantly predict CWBs in both employees and students. Internal conflict at work more significantly predicted interpersonal CWBs than organizational CWBs, $\beta = .32, t = 3.22, p < .05$.

Supplemental Analyses

Additional analyses not pertaining to the hypotheses were performed to further explore the data and what other variables might be influencing one another.

The multidimensional mood questionnaire, as mentioned above, contains three facets: calmness, valence, and energetic arousal. The three facets added together make up the total MDMQ score. Interestingly, certain facets of the MDMQ better predicted other variables than the total score itself. The facet of energetic arousal significantly predicted CWBs directed at the organization, $\beta = -.28, t = -2.84, p < .05$.

The job-affective well-being scale also consists of facets: low pleasure high arousal, low pleasure low arousal, high pleasure low arousal, and high pleasure high arousal, as mentioned above. Different facets of the JAWS better predicted certain variables. For example, the facet of low pleasure high arousal most strongly predicted
organization-directed CWBs in both employees and students, $\beta = .40$, $t = 4.18$ $p < .001$, and interpersonal CWBs, $\beta = .31$, $t = 3.08$ $p < .05$. Feelings making up the low pleasure high arousal facet include: anger, anxiety, disgust, fear, and fury (Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, & Kelloway, 2000). Considering people scoring high in this facet experience those feelings, it is not surprising that people in that facet exhibit the most CWBs. The low pleasure low arousal also significantly predicted organization-directed CWBs, $\beta = .33$, $t = 3.35$, $p = .001$. Feelings encompassing the low pleasure low arousal facet are: bored, depressed, discouraged, gloomy, and fatigued. The feelings consisting of the high pleasure high arousal facet are: energetic, excited, ecstatic, enthusiastic, and inspired (Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, & Kelloway, 2000).

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to examine potential differences in workplace experiences between university students and employees. In order to do so, I measured mood, organizational constraints, interpersonal conflict at work, job-affective well-being, workplace locus of control, counterproductive workplace behaviors, and organizational citizenship behaviors, all of which play a role in workplace behaviors. Because students are not employees, but are often told to think of their role as a student as a “full-time job,” and exhibit most of the same behaviors that employees do, student participants were asked to keep this phrase in mind when responding to survey questions.

In this particular study, being a student or an employee did not matter in exhibiting either type of CWB. Contrary to Hypothesis 1b, there were no significant differences in CWBs between employees and students; one group did not exhibit these behaviors more or less so than the other. Although one group was not significantly in a
better or worse mood than the other, the energetic arousal facet of the multidimensional mood questionnaire significantly predicted organization-directed CWBs. In other words, the more tired and without energy one was, the more organization-directed CWBs one committed. This outcome seems counterintuitive, but potentially participants feel drained and exhausted as a result of schoolwork or job-related work, thus leading them to feel frustrated and consequently exhibit unfavorable workplace behaviors. Additionally, it is possible that those in negative moods were less likely to interpret their behavior as unfavorable or problematic because perhaps it was uncharacteristic of their usual behavior.

Consistent with the second hypothesis, organizational constraints were a significant predictor of both organization-directed and interpersonal CWBs, regardless of role. This means that despite being an employee or a student, organizational constraints was a strong predictor of CWBs. This finding corroborates just how toxic high levels of stress can be to the workplace (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Fuller et al, 2003; Spector & Jex, 1998) even for students. When high levels of stressors exist, more strain is experienced and the less motivated a person becomes to perform tasks asked of them. This may of course result in negative feelings toward the workplace, thus leading to more counterproductivity and unfavorable work behaviors. It makes sense that interpersonal conflict at work was such a strong predictor of interpersonal CWBs. If a high amount of interpersonal conflict is perceived, one will likely act in accordance with this perception and exhibit counterproductive workplace against employees with whom they have or had conflicts. Unfortunately, this seems to create a vicious cycle where conflict is continuously met with interpersonal acts of workplace aggression. These results show us
that different constructs have unique relationships in predicting different types of CWBs (Robinson & Bennett, 1997; Spector et al, 2006).

From the scores on the facets of the job-affective well-being scale, we can conclude that levels of pleasure and arousal play an important role in the types of workplace behaviors that are exhibited. For example, the low pleasure high arousal facet significantly predicted both types of CWBs, but the low pleasure low arousal facet also significantly predicted both CWB types also. High pleasure high arousal predicted organization-directed CWBs, but not interpersonal CWBs. Although these feelings are mostly considered positive, it is possible that people could have been enthusiastic about being counterproductive and inspired to exhibit negative behaviors at work. High pleasure low arousal did not significantly predict organization-directed CWBs. The trend in beta weights was telling in that the low arousal beta weights were lower than were the beta weights for high arousal. This suggests that lower pleasure at work is more dangerous than low arousal, although both low pleasure and low arousal remain quite significantly unfavorable.

