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Abstract

More than ever before, organizations and their employees must be both dynamic and adaptable to survive and prosper in the global market. In response to this new business landscape, organizations are under increased pressure to motivate their employees to continually update their skills and adapt their behavior to changing job demands. Individual differences in the acquisition of new skills and motivation towards work outside of their strict job tasks can therefore determine individual as well as organizational success. The construct of goal orientation is emerging as a useful construct for understanding, at least in part, the differences between individual motivation strategies, organizational climate and employee behaviors. The most recent conceptualization of the construct describes four goal orientations that describe how individuals approach, interpret and respond in achievement situations. These are; mastery approach, a focus on self-referent learning and development; performance approach, a focus on outperforming others and demonstrating normative competence; performance avoid, a focus on avoiding poor performance; and mastery avoid, a desire to avoid loss of skills.

Previous literature has primarily investigated the role of goal orientation on employee’s task performance. This thesis extends this research by investigating the role of goal orientation in predicting non-task behaviors and performance in the workplace. Specifically, this thesis focuses on the possible negative ramifications of adopting a performance approach orientation on employee non-task workplace behavior. Across six chapters, and four empirical studies the hypothesis that a performance approach goal orientation causes individuals to engage in counterproductive and negative non-task behaviors is theorized and tested.
In the first study, the relationship between performance approach goal orientation and a specific type of risk taking, known as status-driven risk taking, is investigated. It is hypothesized that a trait performance approach goal orientation leads individuals to engage in risky behaviors that are motivated by a desire to improve status. Results show that performance approach goal orientation is the largest predictor of status-driven risk taking over mastery and performance avoid orientations, positive and negative affect, Conscientiousness and Neuroticism.

In the second study, the differential prediction of mastery approach and performance approach orientations on positive citizenship behaviors and negative counterproductive behaviors, respectively, are investigated. Trait performance approach orientation, and no other goal orientation, was found to be negatively associated to the HEXACO personality factor, Honesty-Humility. Furthermore performance approach goal orientation predicted organization-directed workplace deviance over and above personality. In contrast, trait mastery approach orientation positively predicted organization-directed organizational citizenship behavior controlling for personality traits.

Using an experimental design in the third study, the relationship between a state performance approach goal orientation and unethical cheating behavior on an anagram task was measured. Results showed that a state performance approach goal orientation led to significantly more cheating on the task than either a state mastery goal orientation or state performance avoid goal orientation.

Finally, in the fourth study, the effect the goal orientation of the team an individual works in on the individual’s non-task work behaviors was examined. Results showed that a team performance goal orientation, either approach or avoid, was positively associated with interpersonal and organization directed workplace deviance. Furthermore,
the negative relationship between trait Honesty-Humility and workplace deviance was
significantly moderated by a team performance orientation.

Across all the studies reported in this thesis there was strong evidence for a ‘dark-
side’ to the performance approach goal orientation. Performance approach goal
orientation at a trait, state and team level was found to be associated with negative non-
task work behaviors. With these results, this thesis extends the current research on goal
orientation, non-task behaviors and person-situation interaction in the organizational
literature.
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CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Overview and Goals for the Chapter

In this first chapter, I will begin by providing a brief overview of the thesis aim and content. Following this, I will introduce the main concepts relevant to this thesis and provide a context for the research questions addressed. This chapter will conclude with an overview of the structure of the thesis as a whole.

Thesis Overview

More than ever before, organizations and their employees must be both dynamic and adaptable to survive and prosper in the global market (E. M. Smith, Ford, & Kozlowski, 1997). In response to this new business landscape, organizations are under increased pressure to motivate their employees to continually update their skills and adapt their behavior to changing job demands (Hall & Mirvis, 1996). Individual differences in the acquisition of new skills and ability to work outside of their strict job tasks can therefore determine individual as well as organizational success. However, sustained inter and intra-organization competition means that employee performance must also remain high.

These new developments in the organizational landscape raise important questions for employee performance. Why is it that some employees are capable of learning and developing skills where others falter? Why do some employees thrive in competitive workplaces and others struggle? Are there any costs or benefits in motivating employees to focus on learning over performance? Does a performance orientated team lead individuals to behave in counterproductive ways? The construct of goal orientation is
emerging as a useful construct for understanding, at least in part, these differences between individual motivation strategies, organizational climate and employee behaviors (see Payne, Youngcourt, & Beaubien, 2007, for review).

This thesis investigates the role of goal orientation in predicting non-task behaviors and performance in the workplace. Specifically, the thesis focuses on the possible negative ramifications of adopting a performance approach orientation – a focus on outperforming others and demonstrating competence – on employee non-task workplace behavior. This research contributes to the understanding of the motivation of non-task behaviors in the workplace. In the current competitive global market understanding why employees may be motivated to engage in positive or negative behaviors outside of their job tasks could contribute to an organization’s success or failure. Across four papers the hypothesis that the performance approach goal orientation causes individuals to engage in counterproductive and negative non-task behaviors is theorized and tested.

To investigate this hypothesis, and the research questions proposed above, there are four empirical studies included in this thesis that investigate the relationship between goal orientation and non-task work behaviors. In Chapter 2, the relationship between performance approach goal orientation and a specific type of risk taking, known as status-driven risk taking, is investigated. It is hypothesized that a trait performance approach goal orientation may lead individuals to engage in risky behaviors that are motivated by a desire to improve status. In Chapter 3, the differential prediction of mastery approach and performance approach orientations on positive citizenship behaviors and negative counterproductive behaviors, respectively, are investigated. Using an experimental design in Chapter 4, the relationship between a state performance approach goal orientation and unethical cheating behavior on an anagram task is measured. Finally, in Chapter 5, the
effect the goal orientation of the team an individual works in on the individual’s non-task work behaviors is examined. Each of these papers across the four chapters, measure these relationships taking into account the established personality antecedents of goal orientation. In the final Chapter, these papers are discussed in the context of the core theme across the thesis, the possible ‘dark-side’ to the performance approach goal orientation in relation to non-task work behaviors.

To begin this investigation I will first introduce the construct of goal orientation as well as the established antecedents and consequences, then review the literature pertaining to other key variables pertinent to this thesis such as personality and non-task behaviors. In a recent meta-analysis, Payne et al. (2007) incorporated theoretical and empirical information from the educational and organizational psychology literatures to create an organizing framework for the goal orientation construct. This framework organizes separate and yet linked constructs into antecedents, proximal consequences and distal consequences of the goal orientation construct. I have adapted this framework to guide this review of the goal orientation literature, see Figure 1 below.
Figure 1. Organizing framework used to guide the literature review for this thesis, adapted from Payne et al. (2007).
Research Context

Achievement Goal Theory and Goal Orientation

Over the past few decades achievement goal theory (Ames, 1992; Dweck, 1986) has become an important theoretical perspective on the motivations behind learning and task performance. Achievement goal theory has its roots in Atkinson’s Theory of Achievement Motivation that focused on the joint influence of a motivation to succeed and a motivation to avoid failure in achievement situations. Though there has been criticism of the clarity of the construct (e.g., Hulleman, Schrager, Bodmann, & Harackiewicz, 2010), at its core, achievement goal theory is the study of cognitive and behavioral approaches in achievement settings (Ames & Archer, 1988; Diener & Dweck, 1978; Dweck, 1986, 1992). These different approaches, known as goal orientations, are perceptual-cognitive frameworks that shape how individuals approach, interpret and respond to achievement situations (Brett & VandeWalle, 1999; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Kaplan & Maehr, 2007). More simply, goal orientations influence the why and how people try to achieve various objectives rather than focusing on the content of what people are attempting to achieve (e.g., objectives, grades, standards), making it separate but complimentary to the goal-setting literature.

The construct of goal orientation has provided a strong theoretical framework for considerable research into the motivational orientations that contribute to individual’s adaptive and maladaptive patterns of engagement in tasks. Initially used to explain differences in student learning behavior (e.g., Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Licht & Dweck, 1984), goal orientation has become one of the most frequently studied motivational constructs in organizational literature (see Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007 for review).
Framework of the Goal Orientation Construct

Early research fervor concerning achievement goal theory focused on two goal orientations; a mastery orientation (also known as learning orientation, task orientation, mastery-challenge) and performance orientation (also referred to as prove orientation, ego orientation, relative ability, self enhancement; e.g., Ames, 1992; Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Rawsthorne & Elliot, 1999). An individual that approaches a task from a mastery orientation focuses on developing competence, gaining skill, and doing one’s best. When a task is approached from a mastery orientation, individuals strive to understand something new or to increase their level of competence in a given activity. Alternatively, when a task is approached from a performance orientation an individual strives to demonstrate competence relative to others, and in doing so, gain favorable judgments of their task performance, or to avoid demonstrating incompetence, to avoid receiving negative judgments of their abilities (Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliott & Dweck, 1988).

Recent empirical evidence suggests that a mastery orientation leads to better job performance (e.g., Payne et al., 2007; Potosky & Ramakrishna, 2002; Sujan, Barton, & Kumar, 1994; VandeWalle, Cron, & Slocum, 2001), academic grades (Bell & Kozlowski, 2002; Harackiewicz, Barron, Tauer, & Elliot, 2002), feedback seeking behaviors (e.g., Kozlowski & Bell, 2006; Tuckey, Brewer, & Williamson, 2002; VandeWalle et al., 2001), and transformational leadership qualities (e.g., Coad & Berry, 1998; Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004). In contrast relationships between these outcomes and a performance orientation has proven to be less clear with studies often reporting conflicting results (see Button, Mathieu, & Zajac, 1996; Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007). Elliot and colleagues (see Elliot & Covington, 2001; Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Elliot & Thrash, 2002; Harackiewicz, Barron, Pintrich, Elliot, & Thrash, 2002) suggested that the reason
performance orientation often produced conflicting results was that competence for this orientation has both positive and negative valences. Elliot suggests that competence in achievement settings is valenced in that it is either constructed in terms of positive, desirable possibilities (e.g., success, outperforming) or negative, undesirable possibilities (e.g., failure, loss; see Elliot and McGregor, 2001). Evidence suggests that individuals process most, if not all, stimuli in terms of valence and do this immediately without attention or awareness (see Bargh, 1997; Zajonc, 1998). This automatic valence-based processing is theorized to instantaneously evoke approach and avoidance behavioral dispositions (Förster, Higgins, & Idson, 1998). Indeed, these approach and avoidance tendencies appear in infancy and appear to be innate to the brain’s neuroanatomical structure (Elliot & Covington, 2001). The strong evidence for valenced reactions to stimuli suggested to Elliot and others that the performance orientations might have both positive (approach) and negative (avoid) components.

The division of the performance orientation into separate dimensions, approach and avoid, brought about more clarity in the relationships between performance goal orientations and behavioral outcomes. An individual tackling a problem from a performance approach orientation focuses on proving competence to others by demonstrating successful performance whereas an individual with a performance avoid orientation aims to avoid the demonstration of incompetence (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Vandewalle, 1997). Empirically, distinguishing performance approach goals from performance avoid goals helped better account for the pattern of conflicting relationships between performance goals and various adaptive and maladaptive outcomes (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Yeo, Sorbello, Koy, & Smillie, 2008). Subsequent research suggests that it is the avoidance form of performance goals that
predict lower intrinsic motivation and performance, with approach goals often relating positively to performance, but not as strongly as mastery orientation.

Researchers also argue that a fourth goal orientation should be added to the achievement goal framework; mastery avoidance (Elliot, 1999; Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Pintrich, 2000). Mastery avoidance is defined as “a focus on avoiding self-referential or task-referential incompetence” (Elliot, 2005, p. 61). The argument for including this fourth goal orientation (in conjunction with performance approach, performance avoid and mastery approach) and the 2 x 2 framework has been empirically supported through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in both specific and general academic contexts (Baranik, Barron, & Finney, 2007; Baranik, Stanley, Bynum, & Lance, 2010; Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Results also demonstrated that mastery avoidance orientation was distinct from the other three orientations and reflected a better model than the three-factor framework (Baranik et al., 2007; Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Baranik, Stanley, Bynum and Lance (2010) showed that mastery-avoidance is positively associated with need for achievement, perceived competence, competitiveness and negative affect and negatively associated with cognitive ability, help seeking and performance. Furthermore, they found positive correlations between mastery avoid and the other goal orientations (mastery approach, performance approach, performance avoid). These relationships, however, were small to moderate leading the authors to conclude that the mastery-avoidance orientation is conceptually and empirically distinct construct with unique antecedents and consequences. Consistent with this evidence, this thesis uses the 2x2 framework where it is appropriate based on the specific research question and context. As the mastery avoid dimension is a relatively new addition to the framework, with empirical support even more recent, this dimension was not included in two papers in this thesis.
Temporal Stability of the Goal Orientation Construct

Initial conceptualizations of goal orientations tended to describe them as dispositional and varying as a result of stable proximal cognitions, such as implicit beliefs of intelligence (Dweck, 1986; Nicholls, 1989). However, since its conception goal orientation has been treated as a stable, dispositional, individual-difference characteristic (e.g., Colquitt & Simmering, 1998) or as a situation specific frame that is dependent on task or environmental cues (e.g., Steele-Johnson, Beauregard, Hoover, & Schmidt, 2000; Stevens & Gist, 1997). In an early attempt to determine the nature of goal orientation, Button et al. (1996) conceptualized goal orientation as a “somewhat stable individual difference factor that may be influenced by situational characteristics” (p. 28). Further research tends to suggest that the type of orientation an individual adopts for a given task is influenced by both dispositional and situational influences (Archer, 1994; Chen, Gully, Whiteman, & Kilcullen, 2000; Kozlowski et al., 2001; Payne et al., 2007). Independent situational and dispositional influences have been shown to affect the type of orientation activated, eliciting a different response pattern (Archer, 1994; Chen et al., 2000; Kozlowski et al., 2001).

Various interventions have been used to induce achievement orientations, typically by manipulating cues that frame training (Kozlowski & Bell, 2006; Kozlowski et al., 2001; Yeo, Loft, Xiao, & Kiewitz, 2009; Yeo et al., 2008). To induce a mastery orientation, cues, instructions and/or feedback emphasize self-referenced improvement, incremental notions of intelligence/ability, and frame errors as opportunities to learn and improve. In contrast, cues that stress demonstrating normative competence, fixed nature of ability and error avoidance induce a performance orientation (e.g., Ames, 1992; Archer, 1994; Kozlowski & Bell, 2006; Kozlowski et al., 2001; Yeo et al., 2009; Yeo et al., 2008).
Demonstrating a similar pattern of results to that found in the trait goal orientation literature, a mastery state orientation has generally been associated with more adaptive patterns of learning and self-regulation than performance approach orientation and performance avoid orientation linked with more maladaptive patterns (see meta-analyses by Rawsthorne & Elliot, 1999; Utman, 1997).

Consistent with current and notable definitions (e.g., Button et al., 1996; Payne et al., 2007) and conceptualizations of other psychological variables (e.g., self-efficacy, anxiety, self-esteem) goal orientation is conceptualized as both a state and a trait, with trait goal orientation having a direct effect on state goal orientation, in this thesis.

Even more recently several researchers have shifted the focus of individual-level achievement goal research to the unit or group level. Work units within organizations can focus on different achievement goals. For example, some work units prioritize learning and development of skill (Kozlowski & Hults, 1987), whereas others emphasize competition between units which is evidenced by incentives and reward structures (Brown, Cron, & Slocum, 1998), or are more concerned with protecting their reputation and avoid divulging mistakes (Edmondson, 1996; Hofmann & Stetzer, 1998). To investigate these group level motivations researchers have formalized the construct of team goal orientation (also referred to as work unit goal orientation). Team goal orientation “refers to the shared perception of the extent to which the unit pursues a particular goal, such as learning, outperforming other units, or avoiding failure” (Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012, p. 1032). Team goal orientation has been shown to be a robust predictor of team performance and behaviors in a number studies investigating work groups and teams (Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2003; DeShon, Kozlowski, Schmidt, Milner, & Wiechmann, 2004; Dragoni, 2005; Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012; LePine, 2005; Mehta, Feild, Armenakis, & Mehta, 2008; Porter, 2005). As noted earlier in the overview of the
chapters, in the final study presented in this thesis team goal orientation and dispositional
goal orientation are incorporated in the prediction of individual-level behavior, taking a
person-situation interaction approach to the understanding of non-task behaviors.

**Domain Specificity of the Goal Orientation Construct.**

Coupled with evolutions in the framework, the movement of the goal orientation construct from academic settings into more applied settings has also seen the rise of measurement and conceptual issues (see Button et al., 1996; DeShon & Gillespie, 2005; Hulleman et al., 2010; Van Yperen, Blaga, & Postmes, 2014). Goal orientation, and the study of achievement goals, has been widely adopted in the three areas of educational, industrial and sports psychology. The question of whether individuals adopt different orientations for different spheres of their life is inherently linked to questions regarding the temporal stability of the construct. In the same manner as the temporal stability issue, there have been advocates for both sides of the debate, either explicitly or through the creation of global or specific measures. For example the Button et al. (1996) measure (e.g., “I try to improve my past performance”) does not make reference to any specific context, such as on the sporting field or to work. This measure, therefore, is inherently a global measure as it implicitly suggests that an individual is likely to adopt the same goal orientation for all life domains.

In contrast, Dweck (1999) suggested that individuals may have domain-specific personality patterns and implicit beliefs. For example, an individual may believe that learning and development is possible within the academic context, but also that ability was fixed when it came to sports. These beliefs may then inform the goal orientation the individual adopts. VandeWalle (1997) supported the notion of domain specificity and created a goal orientation instrument for use within the work domain. Using this measure, VandeWalle et al. (2001) demonstrated stronger relationships with self-efficacy, goal-
setting and performance than Phillips and Gully (1997) using the more global measure. This provides some support for the domain specificity argument, though it is possible that these results reflect the greater clarity in measuring three-dimensional goal orientation (VandeWalle, 1997) over two-dimension (Button et al., 1996). When conducting analyses that simultaneously combined work and academic goal orientation items, Baranik et al. (2007) found empirical evidence for domain specificity rather than support for more global achievement goal orientations. In a more recent review of the extant literature, Van Yperen et al. (2014) meta-analyzed the relationship between goal orientation and performance in three domains of work, sports and education. The authors were critical of the relatively distinct and segmented literature across the domains. The results showed that the domain (sports, work or education) was a moderator of the relationship between goal orientation and performance providing further support for the argument of domain specificity.

To reflect this evidence, domain specific measurement of goal orientation has been used throughout this thesis. That is to say that goal orientation is measured with work or work-related tasks specified as the point of reference. However, I have also drawn theory and conceptual links from work and other domains in attempt to ameliorate the segmented literature criticized by Van Yperen et al. (2014). I believe this approach provides information with which to derive conceptual evidence for hypotheses whilst balancing the evidence of domain specificity.

Antecedents, Correlates and Consequences

Antecedents, correlates and consequences of goal orientation will now be discussed, using the organizing framework adapted from Payne et al. (2007) presented above, see Figure 1.
Antecedents

This introduction will briefly discuss the key antecedents of the goal orientation construct namely personality characteristics, implicit beliefs of intelligence and general self-efficacy. The assumptions regarding antecedents associated with this construct are important to address as they have relevance to the experimental design and manipulations adopted in the research presented in Chapter 4 of this thesis. For example, the manipulations used to induce state goal orientations draw heavily upon the antecedents of goal orientation such as implicit beliefs about intelligence. Additionally, this thesis focuses on the prediction of non-task behaviors over established antecedents of both goal orientation and these behaviors, such as personality.

Personality

For the purposes of this thesis personality is conceptualized as “an individual’s behavioral and emotional characteristics, generally found to be stable over time and in a variety of circumstances” (Landy & Conte, 2010, p. 97). Research has demonstrated that personality characteristics and differences play an important role in workplace behavior, independent of cognitive ability (Mount & Barrick, 1995; Murphy, 1996). The majority of research in the organizational literature has focused on the five factor model (FFM) or ‘Big 5’ model of personality (Digman, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1985, 1987). This model posits that an individual’s personality is best described by where the individual falls on five dimensions; Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism/Emotionality.

At first Conscientiousness, a trait characterized by prudence, diligence, persistence and organization, was lauded as the most important personality characteristic for success at work, with Barrick and Mount (1991) claiming that it was positively related to success in all aspects of work in all occupations. More recently, however, there is
evidence that factors other than Conscientiousness are important for specific industries and occupations. For example, Extraversion has been shown to be important for success in sales, Agreeableness is associated with improved performance in roles involving interpersonal interactions (e.g., customer-service, team-oriented roles), and Openness to Experience is positively related to training and expatriate success (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001; Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998; Vincur, Schippmann, Switzer, & Roth, 1998).

For all the support of the FFM, there have been a number of notable criticisms. Some researchers have argued that five factors are too few to encompass the full range of an individual’s personality (e.g., Hogan & Hogan, 1995; Hough, 1992; Tellegen, 1993). More recently, Ashton and Lee (2001) rekindled this debate by proposing that the optimal number of personality traits consists of six rather than five major dimensions. This proposal differs from those described previously (e.g., Hogan & Hogan, 1995; Hough, 1992) in that it is based on analyses of lexical studies of personality structure, from which the FFM was originally derived. Further, Ashton et al.’s (2004) review more specifically reported that lexical studies of personality structure conducted in diverse languages have repeatedly found six, not five, major dimensions of personality variation. Further studies demonstrated that this structure was replicated in English as well as 11 additional languages including French, German, Korean and Polish (Lee & Ashton, 2008). The new sixth factor discovered in their analyses describes personality characteristics such as sincerity, fairness, lack of conceit and lack of greed and Ashton, Lee and colleagues named this factor ‘Honesty-Humility’ (see Ashton & Lee, 2001; Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2004; Ashton, Lee, Perugini, et al., 2004; Lee & Ashton, 2004). Ashton, Lee, and Son (2000) suggested that this factor represents individual differences in the willingness (or reluctance) to manipulate and exploit others, a trait not adequately
captured in any of the five factors proposed in the FFM. To address this discrepancy, Lee and Ashton developed a new personality inventory to measure the six factors as obtained in lexical studies of personality structure in several languages. This new six-dimensional framework is called the HEXACO model—an acronym of Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion (eXtraversion), Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience. In addition to the extra sixth factor, the HEXACO also includes a modification to the Agreeableness and Emotionality dimensions. Specifically, Agreeableness and Emotionality were re-conceptualized as rotational variants of the two corresponding Big Five factors, a modification that they found evidence for in the results of lexical studies reviewed previously (Ashton, Lee, & de Vries, 2014). For example tendencies related to a quick temper are associated with Neuroticism or low Emotional Stability in the FFM, but with low Agreeableness in the HEXACO framework. Secondly, as the FFM does not include an Honesty-Humility factor, some of the tendencies that are ascribed to the Honesty-Humility factor in the HEXACO model have been relocated from the FFM’s Agreeableness factor (see Ashton & Lee, 2001; Ashton et al., 2014; Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2004; Ashton, Lee, Perugini, et al., 2004; Lee & Ashton, 2004).

Research has demonstrated that the HEXACO shows considerable predictive validity advantages over the traditional five-factor model (Ashton & Lee, 2008), especially when predicting negative or counter-productive behaviors (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001; Lee, Gizzarone, & Ashton, 2003). These gains are largely due to the inclusion of the sixth factor, Honesty-Humility, as individuals scoring low in this factor tend to be more manipulative, self-entitled, materialistic and exploitive. Research has established an association between people scoring low on the HEXACO factor of Honesty-Humility and negative workplace behaviors (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001; Lee, Ashton, & Shin, 2005; Lee et al., 2003; O’Neill, Lewis, & Carswell, 2011; Oh, Lee,
Ashton, & de Vries, 2011) and a number of other negative behavioral outcomes such as, risk-taking (Weller & Thulin, 2012), status-driven risk taking (Ashton, Lee, Pozzebon, Visser, & Worth, 2010), unethical business decision making (Ogunfowora, Bourdage, & Nguyen, 2013) and adult delinquency (Dunlop, Morrison, Koenig, & Silcox, 2012).

**Personality and goal orientation**

The vast majority of research investigating the links between personality and goal orientation has been conducted using the five-factor model of personality. Few studies have investigated the relationship between the big-five personality factors and the three-dimensional framework of goal orientation, most only distinguishing between mastery and performance orientations (for notable exceptions see Bipp, Steinmayr, & Spinath, 2008; Payne et al., 2007; Wang & Erdheim, 2007). To add to this, different measurement tools and conceptual differences have made understanding the relationships between personality and goal orientation more difficult (see Day, Radosevich, & Chasteen, 2003, for review). Most of these studies investigated the relations on an exploratory empirical basis. Elliot and Thrash (2002) were among the first to posit a testable theoretical basis for the linkage between personality and goal orientation. Drawing from a largely biological approach to extraversion and neuroticism they proposed the existence of an approach and avoidance temperament. Elliot and Thrash (2002) argued that based on a largely biologically determined sensitivity to positive (or negative) stimuli, the approach (or avoidance) temperaments would be “accompanied by perceptual vigilance for, affective reactivity to, and a behavioral disposition toward such stimuli” (p. 805). This position led them to hypothesize that approach orientations, mastery and performance approach, would be positively associated with approach personality dimensions, such as extraversion; and avoid personality dimensions, such as neuroticism, would be positively associated with the avoid dimensions of goal orientation. Elliot and Thrash (2002) found
support for their hypotheses as extraversion (and not neuroticism) was a significant predictor of mastery goal adoption and neuroticism (and not extraversion) was a significant positive predictor of performance avoid orientation. However, both extraversion and neuroticism were significant positive predictors of performance approach goal orientation. While partial support has been found for Elliot and Thrash’s (2002) hypotheses in other studies (e.g., Bipp et al., 2008; Day et al., 2003), the associations were relatively weak. Bipp et al. (2008) attempted to provide more insight by investigating the relationships at the facet level of personality. Results largely mirrored those of Elliot and Thrash (2002), however, evidence was also found suggesting that facet level investigation may be warranted. For example performance approach orientation correlated both positively and negatively with sub-facets of the openness to experience factor.

Based on the research to date, the antecedent personality characteristics of goal orientation are not fully understood. As reviewed above, the personality correlates of goal orientation have been investigated within the FFM framework. No research, to our knowledge, has investigated the correlates of goal orientation within the HEXACO framework. The lack of research into the relationships between goal orientation and the HEXACO factors is intriguing given that the HEXACO model is superior to the FFM model when predicting workplace behaviors, especially negative behaviors. The incremental validity associated with the HEXACO framework over the FFM, especially with regards to negative workplace behaviors, is particularly important with regards to the research presented in this thesis, as throughout this thesis the hypothesis that performance approach orientation is associated with counterproductive behaviors is tested. Determining any relationship between performance approach goal orientation and the HEXACO factors may aid in the investigation of negative workplace behaviors. More
specifically, I also present theoretical and empirical reasons for suspecting a positive relationship between performance approach goal orientation and Honesty-Humility, a point which is one of the central themes of this thesis and will be reviewed in more depth in Chapter 3. Therefore, in this thesis the HEXACO framework is utilized with the hope that it can foster a clearer understanding of the relationships between the HEXACO factors, goal orientation and non-task work behaviors and to determine whether goal orientation predicts these non-tasks behaviors over and above personality.

**Implicit Beliefs of Intelligence**

In her social-cognitive framework of achievement, Dweck (1986) theorized that an individual’s implicit beliefs about the stability of intelligence leads to the adoption of a performance or mastery goal orientation. Beliefs about intelligence are thought to range along a continuum from an entity belief, where an individual believes that intelligence and ability are entirely fixed and cannot be improved, to an incremental belief, where an individual believes intelligence and ability are malleable. Dweck (1986) hypothesized that individuals with an entity belief would be more likely to adopt a performance orientation than those that tended to hold an incremental theory of intelligence. In contrast individuals who held an incremental belief would tend towards a mastery orientation. Payne et al. (2007) supported this theory, finding a negative relationship between entity beliefs and mastery orientation and a positive relationship between performance approach and performance avoid orientations. However, it should be noted that the relationship between performance avoid and beliefs about intelligence was assessed using only two papers due to the relatively recent delineation of the performance orientation. The antecedents of mastery avoid orientation were not assessed in the Payne et al. (2007) meta-analysis as few papers have included this extra dimension. Based on Dweck’s
(1986) theory, however, it would be hypothesized that an incremental belief of intelligence would be positively associated with mastery avoid orientation.

