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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine whether variables derived from the self-concordance model mediate the influence of individual and situational variables on workplace deviance. Results revealed that none of the situational and individual level antecedents predicted goal-self-concordance, when operationalized as a difference score. However, when the self-concordance components (i.e., intrinsic and extrinsic motivation) were examined separately, the personality trait of other referenced goals and personal mastery predicted extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation, respectively. Additionally, self-concordance (and its components) did not predict goal attainment measured four weeks later, and goal attainment did not predict need satisfaction. Extrinsic motivation was positively related to interpersonal and organizational deviance, as was need satisfaction. Based on these results, recommendations for future research linking self-concordance model variables and workplace deviance are made.
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal Antecedents of Workplace Deviance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concordance Model</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Investigation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Models</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHODS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants and Procedures</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. RESULTS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic Strategy</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized and Alternative Models</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests of Hypotheses</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory Analyses</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bivariate Correlations and Reliabilities</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summary of Fit Statistics for Hypothesized Models</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Summary of Fit Statistics for Exploratory Models</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hypothesized Model</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hypothesized Model: Model A</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hypothesized Model: Model E</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Post hoc Model</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In recent years, research has expanded its focus of organizational behavior to investigate those actions that may jeopardize an organization and its members. According to Robinson and Bennett (1995) these voluntary behaviors that may harm the well-being of the organization and individuals within the organization are what characterize workplace deviance. Deviance in the workplace not only damages the morale and cohesiveness of an organization, but it can also have a substantial negative financial impact (Murphy, 1993). A variety of individual and situational factors have been shown to predict these different forms of workplace deviance (e.g., Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Cullen & Sackett, 2003; Diefendorff, & Mehta, 2007; Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001; Spector & Fox, 2002; Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh, & Kessler, 2006; Yang & Diefendorff, in press).

Although there has been a recent outpouring of research on different antecedents of deviance, they have tended to emphasize relatively distal attributes, rather than more proximal influences. Further, few studies have looked at the mechanisms by which such distal variables influence workplace deviance. One theory focused on proximal antecedents of behavior and well-being is Sheldon and Elliot’s (1999) self-concordance model. The self-concordance model describes how the locus of causality of the goals in
one’s life (i.e., self-determined versus other-determined) impacts goal attainment, need satisfaction, and ultimately well-being. This model is unique in that it articulates the process by which different goals and daily activities impact a variety of performance- and well-being-related outcomes. Researchers have used this model to explain how stable traits and aspects of situations impact work attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Bono & Judge, 2003; Greguras & Diefendorff, under review; Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005).

The purpose of this study was to examine whether variables derived from the self-concordance model mediate the influence of individual and situational variables on workplace deviance. The current project had two primary objectives. First, the study sought to better understand the process by which situational and individual difference variables influence workplace deviance by considering the role of goal self-concordance and associated variables as mediators of these links. Second, the study sought to expand the application of the self-concordance model to workplace research by providing a first look at whether self-concordance model constructs relate to deviant workplace behaviors. The following sections review prior work on workplace deviance and self-concordance, present a set of hypotheses that integrate these research topics, and describe a study testing these hypotheses.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

_Distal Antecedents of Workplace Deviance_

Workplace deviance can be defined as voluntary actions that endanger the well-being of the organization and/or its members (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Workplace deviance has been identified as one of the three main dimensions of employee job performance, along with task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Indeed, Rotundo and Sackett (2002) found that workplace deviance accounted for approximately the same amount of variance (23%) in ratings of overall employee performance as did task performance (25%). Through the recent interest in workplace deviance, there have been several conceptually-similar constructs emerge including counter-productive work behavior (Fox, et al., 2001), antisocial behavior (Robinson & O’Leary-Kelly, 1998), aggression (Andersson & Pearson, 1999), and retaliation (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Despite the different names, each of these constructs has the same underlying factor of intended harm towards the organization or its members (Fox, et al., 2001).

Workplace deviance is a broad term encompassing behaviors ranging from absenteeism to physical aggression. Robinson and Bennett (1995) argued that deviant behaviors fall into two categories: organizational deviance and interpersonal deviance. Organizational deviance entails acts directed towards the organization, including stealing,
sabotage, and absenteeism. Interpersonal deviance, on the other hand, is directed at the members of the organization and includes such acts as verbal abuse, gossip, and stealing from a coworker.