It is important to keep in mind that here, tenure means the amount of time an employee has been associated with the university. The longer an employee or a student has been associated with the university, the more OCBs both groups exhibit. Tenure did not significantly predict either type of CWB. Perhaps this is consistent with Akers’ (1973) bonding theory in that, the longer an employee is associated with the university, the more bonded they feel to their environment and are therefore less likely to engage in deviant workplace behavior. This could also explain why employees were found to be in more positive moods than students. It is also important to note that students do not have
the opportunity to bond with the university longer than their education timeline allows, whereas most employees attempt make a career out of their association with the university, thus allowing for longer and improved bonding opportunity.

Limitations

The biggest limitation of this study was that of attrition, which rendered the experience sampling methodology portion of the study completely unusable for data analysis. For reasons pertaining to the importance of protecting participant anonymity, participants were not urged to write down the unique identifiers they created at the beginning of the initial survey. Because of this, participants did not remember their unique identifiers and we could not link their ESM data with their data from the initial survey. This problem prevented us from tracking any daily mood changes and their potential effects on the exhibition of both CWBs and OCBs. In addition to the problem of participant attrition, the time between the initial survey and the start of the ESM surveys was about three weeks, which was more than enough time to allow participants to forget their unique identifiers. Although there were a number of participants who remembered their unique identifier, some only participated once or twice out of the five surveys, which would not allow for any meaningful distinctions to be made.

Another limitation of this study was the scale used to measure mood. Initially it was chosen for its brevity, but there was not enough variance in mood within the scale, and it was plagued by very low internal consistency, which was well below .70 and uninterpretable in the calmness facet. In hindsight, there is more to the human mood experience that influences work behaviors than facets of calmness, energetic arousal, and valence. The second part of the study set out to correct for this by using the Positive
The sample of this study is not quite representative of the population, which warrants caution to external validity. Most participants were Caucasian and female due to the demographics of the university. All participants self-selected into the study and were not randomly selected, so it is possible that there exists valuable data not captured by this study. It is also important to note that not all students think of their roles as full-time jobs, and even the ones that do so are not considering this similarity throughout their day. In reality, being a student shares numerous parallels with being an employee, but it is not an actual job or occupation, which might make generalizing these results troublesome.

Future research should include a more reliable mood measure that will allow for more meaningful distinctions in predicting outcome variables, randomly select participants, and instruct participants to keep unique identifiers in a safe place so that data from initial surveys can be linked with data extracted from experience sampling methodology. Future research should also continue to offer the opportunity for monetary incentives in order to prevent the problem of attrition. Because some employees desired to know how they measured up to other employees participating in the survey, it might be beneficial for future research to release a debriefing document for reasons pertaining to self-reflection. Perhaps if employees low in OCBs saw that they ranked low in these behaviors, they would work to balance their behavior in a more positive fashion, as did participants who felt guilty for their counterproductive workplace behavior in the study produced by Ilies, Peng, Savani, and Dimotakis (2013).