**Self-efficacy**

Wood and Bandura (1989) defined self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands” (p.408). Self-efficacy has been widely applied to the organizational literature (e.g., Bandura, 1997; Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Chen, Gully & Eden, 2001) and has been reported to predict a number of important work-related outcomes such as job attitudes (e.g., Saks, 1995), training transfer (Martocchio & Judge, 1997) and job performance (e.g., Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998).

Kanfer (1990) posited that individuals who have an entity belief of intelligence tend to have lower self-efficacy than those with an incremental belief. This led Payne et al. (2007) to suggest that the relationship between self-efficacy might vary as a function of their shared relationship with implicit beliefs of intelligence. Results across a number of studies suggest a largely consistent pattern. Mastery goal orientation is positively associated with self-efficacy, whereas performance avoid is negatively associated and there appears to be no significant relationship with performance approach (e.g., Payne et al., 2007; Stevens & Gist, 1997; Zweig & Webster, 2004). Individuals who are high in self-efficacy are more likely to adopt a mastery orientation and far less likely to adopt a performance avoid orientation. Though measuring the possible moderating role of self-efficacy was beyond the scope of this thesis, I believe that it is an important construct to note in the analysis and interpretation of results and have included suggestions for future research that examines the role of self-efficacy to a greater extent.
Consequences

Significant consequences of the goal orientation construct will now be briefly discussed. The consequences are organized into proximal and distal consequences. Similar to the examination of antecedents, this review will concentrate on consequences relevant to the research interests of this thesis and is not intended as a complete list. Specifically the major proximal consequences of state goal orientation and self-regulation are reviewed and the distal consequences of job performance, task performance, workplace deviance and citizenship behaviors.

**Proximal Consequences**

*State Goal Orientation*

As discussed in the temporal stability review above, state goal orientation refers to the goal adopted in a given situation (Ames & Archer, 1988). State goal orientation is largely informed by environmental and task cues and is therefore commonly induced in experimental settings for a short period of time (e.g., Stevens & Gist, 2007; Bell and Kozlowski, 2006; Yeo, et al., 2009). State goal dimensions – mastery approach, mastery avoid, performance approach, performance avoid – have been shown to be positively related to their trait goal orientation counterparts (Payne et al., 2007; Baranik et al., 2010). Interestingly, Payne et al. (2007) reported a correlation (r=.45) between state mastery orientation and trait performance approach orientation which was much higher than the relationship between these dimensions at either a state or trait level. This suggests that a trait goal orientation may inform a state goal orientation. For example, an individual with a strong trait performance approach orientation may adopt a mastery orientation at times so as to achieve their trait goals.
**Self-regulation**

In its simplest form self-regulation is the means through which individuals take in information about their behavior and use that information to make adjustments (see Vancouver & Day, 2005 for review). The different perceptual-cognitive frameworks produced by adopting a particular goal orientation are theorized to lead to different patterns of self-regulation. Adopting a mastery goal orientation is thought to lead to an adaptive pattern characterized by seeking challenges, intrinsic motivation, escalating effort and persistence. Alternatively, a performance orientation is characterized by a maladaptive pattern of challenge avoidance, low intrinsic motivation, and withdrawing from the task (Ames, 1992; Dweck, 1986; Kozlowski & Bell, 2006).

**Distal Consequences**

Consistent with Payne et al. (2007) and their organizing framework shown in Figure 1, I conceptualize trait goal orientation as a distant antecedent of learning, academic performance and job performance that works in part through the proximal consequences reviewed above as well as other self-regulatory processes. Additionally, in this thesis I add to this framework by proposing the inclusion of status-driven risk taking and non-task work behaviors, specifically workplace deviance and organizational citizenship behavior. In this chapter I will introduce these constructs and briefly review some of the conceptual and empirical evidence suggesting that goal orientation might be a distal antecedent of these additional behaviors and will review this evidence in more detail, and test this hypothesis, in later chapters.

**Learning and Academic Performance**

The relatively recent movement of the goal orientation construct from the educational literature to the organizational literature has meant a great deal of overlap between the two fields. This overlap means that although this thesis primarily focused on
goal orientation within the work context I thought a brief review of the educational literature was warranted. In line with many ‘performance’ constructs, academic performance and learning within an academic context have been measured in a number of ways making comparisons across studies problematic. In two key reviews of the literature, trait mastery approach goal orientation was associated with better academic performance, whereas, trait performance avoid goal orientation, to a lesser degree, was associated with poorer performance (Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007), though the bounds included zero.

These results are consistent with original conceptualizations of goal orientation as mastery approach goal orientation was theorized to be associated with adaptive learning thoughts and behavioral strategies such as persisting in the face of challenges, maintaining self-efficacy and setting higher goals (Dweck, 1986, 1992; Elliott & Dweck, 1988). The findings of Payne et al. (2007) and Cellar et al. (2011) showing a negative relationship between performance avoid goal orientation and learning and academic performance is also consistent with previous research and original conceptualizations. Diener and Dweck (1978) reported that individuals with high levels of performance orientation reported experiencing thoughts unrelated to the tasks and Button et al. (1996) suggested that these individuals have thoughts about avoiding the task – both of which are inhibitors of performance. In addition, motivation to avoid negative outcomes is generally associated with poorer overall performance, relative to a motivation to approach a positive outcome (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996). The relationship between trait performance approach orientation and academic performance has been less consistent. Payne et al. (2007) and Cellar et al. (2011) found no relationship between performance approach goal orientation and learning or academic performance and reported quite large credibility intervals (-.11,.15 and -.01,.22, respectively).
Payne et al. (2007) also analyzed the relationships between state goal orientations and learning and academic performance however the scarcity of studies examining state goal orientations made their results somewhat tenuous. However, the results largely mirrored the trait level analyses though they found that state mastery approach goal orientation had a positive relationship to learning ($\rho = .31$) but no relationship to academic performance.

**Status-driven Risk Taking**

Despite considerable research into competitive risk taking in evolutionary psychology, little research has investigated this style of risk taking in the workplace. To aid in investigation of competitive risk taking within the psychology context, Ashton et al. (2010) formalized the construct of status-driven risk taking (SDRT). Status-driven risk taking is conceptualized as risk taking motivated solely by the prospect of gains in money, influence or social standing (Ashton et al., 2010). Status-driven risk taking has been cited as a cause of demographic differences in observed mortality rates (Ashton et al., 2010; Kraemer, 2000; Wilson & Daly, 1985). These demographic differences are, firstly, human males have higher mortality rates than human females across all ages. Secondly, the difference in ratio of mortality rates between men and women peaks around the teenage and young adult age groups. Thirdly, this ratio of mortality rates is more pronounced among societies that have greater variation in social status (e.g., income inequality, social inequality). Finally, the ratio between mortality rates of men and women is greater when comparing mortality due to ‘external’ or proximate behaviors (e.g., accidents, homicide and suicide) than mortality due to ‘internal’ factors (e.g., disease). These different demographic patterns in mortality rates have been ascribed to individual differences in competitive, or status-driven risk taking in humans (Wilson & Daly, 1985).
Citing evidence from these demographic differences in mortality Ashton et al. (2010) formalized the construct of status-driven risk taking (SDRT). Status-driven risk taking is conceptually different from sensation-seeking and general risk taking as it focuses solely on risk taking behaviors that are primarily committed as a means to an end, however it is a subset of generic risk taking. For example skydiving is a high-risk behavior but would not be classified as SDRT unless the decision to skydive was motivated by the possibility of winning large amounts of money or fame, for example.

**Status-driven risk taking and goal orientation.** No research that I am aware of has established a relationship between status-driven risk taking and goal orientation. In part, this is likely due to the recent formalization of this construct in any area of psychology. Ultimately, I was interested in whether adopting a performance approach goal orientation increased risk-taking over a mastery orientation. It follows that if an individual is focused on outperforming others they may be willing to achieve this goal by any means possible, including taking very large, potentially life-threatening, risks. The conceptual and empirical links between the performance approach orientation and SDRT will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

**Job Performance**

Industrial and Organizational psychologists have devoted a great deal of research and practice into understanding, and ultimately, improving performance of people at work. This interest has garnered a number of a models and theories to define, explain and measure the domain of job performance (e.g., Campbell, McHenry, & Wise, 1990; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Murphy, 1989). Fundamentally, job performance is a measurement of behavior (Landy & Conte, 2010) that can be observed and rated by others. However, increasingly jobs are more complex and the ‘behavior’ required is often unobservable (e.g., problem-solving, thinking, planning) or not simply tied to a direct output of a single
individual (e.g., number of widgets produced in one hour). In the past few decades theories of job performance have focused on a differentiation between task performance, the degree to which an individual accomplished duties and responsibilities required in their role, and non-task performance, behaviors outside of these strict requirements. In their seminal paper, Rotundo and Sackett (2002) demonstrated that when measuring overall job performance, supervisor ratings constituted of three relatively distinct groups of behaviors. Specifically, these behaviors including task performance, citizenship, and counterproductive performance. Given that there is increasing evidence that job performance constitutes three distinct behaviors, I will review the relationship between goal orientation and the global job performance and then review task performance, citizenship and counterproductive performance following each with a review of the relationships between these constructs and goal orientation in the extant literature.
Job Performance and Goal Orientation. Similar to the relationships between goal orientation and academic performance, researchers have speculated that high levels of trait mastery approach orientation would be advantageous to both task performance and overall performance in workplace settings, and indeed the empirical evidence reveals a robust positive association between the two (e.g., Cellar et al., 2011; Colquitt & Simmering, 1998; Payne et al., 2007). Further, researchers have consistently observed a negative correlation between trait performance avoid orientation and overall performance on the job (e.g., Cellar et al., 2011; McGregor & Elliot, 2002; Payne et al., 2007).

However, the relationship between trait performance approach orientation and job performance remains somewhat unclear. The original theoretical conceptualizations of the performance orientations, either approach or avoid, suggested that adopting this orientation would ultimately lead to a maladaptive pattern of behavior characterized by intrusive thoughts and a lack of task persistence (see Button et al., 1996; Dweck, 1992; VandeWalle, 2001). However, Payne et al. (2007) in their review, observed a positive but very weak relationship between trait performance approach goal orientation and performance in work settings (ρ = .11, from 7 studies). Though the findings reviewed above hint at a positive association between performance approach and job performance, the credibility interval of the effect observed by Payne et al. (2007) was very wide (-.16, .37), suggesting the presence of at least one moderator.

Payne et al. (2007) also reviewed the literature using state goal orientations as predictors of job performance. They found a positive relationship between state mastery approach orientation and job performance and no relationship between state performance approach goal orientation and job performance, though these results were obtained from only three studies. In contrast, there was no relationship between state mastery approach orientation and task performance but there was a small but positive relationship between
state performance approach goal orientation and task performance. Again, there were only three reference studies so Payne et al. (2007) suggested exercising caution when interpreting these results. There were too few studies that measured state performance avoid goal orientation and task or job performance to make any inferences about the trends of these results, though it appears to be a negative relationship (Jagacinski, Madden, & Reider, 2001).

These results suggest that there may be an interaction between trait level goal orientation and state goal orientation, brought on through contextual and task cues. In this thesis, chapters 2 and 3 examine relationships between the variables at a trait level, and the chapters 4 and 5 attempt to address the possible trait/state complexity.

Relatively few studies have included either state or trait mastery avoid in their studies of job or task performance so I was unable to review the overall trend with regards to this goal orientation. I would hypothesize a small to zero relationship between job performance and mastery avoid orientation as it appears that the avoid motivation leads to poor performance whereas a mastery focus leads to improvements. To address this lack of research I have included mastery avoid orientation in our research where appropriate to the central research question.

_task Performance_

In this thesis I subscribe to Rotundo and Sackett’s (2002) definition of task performance as “behaviors that contribute to the production of a good or the provision of a service” but not limited to “include only those behaviors that are listed in the job description” (p. 67). Rotundo and Sackett (2002) hypothesized and found that raters of employee job performance weighted task performance higher than counterproductive and citizenship behaviors.
Task Performance and Goal Orientation. Reviewing 25 studies with over four thousand participants, Payne et al. (2007) found that trait mastery approach orientation was not related to task performance, though as reviewed above, was positively related to job performance. They also found that trait performance approach goal orientation was not related to task performance and neither was performance avoid goal orientation (though the latter result was taken from only 4 studies).

Only three studies reviewed in Payne et al. (2007) examined state goal orientation and task performance and the authors were hesitant to make conclusions from these studies. Since this publication, several papers have studied state goal orientation and task performance. The tasks used were largely simulated or complex cognitive tasks performed in a laboratory setting (e.g., a simulated air traffic control task, see Yeo et al., 2009; Yeo et al., 2008). Results seem to suggest that generally approach goals (i.e. mastery approach and performance approach) lead to better performance whereas avoid goals (i.e. mastery avoid and performance avoid) lead to poorer performance (Van Yperen, Blaga, & Postmes, in press; Van Yperen, Elliot, & Anseel, 2009). Specifically, there is a consistent positive relationship between state mastery approach goal orientation and task performance and state performance avoid orientation appears to be consistently negative, whereas the relationship between performance approach orientation and task performance is less clear (Kozlowski & Bell, 2006; Seo & Ilies, 2009; Yeo et al., 2009; Yeo & Neal, 2008; Yeo et al., 2008).

The research presented in this thesis does not primarily focus on task performance as it has become a heavily researched dependent variable. I do acknowledge that task performance represents an important component of job performance – but it is not the sole component. It is, therefore, worthwhile to investigate the relationships between the
non-task components of job performance and goal orientation that have been neglected in the goal orientation literature.

*Workplace Deviance/ Counterproductive Behaviors*

Rotundo and Sackett (2002) reported that counterproductive performance was weighted slightly less important than task performance in manager’s ratings of employee job performance and far more than citizenship behaviors. In fact, they found that task performance and counterproductive performance together explained between 51% - 64% of the variance in overall ratings of job performance.

Though Rotundo and Sackett (2002) used the term ‘counterproductive performance’ they cited Robinson and Bennett’s (1995) definition of workplace deviance. Specifically, Robinson and Bennett (1995) defined workplace deviance as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in doing so threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both”. Robinson and Bennett (1995) originally conceptualized this behavior as emerging either due to a lack of motivation to conform to norms, or a motivation to actively violate them. More recently Bennett, Thau, Aquino and Reed (2005) revised their definition to “voluntary behavior of organizational members that has the potential to cause harm to the organization or to those within, and in doing so violates significant performance enhancing norms” (Bennett, et al., 2005, p. 111). In this thesis, I have chosen to conceptualize negative employee behaviors in line with Bennett et al.’s (2005) conceptualization that stresses that the employee’s behavior is intentionally harmful, within the individual’s control and can be harmful to the organization, other organization members or both. I have tended to use the term ‘workplace deviance’ as it most closely aligns with the measures I have used to capture these behaviors, most notably the Bennett and Robinson (2000) measure of workplace deviance that has been cited over eight hundred times. I have also used ‘counter productivity’ and
‘counterproductive behaviors’ to represent these behaviors as these terms and workplace deviance are used somewhat interchangeably in the literature (Griffin & Lopez, 2005).

Though it should be noted that loosely defined employee “bad behaviors” or employee behaviors that harm the organization have been measured and defined as many constructs including, but not limited to, workplace deviance (e.g., R. J. Bennett & Robinson, 2000; S. L. Robinson & Bennett, 1995), counterproductive workplace behavior (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002; P. E. Spector & Fox, 2002; P. E. Spector et al., 2006), workplace aggression (e.g., Baron, 2004), antisocial behavior (e.g., Aquino & Douglas, 2003; Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997; S. L. Robinson & O’Leary-Kelly, 1998), noncompliant behavior (e.g., Puffer, 1987), organization-motivated aggression (O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996), workplace incivility (e.g., Andersson & Pearson, 1999), organizational retaliatory behavior (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997), workplace bullying (e.g., Hoel, Rayner, & Cooper, 1999), organizational sabotage (Giacalone & Knouse, 1990), dark side behavior (Griffin & O’Leary-Kelly, 2004), dysfunctional behavior (e.g., Griffin, O’Leary-Kelly, & Collins, 1998) and bad behavior (Griffin & Lopez, 2005). There are subtle differences between the constructs, for example, workplace aggression as defined by Baron (2004) specifically addresses aggressive behaviors directed towards individuals whereas deviance as conceptualized by Hollinger and Clark (1982) limits the conceptualization to aggressive behaviors targeting the organization. Despite these subtle differences, overall, each of these constructs vary only slightly in definition and consequently also in the types of behaviors that they encompass. The confusion is also compounded by some construct labels (e.g., counterproductive work behavior, workplace deviance) being used repeatedly but with different definitions or specifications (see Griffin and Lopez, 2005 for review). Nonetheless, there is clearly a significant deal of overlap in content across many of the
constructs (Griffin & Lopez, 2005; Spector & Fox, 2005; Spector et al., 2006) and these constructs are likely to group together to form a broad category that describes potentially harmful workplace behaviors (see Griffin & Lopez, 2005; Sackett, 2002). It is for this reason that while I acknowledge the number of other constructs that fall under the label “bad behavior” in the workplace; I have chosen to focus on workplace deviance as the key dependent variable.

Workplace Deviance and Goal Orientation. Workplace deviance is a pervasive problem, with annual cost estimates in the United States alone estimated to be between $6 billion and $200 billion (Vardi & Weitz, 2004). Additionally, deviant behaviors may also threaten the well-being and health of other employees within the organization (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Therefore, understanding the antecedents of deviant behaviors is important. I am not aware of any paper to date that has specifically investigated the relationships between goal orientation and workplace deviance or counterproductive behaviors. This is surprising given that goal orientation has been frequently studied in relation to other workplace behaviors such as task performance and learning (Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007). Diefendorff and Mehta (2007) provided the closest analysis of this relationship as they measured approach/avoidance motivational dispositional traits and workplace deviance. They divided approach into three traits; personal mastery, competitive excellence and behavioral activation system (BAS) and did not separate the avoid motivation. Personal mastery is most closely aligned to mastery approach orientation and competitive excellence is similar to performance approach goal orientation, though there are conceptual differences between the constructs (Hulleman et al., 2010). Their results suggested that personal mastery is negatively associated with workplace deviance and there was a positive relationship between BAS sensitivity and workplace deviance. They found no relationship between competitive excellence and
either interpersonal or organization directed workplace deviance. Given that they used a different framework, did not measure constructs similar to mastery avoid and performance avoid, did not consider shared antecedents of workplace deviance and motivation, such as personality traits, and largely used participants that were employed on a part-time basis, I believe that the investigation of the specific relationship between goal orientation and workplace deviance reported in this thesis is still warranted. Further to this, the methodological and conceptual limitations in this previous research have been ameliorated in this thesis.

*Organizational Citizenship Behavior*

Rotundo and Sackett (2002) defined citizenship performance as “behavior that contributes to the goals of the organization by contributing to its social and psychological environment” (p. 68-69). This definition differed only slightly from the more common definition of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; C. A. Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) that is usually conceptualized as “behaviors that go beyond task performance and technical proficiency, instead supporting the organizational, social, and psychological context that serves as the critical catalyst for tasks to be completed” (Borman, 2004, p. 238). Given the relatively small definitional discrepancy between Rotundo and Sackett’s (2002) citizenship performance and the more common OCB, I have not treated these as different constructs and have chosen to follow the literature consensus with the use of OCB. Rotundo and Sackett (2002) found that citizenship performance contributed to only 4-20% of variance in rater’s perceptions of employees’ overall performance. Despite this relatively small impact to job performance, citizenship behavior, specifically organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), has become one of most frequently studied measures in the industrial and organizational literature. Luthans (2002) suggested that this
interest may be driven by a general shift towards the positive aspects of work over the neutral, task performance, or negative, workplace deviance.

Peterson et al. (1990) demonstrated that cognitive ability was more closely associated to task performance whereas measures of personality were more closely associated to OCB. Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmit (1997) explained this finding by proposing that task performance is determined by cognitive ability largely through the effect of cognitive ability on knowledge, skills and habits. In contrast, OCB is best predicted by personality characteristics because these behaviors are characterized by perseverance and diligence. In part this rationale suggests that perhaps goal orientation may also be an important consideration in the prediction of OCB.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Goal Orientation. No paper to date that I am aware of has investigated the relationships between OCB and goal orientation directly. Again, this is surprising given the degree to which goal orientation has been included in the prediction of job and task performance. In addition, mastery approach orientation has been associated with a number of adaptive learning strategies, thoughts and self-regulation tactics, including the belief in incremental intelligence, high intrinsic motivation (Elliot and Church, 1997), viewing failure as an opportunity to learn and maintaining high levels of self-efficacy. Considering the focus of mastery-oriented individuals on self-improvement and development, such individuals are likely to foster a sense of collaboration and knowledge sharing with colleagues because colleagues represent a potentially valuable development tool. This collaborative approach may encourage individuals with a mastery approach orientation to engage in citizenship behaviors in the workplace, so as to develop and foster relationships with colleagues.

Based on Rotundo and Sackett (2002), it would seem that measures of job performance include some measurement of workplace deviance and OCB, though it is
difficult to untangle this from task performance. As task performance, workplace
deviance and citizenship behaviors have been demonstrated to be separate and unique
constructs (Lee & Allen, 2002; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Sackett, Berry, Wiemann, &
Laczo, 2006) it is possible that the goal orientation antecedents of these behaviors differ.
It is important to investigate the goal orientation antecedents of these behaviors because
goal orientation appears to be less temporally and contextually stable than other
dispositional variables such as personality traits. This malleability means that researchers
may be able to identify workplace environments that encourage citizenship behaviors
whilst reducing counterproductive behaviors, and how individual differences in goal
orientations interact with these environments.

**Summary of Outstanding Issues**

Together this reviewed research has identified three main issues. First, despite a
focus on the relationships between goal orientation and job performance and task
performance, no research to my knowledge has evaluated the relationship between goal
orientation and the two other distinct components of job performance – workplace
deviance and OCB. This hinders the progress of research on the relationship between goal
orientation and job performance because if the goal is to better understand and improve
job performance understanding the drivers of *all* components of job performance must be
articulated and empirically tested. Second, to the best of my knowledge no empirical
study has investigated whether adopting specifically a performance approach goal
orientation leads to behaviors such as status-driven risk taking and unethical behavior that
are ultimately counterproductive to the organization. This is particularly surprising given
that intra-organization (Kulik, O’Fallon, & Salimath, 2008) and inter-organization
competition has garnered criticism for encouraging unethical behavior (V. M. Bennett,
Pierce, Snyder, & Toffel, 2013; Cai, Liu, & Xiao, 2005), as well as more specifically the
performance approach goal orientation (e.g., VandeWalle, 2001). Finally, previous research has established that trait goal orientation can be manipulated by contextual cues (e.g., Bell & Kozlowski, 2002; Payne et al., 2007; Van Yperen et al., in press; Yeo & Neal, 2008; Yeo et al., 2008) and that the shared perception of goal orientation within teams and work units can be shaped by external cues such as leadership (Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012) and leader-member exchange (Dragoni, 2005). I seek to bring together this research to develop a multi-level model of individual dispositions of personality and goal orientation and group level team goal orientation to examine non-task work performance. From a theoretical perspective, this research taken together contributes to the understanding of the motivation towards non-task behaviors in the workplace.

In Chapter 2, I begin by investigating whether individual differences in goal orientation predict self-rated status-driven risk taking, while controlling for established differences in personality. In Chapter 3 the personality correlates of goal orientation within the HEXACO personality framework are measured and the relationships between goal orientation and non-task performance are examined. Building on the findings in the previous chapters, in Chapter 4 I use an experimental paradigm to investigate whether deviant workplace behaviors, specifically cheating on a cognitive task, differ when different state goal orientations are made salient. In Chapter 5 I report the results from a study that measured team goal orientation and its effect on non-task performance. Finally, in Chapter 6 the overarching messages from these four studies are examined and future directions for this field of research are discussed in relation to the extant literature. To this end, a thesis specific figure to organize this research protocol has been created, see Figure 2.
Figure 2. Framework of research presented in this thesis
CHAPTER 2: TRAIT GOAL ORIENTATION AND STATUS-DRIVEN RISK TAKING

Overview and Goals for the Chapter

In this chapter I focus on investigating the relationship between trait goal orientation and status-driven risk taking. Although goal orientation has become one of the most frequently utilized motivational constructs in the study of workplace behavior and performance, no study I am aware of has investigated how goal orientation may influence an individual’s propensity to take risks at work. In the following paper the conceptual overlaps between a performance approach orientation and status-driven risk taking are discussed and the hypothesis that goal orientation, specifically performance orientations, might be especially important in the attempt to understand status-driven risks is tested.

A shorter version of this paper was accepted following peer-review as part of a symposium at the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Hawaii, 2014. This symposium submission is shown in Appendix A.
Big Risk, Big Payoff: Performance approach predicts status-driven risk taking over personality and affect.

Louw, K.R.; Griffin, M.A.; Yeo, G.B.; Dunlop, P.D.

Employees taking risks in the workplace can lead to dramatic, even fatal, consequences. Fatalities and disabilities continue to be a problem in the modern workplace, with 4,628 work-related fatalities and approximately 4 million nonfatal occupational injuries reported in 2012 in the United States alone (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). In this paper we introduce the construct status-driven risk taking (SDRT) as a potential driver of risk taking in the workplace.

Despite considerable research into competitive or status-driven risk taking in evolutionary psychology, little research has investigated this style of risk taking in the workplace. To aid in the investigation of competitive risk taking within the psychology context, Ashton et al. (2010) formalized the construct of status-driven risk taking (SDRT). Status-driven risk taking describes risk taking motivated solely by the prospect of gains in money, influence or social standing (Ashton et al., 2010). It is conceptually different from sensation-seeking and general risk taking as it focuses solely on risk taking behaviors that are primarily committed as a means to an end; however it is a subset of general risk taking. For example skydiving is a high-risk behavior but would not be classified as SDRT unless the decision to skydive was motivated by the possibility of winning large amounts of money or gaining fame.

Understanding why individuals take status-driven risks in the workplace is important for organizations because employee risk-taking can have significant direct and indirect costs. For example, an employee taking a risk to improve their status may endanger other co-workers or jeopardize the financial integrity of the organization. The
associated costs of workplace risk taking underscore the importance of understanding what motivates individuals to take these risks. Beyond introducing the construct of SDRT, we also investigate the motivational antecedents of this form of risk taking by proposing a link between goal orientation and SDRT. Goal orientation has become one of the most frequently studied motivation constructs in the organizational psychology literature and has been shown to predict a variety of workplace behaviors including job performance (Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007), learning strategies (Ford, Smith, Weissbein, Gully, & Salas, 1998) and training outcomes and adaptability (Kozlowski et al., 2001). In this paper we draw conceptual links between the performance approach orientation and SDRT and empirically investigate the relationship between these constructs in the context of established personality and affect predictors of risk taking behaviors.

**Status-driven risk taking in the workplace**

Competitive risk taking has been cited as a cause of several demographic differences in observed mortality rates. Human males have higher mortality rates than human females across all ages. Secondly, the difference in ratio of mortality rates between men and women peaks around the teenage and young adult age groups. Thirdly, this ratio of mortality rates is more pronounced among societies that have greater variation in social status (e.g., income inequality, social inequality). Finally, the ratio between mortality rates of men and women is greater when comparing mortality due to ‘external’ or proximate behaviors (e.g., accidents, homicide and suicide) than mortality due to ‘internal’ factors (e.g., disease). These different demographic patterns in mortality rates have been ascribed to individual differences in competitive risk taking in humans (Wilson & Daly, 1985). This hypothesis suggests that men tend to be more oriented toward high-risk, status-driven competition than women, a difference that is greatest
during adolescence and young adulthood, especially in societies where social status is particularly polarized.

Citing evidence from demographic differences in mortality Ashton et al. (2010) formalized the construct of status-driven risk taking (SDRT) and created a measure to evaluate individual differences in this behavior in both men and women for the psychology context. To date there have been no large scale studies linking SDRT to workplace safety outcomes or risk-taking outcomes. However, similar demographic differences observed in mortality rates can also be observed in the workplace (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). For example, 92% of fatal workplace incidents in the United States in 2013 involved men whereas just 8% involved women. After taking into account the general trend that women work less hours than men, men still represent a disproportionate share of fatal work injuries (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). Of these workplace incidents, workers over the age of 45 were more likely to be involved in fatal work injuries. However, when the type of injury event is accounted for, older workers are more likely to be involved in accidents resulting from ‘internal’ faults such as trips and slips, whereas younger workers are at greater risks from ‘external’ faults such as homicides in the workplace (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). These demographic differences in accidents mirror that in the wider population suggesting that the disposition towards SDRT is not limited to behaviors outside of the workplace.