Both interpersonal and organizational deviance have been linked to a variety of personality and situational antecedents. In terms of personality, conscientiousness and achievement-striving have been shown to negatively relate to deviance, whereas neuroticism, trait anxiety, and trait anger have shown positive relationships with deviance (Cullen & Sackett, 2003; Fox, et al., 2000; Spector & Fox, 2002). Individuals high in conscientiousness and achievement-striving are presumed to be hardworking, punctual and purposeful (McCrae, 2005), characteristics related to higher levels of performance. Also, individuals high in these traits are more likely to strategically expend effort towards goal attainment and minimize effort on superfluous activities. As a result, individuals high in conscientiousness and achievement-striving are less likely to perform deviant behaviors (Sackett & DeVore, 2001; Salgado, 2002). Alternatively, individuals high in neuroticism, trait anxiety, and trait anger have been shown to be more likely to engage in workplace deviance. Individuals high in these attributes tend to experience negative emotions more often. It is theorized (Fox et al., 2001) that these individuals are motivated to reduce the negative emotions and that they engage in deviant work behaviors in an attempt to do so.

Diefendorff and Mehta (2007) argued that the discretionary nature of workplace deviance suggests a potential role of motivational constructs in predicting workplace deviance. They found that individual differences in motivational traits predicted workplace deviance. Kanfer and Ackerman (2000) identified three underlying
motivational traits: personal mastery (desire to learn and master goals), competitive excellence (desire to compete and perform better than others), and motivation related to anxiety (desire to avoid negative outcomes). Diefendorff and Mehta (2007) found that, in a simultaneous analysis, personal mastery was negatively related to workplace deviance, motivation related to anxiety was positively related to workplace deviance and competitive excellence was not related to workplace deviance (but was significantly related to deviance in bivariate analysis). Kanfer and Heggestad (1997) argued that when dispositional motivation is the focus, motivational traits may be preferred over other trait frameworks (e.g., the big five) because these traits are more specific in their focus on motivation. In contrast, frameworks, such as the big five, are much broader, including many non-motivational aspects of personality.

Situational factors, such as the nature of one’s interpersonal interactions at work and one’s job characteristics, can also relate to deviant behavior. For instance, all three forms of justice (organizational, distributive, and interactional) have been found to relate negatively to deviance (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006; Yang & Diefendorff, in press). Additionally, hindrances to an individual’s ability to effectively perform his/her job also have been linked to deviant behaviors (Spector, et al., 2006). Such hindrances might include organizational constraints (e.g., availability of resources, constraining policies and frequent interruptions; Spector et al., 2006), lack of autonomy, or low perceived control in the job setting (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001), all of which have been found to have a significant, positive relationships with deviant behavior in the workplace (Fox et al., 2001). One possible explanation is that these hindrances create stressful situations within the workplace resulting in attempts by individuals to cope with
the stress by engaging in workplace deviance (Fox et al., 2001). Stress has been shown to manifest itself in a variety of different ways: psychologically, physically and behaviorally; it is argued that deviance is a behavioral manifestation of this strain (Fox et al., 2001). Although there is a growing body of research identifying distal antecedents of workplace deviance, few address the proximal mechanisms linking these antecedents to deviance. In the current study, I explored the potential role of variables from Sheldon and Elliot’s (1999) self-concordance model in explaining the links between distal trait and situational antecedents and workplace deviance. First, I describe the self-concordance model in detail.

**Self-Concordance Model**

The self-concordance model describes the influence of intrinsically- vs. extrinsically-derived goals on goal attainment and well-being (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998; 1999). The perceived locus of control of one’s goals (i.e., internally-derived vs. externally-imposed) is presumed to impact the quality of motivation, resulting in different levels of goal attainment, need satisfaction, and ultimately well-being and behavior (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998; 1999; Sheldon, Ryan, Deci, & Kasser, 2004). Thus, the focus of the model is on the process by which intrinsic and extrinsic goals impact a variety of outcomes (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999).