Conclusion
The findings from our study further corroborate that mood plays an important role in workplace behaviors, and that different psychological antecedents such as stress, conflict, locus of control, and job-affective well-being further influence this relationship whether you are a student or an employee. In order for universities and other organizations to create a symbiotic relationship between employer and employees (including students), they need to create a less stressful environment that allows their employees autonomy and the perception of fairness within the interpersonal functioning of the workplace. Fostering this kind of positive environment will lessen counterproductive workplace behaviors and increase the likelihood for organizational citizenship behaviors, consequently enriching job performance, successful students and a broadening, positive psychological state for all members of the organization.
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## Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tenure</td>
<td>21.77</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ICWS</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OCS</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WLCS</td>
<td>44.55</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>- .14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>(.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. OB</td>
<td>88.40</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>- .37**</td>
<td>(.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CWB</td>
<td>23.98</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>- .19</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CWB</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>- .40**</td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. JAWS HPHA</td>
<td>16.79</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>- .29*</td>
<td>- .43**</td>
<td>(.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. JAWS HPLA</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>- .31*</td>
<td>- .35**</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. JAWS LPLA</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>(.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. JAWS LPLA</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>- .08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>(.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. MDMQ C</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>- .32*</td>
<td>- .16</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>- .41**</td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. MDMQ V</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>- .64</td>
<td>- .27*</td>
<td>- .37**</td>
<td>- .30*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>- .40**</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>- .30*</td>
<td>- .14</td>
<td>- .40**</td>
<td>(.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 61, * = p < .05, ** = p < .01
Role = employees
Mood and Workplace Behavior in a University Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ICABS</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>WCOS</td>
<td>82.03</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>CWB50</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>CWB5</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>JAWS5</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>JAWS50</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>JAWS5</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>JAWS50</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>MDMP</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-133</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>MDMP</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 39. * = p < .05, ** = p < .01.
Role = Students
The Job-Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) will be completed by participants to measure the different ways their jobs make them feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Quite Often</th>
<th>Extremely Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My job made me feel at ease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My job made me feel angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My job made me feel annoyed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My job made me feel anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My job made me feel bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My job made me feel cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My job made me feel calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My job made me feel confused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My job made me feel content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My job made me feel depressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My job made me feel disgusted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My job made me feel discouraged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My job made me feel elated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My job made me feel energetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My job made me feel excited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My job made me feel ecstatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My job made me feel enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My job made me feel frightened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My job made me feel frustrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My job made me feel furious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My job made me feel gloomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My job made me feel fatigued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My job made me feel happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My job made me feel intimidated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My job made me feel inspired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My job made me feel miserable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My job made me feel pleased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My job made me feel proud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My job made me feel satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My job made me feel relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale (ICAWS) will be used to measure the extent to which participants experience interpersonal conflict at work.
The Organizational Constraints Scale (OCS) will be used to determine the extent to which participants experience job constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you find it difficult or impossible to do your job because of ...?</th>
<th>Less than once per month or never</th>
<th>Once or twice per month</th>
<th>Once or twice per week</th>
<th>Once or twice per day</th>
<th>Several times per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Poor equipment or supplies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational rules and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of equipment or supplies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inadequate training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Interruptions by other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of necessary information about what to do or how to do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conflicting job demands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Inadequate help from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Incorrect instructions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Work Locus of Control Scale will be used to measure participants’ beliefs about their jobs in general.

**Work Locus of Control Scale**

Copyright Paul E. Spector, All rights reserved, 1988

The following questions concern your beliefs about jobs in general. They do not refer only to your present job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A job is what you make of it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On most jobs, people can pretty much accomplish whatever they set out to accomplish</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If you know what you want out of a job, you can find a job that gives it to you</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If employees are unhappy with a decision made by their boss, they should do something about it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Making money is primarily a matter of good fortune</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In order to get a really good job, you need to have family members or friends in high places</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When it comes to landing a really good job, who you know is more important than what you know</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To make a lot of money you have to know the right people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It takes a lot of luck to be an outstanding employee on most jobs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make a little money is luck</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>Once or Twice per month</th>
<th>Once or twice per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Purposely wasted your employer’s materials/supplies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|---|---|---|---|---|---
| 2. | Daydreamed rather than did your work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 3. | Complained about insignificant things at work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 4. | Told people outside the job what a lousy place you work for | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 5. | Purposely did your work incorrectly* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 6. | Came to work late without permission | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 7. | Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you weren’t | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 8. | Purposely damaged a piece of equipment or property* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 9. | Purposely dirtied or littered your place of work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 10. | Stolen something belonging to your employer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 11. | Started or continued a damaging or harmful rumor at work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 12. | Been nasty or rude to a client or customer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 13. | Purposely worked slowly when things needed to get done | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 14. | Refused to take on an assignment when asked | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 15. | Purposely came late to an appointment or meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 16. | Failed to report a problem so it would get worse* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 17. | Taken a longer break than you were allowed to take | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 18. | Purposely failed to follow instructions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 19. | Left work earlier than you were allowed to | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 20. | Insulted someone about their job performance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 21. | Made fun of someone’s personal life | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 22. | Took supplies or tools home without permission* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 23. | Tried to look busy while doing nothing* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 24. | Put in to be paid for more hours than you worked* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 25. | Took money from your employer without permission* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 26. | Ignored someone at work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 27. | Refused to help someone at work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 28. | Withheld needed information from someone at work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 29. | Purposely interfered with someone at work doing his/her job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 30. | Blamed someone at work for error you made | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 31. | Started an argument with someone at work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 32. | Stole something belonging to someone at work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 33. | Verbally abused someone at work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 34. | Made an obscene gesture (the finger) to someone at work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 35. | Threatened someone at work with violence* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?**

|   |   |   |   |   |   
|---|---|---|---|---|---
| 36. | Threatened someone at work, but not physically | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

* Not included in the analysis.
37. Said something obscene to someone at work to make them feel bad
38. Hid something so someone at work couldn’t find it*
39. Did something to make someone at work look bad
40. Played a mean prank to embarrass someone at work
41. Destroyed property belonging to someone at work
42. Looked at someone at work’s private mail/property without permission*
43. Hit or pushed someone at work*
44. Insulted or made fun of someone at work
45. Avoided returning a phone call to someone you should at work

Note: items containing an asterisk were removed from the student survey.