In addition to the empirical data, highly publicized incidents such as the Enron Scandal or the Bernie Madoff Ponzi scheme provide additional evidence that these behaviors occur in the workplace. Bernie Madoff risked life in prison when he stole more than $64 billion from his investors – a risk he stated was driven by “ego” and a desire be included ‘in the club’ (Gelles & Tett, 2011). This, and other highly publicized examples, illustrate that the disposition to take status driven risks appears to continue into the
workplace. Beyond the financial and wealth management context, SDRT is also likely to manifest in high-risk workplaces such as hospitals, and mine and construction sites. Generic risk taking, of which SDRT is a subset of, is negatively related to safety behaviors and overall workplace safety in high risk workplaces (Christian, Bradley, Wallace, & Burke, 2009). The theoretical and empirical evidence reviewed above linking SDRT and workplace safety behaviors suggests that understanding the motivational antecedents behind individual differences in SDRT could be an important next step in the creation of safer workplaces – both from an individual and organizational perspective. To develop a better understanding of these motivational processes, we explore the role of goals. In particular, we identify goal orientation as a potentially important determinant of SDRT and discuss theoretical and empirical bases for the way different types of goal orientation might influence the expression of SDRT. Further, we also evaluate this relationship in the context of other dispositional traits of personality and affect.

**Goal orientation and Status-driven Risk Taking**

Goal orientation has emerged as a useful motivational construct for understanding individual differences in behavior in the work context. Goal orientations are believed to create different perceptual-cognitive frameworks for how individuals approach, interpret and respond to achievement situations (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Payne et al., 2007). Original conceptualizations of the construct focused on a distinction between mastery and performance orientations. The behavior of individuals with a mastery orientation is characterized by a focus on self-referent learning and the development of competence through task mastery, whereas, the performance orientation is focused on the demonstration of competence relative to others (see Ames, 1992; Dweck, 1999; Payne et al., 2007). The original mastery-performance distinction has been expanded to include a distinction between approach and avoidance motivation for the
performance orientation (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; VandeWalle, 1997). This framework distinguishes between a mastery orientation, a desire to develop competence through skill development, performance approach, a focus on outperforming others and gaining favorable judgments of competence, and performance avoid, a focus on avoiding poor performance and unfavorable judgments of competence. In this paper, we posit that an individual’s trait goal orientation is an important predictor of SDRT.

There are conceptual reasons why a performance approach orientation might predict SDRT. Individuals with a high performance approach orientation are focused on outperforming peers and want to prove their competence to others (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Rising in status, whether it is in wealth, power or influence, is likely to satisfy this desire to outperform others and demonstrate competence. Therefore, when a performance approach orientation is high, individuals are more likely to take large risks, potentially life threatening risks, which may result in improved status. For example, to achieve the highest returns compared to colleagues a stock broker may invest in high-risk, high-return options, motivated solely by a desire to improve status and wealth compared to his or her colleagues.

The conceptual link between performance avoid orientation and SDRT is less clear. Individuals with a high performance avoid orientation are motivated by a desire to avoid performing poorly relative to peers but are also motivated to demonstrate competence, except that the goal is to avoid being perceived as least competent (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). On the one hand, a high performance avoid orientation may bias individuals towards taking status-driven risks in attempt to avoid being perceived the worst performer. The same fear of failure and desire to demonstrate competence is consistent across both performance orientations and it these motivations that may encourage individuals to take status-driven risks which individuals without a performance
orientation may be less likely to. However, on the other hand, it is possible that the motivation towards avoiding being perceived as incompetent may cause individuals to take less status-driven risks because the ultimate goal for a performance avoid oriented individual is not necessarily to be the best, but rather to perform averagely. If the goal is not to outperform others, and be best, then the perceived gains in taking the risk are reduced.

From the empirical literature, Elliot and Harackiewicz (1996) established that performance goals, approach and avoid, were linked to both a motivation to achieve and an elevated fear of failure. Kaplan and Midgley (1999) posited that in pressurized achievement settings, where performance goals are emphasized (e.g., examinations), the fear of perceived failure may be elevated causing some students to engage in cheating behaviors. The act of cheating is a conceptual example of SDRT if the individual accepts the risk and potential negative ramifications associated with cheating, in order to increase status (e.g., higher marks relative to other students, entry to high status tertiary institution). The empirical evidence seems to support the assertion that the shared conceptual similarities across the performance orientations are likely to lead individuals with a performance orientation, either approach or avoid, to engage in status-driven risks. Therefore, we hypothesize that:

H1a: Performance approach orientation will positively predict SDRT.

H1b: Performance avoid orientation will positively predict SDRT.

Original conceptualizations of the mastery orientation proposed that individuals that adopt this orientation tend to accept failure and errors as a normal part of the learning process (Dweck, 1986, 1992; Grant & Dweck, 2003). Indeed, research has supported this conceptualization and demonstrated that mastery oriented individuals have a more
positive self-image in the response to failure, than those with a performance orientation (Rawsthorne & Elliot, 1999; Stoeber, Stoll, Pescheck, & Otto, 2008). It follows that individuals with a high mastery orientation may feel less drive, than those with a performance orientation, to engage in behaviors that are high risk because they feel less pressure to outperform others, or to present an image of superior status. It is for this reason that we hypothesize that:

H2: Mastery orientation will negatively predict SDRT.

Status-driven risk taking, personality and affect

Individual level predictors of risk taking have been established in the literature. Specifically, personality traits and affectivity are arguably the strongest individual level predictors of risk taking behaviors (Christian et al., 2009; Clarke & Robertson, 2005; Weller & Thulin, 2012). In order to demonstrate that goal orientation provides a unique prediction of SDRT, beyond personality and affect, we included these variables as control variables. Goal orientation has been shown to uniquely predict behaviors over personality (Steinmayr, Bipp, & Spinath, 2011) so there is reason to hypothesize that goal orientation may remain an important predictor of SDRT after controlling for other key variables. To demonstrate that this is an important and necessary step to further the extant literature, we will briefly review the shared relationships between goal orientation, personality and affect.

Personality

Research suggests that low Conscientiousness and Neuroticism have been linked to poorer safety performance and greater risk taking (see Clarke & Robertson, 2005; Weller & Thulin, 2012). Furthermore, Conscientiousness is negatively associated with workplace accidents and injuries (Christian et al., 2009). Ashton et al. (2010) investigated
the link between SDRT and personality and found that SDRT was negatively associated with Consciousness and Emotional Stability (i.e. low Neuroticism).

Previous research has also established the relationship between personality traits and goal orientations (Bipp et al., 2008; Payne et al., 2007; Wang & Erdheim, 2007). In fact, some researchers have argued that the conceptual underpinnings of Conscientiousness which is concerned with reliability, dependability and organization are so closely tied to the conceptualizations of a mastery orientation it is possible that the two constructs overlap. After reporting a correlation of .39 between Conscientiousness and mastery orientation McKinney and Carlson (2002) questioned whether the two constructs are empirically different in the prediction of behaviors, suggesting that a mastery orientation might be the motivational equivalent of Conscientiousness. In addition to this, Neuroticism has been shown to have a consistently positive relationship with both performance approach and performance avoid orientations (e.g., Payne et al. 2007; Bipp et al., 2010). This differential relationship between personality traits and goal orientations suggest that any relationship between goal orientation and SDRT may simply be a product of shared variance with personality traits. In order to investigate this possibility, therefore, we included measurements of Conscientiousness and Neuroticism in the analysis.

Despite the strength of relationships between personality and goal orientation, there has been considerable evidence that goal orientation may predict performance outcomes beyond personality. Firstly, despite the conceptual ties between the organization, diligence and reliability side of Conscientiousness and a mastery orientation, individuals high in Conscientiousness are also conceptualized as achievement oriented which implies a motivation towards normative performance. A focus on achievement and task performance are more associated with a performance approach
orientation than a mastery orientation, suggesting that mastery alone is not simply a proxy for Conscientiousness. Beyond theoretical links, several papers have demonstrated that goal orientation predicts behaviors beyond personality traits (Payne et al., 2007). For example, Steinmayr et al. (2011) demonstrated that goal orientation predicted academic performance beyond personality and cognitive ability.

**Affectivity**

Affectivity is concerned with the study of emotions and mood and is most commonly described as two factors – positive affect and negative affect. Positive affect reflects the extent to which an individual feels enthusiastic, energized, active and alert whereas negative affect is a general dimension of subjective distress that encompasses a number of adverse moods such as anger, contempt, disgust, fear and anxiousness (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). As reported in Watson and Clark (1984) trait negative affect is conceptualized as stable and pervasive differences in negative mood and self-concept. Individuals with high negative affectivity are more likely to experience dissatisfaction and dwell on their shortcomings (Watson & Clark, 1984). From a conceptual standpoint, it is unlikely that individuals with high self-concept and self-esteem will be motivated to take large risks to try to improve their status because they feel positive about their current situation. For this reason, we suspect that negative affect, and not positive affect, would be related to SDRT. In addition, negative affect is negatively associated with safety participation and, to a lesser extent, safety performance over time (Neal & Griffin, 2006) and is positively related to greater risk taking (see Iverson & Erwin, 1997).

As with personality, researchers have also established links between affect and goal orientation. Linnenbrink and Pintrich (2002) posited a reciprocal model that linked performance orientation with negative affect and mastery orientation with positive moods.
and affect. Indeed, mastery orientation is most associated with positive affect and performance orientations are more associated with negative affect, at least within the academic and education context (e.g., Kaplan & Midgley, 1999).

Similar to the issue with personality traits, the differential relationship between affect and goal orientation suggests that any relationship between goal orientation and SDRT may simply be a product of shared variance between affect and SDRT. For this reason and because we were most interested in evaluating the unique prediction of SDRT by goal orientation we included positive and negative affect as controls in the analyses. Despite the conceptual similarities between affect, personality and goal orientation, there is evidence that these constructs are conceptually and empirically distinct. For example, Pekrun, Elliot, and Maier (2009) demonstrated that goal orientation predicted academic performance after controlling for affect. For this reason our final hypothesis predicted:

H3a: Performance approach would remain a positive predictor of SDRT over and above Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Affectivity, and performance avoid and mastery orientations.

H3b: Performance avoid would remain a positive predictor of SDRT over and above Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Affectivity, and performance approach and mastery orientations.

H3c: Mastery orientation would remain a negative predictor of SDRT over and above Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Affectivity and performance orientations.
Method

Participants

Employed Australian participants (n= 452) were recruited through the online panel service, Online Research Unit, to complete measures assessing goal orientation, status-driven risk taking, personality and affect. Participants that completed less than 80% of items were removed from the sample, leaving a total of 261 participants (53.1% Male; Median age 45-49 years). Most participants were employed on a full time basis (35-45 hours, 70.1% of participants). Tenure also varied with most participants (60.4%) reporting greater than 5 years of employment. Finally, employment sector varied with the greatest number of participants reporting clerical/administration (23.4%) and professional (21.9%) job roles.

Measures

Goal Orientation

Goal orientation was measured using the 12-item Goal orientation for the Work Domain instrument (Vandewalle, 1997) on a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree-Strongly Disagree). The instrument measures three goal orientations: mastery (α = .89), performance (prove) approach (α = .85), performance avoid (α = .88).

Status-driven risk taking

Status-driven risk taking was measured using the 8-item measure outlined in Ashton et al. (2010), on a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree-Strongly Disagree; α = .86). Sample items included “If the pay were really high, I would be willing to work with extremely explosive materials” and “I would rather live as an average person in a safe place than live as a rich and powerful person in a dangerous place”
Controls

Personality

Ten items from the personality scale developed by McCrae and Costa (1987), the NEO-PI, were used; five items assessing Conscientiousness, and five items assessing Neuroticism. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they engaged in certain behaviors on a 5 point Likert scale (from 1= strongly agree to 5= strongly disagree).

Affect

Ten items from the Positive Affect and Negative Affect Schedule (Watson et al., 1988) were included. Participants rated how often in the past month they have experienced the feelings listed in the items while at work, rated on a 5 point Likert scale from “Never” to “Always”.

Results

In Table 1 we present the correlation matrix of goal orientation, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, positive affect, negative affect and status-driven risk taking.
Table 1. Correlations between goal orientations, status-driven risk taking, personality traits and affect.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mastery</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PAp</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PAv</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SDRT</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consc.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pos. Affect</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Neg. Affect</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PAp= Performance approach; PAv= Performance avoid; SDRT= Status-driven risk taking; Consc.= Conscientiousness; Pos. Affect= positive affect; Neg. Affect = negative affect. ** p < .01, * p < .05. n = 261. Figures in parentheses along the diagonal are Cronbach’s coefficient alphas.

Correlations between goal orientation, controls and SDRT.

Consistent with hypothesis 1a, performance approach goal orientation was positively associated with SDRT. However, failing to support H1b and H2, there were no significant relationships between mastery and performance avoid orientations and SDRT. As expected, SDRT was negatively associated with Conscientiousness and positively associated with negative affect. There were no significant relationships between SDRT and Neuroticism and positive affect.

Goal orientation prediction of SDRT over personality and affect.

Multiple regression was used to assess whether performance approach goal orientation predicted SDRT, after controlling for positive and negative affect, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, mastery and performance avoid goal orientation (see Table 2).

Personality traits and affect were entered at Step 1, explaining 10.0% of the variance in SDRT. After entry of goal orientation at Step 2, the total variance explained
by the model rose to 16.12%, $F(6, 253) = 8.13, p < .001$. Consistent with previous research, negative affect ($\beta = .26, p < .001$) and Conscientiousness ($\beta = -.25, p < .001$) were significant predictors in the final model. Supporting H1a and H3a performance approach orientation ($\beta = .31, p < .001$) was the largest significant predictor of SDRT. Failing to support H3b that posited performance avoid would positively predict SDRT over the controls, performance avoid significantly negatively predicted SDRT but less strongly than performance approach ($\beta = -.16, p < .05$). However, given that there was a near zero correlation between performance avoid and SDRT it is possible that the significant prediction of SDRT by performance avoid in the regression analysis is evidence of a suppression effect\textsuperscript{1}. Failing to find support for H3c, a negative relationship between mastery and SDRT, mastery orientation was not a significant predictor of SDRT in the final model.

**Table 2. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Status-Driven Risk Taking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE B$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Approach</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Avoid</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ for $R^2$ Change</td>
<td>7.13**</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.10**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* ** $p \leq .01$; * $p < .05$. $n = 252$.

\textsuperscript{1} I would like to thank a thesis examiner for pointing out that these results may be due to suppression.
Discussion

This paper had two broad aims. Firstly we aimed to introduce the construct of SDRT to the workplace psychology literature and secondly, to investigate the motivational antecedents of SDRT focusing on the relationship between goal orientation and SDRT. We hypothesized that performance approach orientation and performance avoid orientation would positively predict SDRT and that these two goal orientations would remain significant predictors over and above personality and affect traits. We also hypothesized an inverse relationship between mastery orientation and SDRT and this would also remain significant after including personality and affect traits in the analysis.

There was mixed support for these hypotheses. As hypothesized there was a positive relationship between performance approach goal orientation and SDRT and performance approach goal orientation predicted SDRT, over and above personality traits and affect. However, contrary to our hypothesized positive relationship between SDRT and performance avoid the results showed that performance avoid orientation negatively predicted SDRT, after controlling for personality and affect. Our hypothesis was largely driven by the conceptual and empirical similarities amongst the performance orientations rather than focusing on the approach and avoidance differences associated with the orientations. The negative relationship between performance avoid orientation and SDRT supports the conceptual argument that the motivation towards avoiding being perceived as incompetent may cause individuals to take less status-driven risks because the ultimate goal for a performance avoid oriented individual is to perform averagely. If the goal is not to outperform others, and be best, then the perceived gains in taking the risk are likely to be reduced.

2 As noted in the results section, it is also possible that the significant prediction of SDRT by performance avoid orientation may be due to suppression.
Results also showed no relationship between SDRT and mastery orientation, though we had hypothesized a negative relationship. A mastery orientation measures approach motivation style behaviors and cognitions because it is about pursing a desirable outcome (i.e. learning and developing skills). It is possible that this approach style motivation rather than the mastery component conflated the relationship between mastery and SDRT. It is also possible that the two constructs are unrelated simply because a desire to learn and develop skills does not encourage or dissuade individuals from taking risks.

Taken together, the results suggested that goal orientation is an important predictor of SDRT. Performance approach goal orientation was the largest predictor of SDRT over established predictors of risk taking, suggesting that there may be potentially negative ramifications when this orientation is adopted in safety critical workplaces. High trait negative affect and performance approach orientation, and low trait Conscientiousness and performance avoid orientation predicted SDRT. Therefore, results suggest that individuals experiencing high negative affect, who tend to be inefficient and unorganized (i.e. low in conscientiousness) who are motivated by demonstrating competence will tend to take risks to improve their status. This is consistent with conceptualizations and empirical evidence of competitive risk taking outlined in previous research (e.g., Ashton et al., 2010).

The results suggesting a link between a trait performance approach orientation and SDRT is important for a number of reasons. First, performance approach goal orientation, similar to negative affect, is conceptualized as both a state and trait, with less temporal stability than personality traits. This is similar to a number of well-established constructs such as self-efficacy or anxiety whereby an individual may be disposed to anxiety but contextual cues and external factors play a large role in the expression of the thoughts and behaviors. Previous experimental and applied research have demonstrated that
manipulations to contextual cues and goal frames can effectively temporarily shift an individual’s goal orientation (e.g., Bell & Kozlowski, 2002; Dragoni, 2005; Kozlowski & Bell, 2006; Van Yperen et al., in press; Yeo et al., 2008). It follows that organizations may be able to effectively reduce the expression of performance approach goal orientation in their employees by using similar contextual cues, such as changing performance appraisal structures and removing incentives for performance. The results of this paper demonstrating a strong link between performance approach goal orientation and SDRT suggest that if employees were less performance approach orientated they may be less likely to take risks that are motivated by status improvements. Alternatively, inducing a performance avoid orientation may reduce SDRT, however there is considerable evidence suggesting that a performance avoid orientation leads to poorer performance (Cellar et al., 2011) so this orientation may only be beneficial when safety is the highest priority. Therefore, creating a workplace culture of valuing learning and mastery may result in employees being less performance approach driven and ultimately less likely to engage in SDRT without compromising employee performance. It is worth noting, however, that SDRT is not necessarily negative to either an individual or an organization’s success. The ramifications of SDRT are more likely to be negative in high-risk safety critical workplaces such as mine sites or hospitals. High SDRT entrepreneurs may be more successful than entrepreneurs less likely to engage in this form of risk-taking, arguably though it may never be better to take risks that are motivated solely by a desire to improve status.

As with any research, this research was not without limitations. The first and most pressing concerns the measurement of personality used in this paper. In their paper investigating the links between personality and SDRT, Ashton et al. (2010) used the six factor personality model known as the HEXACO model (Ashton & Lee, 2001; Lee &
Ashton, 2004). The HEXACO model though similar to the Big Five model has an additional sixth factor of Honesty-Humility. The Honesty-Humility factor describes traits and behaviors associated with a disposition towards fairness, little desire for lavish wealth and a reluctance to flatter and manipulate others to get ahead. Ashton et al. (2010) found the strongest relationship between this factor of Honesty-Humility and SDRT. Future research should use the HEXACO framework to determine whether goal orientation predicts SDRT over personality. In addition, it would be interesting to investigate the relationship between Honesty-Humility and performance approach goal orientation given that they are both so closely aligned with SDRT. This would be particularly interesting as performance approach goal orientation has been reported to have both positive and negative relationships to performance whereas low Honesty-Humility has almost entirely been inversely associated with negative and counterproductive behaviors such as adult delinquency (Dunlop et al., 2012), workplace deviance (Oh et al., 2011) and sexual harassment (Lee et al., 2003). The strength of the relationship between performance approach and SDRT suggests that performance approach goal orientation may have a ‘dark-side’ that warrants investigation.

Further to the issues with personality measurement, this paper was based on self-report measures and cross-sectional. Though there is evidence to suggest that self-report measures of personality and risk-taking correlates with peer-ratings or measurable outcomes such as workplace accidents (Christian et al., 2009), it is possible that the results are conflated due to common method bias. Future research investigating this area should consider using self and peer reports. Furthermore, the cross-sectional design does not allow for any analysis of organizational or contextual cues that may moderate the relationship between SDRT and performance approach goal orientation. The overall model of SDRT, though significant, only predicted 16% of the variance in SDRT. This
indicates that while individual differences provide some explanation of the risk taking behavior, group and organizational level influences should not be discounted. Experimental research that examines whether contextual manipulations of goal orientation affect the propensity to take risks would also be an important and interesting next step.

Despite these limitations, this research is the first to our knowledge to introduce SDRT to the organizational psychology literature. We are also the first to explore the relationships between SDRT and goal orientation and to examine this relationship controlling for personality and affect. The results show that performance approach goal orientation may have a dark-side, motivating individuals to take status-driven risks that may result in costly losses to organizations. Future research unraveling this potential dark-side of performance approach goal orientation is warranted as it may help researchers and practitioners to create safer and more productive workplaces.
Overview and Goals for the Chapter

In Chapter 2 we found that a performance approach goal orientation, and to a lesser extent, a performance avoid orientation, predicted status-driven risk taking over and above Conscientiousness and Neuroticism. In the paper presented in this chapter, we focus on the differential prediction of non-task behaviors between the two approach orientations; mastery approach orientation and performance approach orientation. We build on the first chapter by investigating the ‘dark-side’ of the performance approach orientation from a different angle. Specifically we measure whether performance approach has a direct relationship to workplace deviance. We also contrast this with an investigation of the ‘bright-side’ of mastery approach orientation by measuring whether mastery approach predicts OCB. We also extend on the previous chapter and the extant literature by measuring the relationship between trait goal orientation and the HEXACO personality factors, including the additional Honesty-Humility factor. To our knowledge, no paper has investigated the relationships between the HEXACO personality variables and trait goal orientation. We then measure whether performance approach goal orientation and mastery approach orientation uniquely predict non-task behaviors (i.e., workplace deviance and OCB) over and above the HEXACO personality factors.
Goal orientation has become one of the most frequently studied motivational constructs across a number of domains. In the applied psychology literature goal orientation is often used to predict job performance in organizational settings (see Payne et al., 2007; Van Yperen et al., in press). Goal orientations are perceptual-cognitive frameworks that describe how individuals approach, interpret, and perform in achievement situations (Ames & Archer, 1987). In this paper we focus on the differential predictions of the two approach orientations; mastery approach (a focus on a desire to develop competence through skill development) and performance approach (a focus on demonstrating competence and a desire to perform better than others).

There is general consensus across the organizational psychology literature that a mastery approach orientation is associated with improved job performance and task performance (Payne et al., 2007), however the relationship between performance approach orientation and job performance remains somewhat unclear, despite the relationship between goal orientation and job performance having been measured in a number of papers. The original theoretical conceptualizations of the performance orientations, either approach or avoid, suggested that adopting this orientation would ultimately lead to a maladaptive pattern of behavior characterized by intrusive thoughts and a lack of task persistence (see Button et al., 1996; Dweck, 1992; VandeWalle, 2001). Nonetheless, there appear to be signs of positive relationships between performance approach orientation and a number of positive behaviors such as learning, academic performance and work performance (see Cellar et al.,
Further, Payne et al. (2007) in their review, observed a positive but weak relationship between performance-approach goal orientation and performance in work settings ($\rho = .11$, from 7 studies). Though the findings reviewed above hint at a positive association between performance approach and job performance, the credibility interval of the effect observed by Payne et al. (2007) was wide (-.16, .37), demonstrating the variability in the relationship. We suspect that one reason for the variability might be due to the manner in which job performance was conceptualized. Payne et al. (2007) treated job performance as a single construct, however, Rotundo and Sackett (2002) reported that job performance is best characterized by three components: task performance, workplace deviance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB).

In this paper we suggest that one factor that may shed light on the inconsistency between performance approach orientation and job performance is the potential ‘dark-side’ of performance approach and how this contrasts with the ‘bright-side’ of mastery orientation. Briefly, we argue that adopting a performance approach goal orientation can lead to negative non-task behaviors, such as workplace deviance (we refer to this as the ‘dark side’ of the performance approach orientation). By contrast, adopting a mastery approach orientation should lead to positive non-task behaviors, such as OCB, further reinforcing the ‘bright-side’ of the mastery approach orientation. By investigating these relationships we also add to the growing body of literature that is focusing on non-task behaviors. This increasing focus is likely driven by an improved understanding of the costs of workplace deviance (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Vardi & Weitz, 2004) and benefits of OCB (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006) to organizations. We add to this theoretical literature by investigating the role of
performance and mastery approach goal orientations in the context of established personality predictors of non-task behaviors.

**The dark-side of performance approach orientation**

A performance approach goal orientation is characterized by a focus on normative performance, outperforming others and demonstrating competence (Elliot, 1999; Elliot & Moller, 2003). Adopting a performance approach orientation may bias an individual towards behaviors that lead to short-term gains, but are ultimately counterproductive. When a person adopts a performance approach orientation, outperforming colleagues and/or demonstrating competence is a priority over other goals. There are, however, different ways to achieve this goal. ‘Legitimate’ methods might include working harder or training to improve skills; such methods would presumably lead to genuine improvements in performance, and thus, evaluations of their performance from others. Alternatively, an individual might strive to achieve his or her goal via ‘deviant’ methods, such as undermining colleagues or cheating on a task; that is, methods that allow the individual to ‘shortcut’ the process of actually outperforming his or her peers, but be perceived as outperforming them nonetheless. For example, a performance approach oriented employee might covertly claim credit for a team product so as to demonstrate competence to their supervisor.

Individuals with a performance approach orientation may also engage in behaviors that are more directly harmful to the organization. Taking longer breaks or stealing from the organization may seem at odds with the desire to gain favorable judgments at work but we argue that it is consistent with internal beliefs that are likely to underlie a performance approach orientation. From a conceptual standpoint, adopting a performance approach orientation, to outperform others, seems to require a belief that one in fact can perform better.
than others. It does not seem a far stretch that individuals that perceive that they can be better than others, actually might perceive themselves as better. This belief of superiority may lead to the behaviors best explained as organizational workplace deviance. In addition, adopting a performance approach orientation may cause an individual to disengage entirely from their work and behave in a manner consistent with organization directed workplace deviance.

When disengagement occurs it seems likely that deviant behaviors may be observed because poor performance is externally attributed to the task (or organization) rather than internalized as a measure of poor performance. An example of this style of thinking might be ‘I could outperform others, but my organization/leader doesn’t recognize my talent’.

The empirical literature also provides evidence suggesting that there might be a ‘dark-side’ to the performance approach orientation. Recent research has found evidence of a ‘dark-side’ to the performance orientation in laboratory settings. Poortvliet, Janssen, Van Yperen, and Van de Vliert (2007) showed that individuals with a performance orientation were less open than those with a mastery orientation in their information giving when solving a problem, adopting what the authors termed “an exploitive orientation” (Poortvliet et al., 2007). This exploitive orientation was characterized by individuals taking more information than they were given and exhibiting individualistic rather than cooperative behaviors (Poortvliet et al., 2007). Indeed, Poortvliet, Anseel, Janssen, Van Yperen, and Van de Vliert (2012) showed that in an information exchange context, performance goal oriented individuals, relative to individuals with mastery goals, actively provided less accurate information to partners while at the same time were more willing to actively thwart the task performance of their partner by playing intrusive white noise.
Taken to a workplace, this behavior may be beneficial in the short-term as the individual would possess more information than their colleagues; however, over time this style of interaction is likely to lead to other co-workers being less willing to share information. Additionally, the lack of information sharing and cooperation amongst colleagues may ultimately hurt the organization. The conceptual and empirical evidence together suggests that performance approach orientation may have a dark-side that arises from an individual focusing on their own performance over and above the ultimate goals of the task or organization. In the work context, this might be manifest in deviant behaviors targeted toward the organization. It was therefore hypothesized that:

H1a: Performance approach orientation is positively associated with workplace deviance.