The foundations of the self-concordance model lie in Deci and Ryan’s (1985) self-determination theory (SDT), which addresses the role of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation in goal directed behavior. Deci and Ryan (1985; 2000) argued that in order to fully understand the effects of goal pursuit and attainment, one must consider whether a goal impacts the satisfaction of three basic psychological needs: competence, autonomy
and relatedness. The fulfillment of these needs impacts psychological development and well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Competence is an individual’s need to feel successful in the actions that are taken, whereas autonomy is the need to feel that these actions are self-directed (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Relatedness refers to the need to feel connected to other people (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000). These needs are presumed to be met through different aspects of pursuit and attainment of goals (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Gagne & Deci, 2005). For example, if an individual at work decides to develop an innovative computer program, several needs may be met: autonomy, through the self-directed decision to pursue this goal, and competence by successfully developing the program. Thus, pursuit and attainment of chosen goals can result in need-satisfying experiences, which positively influence well-being. Deci and Ryan (2000) argued that the attainment of intrinsically-derived goals are more able to meet these needs than the attainment of extrinsically-derived goals, and, for this reason, intrinsic goals are related to higher levels of well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The self-concordance model builds on these ideas by specifically considering the role of locus of causality (intrinsic vs. extrinsic) in this process.

According to SDT and the self-concordance model (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000; Gagne & Deci, 2005; Sheldon & Elliot, 1998), individuals may pursue goals for intrinsic or extrinsic reasons, which correspond to autonomous or controlled reasons, respectively. Further, the reason for pursuing a goal impacts a variety of goal-striving and well-being related outcomes (Brett & VandeWalle, 1999; Brunstein, 1993; Diener, et al., 1999; Elliot, et al., 1997). Individuals who pursue goals for controlled reasons are doing so because someone has asked or demanded it of them, with the origin of the goal being
outside of the individual (Ryan & Connell, 1989). These extrinsically motivated goals often do not create a sense of ownership in the individual, resulting in goals that are not concordant with the person’s true self. On the other hand, when pursuit of a goal is motivated by autonomous reasons, the goal is pursued because the individual enjoys it or strongly identifies with the reasons for pursuing the goal. Such activities are concordant with the person’s true self and underlying values (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999) and can result in a greater sense of well-being.

Research has shown that autonomous goals are associated with higher levels of goal attainment, while controlled goals are related to lower levels of goal attainment (Judge, et al., 2005; Sheldon & Elliot, 1998; Sheldon & Houser-Marko, 2001). By definition, a self-concordant, or autonomous, goal is one that is pursued out of enjoyment or because it is aligned with strongly held values and beliefs (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998). Such goals are likely to receive more attention, effort, and persistence. On the other hand, goals that an individual feels are imposed upon him/her (i.e., non-self-concordant) are less likely to receive high effort and be attained (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). However, Sheldon and Elliot (1998) found that the intended effort of both autonomous and controlled goals was high early in goal pursuit, which is similar to results found in loss aversion research where ‘ought’ goals often have high levels of attainment (Schmidt & DeShon, in press). Unlike the loss aversion research, autonomous goals in Sheldon and Elliot’s (1998) research ultimately had higher levels of attainment than controlled goals over time suggesting that “people have difficulty translating […] controlled intentions into actions” (p. 554). These differences in results could be due to the time frame used in the assessment process, where loss aversion research often focuses on short time spans.
research focuses on long time spans (e.g., several months; Bono & Judge, 2003; Greguras & Diefendorff, under review; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999).

The attainment of goals has been shown to significantly predict increases in well-being (Brunstein, 1993). Carver and Scheier (2000) support the idea that faster progress towards a goal results in higher levels of positive affect, which leads to more positive experiences. Although goal attainment has been linked to positive outcomes in other models of goal-directed behavior (e.g., goal-setting theory; Locke & Latham, 1990), a key contribution of the self-concordance model is that it is the attainment of autonomous, or self-concordant, goals that leads to positive outcomes (e.g., well-being, need satisfaction), and not the attainment of controlled, or extrinsic goals. The pursuit and attainment of autonomous goals results in the experience of greater need satisfaction and increases in well-being over time than controlled goals (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). Meeting one’s psychological needs (competence, autonomy, and relatedness) has been shown to lead more positive feelings on a daily basis (Sheldon, Ryan, & Reis, 1996). In other words, attaining intrinsically derived goals leads to more feelings of effectiveness in one’s activities, closeness with others, and control over one’s choices, all of which increase one’s well-being (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999; Sheldon & Kasser, 1998). Therefore, not only does the attainment of these goals matter, but the ‘what’ and ‘why’ of the goal also matter (Sheldon & Kasser, 1998). Sheldon and Kasser (1998) found that the pursuit of intrinsic goals significantly moderated the effect of goal attainment on well-being. Following these findings, Sheldon and Elliot (1999) supported these results in the development and testing of the self-concordance model. Therefore, not only does
attainment lead to higher levels of need satisfaction, but attainment of self-concordant goals results in high need satisfaction (Sheldon & Kasser, 1998). However, few, if any, studies have included this interaction in their models providing little additional supporting or contrary evidence (Bono & Judge, 2003; Greguras & Diefendorff, under review; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999; Sheldon & Kasser, 1998). The current study sought to further test for the presence of this interaction.