The considerable cost of workplace deviance to organizations (Vardi & Weitz, 2004) has fanned research interest into personality antecedents of the behaviors. Using the Big 5 personality model (Digman, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1987), researchers have demonstrated that there is an inverse relationship between Conscientiousness and Agreeableness and workplace deviance (Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004). New lexical studies in multiple languages, however, have revealed that personality may be best described by six factors, not five, a framework called the HEXACO model of personality (Ashton & Lee, 2001). The major difference between the five factor model of personality and the HEXACO model is the addition of the sixth factor, Honesty-Humility. Individuals scoring low in the Honesty-Humility factor tend to be more manipulative, self-entitled, materialistic and exploitive. Analysis using the six factor model of personality has revealed that (low)
Honesty-Humility is a strong predictor of workplace deviance, greater than any other personality trait (Lee et al., 2005).

The personality antecedents of goal orientation have also been investigated by previous researchers (e.g. Bipp et al., 2008; Payne et al., 2007; Wang & Erdheim, 2007). In their review, Payne et al. (2007) found that performance approach orientation was only associated (negatively) with Emotional Stability. The established relationships between personality and goal orientation (Bipp et al., 2008) and between personality and workplace deviance (Colbert et al., 2004) means that any relationship between performance approach and workplace deviance could be attributed to shared variance associated with the relationship to specific personality traits. Most notably, it would be important to investigate whether performance approach goal orientation predicts workplace deviance over the largest established personality predictor – Honesty-Humility. Although the relationship between the HEXACO personality traits and goal orientation has not been investigated in any previous research we are aware of, goal orientation has been demonstrated to predict a wide range of achievement behaviors over and above key dispositional constructs (e.g. academic performance over cognitive ability and personality; Steinmayr et al., 2011). This suggests that goal orientation provides incremental validity over personality in the prediction of performance. For this reason we hypothesized that:

H1b: Performance approach orientation will positively predict workplace deviance over and above Honesty-Humility and the remaining five HEXACO personality traits.
Bright-side of mastery approach orientation

In contrast to performance approach goal orientation, researchers have consistently hypothesized that high levels of mastery approach orientation would be advantageous to both task performance and overall job performance in workplace settings (e.g., Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007). Indeed, the original conceptualization of mastery orientation suggests that it is associated with adaptive learning strategies, thoughts and self-regulation tactics, including the belief in incremental intelligence, high intrinsic motivation (Elliot and Church, 1997), viewing failure as an opportunity to learn, maintaining high levels of self-efficacy, and self-regulatory behaviors such as planning and goal setting (Sujan et al., 1994). A strong mastery approach orientation is likely to foster a sense of collaboration and knowledge sharing with colleagues because colleagues represent a potentially valuable development tool. This collaborative approach may encourage individuals with a mastery approach orientation to engage in citizenship behaviors in the workplace, so as to develop and foster relationships with colleagues. For example, a mastery approach oriented individual may attend a work event that they are not required to attend because they are intrinsically motivated to do so as it could prove to be a valuable learning opportunity. Indeed, a focus on learning and the development of skills has been shown to encourage individuals to collaborate with others relative to those with a performance orientation (Poortvliet et al., 2007). The conceptual and empirical links between prosocial and citizenship behaviors and the mastery orientation lead to the hypothesis:

H2a: Mastery approach orientation is positively associated with OCB.

In a similar vein to workplace deviance, personality antecedents of OCB have been thoroughly investigated. Personality traits, over cognitive abilities and other dispositional
variables, are arguably larger predictors of OCB and workplace deviance than behaviors associated with task performance (Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001; Motowildo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Salgado, 2002). Using the Big 5 personality model (Digman, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1987), researchers have demonstrated that Conscientiousness is the strongest predictor of OCB (Borman et al., 2001; Organ & Ryan, 1995b). Conscientiousness is also strongly associated with a mastery approach orientation (Bipp et al., 2008; Payne et al., 2007). Arguably mastery approach orientation could be a behavioral expression of Conscientiousness. Individuals high in Conscientiousness tend to set “stretch” goals and believe they can achieve them by exerting effort (Barrick, Mount, & Strauss, 1993). A mastery approach orientation could be a behavioral expression of this trait, because a focus on learning and development and a willingness to input effort is consistent with the behavior of an individual with a mastery approach orientation. The shared relationships between OCB, goal orientation and personality reinforce the need to evaluate the relationship between mastery approach orientation and OCB in the context of personality. Similar to workplace deviance, the strength of the goal orientation construct in predicting other behaviors over personality (Steinmayr et al., 2011) suggests that goal orientation is not simply a “compound” trait made up of various aspects of the Big Five. For this reason we hypothesized:

H2b: Mastery approach orientation positively predicts OCB over and above Conscientiousness and the remaining five HEXACO personality traits.
Method

Participants

To recruit a broad cross-section of participants for this study, emails advertising the study were sent to a wide network of people via work and broader community mailing lists. Each participant was also asked to nominate a person who knew them well, so as to act as a source of ‘peer’ ratings; thus, participants were recruited in pairs. In total, 124 adults participated in the study. As this was a study of workplace phenomena only employed participants were recruited, however, data from ten participants who listed their profession as ‘student’ was collected and subsequently excluded. The remaining sample (n = 114, 52.6% female) comprised employees from a variety of employment sectors, including Hospitality (23%), Retail (10.6%), Office Support (9.7%), Professional Services (8%) and Healthcare (7.1%). The mean age of the participants was 30.43 years (SD 13.81, Range 18-70) and the mean tenure with their current employer was 3.14 years (SD 5.30, Range 0-33).

Procedure

Each participant completed two questionnaires. The first, a ‘self-report’ questionnaire, included demographics, measures of their own personality, goal orientation and workplace behaviors. The second was a peer-report phrased version of the personality questionnaire. The peer reports of personality were used to overcome the common rating source effect that arises from using only self-reports, a common occurrence in the goal orientation literature (e.g., Bipp et al., 2008). This methodological improvement also allows for comparisons of results using self-rated personality and peer-rated personality. Peer-rated personality ratings are measures of observable behavior whereas self-reported personality represents self-perceptions of behavior. Participants were also asked to report on the length
(M = 9.31 years, SD = 10.91) and nature of the relationship (Friend 45%; Work Colleague 22.5%; Spouse 12.5%; Family Member 11.3%; Dating 8.8%) with their nominated peer.

Measures

**Workplace Deviance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Workplace deviance was assessed using the 12-item subscale of organizational-targeted workplace deviance (α = .81) from R. J. Bennett and Robinson (2000). Example items include “Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace” and “Neglected to follow your boss’s instructions”. OCB was measured using the eight items of the organizationally-targeted OCB (α = .88) from the measure adapted by Lee and Allen (2002). Example items include “Attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image” and “Keep up with developments in the organization”. Participants rated the frequency of their workplace behaviors on a 7-point scale (1 = never; 7 = daily).

**Goal Orientation**

Goal orientation was assessed using Baranik, Barron and Finney’s (2007) Goal Orientation in a Work Domain measure which measures four goal orientations: mastery approach, mastery avoid, performance approach (also referred to as performance prove), performance avoid (range α =.69-.82). Participants were required to rate their goal orientation on a 7-point scale (1 = not at all true of me; 7 = very true of me). An example mastery approach item is “I often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge”. An example mastery avoid item is “My main goal at work is to avoid messing up the tasks required for my job”. Example performance items are “I like to show that I can perform better than my coworkers” (performance approach) and “Avoiding a show of low ability is
more important to me than learning a new skill” (performance avoid). Though this paper focuses on the differential prediction of approach orientations we included the avoid orientations as controls in the analyses as goal orientations have been shown to be moderate-highly correlated (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Payne et al., 2007).

**HEXACO-PI-R**

The 100-item self and ‘observer’ (i.e., peer-rated) versions of the HEXACO-PI-R (Lee & Ashton, 2004) were used to measure the six broad personality domains: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness (range α = .87-.90). Participants were asked to rate their personality (using the self-version) and their peer’s personality (using the observer version) on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = strongly agree; 1 = strongly disagree).

**Results**

**Associations between goal orientations, HEXACO dimensions and workplace deviance and organizational citizenship behavior**

In Table 3 we report the correlations between self and peer ratings of the HEXACO factors and goal orientations with workplace deviance and OCB. Consistent with H1a, performance approach orientation – and no other goal orientation – was significantly and positively associated with workplace deviance. Replicating previous findings, workplace deviance was also negatively associated with Honesty-Humility, Extraversion and Conscientiousness (Lee et al., 2005). Consistent with H2a, mastery approach orientation, and no other goal orientation, was associated with OCB. Previous research has established a positive correlation between OCB and Conscientiousness (Organ & Ryan, 1995a), which was
replicated in our sample but we also observed a positive correlation between Extraversion and OCB. In Table 1, we also report the correlations between the self and peer ratings of the HEXACO dimensions and goal orientations. Notably, performance approach orientation was negatively associated with Honesty-Humility; a pattern supported by both self ($r = -.34, p < .01$) and peer-ratings ($r = -.24, p < .05$) suggesting that the HEXACO framework might provide a unique understanding of the relationship between personality and goal orientation, over the Big Five model.
Table 3. Correlations between workplace deviance, OCB, goal orientation and self and peer ratings of HEXACO personality dimensions.

| Name     | Mean | SD  | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   | 19   | 20   |
|----------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Gender |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2. Age   | 30.34| 13.79| -0.01|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 3. WD    | 2.12 | 0.82 | 0.20 | 0.27 | (.71) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4. OCB   | 3.81 | 1.34 | 0.05 | 0.05 | -0.05 | (.87) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 5. PAp   | 4.05 | 1.31 | 0.09 | 0.26 | (.19) | 0.06 | (.77) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 6. MAp   | 5.06 | 1.11 | -0.08 | 0.04 | -0.16 | (.30) | (.18) | (.74) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 7. PAv   | 2.85 | 1.24 | -0.02 | -0.06 | 0.18 | -0.12 | (.35) | (.22) | (.77) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 8. MAv   | 3.77 | 1.32 | -0.23 | -0.02 | -0.02 | -0.06 | (.29) | 0.18 | (.44) | (.78) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 9. SR H-H| 3.39 | 0.58 | -0.09 |      | (.32) | -0.46 | (.17) | -0.34 | -0.14 | -0.12 | (.82) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 10. SR Em| 3.16 | 0.59 | -0.32 | -0.12 | -0.20 | 0.01 | 0.07 | -0.04 | (.29) | (.25) | (.14) | (.82) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 11. SR Ext| 3.46 | 0.50 | -0.05 | -0.14 | 0.00 | (.35) | 0.06 | 0.10 | -0.36 | -0.29 | -0.15 | -0.14 | (.80) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 12. SR Ag| 2.98 | 0.60 | 0.13 | 0.13 | -0.09 | -0.05 | -0.16 | 0.04 | -0.22 | -0.09 | (.28) | -0.25 | 0.06 | (.84) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 13. SR Co| 3.40 | 0.57 | -0.13 | 0.34 | -0.23 | (.35) | -0.02 | 0.16 | 0.61 | -0.14 | (.06) | (.34) | -0.02 | 0.07 | 0.08 | (.83) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 14. SR Op| 3.35 | 0.59 | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.18 | -0.21 | -0.18 | -0.05 | -0.05 | (.29) | 0.04 | -0.23 | (.80) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 15. PR H-H| 3.37 | 0.56 | 0.03 | (.35) | -0.24 | 0.09 | -0.08 | 0.07 | (.49) | -0.08 | -0.05 | (.28) | (.34) | 0.08 | (.82) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 16. PR Em| 3.12 | 0.61 | -0.10 | -0.12 | -0.11 | 0.07 | -0.11 | 0.07 | 0.17 | (.09) | (.49) | -0.04 | 0.07 | 0.04 | -0.03 | -0.11 | (.85) |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 17. PR Ext| 3.58 | 0.56 | 0.00 | -0.03 | -0.16 | 0.17 | 0.10 | 0.03 | -0.12 | 0.02 | -0.02 | (.47) | -0.07 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.03 | (.85) |      |      |      |      |      |
| 18. PR Ag| 3.06 | 0.67 | 0.04 | 0.14 | -0.18 | 0.04 | -0.14 | -0.03 | -0.11 | 0.03 | (.22) | -0.16 | 0.10 | (.48) | 0.14 | 0.04 | (.41) | -0.05 | (.28) | (.88) |      |      |
| 19. PR Co| 3.40 | 0.60 | -0.12 | (.34) | -0.23 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.15 | -0.05 | 0.07 | (.27) | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.16 | (.58) | 0.05 | (.39) | 0.15 | 0.11 | 0.22 | (.86) |      |      |
| 20. PR Op| 3.13 | 0.64 | 0.02 | -0.03 | -0.04 | -0.06 | 0.07 | (.20) | -0.12 | -0.13 | 0.11 | -0.04 | 0.12 | -0.06 | 0.03 | (.61) | 0.19 | 0.09 | (.26) | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.83 |      |      |

Note. Significant correlations are bolded. *r* > .24 *p* < .01; *r* > .19, *p* < .05. *n* = 114. Gender, 1 = Female, 2 = Male. WD = Workplace deviance. OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior. PAp = Performance approach orientation; MAp = Mastery approach orientation; PAv = Performance avoid orientation; MAv = Mastery avoid orientation. SR = Self-rated; PR = Peer-rated. H-H = Honesty-Humility; Em = Emotionality; Ext = Extraversion; Ag = Agreeableness; Co = Conscientiousness; Op = Openness. Figures in parentheses along the diagonal are Cronbach’s coefficient alphas.
Goal orientation prediction of non-task behaviors over personality.

A series of hierarchical regression analyses were undertaken to examine the relationship between the goal orientations and non-task behaviors, after controlling for the HEXACO scales (see Table 4).

Workplace Deviance

The self-rated HEXACO dimensions were entered at Step 1, explaining 32.2% of the variance in workplace deviance. After entry of the self-rated goal orientations at Step 2, the total variance explained by the models rose to 35.2%, but this increase was not statistically significant ($F_{\text{change}} (4, 103) = 1.17, p = .33$). In the final model for workplace deviance, Honesty-Humility ($\beta = -.27, p < .01$), Conscientiousness ($\beta = -.31, p < .001$) and Emotionality ($\beta = - .21, p < .05$) were significant predictors.

When the analyses were repeated using peer-reported HEXACO scales in lieu of the self-reported scales, the six HEXACO factors accounted for 19.7% of the variance in workplace deviance. After entry of the self-rated goal orientations at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model increased to 27.4%, $F(10,102) = 3.84, p <.001$. Goal orientation explained an additional 7.7% of the variance in workplace deviance, after controlling for peer-rated personality, $R^2_{\text{change}} = .07, F_{\text{change}} (4, 102) = 2.69, p <.05$. In the final model of workplace deviance, only performance approach orientation ($\beta = .22, p < .05$), Honesty-Humility ($\beta = -.22, p < .05$) and Conscientiousness ($\beta = -.23, p < .05$) were statistically significant predictors. Partially supporting H1b, the results provide some evidence that performance approach positively predicts workplace deviance over personality.
Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The self-rated HEXACO dimensions were entered at Step 1, explaining 26.4% of the variance in OCB. After entry of the self-rated goal orientations at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model rose to 32.2%, though this change only approached statistical significance $R^2$ change = .12, $F$ change (4, 101) = 2.18, $p = .07$. In the final model, mastery approach orientation ($\beta = .26, p < .01$), Conscientiousness ($\beta = .23, p < .05$) and Extraversion ($\beta = .36, p < .001$) were significant predictors.

When the analyses were repeated using peer-reported personality, goal orientation explained an additional 11.9% of the variance in OCB, after controlling for personality, $R^2$ change = .12, $F$ change (4, 101) = 3.69, $p < .01$. In the final model of OCB, mastery approach orientation ($\beta = .33, p < .01$), Openness ($\beta = -.25, p < .05$), Extraversion ($\beta = .23, p < .05$), and mastery avoid orientation ($\beta = -.22, p < .05$) were statistically significant. Results suggest that mastery approach orientation explains OCB over personality factors alone, supporting H2b.
Table 4. Final model regression analyses predicting Workplace Deviance and OCB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Self-Reported Personality</th>
<th>Peer-Report Personality</th>
<th>Self-Reported Personality</th>
<th>Peer-Report Personality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty-Humility</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery Approach</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Approach</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery Avoid</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Avoid</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² | .32** | .35** | .20** | .27** | .26** | .32** | .07   | .19** |
R² Change from Step 1 | .03   | .08*  | .06   | .06   | .12*  |

Note: ** p < .01; * p < .05. n = 114. OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Unless otherwise stated, figures in cells are beta coefficients.
Discussion

The current study investigated the differential predictions of performance approach versus mastery approach on workplace deviance and OCB respectively. Strengthening the applicability of the results, personality measurements were included in the analyses to determine the unique prediction of performance approach and mastery approach on workplace deviance and OCB respectively. Findings in relation to each of these aims are discussed below.

Differential Predictions of Performance Approach and Mastery Approach Goal Orientations

Supporting our hypotheses, performance approach was positively associated with workplace deviance and mastery approach was positively related to OCB. The differential pattern of relationships between the goal orientations and the non-task work behaviors demonstrates the importance of considering goal orientation in job performance. It is also consistent with the theory posited in this paper that performance approach goal orientation has a dark-side whereas mastery approach is associated with ‘bright’ non-task behaviors.

Partially supporting our hypothesis, performance approach orientation was a positive predictor of workplace deviance, however, this relationship only emerged when using peer-ratings of personality, and not self-ratings. This suggests that when an individual is rating his or her own personality, and perhaps more specifically the Honesty-Humility component, they may be using the same frame of reference as when responding to the goal orientation measure. By contrast, the peers appear to be using different cues to rate personality and performance approach goal orientation. Despite the pattern of results changing when using self-ratings, they do provide evidence of a potential dark-side to the adoption of a performance approach orientation.
Demonstrating a robust finding, mastery approach was a significant predictor of OCB over and above self and peer ratings of personality, supporting our hypothesis. This finding extends previous research by showing that mastery approach is positively associated with non-task behaviors as well as the established findings with job and task performance (Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007). This is an important finding as it suggests that the potential benefits of adopting a mastery approach orientation extend beyond task performance. These results also support the consistent finding that mastery approach orientation is associated with ‘bright’ behaviors in the work context. That mastery approach predicted OCB after controlling for personality also suggests that mastery approach orientation is not simply a behavioral expression of personality traits such as Conscientiousness and Openness.

**HEXACO Correlates of Goal Orientations**

Further to the hypothesized results, the use of the HEXACO framework over the Big Five model of personality produced a noteworthy finding. Performance approach orientation, and no other orientation, was related to Honesty-Humility, a negative correlation that was significant both when self and peer assessments of personality were examined. Some of the behavioral outcomes associated with low levels of Honesty-Humility include risk-taking (Weller & Thulin, 2012), unethical business decision making (Ogunfowora et al., 2013) and adult delinquency (Dunlop et al., 2012). Additionally, the theoretical ties between the performance approach goal orientation and trait Honesty-Humility lead us to suspect that performance approach goal orientation might be a behavioral expression of trait low Honesty-Humility. Individuals low in Honesty-Humility are likely to perceive the world and other people in specific ways. For example, they are more likely to view themselves as entitled and deserving of special treatment, value being seen as important and have less concern with breaking rules than most other
people. Based on these characteristics, adopting a performance approach goal orientation seems to be a more natural fit than adopting a mastery orientation. Developing true skill mastery may be of less interest if there is a quicker, and arguably, easier way of achieving a normative based goal. Taken together, both the correlation between Honesty-Humility and performance approach orientation and the conceptual ties between the two constructs supports the possible ‘dark-side’ of a performance approach orientation, and further investigation into behaviors associated with this goal orientation is warranted.

**Implications**

This research extends the current literature in the understanding of individual differences in the motivation towards workplace deviance and OCB. It also builds upon the current research and conceptualization of the goal orientation construct in the extant literature. This research demonstrates that the performance approach orientation, which has often been hypothesized to have positive relationship to self-regulation and performance (e.g., Cellar et al., 2011), has a dark-side. The negative relationship between Honesty-Humility and performance approach orientation as well as the positive relationship between performance approach goal orientation and workplace deviance demonstrate this dark-side.

Our research findings may also help to clarify the relationship between performance approach goal orientation and job performance. The reported relationships between performance approach goal orientation and job performance in previous research have been inconsistent (see Payne et al., 2007, for review). Previous research (e.g., Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007) has treated job performance as a single construct, however, Rotundo and Sackett (2002) reported that job performance is best characterized by three components: task performance, workplace deviance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Our results showing a positive association
between performance approach orientation and one of components of job performance, workplace deviance, suggests that potential benefits in adopting this goal orientation to other components of job performance, such as task performance, may have been masked in previous research. Unraveling the relationship between performance approach orientation and workplace deviance should be an important priority for researchers as it may help to clarify some of the conflicting theories and results surrounding the relationship between performance approach and overall job performance. Our findings may also help to explain the consistently positive relationship between mastery approach goal orientation and job performance (Cellar et al., 2011). The finding in this paper that mastery approach orientation predicts OCB, over personality, suggests that mastery approach goal orientation is associated with ‘bright-side’ non-task behaviors.

**Study Limitations and Future Research**

Although these findings are promising, and the use of self and peer-ratings supports the robustness of our findings, we do acknowledge several limitations. First, the dependent variables used in this thesis, OCB and workplace deviance, were based on self-report. There is evidence that self-reports, in general, are valid (P. Spector, 1992) and self-report measures of non-task behaviors is commonplace in the literature (R. J. Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Griffin & Lopez, 2005; Lee & Allen, 2002). The concern over self-report measures with regards to workplace deviance may be additionally unwarranted because the behaviors are largely intended to be secret. Ones, Viswesvaran, and Schmidt (1993) supports this notion in their meta-analysis of integrity measures as they found that self-report measures of deviant behaviors tended to result in higher estimates of validity than external measures. For this reason, we believe that the use of self-report measures of workplace deviance and OCB are appropriate for this research.
Second, there has been some criticism of the use of samples of employees from different employment sectors. As researchers (e.g., Griffin & Lopez, 2005) have called attention to, a ‘deviant’ behavior in one workplace may be acceptable or preferred in another (e.g., consuming wine on the job as a psychologist, versus a vintner). Although we acknowledge the use of diverse employments sectors as a potential limitation there is no reason to suspect that this would have changed the differential predictions of workplace deviance and OCB reported in this paper. Additionally, the use of participants from diverse employment sectors enhances the generalizability of the findings.

It would be important to unravel the relationship between personality, goal orientation and non-task behaviors using a longitudinal methodology. This approach would strengthen the findings in this paper and would reduce the chance that common method variance inflated the reported relationships. Additionally, recent research has shown that cues in an individual’s environment or the context around a task can influence an individual’s goal orientation (Bell & Kozlowski, 2002; Dragoni, 2005; Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012; Kozlowski & Bell, 2006; Yeo et al., 2009; Yeo & Neal, 2008; Yeo et al., 2008). Given that an individual’s goal orientation can be altered by contextual cues, it would be interesting to investigate the effect of the workplace environment on the expression of goal orientation, workplace deviance and OCB.

Conclusion

Goal orientation has become one of the most studied motivational constructs in the psychology literature. However, the relationship between performance approach goal orientation and job performance has been much less consistent than the established relationship between mastery approach orientation. In this paper we investigated one possible reason for this by proposing that performance approach orientation is associated with workplace deviance that conflates the relationship between the orientation and job
performance ratings. Results suggest that the performance approach orientation has a
dark-side as it associated with workplace deviance and there is evidence that performance
approach orientation predicts workplace deviance over personality traits. Further to this,
results suggested a negative relationship between performance approach and Honesty-
Humility, a personality factor highly related to antisocial and even delinquent behaviors.
In contrast, mastery approach was associated with ‘bright’ OCBs. This study is the first to
explore the relationships between these two constructs and to show that goal orientation
adds to the understanding of workplace deviance and OCB, beyond personality. We hope
that this research encourages more research into the role of goal orientation and aspects of
non-task job performance.
CHAPTER 4: STATE GOAL ORIENTATION AND UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR

Overview and Goals for this Chapter

In Chapter 3, the differential predictions of approach goal orientations were examined in the context of non-task performance. Specifically, there was evidence that trait performance approach goal orientation was associated with workplace deviance and trait mastery orientation predicted OCB, and that these relationships were significant after controlling for HEXACO personality traits. In Chapter 2, results showed that performance approach orientation predicted status-driven risk taking, demonstrating a potential dark-side to this orientation. In this Chapter, I build on both of these findings by investigating whether trait and state goal orientation are related to an objective measure of unethical behavior using an experimental paradigm. As discussed in the general introduction to this thesis, an individual’s goal orientation can be temporarily shifted by relatively small manipulations to an individual’s work context and environment. Contextual cues, such as leadership style and reward structures, have been shown to affect an individual’s state goal orientation in the workplace. Therefore, it is important to investigate the potential dark-side of both trait and state performance approach goal orientation because an individual’s goal orientation is likely to change in response to different contextual cues in their workplace.
Driven to cheat? State performance approach goal orientation and unethical behavior.
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In recent years, and in the wake of the global financial crisis, a number of high profile scandals stemming from unethical employee behavior have surfaced in organizations ranging from corporate business to athletic teams to religious organizations (see Pavlo, 2013; Pérez-Peña, 2011, November 22). The public outcry in response to these scandals has only sought to increase the research attention focused on understanding both the individual and organizational factors that foster and encourage unethical behaviors. Research attention focusing on understanding the mechanisms behind unethical workplace behavior is additionally important because recent evidence suggests that unethical behavior is increasing globally (Ernst & Young, 2013). In this paper we adopt a person-situation perspective of unethical behavior, focusing on cheating behaviors, by investigating the role of trait and state goal orientation on cheating behavior in an experimental task. Although some determinants of unethical behavior have been identified, we will present conceptual and theoretical evidence suggesting a link between goal orientation and unethical behaviors.

Goal orientation has emerged as a useful framework to understand the motivational antecedents of a number of disparate behaviors including learning and academic achievement (see Colquitt, LePine, & Noe, 2000), job performance (see Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007) and sporting performance (e.g., Van Yperen & Duda, 1999). Goal orientations are believed to be perceptual-cognitive frameworks for how individuals approach, interpret and perform in achievement situations (Ames & Archer, 1987, 1988). In this paper we focus on the most commonly published three-factor model of goal orientation that distinguishes between mastery, performance approach and performance avoid dimensions. In this
framework a mastery orientation is characterized by a desire to develop knowledge and skills in order to master a task (Elliot & Church, 1997). The performance orientations, delineated into performance approach and performance avoid, are characterized by a focus on outcome and normative performance where the approach orientation is centered on outperforming others, and performance avoid, a focus on avoiding poor performance (Elliot & McGregor, 2001).

The conceptualization of goal orientation as a trait or a situation-specific state has been debated in the literature. Some researchers have treated goal orientation as a stable trait that varies between individuals (e.g., Bipp et al., 2008; Colquitt & Simmering, 1998) whereas others treat it as a situationally specific state that is manipulated based on the task and context (e.g., Stevens & Gist, 1997). Consistent with notable and current conceptualizations (e.g., Button et al., 1996; Payne et al., 2007) and conceptualizations of other psychological variables (e.g., self-efficacy, anxiety, self-esteem), we view goal orientation as both a state and a trait, with trait goal orientation having a direct effect on state goal orientation. And environmental and contextual cues may temporarily shift an individual’s state goal orientation.

Mastery orientation is largely viewed as the most adaptive motivational orientation because it is associated with positive approach-oriented self-regulation strategies including effort, persistence after failure and task absorption (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Performance avoid orientation has largely been associated with maladaptive learning strategies and poorer performance (Payne et al., 2007). However, performance approach goal orientation has been associated with challenge-based affect, cognitions and behaviors such as excitement, task-absorption and persistence that tend to facilitate performance. In their recent paper
Murayama and Elliot (2012) proposed and tested a model of opposing processes that asserts that competition prompts both performance approach and avoidance goal orientations but performance approach leads to improved performance whereas performance avoid leads to poorer performance. Though their results provided evidence that performance approach goal orientation leads to improved performance we propose that this might come at a cost to ethical behavior practices. Specifically, we suggest that one underlying cause of unethical behavior is a state performance approach goal orientation that stresses normative performance and encourages competition between colleagues. Furthermore, we will disentangle these contextual performance approach cues from dispositional individual differences, including personality and trait goal orientation. First, we will briefly review the literature addressing unethical workplace behavior and the established dispositional and contextual factors predicting this behavior, followed by an introduction of the rationale for linking goal orientation to these behaviors.