Recently, research has begun applying the self-concordance model in the workplace. Judge and colleagues (2005) examined whether core self-evaluations operated through self-concordance model variables to impact satisfaction. They found that self-concordance model constructs (i.e., goal self-concordance, goal attainment, need satisfaction, and well-being) partially mediated the relationship between core-self evaluations and job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2005). Greguras and Diefendorff (under review) found that constructs from the self-concordance model (i.e., self-concordance, goal attainment, and need satisfaction) fully mediated the relationships of proactive personality with in-role performance and organizational citizenship behaviors. Transformational leaders have also been shown to effect goal self-concordance in the workplace. Bono and Judge (2003) found that followers of transformational leaders are more likely to pursue self-concordant goals. Transformational leaders tend to emphasize identification with the values of the organization. Bono and Judge (2003) theorized that this increased identification with the values of the organization results in individuals identifying more with the goals they pursue and perceiving greater concordance with the goals. This study suggested one way in which an organization can develop higher levels of self-concordance in employees through leadership and possibly empowerment.
programs. In each of the studies just discussed, self-concordance model constructs were used to explain previously established relationships in organizational research by elaborating on the underlying mechanism responsible for the relationships.

Current Investigation

Although initial work has demonstrated that the self-concordance model can be applied to understand workplace issues, only a limited set of outcome variables and antecedents have been examined. As elaborated below, I anticipated that workplace deviance may have strong connections with self-concordance model constructs. Furthermore, given the focus on the pursuit of specific goals in one’s life, the self-concordance model is presumed to be a relatively proximal influence on workplace deviance, and as such, may mediate the influence of individual difference and situational factors (see Figure 1). In the following sections, I describe the anticipated links among the model constructs, starting with these individual and situational difference factors and working my way forward through the model. Although many researchers have distinguished between interpersonal and organizational deviance, they tend to be highly related to each other and also exhibit similar relationships with antecedent constructs (Diefendorff & Mehta, 2007; Fox, et al., 2001; Spector, et al., 2006). Because I expected the same pattern of relationships for interpersonal and organizational deviance, I did not make separate hypotheses for the two types of deviance.

Individual Difference Antecedents

One set of person level variables with links to workplace deviance is motivational traits (Diefendorff & Mehta, 2007). For the current study, I used Kanfer and Ackerman’s
The conceptualization of motivational traits, which includes personal mastery, competitive excellence, and motivation related to anxiety. Personal mastery is an approach-oriented trait reflecting the desire to learn and master tasks (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000). Diefendorff and Mehta (2007) found that personal mastery was negatively related to workplace deviance. I anticipated finding such a link and that it would be mediated by variables from the self-concordance model. At the root of personal mastery lies the desire for improvement, either through learning new skills, acquiring new knowledge, or setting high personal standards for achievement (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000). Individuals high in personal mastery are typically driven and passionate in their pursuit of new and challenging goals. Indeed, Hinsz and Jundt (2005) found that personal mastery was positively related to performance and personal goals as well as expectations for success. These expectations of success instill confidence in

Figure 1. Hypothesized Model
individuals to choose challenging goals. Learning goal orientation, which is similar to personal mastery, has been found to relate positively to internal locus of control (Button, Mathieu, & Zajac, 1996), such that individuals with an internal locus of control perceive outcomes as being under their control, which has been linked to a greater sense of self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Therefore, by perceiving outcomes as under one’s own control and feeling confident that one can tackle challenges, the goals that high personal mastery individuals pursue may be more likely to be perceived as intrinsically derived. As a result, I expected that individuals high in personal mastery would be more likely to report pursuing self-concordant goals and experience higher levels of goal attainment.