**Unethical workplace behavior**

In their review of the literature Treviño, Weaver, and Reynolds (2006) defined behavioral ethics as referring “to individual behavior that is subject to or judged according to generally accepted moral norms of behavior” (p.952). They went on to note that within this literature researchers have “focused specifically on unethical behaviors, such as lying, cheating, and stealing” (p. 952). In line with this conceptualization of unethical behavior we examine the degree to which participants engage in the morally unacceptable behavior of cheating on a task. We selected to measure propensity to cheat on a task because previous research has established that most people judge cheating to be inappropriate or morally unacceptable (e.g., T. R. Cohen, 2010) in line with Trevino et al.’s (2006) definition.
Furthermore, cheating behavior within the workplace has the propensity to be harmful to other colleagues as well as to the organization as a whole.

**Predictors of unethical behavior**

Previous research has established both dispositional and situational antecedents of unethical behaviors (see Kish-Gephart, Harrison, & Treviño, 2010 for review; Tenbrunsel & Smith-Crowe, 2008). Demographic characteristics such as age, gender and education have been found to predict intentions to behave unethically as well as unethical behaviors. However, recent meta-analytic evidence suggests that these relationships are small and most commonly disappear when controlling for other more robust dispositional and situational factors (Kish-Gephart et al., 2010). As an example of a more robust dispositional factor, personality traits have been linked to (un)ethical decision making and moral behavior. Specifically, the personality factor of Honesty-Humility of the HEXACO framework of personality, has been shown to be negatively associated with unethical and counterproductive behaviors (Ashton, Lee, Perugini, et al., 2004; Hershfield, Cohen, & Thompson, 2011; Lee, Ashton, Morrison, Cordery, & Dunlop, 2008).

Situational and contextual factors also impact various stages of the decision making process leading to unethical intentions and behavior. Organizational climates, informal communication systems, and formal communication systems (e.g., reward structures, sanctions and surveillance) contribute to an organization’s ‘ethical infrastructure’ (Tenbrunsel, Smith-Crowe, & Umphress, 2003). As the “pressure to do wrong” increases or becomes salient to employees they are more likely behave unethically (Hegarty & Sims, 1978; Tenbrunsel, 1998). Similarly, in an organizational climate where ethical decision making is emphasized there are less unethical decisions at an individual level (Kish-Gephart...
Several researchers have pointed to intra-organizational competition (Kulik et al., 2008) and inter-organization competition (V. M. Bennett et al., 2013; Cai et al., 2005) as situational and contextual predictors of unethical behavior of individuals. Drawing upon the Enron scandal as a case-study, Kulik et al. (2008) provided a conceptual model explaining how internally competitive organizations may foster unethical behavior in employees. Using the example of forced-ranking systems, that force managers to rank preset percentages of their employees as either “A players”, “B players” or “C players”, Kulik et al. (2008) argue that individual-level intra-organizational competition inevitably leads to unethical behavior and even corruption as employees are motivated to find any way to perform better than their colleagues. Furthermore, empirical evidence has shown that high organizational-level competition increases unethical behavior at the organizational level (V. M. Bennett et al., 2013; Cai et al., 2005), which is contrary to predictions made by economists and economic theorists (see Kulik et al., 2008; Stiglitz, 2003). The relationship between individual-level and organization-level competition and unethical behavior suggests that an individual’s perception and predisposition towards normative comparison and competitiveness, in comparison to a focus on self-referential development and skill competency, might be an important predictor of unethical behavior. The construct of goal orientation has emerged as a useful framework for the understanding of motivations behind an individual’s predisposition towards normative performance, competition, learning and development (Murayama & Elliot, 2012).

**Goal orientation and unethical behavior**

Recent empirical evidence suggests that adopting a mastery orientation leads to better performance in workplace settings (e.g., Potosky & Ramakrishna, 2002; Sujan et al., 1994;
VandeWalle et al., 2001), schools (Bell & Kozlowski, 2002; Harackiewicz, Barron, Tauer, et al., 2002), and on the sporting field (see Van Yperen et al., 2014) over performance orientations. In contrast, relationships between these outcomes and performance orientation have been less clear, with studies often demonstrating conflicting results (see Payne et al., 2007). Although some of these inconsistencies were explained when the performance orientation was separated into performance approach and performance avoid, the relationship between performance approach and job performance remains unclear (see Elliot & Moller, 2003; VandeWalle, 2001 for review). We posit that one possible explanation for these conflicting results in terms of performance is that performance approach goal orientation is associated with unethical behavior which is ultimately counterproductive.

There are several conceptual reasons why trait and state goal orientation might be associated with unethical behavior. We will begin by introducing the conceptual links between trait goal orientation and unethical behavior before moving to state goal orientation.

**Trait goal orientation and unethical behavior**

There are two major reasons we propose a link between goal orientation – specifically performance approach goal orientation – and unethical behavior. Firstly, if an individual has a dispositional desire to outperform colleagues, there are potentially many different ways to achieve this goal. Legitimate methods might include simply working harder or seeking training to improve skills, and these methods would presumably lead to genuine long-term improvements. However, less ethical and perhaps faster methods to achieve superior performance relative to colleagues might include undermining colleagues in front of the supervisor, sabotaging the colleagues’ work, or finding ways to cheat.
Individuals who are trait mastery oriented are not likely to engage in unethical behavior in order to achieve performance improvement because they are motivated by learning and developing their personal skill. Utilizing unethical shortcut methods are not likely to be tempting because they are not consistent with the individual’s ultimate goal of learning and developing competence. For example, an employee who has a goal of learning and developing their skills in sales are unlikely to inflate or lie about the number of sales they obtained in a given month because a faked objective number of sales has no relation to their self-referenced learning goal.

Individuals with a disposition towards performance avoid orientation are focused on normative performance but are concerned with avoiding being the poorest performer. The conceptual relationship between a performance avoid orientation and unethical behavior is less clear. On the one hand, the focus on normative performance may bias individuals with a performance avoid orientation to consider taking less legitimate shortcut methods to achieving their goal, similar to individuals with a trait performance approach orientation. However, on the other hand, a trait performance avoid orientation may lead to less unethical behavior because the ultimate goal is to avoid being the poorest performer and demonstrating poor performance and therefore behaving unethically to achieve this goal may be perceived as too costly.

From the empirical literature, recent research has shown that a performance goal orientation has been associated with a number of constructs that have been conceptually and empirically linked to intentions to behave unethically and unethical behavior (Louw, Dunlop, Yeo, & Griffin, 2013, July). Both performance approach and perform avoid orientations focus on normative performance and as such foster a belief that colleagues are competitors to
outperform rather than cooperative collaborators. Indeed, trait performance orientations have been linked to competitiveness in a variety of domains including sports (Ryska, 2003) and the workplace (VandeWalle, 2001). Given that intra-individual and inter-organizational competitiveness has been demonstrated to increase unethical behavior (V. M. Bennett et al., 2013; Cai et al., 2005; Kulik et al., 2008), it follows that as a performance orientation increases the propensity for individuals to interpret and perceive situations as a competition, a performance orientation may also increase unethical behavior. Based on this conceptual argument, both trait performance approach and performance avoid should increase unethical behavior. Furthermore, the performance approach goal orientation, the focus on being the best performer, may result in greater unethical behavior than a performance avoid orientation (a focus on avoiding being the worst performer) because a performance approach goal orientation is a much more challenging competitive target. Conversely to the performance orientations, a disposition towards a mastery orientation, that casts colleagues in the role of collaborators rather than competitors, may reduce unethical behavior. Drawing together both the conceptual and empirical links between trait goal orientation and unethical behavior we hypothesize:

H1a: Trait performance approach goal orientation will be positively associated with unethical behavior.

H1b: Trait performance avoid goal orientation will be positively associated with unethical behavior.

H1c: Trait mastery orientation will be negatively associated with unethical behavior.

H1d: Trait performance approach goal orientation will have the strongest relationship to unethical behavior over performance avoid and mastery orientations.
State goal orientation and unethical behavior

State goal orientation is the goal orientation an individual adopts in a given situation, context or task (Ames & Archer, 1988). In an early attempt to determine the nature of goal orientation, Button et al. (1996) defined goal orientation as a “somewhat stable individual difference factor that may be influenced by situational characteristics” (p. 28). Further research suggests that the type of orientation an individual adopts for a given task is influenced by both dispositional and situational influences (Archer, 1994; Chen et al., 2000; Kozlowski et al., 2001; Payne et al., 2007). Independent situational and dispositional influences have been shown to affect the type of orientation activated which subsequently elicits a different response pattern (Archer, 1994; Chen et al., 2000; Kozlowski et al., 2001). Various interventions have been used to induce goal orientations, typically by manipulating cues that frame a task or training (Kozlowski & Bell, 2006; Kozlowski et al., 2001; Yeo et al., 2009; Yeo et al., 2008). To induce a mastery orientation, cues, instructions and/or feedback emphasize self-referenced improvement, incremental notions of intelligence/ability, and frame errors as opportunities to learn and improve. In contrast, cues that stress demonstrating normative competence, fixed nature of ability and error avoidance induce a performance orientation (e.g., Ames, 1992; Archer, 1994; Kozlowski & Bell, 2006; Kozlowski et al., 2001; Yeo et al., 2009; Yeo et al., 2008).

Given that there is robust evidence that even subtle changes to the contextual cues influences as individual’s goal orientation, it is important to determine whether a state goal orientation predicts unethical behavior over and above trait goal orientation. There is a strong relationship between the outcomes associated with trait and state goal orientations (see Payne...
et al., 2007). Indeed, state goal orientation appears to mirror trait goal orientation in relation to outcome variables such as task performance (Kozlowski & Bell, 2006) and academic performance (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996).

Despite the mirroring of results between state and trait goal orientation it is important to investigate both state and trait goal orientation in relation to unethical behavior because interventions stemming from the application of the results in the workplace would be different based on the relative importance of the individual or the situation. For example, if trait goal orientation predicts unethical behavior over state goal orientation practitioners would be advised to consider goal orientation in personnel selection. However, if state goal orientation predicts unethical behavior over trait goal orientation it suggests that the context, or organizational climate of the workplace, should be the target of interventions. For these reasons, we measured trait goal orientation before applying manipulations to induce state goal orientations for the task measuring unethical behavior.

There are conceptual and empirical reasons why the context or organizational climate, and the state goal orientation this causes individuals to adopt, may be more important than an individual’s disposition. In the educational psychology literature, Ames and Archer (1988) showed that students who perceived their classrooms as mastery oriented were more likely to engage in adaptive learning strategies whereas students who perceived their classrooms as performance oriented were more likely to report maladaptive learning strategies. Further, Kaplan and Midgley (1999) posited that in pressurized achievement settings, where performance goals are emphasized over learning goals, the fear of failure may be elevated. A heightened fear of failure is of concern because Schab (1991) reported that fear of failure was the most common reason linked to self-report cheating among high-school students.
The similarity of relationships between trait and state goal orientation on behavioral outcome variables (e.g., task performance, learning, academic performance) and research suggesting that a performance orientation, either approach or avoid, in the classroom is more likely to lead to cheating behavior, suggests a similar pattern of results between state and trait goal orientations and unethical behavior. Specifically, that state performance approach goal orientation is more likely to lead to unethical behavior than a state performance avoid orientation, and a state mastery orientation is least likely to lead to unethical behavior. Additionally, the malleability of an individual’s goal orientation and the relative ease with which a state goal orientation is induced, lead us to hypothesize that the state goal orientation may be more salient to the individual and therefore predict unethical behavior over trait goal orientation.

In order to determine whether trait and/or state goal orientation predicted unethical behaviors over established personality predictors such as Honesty-Humility, trait goal orientation and HEXACO personality traits was measured before participants completed a task that allowed them to behave unethically. Prior to completing the task, participants were randomly allocated to one of three experimental conditions that, through a series of instructions, were designed to manipulate their state goal orientation during the task. Taken together the conceptual and empirical research reviewed above lead us to hypothesize:

H2a: State performance approach goal orientation will result in the greatest unethical behavior over performance avoid and mastery orientations.

H2b: State performance avoid goal orientation will result in greater unethical behavior than state mastery orientation.

H3: The hypothesized significant differences in unethical behavior across the state goal orientations will remain significant after controlling for individual differences in trait goal orientation and personality.
Method

Procedure

Participants completed a two phase study advertised as an experimental study that “examines how certain personality traits are related to your mental processing skills”. Participants were informed that they would be asked to complete three online questionnaires measuring personality traits followed by some ‘word jumbles’ in a laboratory setting. In the first phase, participants completed measures of personality and trait goal orientation. In the second phase, which was one week after the first, participants were randomly allocated to one of three conditions (mastery, performance avoid or performance approach). Instructions and information about the experiment were given to the participants to induce a state goal orientation (see Experimental Manipulation). Participants then completed the experimental task that involved solving two sets of eight anagrams. Following this, a short manipulation check questionnaire and three debrief questions were asked. Participants were fully debriefed at the conclusion of data collection.

Measures

Trait Goal Orientation

The 12-item revised Achievement Goal Questionnaire (AGQ-R) was used to measure four goal orientations; mastery approach, performance approach, performance avoid (Elliot & Murayama, 2008). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed with the statements in general on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = strongly agree; 1= strongly disagree).
Unethical Behavior

To test the degree to which participants exhibited unethical behavior, we employed a measure designed to test a behavioral outcome of unethical behavior, specifically cheating on a task. The task adapted from Cameron and Miller (2009) and Hershfield et al. (2011) involved solving eight anagrams (scrambled letters that need to be unscrambled in order to form English words). Participants were given two sets of eight anagrams, the first being a practice set designed to familiarize them with the task and allow for the opportunity to try out strategies for solving the anagrams (a key goal frame in the mastery condition instruction, see the Manipulation section below). The solutions for the practice set were presented after 8 minutes. Following the practice set of anagrams, participants were given the test set of anagrams taken from Cameron and Miller (2009). The specific anagrams they were given were: EFLORW (flower), ADELMN (menald), ELOWY (yellow), DEINNR (dinner), AEHMMR (hammer), BMOOTT (bottom), ACCIPR (capric), CEEEHS (cheese), and ADDENS (sadden). Participants were presented with scrambled words without the solutions and were told that they needed to solve each anagram in order, meaning that they could not move onto the second anagram until they had solved the first anagram and so on. Anagram 2 (“menald”) and anagram 7 (“capric”) were intended to be practically unsolvable because their solutions are uncommon words. Cameron and Miller (2009) piloted this task and found that not a single college student was familiar with these words.

Participants were given 15 minutes to complete as many anagrams, in order, as possible. The time limit given was generous to ensure that participants had enough time to notice that, while they could not solve the second anagram, there were many other anagrams they could solve. After time elapsed, participants were requested to input the number of
anagrams they solved in order, into a computer situated in front of them. Participants were reminded that this must be in the order and were provided with an example to ensure they understood this. In addition, as in other cheating paradigms (Mazar, Amir, & Ariely, 2008), anonymity was assured so that participants were encouraged to behave in a way that aligned with their true preferences. Deception about the true intention of the study, to measure unethical behavior, was maintained throughout the experimental process by suggesting the research objective was to measure whether personality traits affect cognitive processing. Cheating behavior was operationalized as the number of anagrams participants reported solving in order as the higher the number of anagrams solved the greater the number of cheating incidents (i.e., 1 anagram reported solved = no cheating; 2-6 anagrams reported solved = 1 cheating occurrence; 7+ anagrams reported solved = 2 cheating occurrences).

**Experimental Manipulation**

At least one week after completing the online trait measures participants attended a group experimental session. Prior to completing the anagram task participants were given instructions that were designed to induce a state goal orientation. Participants were provided with either mastery, performance approach or performance avoid instructions depending on their randomly allocated condition. The instructions for each participant were listed on the computer that they completed the task and were reviewed by the experimenter with the participants. The goal frame and goal content of the instructions were manipulated in line with a method adapted from Kozlowski and Bell (2006).

The instructions for the anagram task were framed so as to induce either a mastery, performance approach or performance avoid goal orientation. The instructions for the mastery condition framed success in the task as acquiring knowledge and developing skills
and participants should use the practice as an opportunity to learn new skills. Tapping into the implicit beliefs associated with the mastery goal orientation (Dweck, 1986; Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Mueller & Dweck, 1998), participants were also encouraged to view failures to solve anagrams as an opportunity to develop their skills (e.g., “When acquiring any new skill you may find some aspects difficult, but you can learn from those challenges and improve your skills”). In contrast, information in the performance conditions framed task performance as a demonstration of competence (e.g., “In our previous work, we’ve found that the ability to solve anagrams quickly and accurately reflects the basic cognitive capabilities that people possess. The higher their underlying cognitive-processing capacity, the better their performance on this task”).

The specific goals given to the participants differed based on the experimental condition they were assigned to. Participants in the mastery condition were instructed that their purpose was to “experiment with different strategies and learn how to master the task” and the task would give them an “opportunity to develop your cognitive capabilities” at solving anagrams. Normative performance was stressed in the performance conditions. Participants in the performance approach condition were instructed that their purpose was to “perform better than other people on this task” and the task would give participants the opportunity to “demonstrate that you have high cognitive capabilities compared to other participants” whereas participants in the performance avoid condition were instructed that their aim was to “avoid demonstrating low ability by performing poorly” and the task would give them the opportunity to “avoid demonstrating that you have low cognitive capabilities compared to others”.
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HEXACO-PI-R

As previously mentioned, the Honesty-Humility factor of the HEXACO personality framework has been shown to negatively predict unethical behavior and intentions to behave unethically (Hershfield et al., 2011; Lee & Allen, 2002; Lee et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2005). The HEXACO framework shows considerable predictive validity advantages over the traditional five-factor model of personality (Lee et al., 2008), especially when predicting negative or counter-productive behaviors (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001; Lee et al., 2003). These gains are largely due to the inclusion of the Honesty-Humility factor. Individuals scoring low in Honesty-Humility tend to be more manipulative, self-entitled, materialistic and exploitive (Ashton & Lee, 2008). Previous research has found that performance approach goal orientation, and no other goal orientation was negatively associated with Honesty-Humility and that trait performance approach goal orientation predicted counterproductive workplace behaviors (Louw et al., 2013). In order to demonstrate that goal orientation was associated with cheating after controlling for shared variance, especially because of the established performance approach and Honesty-Humility relationship, the HEXACO personality traits were measured. The 100-item self-version of the HEXACO-PI-R (Lee & Ashton, 2004) were used to measure the six broad personality domains: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness (range α = .87-.90). Participants were asked to respond to each statement on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = strongly agree; 1= strongly disagree).

Participants

Participants were undergraduate students from a Western Australian University (n=217) who participated for course credit. Of this sample, 58 participants (26.7%)
completed the baseline measures of the HEXACO and trait goal orientation, but failed to attend the experimental task. In line with previous research (Hershfield et al., 2011; R. J. Robinson, Lewicki, & Donahue, 2000) we conceptualize making a commitment to attend a study but subsequently failing to attend as a ‘false promise’. False promises are morally dubious and therefore may be considered a further example of unethical behavior (Treviño et al., 2006). For this reason we decided to examine whether there were any trait differences between participants who made a false promise and those that did not (i.e., showed up to the second component of testing). Though we had not generated a priori hypotheses about participants who gave a false promise, given that a false promise is an example of unethical behavior we would expect the same pattern of results outlined in H1. The trait differences between the participants who gave a false promise and those that did not are reported in the results section.

In order to determine whether participants were blind to the true intention of the experimental task (i.e., to measure unethical cheating behavior) participants were asked three debrief questions. Specifically these were “How did you find the task? Were there any aspects that you particularly liked or disliked?”; “Did you find any aspects of the anagram task unusual or suspicious?” and “What do you think the purpose of this research is?”. Responses to these questions were coded based on the degree to which participants accurately guessed the true research question. Participants that mentioned ‘cheating’ or ‘lying’ as a research purpose (e.g., one participant wrote “to assess participant honesty, persistence in solving the anagram, or how each individual’s mind works in solving it”) were removed from further analyses (n=15). This left a final sample of 144 participants (Mean age
Results

Trait Differences in False Promise Propensity

A series of independent-samples t-tests were conducted in order to determine whether there were any significant differences on the HEXACO personality dimensions and trait goal orientations between those participants who gave a false promise and participants who did not. Given that we have conceptualized not attending the experimental study (i.e., a false promise) as an unethical behavior, we would expect that the trait differences we outlined above, namely low Honesty-Humility and high performance orientations, would also be associated with a false promise. Consistent with this, participants who attended both parts of the study (i.e., did not give a false promise) were significantly higher on Honesty-Humility ($M=3.34$, $SD=.59$) than those who did not ($M=3.14$, $SD=.61$), $t(215) = 2.16$, $p < .05$. In addition, with a trend towards significance, individuals who attended the lab study were lower on performance approach orientation ($M=3.81$, $SD=.80$) than those that did not attend ($M=4.02$, $SD=.68$), $t(125.07)^3 = 2.13$, $p = .058$. There were no other significant trait differences, or even trends towards significant differences, between the groups. These findings will be examined further in the discussion below in relation to the theory of the relationship between dispositional variables and unethical behavior as well as the implications to the findings concerning the experimental task detailed below. The following

---

$^3$ Note. The assumption of equal variances was not met and therefore an adjusted degree of freedom has been reported.
results exclude the participants that did not attend the experimental task. Trait correlations that include participants that did not attend the experimental task are reported in Appendix B.

**Manipulation Check**

Participants were asked three manipulation check questions adapted from Kozlowski and Bell (2006) to evaluate the effectiveness of the manipulation, and all were rated on a 5-point “Strongly Disagree”—“Strongly Agree” Likert scale. Participants in the performance approach condition ($M = 3.52, SD = 1.08$) were significantly more likely to agree to the statement “I tried to perform better than other people”, $F(2,141)= 3.72, p <.05$ than those in the mastery ($M = 2.90, SD = 1.23$) or performance avoid ($M = 3.19, SD = 1.30$). However, there were no significant differences in the responses to the mastery approach manipulation check “I didn’t really focus on how well I was doing relative to others, I focused on improving my own skills” across the mastery ($M = 3.58, SD = 1.23$), performance approach ($M = 3.35, SD = 1.17$) or performance avoid ($M = 3.20, SD = 1.11$) conditions. Similarly there was no significant differences in the performance avoid manipulation check “I tried not to perform worse than others” across the performance avoid ($M = 3.71, SD = 1.09$), performance approach ($M = 3.48, SD = 1.15$) and mastery ($M = 3.46, SD = 1.20$). Though there were no significant differences between the mean responses to these items, the differences between the means were in the expected direction. Overall, adherence to the goals was high (“I was strongly committed to pursuing the goal I was given”) with a mean score of 4.04 (out of 5) and there was no significant difference between the three experimental conditions in the responses to this question $F(2,141)=.63, p=.535$. 
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Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Prior to conducting analyses, a one-way between groups MANOVA was conducted to investigate any baseline differences in the six HEXACO personality traits and trait goal orientations across the three experimental conditions. There were no statistically significant trait differences in personality and goal orientation across the experimental conditions, $F(20, 288) = 1.48, p = .09$.

Descriptive statistics and correlations for the baseline measures of the HEXACO personality traits and trait goal orientations are shown in Table 5. Failing to support H1a and H1b, there were no significant positive association between trait performance approach or performance avoid goal orientation and unethical behavior. Trait mastery orientation was also not negatively associated with cheating behavior, failing to support H1c. As there was no significant relationships between any of the trait goal orientations and unethical behavior, H1d, which hypothesized the magnitude of relationships between the goal orientations, was also not supported.
Table 5. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations between demographic and HEXACO personality and goal orientation traits.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>4.41</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. Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.02</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. Cheating Behavior</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Honest-Humility</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotionality</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Extraversion</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Agreeableness</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Openness</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mastery</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Performance Approach</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Performance Avoid</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. n=144. Correlations significant ($p < .05$) in bold. All correlations $\geq |.15|$ significant $p < .05$; correlations $\geq |.22|$ significant $p < .01$. 
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Mean differences in unethical behavior across the state goal orientation experimental conditions.

The performance approach condition was associated with the most unethical behavior (\(M=4.58, SD=2.74\)) followed by the state mastery orientation condition (\(M=3.42, SD=2.87\)). State performance avoid condition was associated with the smallest numerical mean level of reported anagrams solved (\(M = 3.22, SD=2.53\)).

To test the hypothesis H2a, that state performance approach would have the largest effect on unethical behavior over state performance avoid and mastery orientations, a one-way between groups ANOVA with a planned comparison was performed. The results of the between groups ANOVA rejected the null hypothesis of no difference between the means in cheating behavior across the conditions (mastery, performance approach, performance avoid) \(F(2,141) = 3.35, p<.05, \eta^2_p = .045\). Supporting H2a, state performance approach goal orientation was associated with significantly more cheating on the task than state performance avoid orientation and state mastery orientations \(t (141) = 2.64, p<.05\).

Hypothesis H2b posited that state performance avoid would be associated with greater cheating on the task than the state mastery condition. Given that the state mastery orientation was associated with numerically greater cheating than the state performance avoid condition this hypothesis was not supported. To determine the nature of the difference between the two conditions a second planned comparison was conducted. Results showed that there was no significant difference in cheating between the two conditions \(t (141) = .36, p=.722\). A visual depiction of the means, along with 95% confidence intervals, is presented in Figure 3.
Mean differences in unethical behavior based on experimental condition controlling for trait goal orientation and personality

To measure whether the differences in cheating behavior across the experimental conditions remained significant after controlling for trait goal orientation and personality, a between-groups ANCOVA was performed. Providing support for H3, after adjusting for individual differences in trait goal orientation and the HEXACO personality traits, the difference between the means in cheating behavior across the experimental conditions remained significant $F(2,131) = 3.22, p<.05, \eta^2_{\text{partial}} = .047$. This suggests that the experimentally manipulated state goal orientation affected cheating behavior over and above individual differences in trait goal orientation and personality, with a state performance approach goal orientation resulting in the greatest cheating behavior.

**Discussion**

The current research aimed to investigate the relationships between state and trait goal orientation and unethical behavior. We found that while trait goal orientations were
not associated with cheating on the task, there was a trend towards the trait performance approach goal orientation being associated with giving a false promise. Results also showed that a state performance approach goal orientation resulted in significantly more unethical behavior than either a state performance avoid or mastery orientations. Additionally, this difference remained significant after controlling for individual differences in trait goal orientation and personality. These results will be discussed in greater detail below with reference to the existing literature and implications for future research and practice.

**Trait Goal Orientation and Unethical Behavior**

Failing to support our hypotheses, there was no significant relationship between trait goal orientations and cheating on the task, suggesting that trait goal orientation is not associated with unethical behavior. Further to this, there was no significant relationship between any of the HEXACO personality traits and cheating on the task. This conflicts with previous research demonstrating an inverse relationship between the Honesty-Humility factor and unethical behavior (Hershfield et al., 2011). It is possible that the instructions given to the participants made the state goal orientation most salient and these goals subsequently overrode any trait individual differences. Alternatively, the failure to find any trait predictions of unethical behavior on the experimental task could be due to the range restriction associated with a portion of participants not attending the experimental task. This possibility is consistent with the results showing significant differences between participants that gave a false promise by not attending the experimental task. Participants that gave a false promise, an example of an unethical behavior, were significantly lower on the trait Honesty-Humility. There was also trend towards a significant difference in performance approach orientation, with participants that gave a false promise (i.e., did not attend the experimental task) higher in trait
performance approach goal orientation. From a conceptual standpoint it follows that individuals who tend to be manipulative, less rule-following and feel entitled to elevated social status (traits of those low in Honesty-Humility factor) are more likely to give a false promise than individuals high in Honesty-Humility. This result is also consistent with a number of previous studies that have linked the trait Honesty-Humility to unethical behaviors (Dunlop et al., 2012; Hershfield et al., 2011).