**Hypothesis 1:** Personal mastery is positively related with (a) goal self-concordance and (b) goal attainment.

Competitive excellence reflects an individual’s desire to compete with and be regarded as superior in performance relative to others (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000). Diefendorff and Mehta (2007) found that competitive excellence was correlated with deviance, but was not a significant predictor in the full model. One potential explanation for the lack of a significant link is that the operationalization of competitive excellence used in Diefendorff and Mehta’s full model combined two subscales that might be expected to have different relationships with deviance. In particular, the competitive excellence construct is comprised of competitiveness and other-referenced-goals, the first of which reflects a pure approach tendency (performing better than others) and the second of which reflects a mix of approach and avoidance tendencies (not performing worse than others; Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000). Individuals high in competitiveness are
motivated to attain higher performance levels than those around them. Conceptually, competitiveness is similar to performance-prove goal orientation, which has been shown to relate to high effort and better performance (VandeWalle, Cron, & Slocum, 2001). Hinz and Jundt (2005) found competitiveness to be positively related to practice performance, as well as personal goals, which mediated the link between competitiveness and performance. Thus, individuals high in competitiveness may be less likely to engage in workplace deviance, with this effect being driven by the selection of self-concordant goals and their associated benefits.

In contrast, individuals high in other-referenced goals are focused on not looking bad compared to others. Therefore, their motivation is guided by standards set by others, rather than by internal standards, which may translate into a tendency to pursue goals for introjected (i.e., extrinsic) reasons. This preoccupation with external standards that are not under their own control may create a sense of anxiety and a reduced chance at goal attainment. The trait of other-referenced goals is conceptually similar to performance-avoid goal orientation, which has been shown to relate to lower effort and performance (VandeWalle et al., 2001). Empirical work on the effects of other-referenced goals is mixed as Hinz and Jundt (2005) found that this trait was positively related to personal goals but not significantly related to task performance. However, it is not clear whether the personal goals in Hinz and Jundt (2005) were extrinsic or intrinsic, given the use of an experimental task in a lab setting. As such, in the present investigation, I anticipated that high other-referenced goal individuals would be more likely to pursue extrinsic goals, which should lead to lower levels of goal attainment, need satisfaction and well-being, which are expected to result in greater workplace deviance.
Hypothesis 2: Competitiveness is positively related with goal self-concordance.

Hypothesis 3: Other-referenced goals is negatively related with goal self-concordance.

Motivation related to anxiety is an avoidance motivation trait where individuals are motivated by the desire to avoid negative outcomes (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000). This trait reflects how motivated individuals are by anxiety, worry, and fear of failure. Diefendorff and Mehta (2007) found that avoidance motivation (a composite including motivation related to anxiety) was positively related to workplace deviance. Elliot and Harackiewicz (1996) proposed that high levels of avoidance motivation can lead to higher levels of sensitivity to feedback and the tendency to view feedback as a personal attack instead of a helpful tool. Therefore, individuals high in avoidance motivation will be especially sensitive to feedback regarding the pursuit of goals and achievement (Elliot, & Harackiewicz, 1996). Additionally, this type of motivation has been shown to negatively relate to goal level. Particularly, Hinz and Jundt (2005) found that a component of motivation related to anxiety (i.e., emotionality) was negatively related to task performance, self-efficacy, and personal goals.

In the present investigation, I expected that anxiety-driven motivation would result in the pursuit of fewer self-concordant goals. Individuals high in this trait will seek to avoid feeling anxious, which may result in the selection of goals that are easy and unlikely to reveal personal weaknesses. Thus, the focus of goal selection is not on what one wishes to approach (e.g., desired, intrinsically-motivated goals) but rather on what one wishes to avoid (e.g., imposed, extrinsically-motivated goals), with a focus on not
failing. Further, pursuit of avoidance goals has been shown to negatively influence subjective well-being (Elliot, et al., 1997).

*Hypothesis 4:* Motivation related to anxiety is negatively related to goal self-concordance.