Though we hypothesized that performance approach goal orientation would be positively associated with unethical behavior we grounded the rationale for this hypothesis in the idea that a focus on being the best is antithetical to cooperation and collaboration with colleagues. This focus on competition is likely to lead individuals to engage in unethical or counterproductive behaviors to achieve their goal. However, the example of a false promise does not neatly align with this rationale because not attending the study does not achieve the goal of being the best or demonstrating competence and it may actively thwart this goal with respect to the academic grades. With regards to the trend towards higher trait performance approach orientated individual giving a false promise, we suggest an alternate and complimentary link that draws on the relationship between Honesty-Humility and performance approach orientation. Adopting a performance approach orientation, to outperform others, seems to require a belief that one in fact can perform better than others. It follows that individuals that perceive that they can be better than others might actually perceive themselves as better. This belief of superiority may result in individuals with a performance approach orientation tending to be less rule-following and feeling entitled to elevated social status. Being less concerned with rules and an inflated sense of entitlement are consistent with giving false promises. Unraveling the mechanism behind the relationship between trait performance approach
goal orientation and unethical behavior is clearly an interesting direction for future research.

**State Goal Orientation and Unethical Behavior**

Consistent with our hypothesis, a state performance approach goal orientation was associated with more unethical behavior than either the state performance avoid or mastery orientations. However contrary to our magnitude hypothesis, there was no significant difference in unethical behavior between state mastery and performance avoid orientations. Further, state goal orientation predicted cheating on the task while controlling for trait goal orientation and the six HEXACO personality traits. These results suggest that state goal orientation is perhaps more important than trait goal orientation when predicting unethical workplace behavior.

These results are particularly important for two reasons. Firstly, relatively minor manipulations to task framing, that produced a state goal orientation, were enough to disrupt established dispositional predictors of unethical behavior such as the personality factor Honesty-Humility. This suggests that state goal orientation may be an important predictor of unethical behavior. Secondly, recent research has established that contextual cues that focus on competition with peers lead individuals to adopt either a performance approach or avoid orientation (Murayama & Elliot, 2012). Murayama and Elliot (2012) posited that performance approach orientation was associated with improved performance; whereas a performance avoid orientation was associated with poorer performance. Our results suggest that gains in performance attributed to a performance approach orientation may, in part, be attributed to an increase in unethical behavior. The performance approach goal orientation is focused on normative performance and demonstrating competence to others. The result suggesting that an environment that induces a state performance approach goal orientation might lead to unethical behavior is
somewhat controversial because some researchers view competition in the workplace as a performance enhancer (e.g., Sauers & Bass, 1990). Supporters of this view believe that competition leads individuals to do their best. This viewpoint is consistent with social comparison theory that suggests that individuals seek to compare themselves with others to affirm their own competence (Festinger, 1954; Suls & Wheeler, 2000; Klein, 1997) and therefore individuals prefer to compete with others. Our findings suggest that while individuals may prefer to compete with others, and indeed even might demonstrate increased performance, this may come at a cost to ethical behavior and practices. Taken to a workplace setting, unethical behavior in employees is costly to organizations (Ernst & Young, 2013).

**Limitations and Future Directions**

As with any research this study was not without limitations. First, the significant differences between participants that attended the experimental task and those that did not poses a potential limitation for the interpretation of the results from the experimental task. Given that participants that attended the lab study were significantly higher in Honesty-Humility and nearly significantly less trait performance approach oriented it suggests that there might have been some range attenuation in the lab study sample. This attenuation may have masked possible trait differences in cheating behaviors across the experimental groups. However, given that there were no significant trait differences across the participants in each of experimental conditions due to random allocation we can have faith in the results showing a significant increase in unethical behavior in the state performance approach condition. However, we should be cautious in suggesting that state goal orientation may be more important that trait goal orientation or personality variables in the prediction of unethical behavior.
Second, the participants were relatively young and mostly female as a group. Previous research has established that women are more likely to cheat on tasks than men and young people are more likely to engage in unethical behavior than older individuals (see Kish-Gephart et al., 2010 for review). It is possible that the skewed sample may have caused some range attenuation in cheating behavior, however, random allocation across the conditions means that this was unlikely to have affected the results pertaining to state goal orientation. Nonetheless, it would be important to replicate this study with a more diverse sample.

Third, the non-significant differences between the conditions on the manipulation check questions should be noted as a potential limitation. Although we found that the participants in the performance approach condition were significantly more likely to agree with the question measuring this orientation, we did not find this agreement for the mastery and performance avoid conditions. In hindsight the mastery approach manipulation check (i.e., “I didn’t really focus on how well I was doing relative to others, I focused on improving my own skills”) question was not ideal because it is double-barreled and contains elements of the performance orientation. It measures both the absence of a performance orientation as well as the presence of a mastery orientation. This question was adapted from Kozlowski and Bell (2006) however in future research this should be revised. It is possible that this confounded any significant differences between the conditions. Although we acknowledge that the issue of the non-significant differences between the conditions as a potential limitation, the response suggesting a high adherence to the given goals across the conditions suggests that the manipulations may have been effective. Additionally, the mean responses to the manipulation check questions were in the expected direction, consistent with the manipulations being effective.
Fourth, the laboratory setting allowed us to control for confounding variables such as the opportunity to behave unethically and contextual cues, however, it did come at the cost of a ‘real-life’ task with ‘real-life’ contextual factors. For example, while anonymity was assured, the laboratory setting may have altered an individual disposition towards or away from cheating. Individuals may have been less inclined to engage in cheating on the task because they were being observed. Alternatively, it is possible that participants were more likely to cheat because the relative costs of cheating were small or cheat less because the gains of cheating were also small. In a real world situation the cost and potential reward of behaving unethically would be substantially higher (e.g., imprisonment or being forced to leave the organization versus millions of dollars or a promotion within the organization). Based on these limitations, examining the role of state and trait goal orientation on unethical behavior in the workplace is a vital next step.

Finally, the pattern of results in Figure 3 showing the degree of unethical behavior across the state goal orientation conditions suggests that unethical behavior may not be due to the performance dimension of the performance orientations. Unethical behavior may not be a product of the normative comparison and focus on outcomes that is consistent across the performance approach and performance avoid orientations. Instead however it might be the combination of both a focus on performance goal and approach goals. This could be an important avenue for future research to determine whether approach goals increase unethical behavior and the combination of both approach and performance goals leads to increased unethical behavior.

**Conclusion**

Results suggest that an experimentally induced state performance approach goal orientation is associated with unethical behavior. These results support previous research suggesting that there might be a dark-side to the performance approach goal orientation
(Elliot & Moller, 2003; Louw et al., 2013, July; VandeWalle, 2001). By encouraging employees to compete at an intra- and inter-organizational level there may be an ultimate cost to organizations if employees engage in unethical behavior to shortcut the process of performance improvement. This study also reinforces the importance of considering the context and situation in the prediction of unethical behavior and suggests that state goal orientation might be an important consideration in future studies.
Overview and Goals for the Chapter

In Chapter 2 and 3 the relationships between trait goal orientations and non-task behaviors, such as SDRT, OCB and workplace deviance were explored. In the previous Chapter, the relationship between goal orientation and counterproductive workplace behaviors was again explored but extended the previous chapters by incorporating both state and trait goal orientation measures. In this Chapter, I build on these findings by incorporating the construct of team goal orientation into the established relationships between personality, OCB and workplace deviance. Extending on the studies reported in previous chapters, in this Chapter I take a multilevel approach to understanding the relationship between goal orientation and non-task performance, using employees in diverse workplaces.
The Moderating Role of Team Goal Orientation on the Relationship between Personality, Workplace Deviance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Louw, K.R.; Griffin, M.A.; Yeo, G.B.; Dunlop, P.D.

In recent years team goal orientation has emerged as a key predictor of team performance, team adaptation, team commitment and efficacy (Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2003; DeShon et al., 2004; LePine, 2005; Mehta et al., 2008; Porter, 2005). Team goal orientation refers to the shared perceptions of members within a team regarding the team’s motivation towards specific achievement goals (Dragoni, 2005; Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012; Mehta et al., 2008). The research focus on team goal orientation is driven in part by the reliance on work teams and the need to continually learn and adapt to stay relevant in the modern workplace (Appelbaum & Blatt; S. G. Cohen & Bailey, 1997). Mehta et al. (2008) distinguished between three team goal orientations: (1) mastery (or learning), characterized by team members focusing on learning and skill development; (2) performance approach (or prove) orientation, characterized by team members competing for recognition, financial incentives and rewards; (3) performance avoid orientation, characterized by a focus on avoiding mistakes and blame. In their recent paper, Mehta et al. (2008) found that team performance approach orientation, and no other team orientation, was positively associated with objective team performance. In this paper we investigate this finding in the context of individual non-task performance.

Despite the reliance of teams in the modern workplace, and the research interest in team goal orientation and task performance, no research to our knowledge has investigated the role that team goal orientation plays in the prediction of workplace behaviors that are not related to task performance. Non-task behaviors, specifically workplace deviance and
Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), are important components of supervisor’s ratings of job performance (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002) and have also been linked to organization-level performance (Dunlop & Lee, 2004). Furthermore, conceptual and empirical evidence has suggested that the antecedents of task-related behaviors differ to that of workplace deviance and OCB (Motowidlo et al., 1997; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Organ & Ryan, 1995b; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002).

The investigation into the relationship between team goal orientation and OCB and workplace deviance presents a possible avenue to advance the understanding of team performance. Although team performance approach has been shown to improve team performance (Mehta et al., 2008), recent research has demonstrated that at an individual trait level a performance approach orientation, and no other goal orientation, is associated with workplace deviance (Louw et al., 2013, July). In this paper we propose that gains in performance associated with a team performance approach orientation may be undermined by increases in workplace deviance. We also investigate the individual non-task behaviors associated with team mastery and performance avoid orientations with the goal of clarifying the relationships between these orientations and non-task behaviors, specifically OCB and workplace deviance. Finally, taking a person-situation perspective, we also attempt to further add to the extant literature by proposing and measuring whether team goal orientation is a moderator between established dispositional relationships and these behaviors.

**Team Goal Orientation**

Goal orientation was originally conceptualized as a disposition that shaped an individual’s interpretation and response to achievement situations (Ames, 1992; Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988). It was originally theorized as two
dimensions; mastery (also commonly referred to as ‘learning’) orientation and performance orientation (Button et al., 1996), however, more recent conceptualizations have supported at least three dimensions; mastery orientation, performance approach (also commonly referred to as ‘performance prove’), and performance avoid (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Vandewalle, 1997). Individuals with a strong mastery goal orientation are characterized by a desire to develop knowledge and skills in order to master a task (Elliot & Church, 1997). It is largely viewed as the most adaptive motivational orientation because it is associated with positive approach-oriented self-regulation strategies including effort, persistence after failure and task absorption (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). In contrast, the performance orientations, delineated into performance approach and performance avoid, are characterized by a focus on outcome and normative performance, where the approach orientation describes a focus on gaining favorable judgments of competence and outperforming others, and performance avoid, a focus on avoiding unfavorable judgments of competence and avoiding being the worst performer (Elliot & McGregor, 2001).

More recent refinements of the original goal orientation construct have provided evidence for a situational view that suggests that situational cues such as evaluative feedback (Butler, 1993), leadership (Ames & Archer, 1988), and goal content (Kozlowski & Bell, 2006) influence the type of goal orientation individuals adopt in a given situation. The malleability of dispositional goal orientation has given rise to the study of state goal orientation that is dynamic and contextually specific (see Payne et al., 2007; Van Yperen et al., in press). The type of orientation an individual adopts for a given task is influenced by both dispositional and situational influences (Archer, 1994; Chen et al., 2000; Kozlowski et al., 2001; Payne et al., 2007). Independent situational and dispositional influences have been
shown to affect the type of orientation activated, eliciting a different perception and response pattern to achievement situations (Archer, 1994; Chen et al., 2000; Kozlowski et al., 2001).

Moving beyond the individual-level, contextual cues also appear to influence the goal orientations of teams (Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2003; Dragoni, 2005). Through a combination of top-down and bottom-up effects state goal orientations are created within work groups and teams (Dragoni, 2005). Mehta et al. (2008) proposes that the psychological climate of the workplace, and teams within the workplace, inform the team goal orientation through leadership and other situational factors such as performance appraisals and organization systems and policies. For example, a psychological climate that emphasizes learning and skill development through organizational policies that reward innovation and creativity are likely to foster a team mastery goal orientation (Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2002). There is evidence that teams and work groups within organizations focus on different achievement goals. For example, some teams are focused on continual learning and the development of new skills by their members (Kozlowski & Hults, 1987), whereas others are more characterized by competition for recognition, financial incentives and rewards (Brown et al., 1998). Additionally, other work teams appear to be more focused on avoiding mistakes and protecting their reputation at an organization and individual level (Hofmann & Stetzer, 1998). The contextual cues within these environments are likely to shape team goal orientations of mastery, performance approach and performance avoid respectively. Despite earlier research focusing on just the distinction between team mastery orientation and team performance orientation, Mehta et al. (2008) showed that the three dimensions of goal orientation commonly used to describe individual dispositions (mastery, performance approach, performance avoid) were distinct dimensions at the team level. They reported that
team performance approach, and not team mastery orientation as hypothesized, resulted in
greater team performance. We propose that this improved performance may come at a cost in
the form of increased workplace deviance and there may be potential benefits to a team
mastery orientation beyond team task performance. We will briefly introduce the constructs
of workplace deviance and OCB and then outline the conceptual and empirical reasons
behind our proposed link between team goal orientation and non-task behaviors.

Workplace Deviance and Organizational Citizenship Performance

Rotundo and Sackett (2002) demonstrated that when measuring overall job
performance, supervisor ratings constituted of three relatively distinct groups of behaviors
(see also Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Specifically, these behaviors related to task
performance, citizenship, and counterproductive performance. Organizational citizenship
behavior and workplace deviance are often described as behaviors that contribute to an
individual’s non-task work performance (Sackett et al., 2006). Workplace deviance (strongly
related to counterproductive workplace behavior) is defined as “voluntary behavior of
organizational members that has the potential to cause harm to the organization or to those
within, and in doing so violates significant performance enhancing norms” (R. J. Bennett et
al., 2005, p. 111). R. J. Bennett and Robinson (2000) delineated the construct into
organizational workplace deviance (negative behavior that is directed towards the
organization) and interpersonal workplace deviance (behaviors directed towards colleagues
and members of the organization). Workplace deviance is a pervasive problem, with annual
cost estimates in the USA alone estimated to be between $6 billion and $200 billion (Vardi &
Weitz, 2004) and this figure is likely to be expanding (Ernst & Young, 2013). In contrast,
OCB is characterized by positive, proactive and prosocial behaviors that go beyond
behaviors associated with job tasks (Borman, 2004). In line with R. J. Bennett and Robinson (2000), Lee and Allen (2002) separated these behaviors into those directed towards individuals (interpersonal OCB) or the organization (organizational OCB). The costs of workplace deviance and benefits of OCB to organizations underpin the need to investigate the dispositional and contextual factors that predict these behaviors.

**Team Goal Orientation and Non-task Performance**

The relationship between team goal orientation and job performance is less formalized than the relationship between trait goal orientation and performance as the construct of team goal orientation has only emerged recently. Of the papers that have investigated the relationship between team goal orientation and job performance, team mastery orientation has generally been associated with positive outcomes with regards to performance (Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2003), however there have been notable exceptions to this relationship (Mehta et al., 2008; Porter, 2005). Mehta et al. (2008) were the first to use three factor model of goal orientation and differentiate between performance approach and performance avoid conditions in the prediction of team performance. They found that a team performance approach orientation was positively associated with team performance and no relationship between team performance avoid and team performance. These results suggest that a workplace climate that is characterized by competition for recognition, financial incentives and rewards, that fosters a team performance approach orientation, is associated with improved team performance. Competition with colleagues for rewards, status and even survival within an organization is a tool often used by managers to motivate employee performance (Churchill, Ford, & Walker, 1997; DuBois, 2012, January 25). Yet there has been considerable criticism of intra-organizational competition because of the relationship
between this workplace climate and unethical and counterproductive behavior (e.g., Kulik et al., 2008). We propose that even though a team performance approach orientation may be beneficial to team performance, individuals may be inclined to engage in workplace deviance to achieve these performance outcomes. Individuals in a team that is focused on competition and proving competence have several ways to achieve their goal. They could employ positive and adaptive self-regulation tactics such as, working harder, taking on additional training or seeking help from colleagues. Alternatively, an individual encouraged to view other team member as competitors, may be more inclined to seek less legitimate or ‘deviant' methods to achieve their goal. For example, the individual might undermine other team members to appear more competent or find ways to cheat the system to give the impression of improving performance. Adopting these deviant methods might lead to short term improvements in performance (either actual and/or fictitious) however there will be long-term costs to the organization. Beyond interpersonally deviant behaviors, a team performance approach orientation may cause individuals to engage in behaviors that are more directly harmful to the organization such as stealing from the organization or taking unsanctioned leave because individual performance is more salient than the overarching organizational goals. Further, a performance goal that stresses normative performance is likely to encourage an individualistic approach rather than collaborative prosocial mindset. For these reasons, we hypothesize:

H1: Team performance approach orientation will positively predict interpersonal and organizational workplace deviance.

A workplace that fosters a team performance avoid orientation is characterized by employees being focused on the preservation of their reputation, avoiding the admission of
mistakes and attempting to shift blame for any limitations (Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012). Individuals in a team with a performance avoid orientation are likely to feel greater pressure to perform to avoid threats to their personal reputation. They are also likely to view their colleagues as competitors rather than collaborators because they are focusing on avoiding being the worst performer. These internal beliefs are likely to see individuals within a team performance avoid orientation engage in the same deviant behaviors that individuals within a team with a performance approach orientation, not to achieve the best performance, but to avoid being the worst performer. Poortvliet et al. (2007) showed that individuals with a state performance orientation were less open than those with a state mastery orientation in their information giving when solving a problem, adopting what the authors termed “an exploitive orientation” (Poortvliet et al., 2007). This exploitive orientation was characterized by individuals taking more information than they were given and exhibiting individualistic rather than cooperative behaviors (Poortvliet et al., 2007). Indeed, Poortvliet et al. (2012) showed that in an information exchange context, performance goal oriented individuals, relative to individuals with mastery goals, actively provided less accurate information to partners while at the same time were more willing to actively thwart the task performance of their partner by playing intrusive white noise. Though the researchers did not separate performance approach goals from performance avoid goals in either study nor was it conducted at a team level, their results suggest that inducing a performance goal leads individuals to behave less collaboratively. For these reasons we hypothesized:

H2: Team performance avoid orientation will positively predict interpersonal and organizational workplace deviance.
Unlike the team performance orientation, a team mastery orientation is characterized by a team that emphasizes continual learning and the development of new skills by its members. Policies and reward structures reinforce learning and skill development rather than simply normative performance. In this workplace climate, fostering a team mastery orientation, team members are likely to be viewed as sources of collaboration to develop personal skills because skill development is valued over normative performance. It follows that individuals will be more likely to provide additional help to colleagues to aid them in achieving their personal and team goals because their goals are not in conflict with their own. They may help others who have been absent or willingly give their time to help others with work-related problems, behaviors best classified as interpersonal OCB. Indeed, beyond demonstrating citizenship behaviors to colleagues, a team mastery orientation is likely to also increase organization directed OCB. A team mastery orientation, which is created by a workplace climate focused on skill development, is likely to promote a perception that the organization is concerned with the long-term development of individuals. This perceived long-term investment in their employees may lead individuals to have a stronger commitment to their organization, and in turn, be more willing to go above and beyond for their organization. For these reasons we hypothesize:

H3: Team mastery orientation will positively predict interpersonal and organization directed OCB.

**Moderating Effect of Team Goal Orientation**

The person-situation interaction has been a permanent research focus in the personality and organizational psychology literature (Bowers, 1973; Buss, 1977; Schneider,
1983; Tett & Burnett, 2003). Indeed, in goal orientation research where it seems that individuals with the same trait goal orientation can behave consistently across situations (Dweck, 1986, 1992; Klein, Noe, & Wang, 2006) and that situations can cause different people to behave similarly (Dragoni, 2005; Van Yperen et al., in press; Yeo et al., 2008) it seems that the only way to gain a complete picture is to use an interactionist approach. The attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) model posits that individuals will select organizations that they perceive to hold similar values to themselves and likewise organizations will select individuals they perceive to hold similar values to that of the organization. Finally, when the person-organization fit is poor, employees will leave the organization (Schneider, 1983, 1987; Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995). Drawing upon this model, we hypothesize that:

**H4:** Self-rated trait goal orientation will be positively related to both self-rated perception of the team goal orientation as well as team-rated team goal orientation.

Personality traits, over cognitive abilities and other dispositional variables, are arguably larger predictors of OCB and workplace deviance than behaviors associated with task performance (Borman et al., 2001; Motowildo et al., 1997; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Salgado, 2002). Using the Big 5 personality model (Digman, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1987), researchers have demonstrated that Conscientiousness is the strongest predictor of OCB (Borman et al., 2001; Organ & Ryan, 1995b). In contrast, there is an inverse relationship between Conscientiousness and Agreeableness and workplace deviance (Colbert et al., 2004). New lexical studies in multiple languages, however, have revealed that personality may be best described by six factors, not five, called the HEXACO model of personality (Ashton & Lee, 2001). The major change from the five factor model of personality is the addition of the sixth factor, Honesty-Humility. Individuals scoring low in the Honesty-Humility factor tend to be more manipulative, self-entitled, materialistic and exploitive.
Analysis using the six factor model of personality has revealed that (low) Honesty-Humility is a very strong predictor of workplace deviance, greater than any other personality trait (Lee et al., 2005).

Taking a person-environment interaction approach, we propose that there may be an interplay between the individual differences in Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility and team goal orientation in prediction of OCB and workplace deviance, respectively. Drawing upon Tett and Burnett’s (2003) theory of trait activation, we propose that team goal orientation moderates the relationship between these personality characteristics, dispositional goal orientations and non-task behaviors. The principle of trait activation suggests that personality traits are expressed in response to trait-relevant situation cues (Tett & Guterman, 2000). In a work context with a team performance orientation, either approach or avoid, normative performance is stressed and perceived competence is tied to performance outcomes. Individuals with low Honesty-Humility, who tend to be manipulative, self-entitled, materialistic and exploitative, are likely to see opportunities to get ahead that others may not. They are less likely to feel that the rules apply to them because they tend to feel entitled to special treatment. Additionally, low Honesty-Humility individuals tend to be more materialistic and desire lavish wealth so financial rewards for normative performance may be more of an incentive than it is to those low in the trait. Based on this, individuals with trait low Honesty-Humility are arguably more likely than those high in the trait to choose ‘deviant’ methods, over more legitimate methods, to achieve superior performance when performance goals have been stressed by team members and the organization more broadly. That is to say that an organizational climate that fosters a team performance (either approach
or avoid) orientation as well as team members holding a performance orientation activates the Honesty-Humility trait. Based on this, we hypothesize:

H5: Team performance approach orientation will moderate the relationship between Honesty-Humility and workplace deviance (interpersonal and organizational), controlling for dispositional goal orientation and team mastery and performance avoid orientations, such that when Honesty-Humility is low and team performance approach orientation is high there will be greater workplace deviance.

H6: Team performance avoid orientation will moderate the relationship between Honesty-Humility and workplace deviance (interpersonal and organizational), controlling for dispositional goal orientation and team mastery and performance approach orientations, such that when Honesty-Humility is low and team performance avoid orientation is high there will be greater workplace deviance.

Research has established that OCB is predicted by the personality trait Conscientiousness (Organ & Ryan, 1995b). We argue that in a similar vein to workplace deviance, a team mastery orientation activates latent Conscientious traits. Individuals high in Conscientiousness tend to be organized, work in a disciplined way towards their goals, strive for accuracy and perfection and are careful in decision making. In a situation where learning, skill development and collaboration with colleagues are emphasized, colleagues may be viewed as a resource to achieve personal development goals. Individuals high in Conscientiousness are likely to more readily access these “resources” and in doing so be more willing to help their colleagues, demonstrating interpersonally directed OCBs. Further, individuals high in Conscientiousness are also more likely to take up opportunities to develop their skills by seeing opportunities outside of their task roles to develop their skills, such as attending non-compulsory work functions and keeping abreast of developments in their field. In this way, a team mastery orientation activates latent Conscientious traits to increase both interpersonal and organizational OCB. Based on this, we hypothesize:
H7: Team mastery orientation will moderate the relationship between Conscientiousness and OCB (interpersonal and organizational), controlling for dispositional goal orientation and team performance orientations, such that when Conscientiousness is high and team mastery orientation is high individuals will demonstrate greater OCB.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited through industry mailing lists and alumni and postgraduate mailing lists from three Western Australian universities. Details of the experiment were also advertised online via the Australian Psychological Society. Eligible participants were required to be employed at a fixed workplace and must have at least three co-workers they work with on a daily basis. A total of sample ($n=287$) of participants ($n=74$) and team-members ($n=215$) were involved in the research. The participants, ($n=74$; 67% female, Median Age = 27, Range 17-62) were employed on a full-time (43.2%), part-time (28.4%), casual (27.0%) or freelance basis (1.4%). Participants that did not have a fixed employment team or organizational climate (i.e., short contract employees) were screened out prior to participation. Most participants were employed in mid-level (58.1%) and entry-level positions (37.8%) within their organization, with 2.7% responding that they were in a senior management position. Mean tenure within their current organization was 2.87 years with the median tenure of 2 years. Employment sector was varied with the greatest participants employed in Retail and Consumer Products (18.9%), followed by Information and Communication Technology (14.9%), Education and Training (10.8%) and Consulting/Strategy (9.8%). The team members of several participants ($n=15$) did not complete the peer component of the experiment leaving a sample of 59 with complete data of
both participants and team members. These participants were left in analyses that used only self-rated data to preserve sample size. Analyses were conducted with and without these participants and the significance of analyses did not change and there did not appear to be systematic demographic differences in participants with incomplete team-rated information.

**Participant Teams**

After participants were recruited, participants nominated team-members that they worked with daily and may be able to participate. Team members were classified as any employee that worked within the same organization at the same workplace. We did not restrict the team members to employees in the same role as the participant (i.e. an administration assistant could be classified as a team member of a consultant). Peers, supervisors and subordinates of the participant were accepted. Together the sample of team members was 215 (Median Age = 27.0 years; 67% female). Mean tenure with the current organization was 4.43 years and most classified themselves as mid-level (46.5%) within the organization, followed by entry-level (36.7%) and senior management (11.6%). Team members varied on the basis of their employment with most classifying their employment as full-time (49.3%), followed by part-time (29.3%) and casual (36.7%). On average there were 3 team members rating the team goal orientation of each team.

**Measures**

Participants and team members completed the measures online and were provided with unique codes to ensure anonymity.
**Trait Goal Orientation**

Trait goal orientation was measured using the 12-item Goal orientation for the Work Domain instrument (Vandewalle, 1997) on a five-point Likert scale (*Strongly Agree*-*Strongly Disagree*). The instrument measures three goal orientations: mastery ($\alpha = .89$), performance (prove) approach ($\alpha = .85$), performance avoid ($\alpha = .88$).

**Personality Traits**

The 10 corresponding Honesty-Humility and 10 corresponding Conscientiousness items from the 60-item self-version of the HEXACO-PI-R (Ashton & Lee, 2009) were used to measure the Honesty-Humility personality ($\alpha = .79$) and Conscientiousness ($\alpha = .78$). Participants were asked to rate their agreement with statements about their personality on a 5-point Likert scale ($5 = strongly agree; 1 = strongly disagree$).

**Workplace Deviance**

Workplace deviance was assessed using the two scales of the R. J. Bennett and Robinson (2000) measure; the 12-item scale of organizational deviance (deviant behaviors directly harmful to the organization; $\alpha = .88$) and the 7-item scale of interpersonal deviance (deviant behaviors directly harmful to other individuals within the organization; $\alpha = .87$). Participants rated the frequency of their workplace behaviors on a 7-point scale ($1 = never; 7 = daily$).

**Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

OCB was measured using the eight items of the organizationally-targeted OCB ($\alpha = .88$) and the eight items of interpersonally-targeted OCB ($\alpha = .81$) from the measure adapted
by Lee and Allen (2002). Participants rated the frequency of their workplace behaviors on a 7-point scale (1 = never; 7 = daily).

Team Goal Orientation

In line with previous research measuring team goal orientation (e.g., Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2003; Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012; Mehta et al., 2008), team goal orientation was measured using a 13-item scale adapted from the goal orientation for the Work Domain instrument (VandeWalle, 1997). Five items assessed mastery orientation (α=.89), four items measured the team performance (prove) approach orientation (α = .85) and four items measured team performance avoid orientation (α = .88). Employees were asked to indicate their agreement with four statements along a 5-point Likert-type scale (5 = strongly agree; 1 = strongly disagree). In line with previous research (e.g., Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012; Mehta et al., 2008) scores from team-members were aggregated to give composite scores of team-rated team goal orientation. A sample mastery item was “My team/department likes challenging and difficult assignments that teach new things”. ICCs for the mastery scale were ICC(1) =0.35 and ICC(2) =.61. A sample team performance approach orientation was “The employees in my department/team prefer to work on tasks where they can prove their ability to others”. ICCs for the performance approach scale were ICC(1) =0.32 and ICC(2) =.57. Finally, a sample team performance avoid item was “This team prefers to avoid situations where it might perform poorly”. ICCs for the performance avoid scale were ICC(1) =0.25 and ICC(2) =.50. Both participants and team members of the participants completed these items to give self-rated team goal orientation and team-rated team goal orientation.
Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 6 presents descriptive statistics and correlations between workplace deviance, OCB, personality traits, trait goal orientations and team-rated and self-rated team goal orientation. Replicating established trends in the literature, there was a strong correlation between interpersonal and organizational OCB and interpersonal and organizational workplace deviance (R. J. Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Lee & Allen, 2002; S. L. Robinson & Bennett, 1995) and Honesty-Humility was negatively associated with both forms of deviance (Lee et al., 2005). Both trait performance approach and performance avoid goal orientations were positively associated with interpersonal and organizational workplace deviance whereas trait mastery orientation approached significance in the opposite direction and was positively associated with Honesty-Humility. Both team-rated and self-rated team performance approach and performance avoid were positively associated with both forms of workplace deviance, consistent with H1 and H2. Results failed to support H3 as team mastery orientation was not associated with OCB as hypothesized. However, team mastery did negatively predict workplace deviance. In H4, drawing upon the ASA model we posited that individual trait goal orientation would align with team goal orientation. Results largely supported this hypothesis as trait performance approach goal orientation was significantly correlated with team-rated and self-rated team performance approach orientation and trait mastery was significantly related to team mastery orientation using both team-member ratings and participant ratings. Trait performance avoid, however, was only related to the participant’s perception of team performance avoid orientation and not to team member’s ratings of team performance avoid orientation.

| Name                             | Mean  | SD    | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20  | 21  | 22  | 23  |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Age                              | 28.36 | 10.25 | -   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Gender                           | -     | -     | -19 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Tenure                           | 2.87  | 3.86  | .45 | .23 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| HH                               | 3.32  | 0.71  | -11 | .33 | .33 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Co                               | 3.60  | 0.55  | .15 | -.01| -.01| .45 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| WDI                              | 2.14  | 1.21  | .14 | -.13| -.13| -.55| -.06|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| WDBO                             | 2.51  | 1.16  | .11 | -.23| -.23| -.56| -.08| .77  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| OCBI                             | 4.73  | 1.18  | -.15| .08 | .08 | .16 | .18 | .07 | .14 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| OCBO                             | 4.36  | 1.22  | -.02| .10 | .10 | .31 | .20 | .04 | .13 | .68  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Trait PAp                        | 3.47  | 0.74  | -.01| -.23| -.23| -.47| -.17| .29  | .29 | .09  | -.06|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Trait Pav                        | 2.96  | 0.87  | -.16| -.10| -.10| -.48| -.24| .34  | .32 | .16  | .05 | .53  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Trait Mastery                    | 3.87  | 0.58  | .13 | .07 | .07 | .33 | .15 | -.17| -.12| .27  | .34 | -.10| -.31 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Team-rated team PAp              | 3.42  | 0.53  | .06 | -.16| -.16| -.45| -.12| .39  | .34 | -.09 | -.14| .30  | .26  | .23  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Self-rated team PAp              | 3.44  | 0.65  | .14 | -.19| -.19| -.42| -.08| .33  | .29 | -.10| -.09| .40  | .19  | .00  | .26  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Team-rated team Pav              | 2.91  | 0.59  | .06 | -.14| -.14| -.46| -.13| .40  | .43 | .06  | -.08| .39  | .25  | -.23| .65  | .39  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Self-rated team Pav              | 3.09  | 0.76  | .13 | -.26| -.26| -.35| -.06| .26  | .30 | .04  | -.02| .31  | .49  | -.07| .27  | .22  | .33  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Team-rated team Mastery          | 3.46  | 0.54  | .07 | .12 | .12 | .29 | -.13| -.29 | -.26| -.11 | .13 | -.43| -.31 | .34  | -.06| -.30| -.37| -.26  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Self-rated team Mastery          | 3.40  | 0.74  | .14 | .07 | .07 | .28 | .02 | -.26| -.17| -.06 | .09 | -.23| -.35 | .41  | -.41| .21 | -.39| -.47| .44  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| T-R HH*Team PAP                  | -0.46 | 1.58  | .39 | .29 | .29 | .53 | .08 | -.64| -.54| .38  | .32 | -.33| -.20 | .25  | -.52| -.45| -.35| -.25| .23  | .27  |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| S-R HH*Team PAP                  | -0.42 | 1.51  | .37 | .31 | .31 | .42 | .06 | -.42| -.43| .19  | .10 | -.31| -.30 | .14  | -.44| -.28| -.33| -.26| .15  | .20  | .78  |     |     |     |     |     |
| T-R HH*Team PAV                  | -0.47 | 1.41  | .38 | .39 | .39 | .51 | -.01| -.61| -.62| .29  | .25 | -.28| -.28 | .20  | -.39| -.37| -.37| -.30| .08  | .10  | .81  | .80  |     |     |     |     |
| S-R HH*Team PAV                  | -0.35 | 1.30  | -.27| .13 | .13 | .03 | -.26| -.31| -.26| .23  | .12 | -.06| .15  | .13  | -.31| -.30| -.33| .09  | .12  | -.11| .56  | .42  | .57  |     |     |     |
| T-R Co*Team Mastery              | -.13  | 1.07  | .16 | -.06| -.06| .10 | .31 | .13 | .21 | .13  | .15 | -.13| .06  | .06  | -.02| -.03| -.15| .08  | .04  | .12 | -.29| -.32| -.32| -.12|     |
| S-R Co*Team Mastery              | 0.02  | 1.00  | .11 | .04 | .04 | .15 | .13 | .13 | .11 | .03  | .06 | -.22| -.05 | .16  | -.11| -.02| -.17| .13  | .07  | -.31| -.10| -.30| -.45| .42  |     |

*Note. Co*= Conscientiousness; HH= Honesty-Humility; WDI= Interpersonal workplace deviance; WDO= Organizational workplace deviance; OCBI= Interpersonal Organizational Citizenship Behavior; OCBO=Organization directed Organization Citizenship Behavior; PAp=Performance approach; PAv= Performance avoid; T-R=team-rated; S-R=self-rated. Self-rated variables n=72, Team-rated variables and product terms including team rated variables n=58 All significant correlations are bolded, r ≥ .26 = p < .05; r ≥ .31 = p < .01.*
Data Analyses

To explore the main effects and interaction effects of trait personality (Honesty-Humility or Conscientiousness) and team goal orientation (team-rated and self-rated, performance approach, performance avoid, mastery) on workplace deviance, moderated hierarchical regressions were conducted. Prior to conducting the analyses, the interaction terms were developed by creating product terms from the standardized main effects (i.e., Honesty-Humility, Conscientiousness, self-rated team goal orientation, team-rated team goal orientation). In the first step of the analysis the control variables of trait goal orientation and team goal orientation except the moderator team goal orientation were entered into the model. For analyses measuring team-rated team orientation as a main effect and moderator, team-rated team orientations were entered as control variables whereas self-rated team orientations were entered as a control for analyses using self-rated team orientation. Following control variables, the standardized main effects were entered in step 2 (specified team goal orientation and personality trait) followed by the interaction term at step 3.

Moderated Hierarchical Regression Team Performance Approach Orientation

Trait measures of mastery, performance approach, performance avoid goal orientation and team mastery and performance avoid were entered in at Step 1, explaining 16% of the variance in interpersonal workplace deviance using self-rated team performance approach orientation, and 24% of the variance using team-rated team performance approach orientation. This increased significantly after including Honesty-Humility and team performance approach orientation in Step 2 using both self-rated ($F_{change} = 9.88, p < .01$, $p < .01$)

---

4 Note. The differences between the analysis using self-rated and team rated team goal orientation at Step 1 are present as missing values in team data were deleted using the listwise method.
\( \Delta R^2 = .20 \) and team-rated team goal orientation \((F_{change} = 9.45, p < .01, \Delta R^2 = .21)\), though this was largely due to the inclusion of the Honesty-Humility as team performance approach orientation was not a significant predictor in either analysis, failing to support H1. The inclusion of the interaction term in Step 3, resulted in a significant increase in variance accounted for in interpersonal workplace deviance using the team-rated team performance approach \((F_{change} = 13.26, p < .01, \Delta R^2 = .12)\). The final model using team-rated performance climate accounted for 57% of the variance in interpersonal workplace deviance and there was a significant interaction of Honesty-Humility and team-rated team performance approach orientation \((\beta = -.46, t = -3.64, p < .001)\), supporting H5. There was also a significant main effect of dispositional Honesty-Humility \((\beta = -.39, t = -2.88, p < .01)\). This pattern of results was mirrored in the analysis using self-rated team performance approach goal orientation. The interaction between Honesty-Humility and self-rated performance approach climate approached significance \((\beta = -.20, t = -1.77, p = .08)\) and the main effect of dispositional Honesty-Humility was significant \((\beta = -.38, t = -2.80, p < .01); \) see Figure 1). The final model explained 39% of the variance interpersonal deviance though this was not quite a significant change from Step 2 \((F_{change} = 3.15, p = .08, \Delta R^2 = .03); \) see Table 7).

Similar to the results pertaining to interpersonal workplace deviance, there was no main effect of team performance approach orientation on organizational workplace deviance, failing to support H1. However, there was a significant interaction between Honesty-Humility and team performance approach orientation, replicated using both team-rated \((\beta = -.35, t = -2.67, p < .05)\) and self-rated \((\beta = -.23, t = -2.02, p < .05)\) team performance approach orientation. Results supported H5 as team performance approach goal orientation (both self- and team-rated) significantly moderated the relationship between Honesty-Humility and
interpersonal workplace deviance, such that as Honesty-Humility is reduced and team performance approach orientation increases, workplace deviance increases (see Figure 4). Overall, the model explained 37% of the variance in organizational deviance using self-ratings of team performance approach orientation and 53% using team member ratings (see Table 7).

**Moderated Hierarchical Regression Team Performance Avoid Orientation**

Data analyses were replicated using team performance avoid climate and the results largely mirrored the results using a team performance approach orientation. Team performance avoid did not predict either interpersonal or organizational deviance after controlling for trait goal orientation and team performance approach and mastery orientations, failing to support H2. However, providing support for H6, there was a significant interaction between Honesty-Humility and team performance avoid climate in the prediction of both interpersonal and organizational deviance. Results supported H6 as team performance avoid goal orientation significantly moderated the relationship between Honesty-Humility and interpersonal and organizational workplace deviance, such that as Honesty-Humility is reduced and team performance avoid orientation increases, workplace deviance increases. Demonstrating a robust finding, these results were replicated across team-ratings of team orientation and self-ratings (see Figure 5). Overall, the models explained 55% and 45% in interpersonally directed workplace deviance and 50% and 41% of organizational workplace deviance, using team-ratings and self-ratings respectively (see Table 8).
Moderated Hierarchical Regression Team Mastery Orientation

Finally, the analyses were conducting using Conscientiousness and team mastery orientation. Trait measures of goal orientation appeared to be the more robust predictors of both interpersonal and organizational OCB as no team orientations predicted OCB, despite our hypothesis that team mastery orientation would positively predict OCB in H3. Also failing to support H7, there was no significant interaction between Conscientiousness and team mastery orientation (see Table 9).
### Table 7. Hierarchical moderated regression of team performance approach predicting Interpersonal and Organizational directed Workplace Deviance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Mastery</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait PAp</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait PAv</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Mastery</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team PAv</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPAp</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH*TPAp</td>
<td>-.20+</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F values</td>
<td>2.49*</td>
<td>6.34**</td>
<td>6.12**</td>
<td>3.35*</td>
<td>5.87**</td>
<td>8.05**</td>
<td>3.16*</td>
<td>6.35**</td>
<td>6.31**</td>
<td>2.99*</td>
<td>7.89**</td>
<td>8.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in R²</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Change</td>
<td>9.88**</td>
<td>3.15+</td>
<td>9.45**</td>
<td>13.26*</td>
<td>8.77**</td>
<td>4.08*</td>
<td>9.99**</td>
<td>7.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: **p < .01; *p < .05. n = 59 for analyses with team ratings of team goal orientation; n = 71 for self-rated team goal orientation PAp= Performance approach; PAv= Performance avoid; HH= Honesty-Humility; TPAv=Team Performance avoid. Unless otherwise stated, figures in cells are beta coefficients.
Figure 4. Moderation of Team Performance Approach Orientation on Honesty-Humility and Workplace Deviance.
Table 8. Hierarchical moderated regression of team performance avoid predicting Interpersonal and Organizational directed Workplace Deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable = Workplace Deviance</strong></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></td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Reported Team Performance Avoid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team-Report Team Performance Avoid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Reported Team Performance Avoid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team-Report Team Performance Avoid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Mastery</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait PAp</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait PAv</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Mastery</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team PAp</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></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>HH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-43**</td>
<td>-45**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>-62**</td>
<td>-46**</td>
<td>-46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeamPAv</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></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>HH*TPAv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-34**</td>
<td>-39**</td>
<td>-30**</td>
<td>-30**</td>
<td>-30**</td>
<td>-30**</td>
<td>-40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F values</strong></td>
<td>4.45*</td>
<td>5.08*</td>
<td>6.47*</td>
<td>3.75*</td>
<td>5.87*</td>
<td>7.57*</td>
<td>2.83*</td>
<td>4.53*</td>
<td>5.40*</td>
<td>2.72*</td>
<td>7.89*</td>
<td>8.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in R²</strong></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F Change</strong></td>
<td>5.22*</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>8.46*</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>7.41*</td>
<td>8.04*</td>
<td>6.07*</td>
<td>8.05**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **p < .01; *p < .05. n = 59 for analyses with team ratings of team goal orientation; n = 71 for self-rated team goal orientation. PAp= Performance approach; PAv= Performance avoid; HH= Honesty-Humility; TPAv=Team Performance avoid. Unless otherwise stated, figures in cells are beta coefficients.
Figure 5. Moderation of Team Performance Avoid on Honesty-Humility and Workplace Deviance.
Table 9. Hierarchical moderated regression of team mastery predicting Interpersonal and Organizational directed OCB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Self-Reported Team Mastery Orientation</th>
<th>Team-Report Team Mastery Orientation</th>
<th>Self-Reported Team Mastery Orientation</th>
<th>Team-Report Team Mastery Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Mastery</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait PAp</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait PAv</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team PAp</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team PAv</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Mastery</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consc*TMa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F values</td>
<td>2.61*</td>
<td>2.53*</td>
<td>2.23*</td>
<td>2.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in R²</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Change</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** p < .01; * p < .05. n = 59 for analyses with team ratings of team goal orientation; n = 71 for self-rated team goal orientation. PAp= Performance approach; PAv= Performance avoid; Consc=Conscientiousness; TMa= Team mastery orientation. Unless otherwise stated, figures in cells are beta coefficients.
Discussion

The aim of this paper was to investigate the relationship between team goal orientations (mastery, performance approach, performance avoid) and non-task work performance, specifically workplace deviance and OCB. We hypothesized that team performance approach and avoid goal orientations would positively predict workplace deviance and a team mastery orientation would positively predict OCB. Further, drawing from trait activation theory, we predicted that team performance, approach and avoid, orientations would moderate the established relationship between Honesty-Humility and workplace deviance. And, that a team mastery goal orientation would significantly moderate the relationship between Conscientiousness and OCB. Finally, we also hypothesized that an individual’s trait goal orientation would be positively related to the team-rated and self-rated team goal orientation, in line with the A-S-A framework.

Support for these hypotheses was mixed and will be discussed below.

Team Goal Orientation and Non-task Behaviors

Consistent with our hypotheses, both team performance approach and team performance avoid orientations were associated with workplace deviance. However, both team performance orientations did not predict workplace deviance after controlling for individual differences in trait goal orientation and Honesty-Humility. Furthermore, though we hypothesized that a team mastery orientation would positively predict OCB, there was no relationship between team mastery orientation and OCB. However, there was a negative relationship between team mastery orientation and workplace deviance. Overall this suggests that while there is a relationship between team goal orientation and workplace deviance this does provide a unique contribution to the prediction of workplace deviance over individual trait goal orientation.
Moderating Role of Team Performance Goal Orientation

In line with our hypotheses, the results suggested that a team performance orientation, either approach or avoid, interacts with an individual’s disposition towards honesty and humility, such that when individuals with low Honesty-Humility are in teams with a high performance orientation they tend to commit more interpersonally and organizationally deviant behaviors. This hypothesized relationship is in line with trait activation theory that posits that dispositional traits might be activated by environmental and contextual cues (Tett & Burnett, 2003; Tett & Guterman, 2000). Our contention is that a team performance orientation forces employees to view their colleagues as competitors whilst also stressing that performance outcomes are more important than skills developed in the process. For individuals low in Honesty-Humility, these contextual cues are likely to activate this trait to behave in a less honest or ‘deviant’ ways to achieve the specified normative outcomes. Though team performance may be improved by fostering a team performance approach orientation (Mehta et al., 2008), employees may achieve this elevated performance by engaging in behaviors that are ultimately counterproductive to their own development as well as to the organization. It is important to stress that the contribution of workplace deviance to an organization’s bottom line is not trivial (Vardi & Weitz, 2004), therefore short term gains in team performance may be met with long term losses to the organization.

Moderating Role of Team Mastery Orientation

Though we hypothesized a positive relationship between a team mastery orientation and OCB, there was no observable relationship between these constructs. Individual trait mastery goal orientation was most associated with OCB replicating previous research (Louw et al., 2013, July). Taken together this suggests that while the construct of goal orientation may provide a useful framework for investigating OCB at
the trait individual level it does not appear to transfer to the team level. One explanation for this is that the construct of OCB does not tap into the proactive learning behaviors that a team mastery orientation fosters. It may be that a team performance orientation may actually encourage employees to demonstrate OCB, not because they are intrinsically motivated to do so, but because OCBs may be externally rewarded. Rewards for OCB may be official through financial incentives or unofficial by garnering favor with managers and supervisors and thus the relationship between team goal orientation and OCB is more fluid that it appears to be with workplace deviance. It may be more fruitful to investigate the relationship between team mastery orientation and team innovation or proactive learning behaviors.

**Trait and Team Goal Orientation**

As hypothesized, we found significant positive relationships between an individual’s trait goal orientation and team-rated team goal orientation. There was also a significant positive relationship between trait goal orientation and self-rated team goal orientation. The results suggest that the ASA model might hold for motivational orientation. For example, individuals who are trait performance approach oriented may be attracted to workplaces that foster a team performance approach orientation. Additionally, an individual that demonstrates that they are motivated in similar ways to teams within the organization may be more likely to be recruited to the organizations and those that have different motivational styles to their teams may leave the organization. Alternatively, it is possible that over time the dissonance between trait goal orientation and team goal orientation is reduced. Future research that takes a dynamic multi-level approach is required to unravel this relationship further. Specifically, this would require longitudinal research that measures an employee’s assimilation into a new organization.
Theoretical and Practical Implications

Our findings have several implications for research and practice. Our results suggest that even though a team performance approach orientation has been shown to positively predict team performance, this team orientation is also associated with workplace deviance. This adds to the understanding of how motivation at a team level influences individual behavior. It also extends the findings of Mehta et al. (2008) by demonstrating that a team performance approach goal orientation may have a dark-side, influencing team members to engage in workplace deviance.

In addition, our results suggest that individual differences in Honesty-Humility may be more important in organizations where performance goals are stressed. From a practical perspective, practitioners may want to consider the team goal orientation of teams engaging in activities where workplace deviance may be especially harmful, such as safety critical workplaces or when teams have a high degree of autonomy. Alternatively, if a team performance orientation is stressed it may be more important to assess individual differences in Honesty-Humility amongst team members. The negative relationship between team mastery orientation and workplace deviance suggest that an organizational climate that promotes a team mastery orientation may be a potential buffer of workplace deviance but this requires further investigation. This may ultimately be a beneficial approach as a team mastery orientation has also been associated with improved team performance, at least in some research papers (e.g., Bunderson & Sutcliffe, 2003).

Limitations and Future Directions

One possible limitation of the research design was that participants were given the opportunity to select the team members that participated in the research. Though we stressed that a team member needed to work with the participant on a daily basis we had no way of ensuring that this was this case. The relatively large agreement across team
members and participants, however, suggests that this might not have affected our data. Secondly, the sample of participants with complete data was relatively small (n = 59), however, the use of team members increased the overall sample size (n = 215).

In addition, the use of self-rated dependent variables (i.e., OCB and workplace deviance) may also be a limitation of the research. Though anonymity was assured, it is possible that participants may not have accurately reported their work behaviors. We did also capture team member ratings of OCB however this resulted in no change to the data reported above. The concern over self-report measures with regards to workplace deviance may be unwarranted because arguably team or peer-ratings of workplace deviance may be less accurate than self-ratings because the behaviors are largely intended to be secret. Ones et al. (1993) supported this notion in their meta-analysis of integrity measures as they found that self-report measures of deviant behaviors tended to result in higher estimates of validity than external measures. For this reason, we believe that the use of a self-report measure of workplace deviance is appropriate for this research. To build on the current research, a potentially enlightening avenue would be to include objective measures of team performance as well as measures of individual workplace deviance and OCB. This would allow for a direct investigation of whether gains in team performance come at the cost of increased individual level deviance.

Our research findings are strengthened by the research design that incorporates both self-perceptions of the team orientation as well as team-member ratings and takes into account individual’s trait goal orientation, as suggested by Mehta et al. (2008). However, it would also be important to consider the potential moderator of task difficulty and time-frame. Complex tasks may require more skill development to perform well. Mastery orientation requires a long term-perspective and takes a considerable amount of time to evolve (Yeo & Neal, 2004). The cross sectional approach taken in this paper may
not have adequately measured this relationship. Additionally, it may be fruitful to investigate the role of leader goal orientation in the relationship between team goal orientation and workplace deviance as well as OCB, as there appears to be a demonstrable interplay between team and leader goal orientation on team performance (Dragoni, 2005; Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012).

Conclusion

This is the first study, to our knowledge, to measure the relationship between team goal orientation and individual non-task behaviors. Additionally, the research findings are very generalizable as they are based on a diverse sample of teams encompassing different industries and organizational structures. We found evidence that team performance goal orientations (both approach and avoid) are associated with workplace deviance and they interact with dispositional traits to increase these negative behaviors. This also the first study, that we are aware of, to incorporate trait individual goal orientations as well as team goal orientations in the model of workplace behavior. With these results, we extend the current research on goal orientation, non-task behaviors and person-situation interaction in the organizational literature.
CHAPTER 6: GENERAL DISCUSSION

Overview and Goals for the Chapter

In this final Chapter, the four empirical studies presented in this thesis will be discussed in the context of the extant literature. This chapter will begin with a brief overview of the four studies and review the empirical findings of each, followed by a discussion drawing together the results. I will then move to a discussion of the themes presented in thesis, applications to applied settings, general limitations and final conclusions.

Chapter Overview

There were three overarching research aims addressed in this thesis. First, despite a strong empirical focus on the relationships between goal orientation and job performance and task performance, no research to our knowledge had evaluated the relationship between goal orientation and the two other distinct components of job performance – workplace deviance and OCB. The lack of research addressing the non-task performance components of job performance hinders the progress of research on the relationship between goal orientation and job performance because the three identified components of job performance were conflated in previous literature.

Second, to the best of our knowledge no empirical study had investigated whether adopting a performance approach goal orientation leads to behaviors such as status-driven risk taking and unethical behavior that are ultimately counterproductive to the organization.
The lack of previous research in this area was particularly surprising given that intra-organization (Kulik et al., 2008) and inter-organization competition has garnered criticism for encouraging unethical behavior (V. M. Bennett et al., 2013; Cai et al., 2005), as well as more specifically the performance approach goal orientation (e.g. VandeWalle, 2001). The importance of understanding whether performance approach goal orientation has a ‘dark-side’ is essential because a number of studies have posited a positive association between performance approach and overall performance (e.g. Mehta et al., 2008; Murayama & Elliot, 2012). These papers have not adequately addressed the possibility that a performance approach orientation leads to the perception of temporary gains in performance because individuals with a performance approach orientation have a greater willingness to engage in ‘dark-side’ behaviors that are ultimately counterproductive to organizations.

Finally, previous research has established that trait goal orientation can be manipulated by contextual cues (e.g. Bell & Kozlowski, 2002; Payne et al., 2007; Van Yperen et al., in press; Yeo & Neal, 2008; Yeo et al., 2008) and that the shared perception of goal orientation within teams and work units can be shaped by external cues such as leaders (Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012) and leader-member exchange (Dragoni, 2005). This thesis brought this previous research together in an attempt to develop a multi-level model of individual dispositions of personality and goal orientation as well as group level team goal orientation to examine non-task work performance. In Chapter 1, I introduced the organizing framework of the studies presented in this thesis to address these research questions. It is presented again below to guide the overview of the studies and findings of the four studies presented in Chapters 2-5 (see Figure 6).
Figure 6. Framework of research presented in this thesis
Thesis Chapter Review

In Chapter 2, the construct of status-driven risk taking (SDRT) was introduced to describe workplace risk-taking motivated by a desire to improve status. The relationship between goal orientation and SDRT over established personality traits was investigated. Results showed that both trait performance approach orientation and performance avoid orientation predicted SDRT over Conscientiousness and Neuroticism, with performance approach orientation being the strongest predictor of these risk-taking behaviors.

In Chapter 3, the findings in the previous chapter were built upon by investigating the ‘dark-side’ of trait performance approach orientation and ‘bright-side’ of trait mastery approach orientation by exploring the differential predictions of workplace deviance and OCB by these approach orientations and the HEXACO personality traits. The results from this study showed that trait performance approach goal orientation, and no other goal orientation, was associated with low Honesty-Humility, a relationship that was supported with both self and peer ratings of personality. Further, trait performance approach goal orientation was associated with workplace deviance, underscoring the potential dark-side of this goal orientation. In contrast, trait mastery approach orientation was associated with OCB and predicted this behavior over the six HEXACO personality traits and other goal orientations.

After investigating the relationships between trait goal orientation and non-task behaviors, in Chapter 4 and 5 a person-situation approach was taken to investigate the relationship between both state and trait goal orientations and non-task work behaviors. In Chapter 4, an experimental approach was used to investigate the relationships between state and trait goal orientation and unethical behavior by manipulating instructions given to participants before they had the opportunity to cheat on an anagram task. Results showed that even slight manipulations to the goal frame and goal content in the
instructions led to significant differences in the amount of cheating. Participants in the condition that induced a state performance approach goal orientation were significantly more likely to cheat on the task than either the state performance avoid or state mastery conditions. These results extended the findings in Chapter 2 and 3 suggesting a dark-side to the performance approach goal orientation at a trait level.

In Chapter 5, the research across the previous chapters was extended by introducing the construct of team goal orientation, the first step towards an integrated multilevel model of goal orientation and non-task performance. Self and team ratings of team goal orientation, personality traits, OCB and workplace deviance were measured. Although there was no relationship between team mastery goal orientation and OCB, results showed that team performance approach and avoid goal orientations significantly moderated the relationship between trait Honesty-Humility and workplace deviance.

**Key Findings Integrated Across the Thesis**

In Chapter 1, the organizing framework adapted from Payne et al. (2007), that distinguishes between the antecedents, proximal and distal consequences of goal orientation, was used to guide the review of existing literature (see Figure 1). In this chapter I draw upon this framework again to discuss the findings in this thesis.

**Personality Antecedents of Goal Orientation**

In the four studies presented in this thesis personality was measured as the main antecedent of goal orientation. The personality antecedents of goal orientation were largely used as control variables; however, the use of the HEXACO framework over the Big Five model has also created some new insights that extend the existing literature. In Chapter 2, the Big Five framework was used and only Conscientiousness and Neuroticism were measured. Consistent with previous research (Bipp et al., 2008; Payne
et al., 2007) there was a positive relationship between Conscientiousness and mastery orientation and a positive relationship between Neuroticism and performance avoid orientation. In this sample, there was also a positive relationship between performance approach goal orientation and Conscientiousness.

In the last three studies the HEXACO personality framework was used. The most notable difference between the HEXACO framework and the Big Five model is the addition of a sixth factor, Honesty-Humility (Ashton et al., 2014). Individuals low in Honesty-Humility are more likely to view themselves as entitled and deserving of special treatment, highly value others perceiving them as important and have less concern with breaking rules than most other people. Some of the behavioral outcomes associated with low levels of Honesty-Humility include risk-taking (Weller & Thulin, 2012), unethical business decision making (Ogunfowora et al., 2013) and adult delinquency (Dunlop et al., 2012). In the final three studies presented in this thesis we examined the relationship between the HEXACO factors and trait goal orientations. The most notable finding was the consistent significant negative relationship between Honesty-Humility and trait performance approach goal orientation. This relationship was observed in Chapters 2, 3 and 4. This relationship was also replicated when using peer-ratings of personality in an attempt to reduce common method variance.

The robust relationship between Honesty-Humility and performance approach orientation is a significant finding for two main reasons. First, the significant relationship underscores the importance of using the HEXACO framework as an antecedent of goal orientation. The ‘Big Five’ model does not adequately address the traits that encompass a

---

5 Unfortunately as different forms of the HEXACO personality inventory (i.e. the longer 100-item and shorter 60-item questionnaire) were used it was not possible to collate the samples to investigate the HEXACO relationships across the studies.
disposition towards fairness, sincerity, greed avoidance and modesty (Ashton et al., 2014; Lee & Ashton, 2004) which appear to be intrinsically tied to a disposition towards a performance approach goal orientation. Second, the relationship between Honesty-Humility and performance approach goal orientation, together with the conceptual links between the two constructs, supports the possible dark-side of a performance approach orientation that has been investigated throughout this thesis. Additionally, the theoretical ties between the performance approach goal orientation and trait Honesty-Humility support our suggestion that performance approach goal orientation might be a behavioral expression of trait low Honesty-Humility. Further research investigating the possible moderating role of goal orientation on the relationship between HEXACO personality traits, particularly the Honesty-Humility trait, on negative workplace behaviors is warranted.

**Proximal Consequences of trait Goal Orientation**

I will now summarize the findings across the thesis in relation to the proximal consequences of trait goal orientation. In their organizing framework Payne et al. (2007) specified state goal orientation and other notable self-regulatory variables as proximal consequences to trait goal orientation as they are believed to play a role in directing and sustaining effort in achievement settings. Here I discuss the relationships between trait goal orientation and two proximal consequences of trait goal orientation that were reported across the thesis—state goal orientation and team goal orientation.

**State Goal Orientation**

State goal orientation, from a conceptual standpoint, serves as an explanatory mechanism of the relationship between goal orientation and distal consequences. In Chapter 4, state goal orientation was experimentally induced to investigate the role of state goal orientation in the prediction of unethical behavior over and above trait
measures. Results showed that state goal orientation, specifically experimentally induced performance approach orientation, was associated with the greatest cheating behavior controlling for trait goal orientation and personality. However, this effect may have been attenuated by significant trait differences between participants that attended the experimental session and those that did not. Despite the trait differences in participants, these results support previous literature (e.g. Bell and Kozlowski, 2006) that have demonstrated that even small manipulations to goal frame and goal content can affect an individual’s goal orientation and subsequent behavior. The malleability of the goal orientation construct highlights the need to consider state goal orientation as well as trait goal orientation in the prediction of behavior. This is especially important when attempting to investigate antecedents and consequences of goal orientation in applied settings where individuals are likely to receive contextual cues that may influence their motivational style.

**Team Goal Orientation**

In recent years, researchers have begun to focus on group level motivations in the form of team goal orientation. Team goal orientation “refers to the shared perception of the extent to which the unit pursues a particular goal, such as learning, outperforming other units, or avoiding failure” (Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012, p. 1032). In Chapter 5, the moderating role of team goal orientation on the relationship between personality and non-task behaviors was investigated. The methodological approach used also allowed for the measurement of the relationship between an individual’s trait goal orientation and (1) their perception of their team’s goal orientation and (2) their team’s perception of the team goal orientation. Drawing upon the attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) model, trait goal orientation was hypothesized to be related to both team-rated and self-rated team goal orientation. Results showed support for this hypothesis, as there were significant
positive relationships between the trait goal orientations and both self and team-rated
team goal orientations.

This suggests that team goal orientation may be a proximal consequence of trait
goal orientation because trait goal orientation may inform the types of teams individuals	
tend to work in. Alternatively, over time the dissonance between an individual’s trait goal
orientation and team’s goal orientation may be shaped such that an individual adjusts
his/her self-perceptions of their motivational style to match contextual cues in the work
environment. It is clear that further research unravelling the complex relationship between
individual and team-level goal orientation is needed. However, our initial finding of a
relationship between these two constructs represents an illuminating first step.

**Distal Consequences of Goal Orientation**

Along with proximal consequences of trait goal orientation, in this thesis distal
outcomes of trait goal orientation such as workplace deviance, unethical behavior, OCB
and status-driven risk taking were investigated. In line with the organizing framework
adapted from Payne et al. (2007), see Figure 1, trait goal orientation is hypothesized to be
a distal antecedent of these outcomes working through the more proximal consequences
reviewed above, specifically state and team goal orientation. For this reason, I have
segmented the key thesis findings in relation to trait, state and team goal orientation for
the distal outcomes where proximal consequences of trait goal orientation were measured.

**Workplace Deviance**

Workplace deviance is a pervasive a problem for organizations. Workplace
deviance at an individual level has been shown to be negatively associated to business
unit performance (Dunlop & Lee, 2004). An organization’s overall success could be
determined by the degree to which employees engage in workplace deviance. Therefore,
understanding the motivational antecedents of workplace deviance is an important priority.

**Trait Goal Orientation**

Across this thesis a theoretical framework hypothesizing the relationship between performance approach goal orientation and workplace deviance has been developed and tested. In Chapter 3, results showed that trait performance approach goal orientation, and no other goal orientation, was positively associated with organization directed workplace deviance. Similarly, in Chapter 5, results showed that trait performance approach goal orientation was associated with interpersonal and organizational directed workplace deviance. However, in Chapter 5, performance avoid also had a significant positive relationship with both forms of workplace deviance. The positive relationship between performance avoid orientation and workplace deviance, whilst overlooked in previous literature to the best of my knowledge, is expected from both a conceptual and empirical standpoint. Conceptually, performance avoid orientation is likely to cause individuals to view colleagues as competitors in a similar vein to individuals with a performance approach orientation. Individuals with a performance avoid orientation may therefore engage in counterproductive behaviors in attempt to shortcut the process of improving performance with the ultimate goal to avoid being the worst performer. Additionally, previous research has established a consistent negative relationship between performance avoid orientation and self-efficacy (Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007). Individuals that have low self-efficacy and a focus on normative performance are perhaps more likely to engage in counterproductive behaviors to improve performance because they have low confidence in achieving their goal through sustained effort and ability. Empirically, trait performance avoid orientation has also been consistently associated with the poorest job
performance ratings compared to any other trait goal orientations (Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007).

The consistent hypothesized finding of a relationship between trait performance approach orientation and workplace deviance is both an interesting and illuminating step forward in the goal orientation literature. Throughout this thesis it has been argued that when attempting to pursue a goal of normative performance, individuals have a number of ways to achieve their goal. Legitimate paths to long-term improvement might involve putting in more effort, asking for help from colleagues or seeking out opportunities to develop. However, employees may also engage in ‘deviant’ methods to improve normative performance that circumvents the need to develop skill or exert more effort. These deviant methods might include cheating, undermining colleagues in front of a supervisor or claiming others’ work as their own. The consistent finding of a positive relationship between trait performance approach goal orientation and workplace deviance represents an important step forward in the literature because there have been conflicting findings in the research investigating the relationship between trait performance approach goal orientation and job performance. I have argued that these conflicting results may be due to a conflation between the distinct components of supervisor’s ratings of job performance (i.e. task performance, workplace deviance, OCB; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Sackett, 2002) whereby any improvements in task performance are offset by an increase in workplace deviance. Furthermore, any gains to perceived performance are likely to be temporary because the gains are not based on legitimate methods of skill development. The link between performance approach goal orientation and workplace deviance furthers the understanding of how individual differences in motivational traits affect employee behavior and perhaps ultimately organizational success.
Team Goal Orientation

Teams have become a pillar of the modern workplace (Appelbaum & Blatt, 1994; S. G. Cohen & Bailey, 1997). The reliance on team-based workplaces emphasizes the need to evaluate the relationship between team goal orientation and workplace deviance. Through a combination of top-down and bottom-up effects state goal orientations are created within work groups (Dragoni, 2005). Mehta et al. (2008) propose that the psychological climate of the workplace, and teams within the workplace, inform the team goal orientation through leadership and other situational factors such as performance appraisals and organization systems and policies. In Chapter 5, results showed that both team-rated and self-rated team performance approach and avoid orientations were positively associated with self-reported workplace deviance. In contrast, self and team-rated team mastery orientation was associated with less workplace deviance at the individual level. These results suggest that workplaces that are characterized by competition for recognition, financial incentives and rewards as well as workplaces that are more focused on avoiding mistakes and protecting their reputation at an organization and individual level may lead to greater interpersonal and organizational directed workplace deviance. In contrast, an organization that is focused on continual learning and the development of new skills by their members may lead to less workplace deviance.

Team performance approach orientation also significantly moderated the relationship between trait Honesty-Humility and workplace deviance, controlling for other personality variables and trait goal orientations, such that when Honesty-Humility was low and team performance approach orientation was high there was greater workplace deviance at an individual level. This pattern of results was also found in relation to a team performance avoid orientation. The results suggested that a team performance orientation, either approach or avoid, interacts with an individual’s
disposition towards honesty and humility, such that when individuals with low Honesty-Humility are in teams with a high performance orientation they tend to behave in a more interpersonally and organizationally deviant manner. This pattern of results is consistent with trait activation theory that posits that dispositional traits might be activated by environmental and contextual cues (Tett & Burnett, 2003; Tett & Guterman, 2000). Our contention is that a team performance orientation, approach or avoid, triggers employees to view their colleagues as competitors whilst also implying that performance outcomes are more important than skills developed over time. For individuals low in Honesty-Humility, these contextual cues are likely to activate this trait to behave in a less honest or ‘deviant’ way to achieve the specified normative outcomes.

The finding that a team performance approach orientation is associated with workplace deviance is particularly important as recent research has suggested that a team performance approach orientation leads to improved team performance (Mehta et al., 2008). Our research suggests that though team performance may be improved by fostering a team performance approach orientation, employees may achieve this elevated performance by engaging in behaviors that are ultimately counterproductive to their own development as well as to the organization. It is important to stress that the cost of employee workplace deviance to an organization is not trivial (Dunlop & Lee, 2004; Vardi & Weitz, 2004), therefore short term gains in team performance may be met with long term losses to the organization.

**Unethical Behavior**

Unethical workplace behavior is increasing globally (Ernst & Young, 2013). Therefore, understanding why and under what workplace conditions employees are more likely to behave unethically is a pressing problem for researchers and practitioners. In Chapter 4, results showed that contextual cues designed to induce a state performance
approach goal orientation significantly increased cheating on an anagram task over either mastery or performance avoid conditions. These results suggest that even small workplace cues that stress normative performance, specifically outperforming others, without focusing on skill development and learning may lead to employees behaving unethically to meet their performance targets. Further research investigating the mechanisms and potential moderators of the relationship between state goal orientation, specifically state performance approach, and unethical behavior is warranted, especially in light of the limitations regarding the sample used in the study. Results also showed that there was a trend towards trait performance approach orientation being positively associated with making a false promise – an established example of unethical behavior. This relationship suggests that at a dispositional level a performance approach orientation, that promotes a belief of superiority, may lead to individuals over promising and under delivering.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Trait Goal Orientation

In Chapter 3, the role of goal orientation in the prediction of organization directed OCB was investigated. Results showed that trait mastery approach orientation, and no other goal orientation, was positively associated with OCB. Furthermore, mastery approach orientation was a significant predictor of OCB over the six HEXACO personality and other trait goal orientations. In Chapter 5, the relationship between trait goal orientation and interpersonal and organization directed OCB was also investigated. The results replicated that from Chapter 3, showing that mastery orientation (the trichotomous model of goal orientation was used) was positively associated with both forms of OCB. This finding extends previous research by showing that mastery approach is positively associated with non-task behaviors as well as the established findings with
job and task performance (e.g. Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007). These results also help to explain why mastery approach orientation is consistently associated with ‘bright’ behaviors in the work context.

**Team Goal Orientation**

In Chapter 5, results showed that there was no significant relationship between team goal orientation and OCB. Team mastery orientation also did not significantly moderate the relationship between Conscientiousness and OCB. This suggests that a climate that stresses learning and skill development does not appear to increase or decrease citizenship behavior at the individual level.

Taken together with the previous research investigating the relationship between *trait* goal orientation and OCB, the results suggest that while the construct of goal orientation may provide a useful framework for investigating OCB at the individual level it does not appear to transfer to the team level. One explanation for this difference is that the construct of OCB does not tap into the proactive learning behaviors that a team mastery orientation fosters. Specifically a team mastery goal orientation is characterized by a team focus on learning and skill development which is likely to lead to proactive learning behaviors such as attending a workshop or conference or working collaboratively with other team members. However, these behaviors may not necessarily encourage citizenship behaviors such as defending the organization when it is criticized or asking a colleague about a non-work related problem. It is also possible that a team performance orientation may actually encourage employees to demonstrate OCB, not because they are intrinsically motivated to do so, but because OCBs may be externally rewarded. For example, a highly performance oriented individual may ask colleagues about a non-work related problem as a form of impression management. Additionally, rewards for OCB may be official through financial incentives or unofficial by garnering favor with
managers and supervisors and individuals may demonstrate citizenship behaviors not because they are intrinsically motivated to do so but rather in an attempt to garner these rewards. The relationship between team goal orientation and OCB appears to be more fluid than it is with workplace deviance because. As proposed in Chapter 5, it may be more fruitful to investigate the relationship between team mastery orientation and team innovation or proactive learning behaviors.

**Status-Driven Risk Taking**

Status-driven risk taking describes risk taking motivated solely by the prospect of gains in money, influence or social standing (Ashton et al., 2010). In the paper presented in Chapter 2, we drew upon demographic differences in workplace injuries and fatalities, to make the argument that SDRT may prove to be an important component of understanding risk-taking and unsafe practices in the workplace. Trait performance approach and avoid goal orientations significantly predicted SDRT over Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, positive and negative affect. Furthermore, performance approach goal orientation was the largest predictor of SDRT. Results suggest that individuals experiencing high negative affect, who tend to be inefficient and unorganized (i.e., low in conscientiousness) and are motivated by demonstrating competence will tend to take risks to improve their status. This paper was the first to my knowledge to introduce SDRT to the organizational psychology literature and the first to explore the relationships between SDRT and goal orientation. Bringing SDRT to the workplace is an important step forward particularly in safety research because competitive risk-taking has not been adequately assessed up to this point. The results suggest are again consistent with trait performance approach goal orientation having a dark-side, motivating individuals to take status-driven risks that may result in costly losses to organizations.
General Limitations and Future Research Directions

There are some general limitations that apply across the studies presented in this thesis. These limitations are primarily derived from issues with the constructs and measurement of goal orientation and workplace deviance and general limitations with the methodological approach. Each of these issues will be addressed below integrating directions for future research.

Potential Measurement Limitations and Future Directions

In this section I will describe potential limitations and opportunities for future research arising from the measurement of goal orientation, workplace deviance and OCB.

Goal Orientation

There are a number of ambiguities in the conceptualization of the goal orientation construct (Hulleman et al., 2010). In the movement of the construct from the educational to the organizational and sporting realms there have been different labels for the same goal orientation and the same label for different goal orientations. Specifically, the performance approach goal orientation, which is often referred to as performance prove orientation in the organizational literature, has been defined in several ways. Some researchers (e.g. Grant & Dweck, 2003; Vandewalle, 1997) have operationalized the performance approach goal orientation as a focus on the appearance of performing better than others whereas other researchers (e.g. Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Grant & Dweck, 2003) define the orientation in terms of normative ability, specifically, being better than others. Finally, others (e.g. Brett & VandeWalle, 1999; Elliot & Church, 1997) have combined these two components to conceptualize the performance approach goal orientation as a focus on demonstrating superior normative performance to others. Hulleman et al. (2010) labelled this combination as an “evaluative” approach. In this research we have taken an evaluative approach to the conceptualization of the performance approach goal.
orientation and have used measures that capture both appearance and ability components of a performance approach goal orientation (i.e., Baranik et al., 2007; Elliot & Murayama, 2008; Vandewalle, 1997). Though I believe this is the most robust conceptualization of the performance approach goal orientation, and is used frequently in the published literature, the ambiguities in the goal orientation construct may limit the findings in this thesis. If future research shows that there are different antecedents and consequences of the performance approach goal orientation based on whether it is conceptualized, and measured, as a focus on ability or appearance, then the findings across these papers may be somewhat limited. One possibility is that the focus on appearing better than others may be more likely to lead to workplace deviance and unethical behavior than being better than others because an intrinsic motivation to perform well normatively may result in an increase in adaptive self-regulatory strategies. In contrast, a focus on appearing better than others may lead to counterproductive routes to performance (e.g., cheating, taking ownership of colleagues’ work) because the focus is only on appearing superior rather than actually being superior.

Changes to the structure and conceptualization of the goal orientation dimensions also pose a potential avenue for future research. Recent conceptualizations of the goal orientation construct have added the mastery avoid dimension to the established mastery (approach), performance approach and performance avoid orientations (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). In this thesis mastery avoid orientation was not included as an experimental condition in the anagram task in Chapter 4 and was also not measured as a team goal orientation in Chapter 5. The decision not to include the mastery avoid orientation was informed by the specific research question in the chapters that centered on the dark-side of the performance approach orientation. Additionally, mastery avoid orientation has not been routinely included in contemporary experimental manipulations.
of goal orientation (Kozlowski & Bell, 2006; Yeo et al., 2009; Yeo & Neal, 2008; Yeo et al., 2008) or team level analyses (Dragoni, 2005; Dragoni & Kuenzi, 2012; Dragoni, Tesluk, Russell, & Oh, 2009). However, research is increasingly demonstrating the usefulness of the mastery avoid dimension in the understanding of performance (Van Yperen et al., 2009). Future research investigating the relationship between goal orientation and non-task work performance may find the mastery avoid orientation an interesting addition. On the one hand, mastery avoid could be linked with workplace deviance because it often associated with a general diminished motivation towards work. Alternatively, mastery avoid orientation could be associated with citizenship behaviors because the desire to avoid losing skills might motivate an individual to engage in extra-curricular events to offset possible deficits in performance. For example, an older worker nearing retirement might volunteer to work longer hours to demonstrate their utility to the organization. Testing the relationship between mastery avoid orientation and non-task behaviors could therefore be an interesting and enlightening direction for future research.

**Workplace Deviance and OCB**

Throughout this thesis workplace deviance and OCB have been captured using self-report measures which some may view as a limitation of the research. There is some debate in the academic literature as to whether self-ratings or peer-ratings of workplace deviance are superior (see Griffin & Lopez, 2005). Arguably deviant behaviors are often done in secret so peer ratings may underestimate the behavior (Griffin & Lopez, 2005). With regards to OCB, in attempt to rectify the potential limitation of the use of self-report measurement, in Chapter 5 we also measured peer-rated OCB however the results mirrored the results found using self-ratings.
Potential Methodological Limitations and Future Directions

Task Performance

Across this thesis I have posited that previous research measuring the relationship between goal orientation, specifically performance approach orientation, and job performance may have detrimentally conflated workplace deviance and task performance. I have argued that the conflicting and variable findings with regards to the relationship between performance approach orientation and job performance may be due to this conflation between task performance and workplace deviance. Additionally, I posited that the positive effects of a performance approach orientation on task performance (Murayama & Elliot, 2012) are potentially being cancelled out or undermined by the associated increase in workplace deviance. Task performance, however, was not explicitly measured in this thesis so the posited conflation of task performance and workplace deviance in the measurement of job performance was not assessed. Given that the studies in this thesis have provided consistent evidence that there is a positive relationship between performance approach orientation and workplace deviance future research should consider explicitly assessing whether this conflation of components of job performance is occurring. Additionally, incorporating objective measures of job performance that include specific measurements of task performance, counterproductive performance (workplace deviance) and citizenship performance (OCB) would be an important next step to establish whether the components of job performance ratings have different relationships with each goal orientation.

Participant Sample

In this thesis participants were primarily Caucasian Australians employed in professional roles. Though I attempted to gain participants from diverse backgrounds, it would be important to investigate the relationship between goal orientation and non-task
performance in cross-cultural samples, especially in cultures that are characterized as more collectivist than individualistic. This is particularly relevant to the performance orientations because individuals from collectivist cultures, and teams consisting primarily of individuals with collectivist traditions, tend to be more cooperative than individuals and teams with individualistic cultural traditions who tend to be more competitive (Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991). Therefore, a focus on normative performance, or more specifically a performance orientation, may result in different perceptions across different cultures.

**Design Approach**

In this thesis goal orientation has been conceptualized as both a state and trait variable, similar to other established constructs such as anxiety and self-efficacy. Though we have found similar results across state and trait goal orientations, it would be interesting to investigate the dynamic processes between state and trait goal orientation on non-task performance which the cross-sectional approach taken in this thesis may not have adequately addressed. For example, results in Chapter 5 showed that an individual’s trait goal orientation was associated with team-rated team goal orientation. It was argued that this could be explained by the A-S-A framework, however a cross-sectional approach can only suggest this framework as a causal mechanism. Further unravelling this with a longitudinal approach would be an important next step for future research.

**Conclusions**

The research presented in this thesis contributes to the understanding of the motivation of non-task behaviors in the workplace. The overall trend in this thesis is that despite some positive links between performance approach goal orientation and job performance, performance approach goal orientation appears to have a dark side. This thesis presents the first research to our knowledge, to demonstrate that trait performance
approach goal orientation is the largest predictor of status-driven risk taking as well as discuss this form of competitive risk taking in terms of workplace behaviors. Research presented in this thesis also demonstrates a consistent link between trait performance approach goal orientation and low trait Honesty-Humility and a positive relationship between trait performance approach orientation and workplace deviance. In contrast, trait mastery approach has been shown to be positively associated with OCB. This thesis also is the first to measure the relationship between team goal orientation and individual non-task behaviors. Results showed that team performance approach and avoid are associated with workplace deviance and team performance orientations moderate the relationship between trait Honesty-Humility and workplace deviance. With these results, this thesis extends the current research on goal orientation, non-task behaviors and person-situation interactions in the organizational literature.
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Despite considerable research into competitive risk taking in evolutionary psychology, little research has investigated this style of risk taking in the organizational context. To aid this investigation, Ashton et al. (2010) formalized the construct of status-driven risk taking (SDRT). Status-driven risk taking is conceptually different from sensation-seeking and general risk taking as it focuses on risk-taking behaviors that are primarily committed as a means to an end. It is characterized by risk-taking motivated solely by the prospect of gains in money, influence or social standing (Ashton et al., 2010). Historical examples of this style of risk taking can be seen in cases from the corporate world such as the Enron scandal and insider-trading allegations in a number of financial institutions. To date there have been no large scale studies linking SDRT to safety outcomes, however, generic trait risk taking has been demonstrated to negatively predict occupational safety behaviors (Christian et al., 2009). Understanding the mechanisms and antecedents behind this form of risk-taking, therefore, could be an important next step in the creation of safer workplaces – both from an individual and organizational goal perspective.

Investigating the role of goal orientations in risk taking and safety behaviors could provide insight into the motivation behind these behaviors. However, no research to our
knowledge has investigated the role of goal orientation in the context of risk taking or safety behaviors, despite it being one of the most frequently studied motivational constructs in the organizational psychology literature. Goal orientations are believed to create different perceptual-cognitive frameworks for how individuals approach, interpret and respond to achievement situations (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Payne et al., 2007). Elliot and Harackiewicz (1996) established that performance approach goals were linked to both the motive to achieve combined with an elevated fear of failure. Kaplan and Midgley (1999) posited that in pressurized achievement settings, where performance goals are emphasized, the fear of failure may be elevated causing some students to engage in cheating. The act of cheating could be an example of SDRT if the individual accepts the risk of getting caught in order to be at the top of the class.

Based on this research and our own research that demonstrated a link between performance approach goal orientation and lowered trait honesty and humility, it was hypothesized that performance-approach goal orientation would be a significant positive predictor of status-driven risk taking when controlling for the effects of affectivity, conscientiousness and mastery goal orientation. Similarly, it was hypothesized that performance approach goal orientation would negatively predict proactive safety behaviors and safety compliance when controlling for affectivity, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and mastery goal orientation. We control for these variables as previous research suggests that negative affect (see Iverson & Erwin, 1997), low conscientiousness (see Clarke & Robertson, 2005; Weller & Thulin, 2012) and low neuroticism (Weller & Thulin, 2012) are important predictors of risk taking and workplace accidents.

To test these hypotheses, a sample of employees from diverse industries (n=261) completed self-report measures of goal orientation (Vandewalle, 1997), SDRT (Ashton et al., 2010), Conscientiousness and Neuroticism (McCrae & Costa, 1987), Affectivity
(Watson et al., 1988) and two specially developed scales measuring proactive safety behaviors and safety proficiency.

Multiple regression was used to assess whether performance approach goal orientation could predict SDRT, after controlling for the influence of positive and negative affect, conscientiousness, neuroticism and mastery goal orientations. Consistent with previous research into general risk taking, negative affect ($\beta = .25, p < .001$), conscientiousness ($\beta = -.21, p < .001$) and neuroticism ($\beta = -.17, p < .05$) were significant predictors in the final model. Interestingly, as hypothesized, performance approach orientation ($\beta = .25, p < .001$) was also a significant predictor, when controlling for positive affect ($\beta = -.08, p = .249$) and mastery goal orientation ($\beta = .03, p = .713$). This suggests that individuals experiencing high negative affect, who tend to be inefficient and unorganized (i.e. low in conscientiousness), more emotionally stable and motivated by demonstrating competence will tend to take risks to improve their status. However, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 16.12%, $F(6, 253) = 8.13, p < .001$, suggesting that while individual differences are important, future considerations should perhaps focus on group-level or context specific determinants.

For the sake of brevity for this overview, the results pertaining to the prediction of proactive safety behaviors and safety proficiency have not been discussed in detail here, but will be presented. Contrary to our hypothesis, results suggested a mastery goal orientation was a significant predictor of proactive safety behaviors when controlling for affect and conscientiousness, however, only performance approach predicted safety proficiency behaviors. This differential prediction of safety behaviors suggests that goal orientation may provide an important perspective on the motivational underpinnings of these behaviors.
Appendix B: Descriptive statistics and correlations between HEXACO personality traits and trait goal orientation including non-attending participants from Chapter 4.

The descriptive statistics and correlations of the trait measures assessed in Chapter 4 are presented below. The results include participants who attended the experimental task and those that gave a false promise and did not attend. It should be noted that when the additional participants (n=58) that gave a false promise were included in the analyses the relationship between Honesty-Humility and performance approach goal orientation, reported in Chapter 3, became significant.
Table 10. Descriptive statistics and correlations between HEXACO personality traits and trait goal orientation including non-attending participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>4.38</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. Honesty-Humility</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emotionality</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extraversion</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Openness</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Performance</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mastery</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=217 for HEXACO personality traits; N=216 for goal orientation traits. All correlations ≥ |.14| significant p < .05; correlations ≥ |.19| significant p < .01.