**Situational Antecedents**

Organizational constraints entail a variety of situational factors that may hinder one’s job performance. Peters and O’Connor (1980) identified several types of organizational constraints including rules and procedures, availability of resources, and inadequate training. Organizational constraints have previously been linked to deviance in the workplace (Spector & Jex, 1998; Spector et al., 2006). These constraints create frustration and higher stress levels, resulting in behavioral manifestation of this strain in the form of deviant behaviors. Fox et al. (2001) argued that individuals may use deviance as a coping mechanism as a way to relieve the stress associated with these constraints. However, I anticipated that the effect of organizational constraints on deviance may operate through the perception that one’s goals are not self-concordant. That is, I anticipated that constraints might limit the extent to which individuals perceive that they are pursuing goals for autonomous, intrinsic reasons.

The current study examined how the relationship between organizational constraints and deviance could be explained by the pursuit of self-concordant goals. High levels of organizational constraints create a controlled environment, one in which it may be difficult to pursue goals for intrinsic reasons. High levels of organizational constraints may not only hinder the selection of intrinsically-motivated goals, but also hinder the attainment of one’s goals (e.g., by way of poor resources, frequent interruptions by co-
workers, rules and regulations that block progress). For this reason, I hypothesized that organizational constraints would be negatively related to goal self-concordance and goal attainment.

**Hypothesis 5:** Organizational constraints is negatively related to (a) goal self-concordance and (b) goal attainment.

Research has also looked at the effect of perceived autonomy on workplace deviance (Fox, et al., 2001). Autonomy is defined as the level of perceived control an individual has in a situation (Fox, et al., 2001). According to Deci and Ryan, (1985, 2000) one of the primary psychological needs is the need for autonomy, which is met by the pursuit of intrinsically-derived goals (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). Additionally, according to Bandura’s (1997) social cognitive theory, individuals desire to have control in their lives as a way to acquire desirable outcomes (e.g., productivity, creativity, and psychological well-being). Higher autonomy within the workplace, by definition, allows greater freedom to choose goals. With this freedom, individuals will be naturally drawn to select goals that are enjoyable and valued and that can lead to the satisfaction of one’s basic psychological needs. In short, high levels of task autonomy are likely to lead to higher levels of self-concordant goals. As a note of clarification, job autonomy is conceptually distinct from Deci and Ryan’s (1985, 2000) need for autonomy in that job autonomy is an individual’s perceived control at work, whereas, need for autonomy is a psychological need that may be met by pursuit intrinsically motivating goals. Though there is conceptual overlap, no prior research has examined the links between these variables.

**Hypothesis 6:** Autonomy is positively related to goal self-concordance.
According to Sheldon and Elliot (1999) the self-concordance of the goals one pursues is directly related to attainment of these goals. Goals pursued for intrinsic reasons have been found to positively influence the attainment of those goals (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998; Sheldon & Houser-Marko, 2001; Judge, et al., 2005). One’s effort towards achievement of intrinsic goals is sustained over time because the goals align with personal values. In contrast, goals that are pursued for controlled, or extrinsic, reasons have been shown to have lower levels of attainment compared to intrinsic goals (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998; Sheldon & Houser-Marko, 2001; Judge, et al., 2005). Further, and as articulated by self-determination theory and the self-concordance model (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998; 1999; Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000), goal attainment helps individuals meet their basic psychological needs (i.e., competence, relatedness, and autonomy). As such, higher levels of attainment result in greater need satisfaction. Additionally, Sheldon and Elliot (1999) suggested that attainment of intrinsic goals will have a greater impact on need satisfaction than attainment of extrinsic goals. According to the self determination theory, need satisfaction positively relates to well being (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). Subjective well-being is derived from a combination of several factors including affect, life satisfaction, and satisfaction in important life domains (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). These links are all depicted in Figure 1 and are examined in the process of linking distal antecedents to workplace deviance through the goal self-concordance model.

Although I know of no prior work that has examined the links between subjective well-being and workplace deviance, past work has examined the links of job satisfaction
with workplace deviance, which may be considered an indicator of subjective well-being (Diener et al., 1999). Previous research has shown job satisfaction to be negatively related to counterproductive work behaviors including: sabotage, theft, withdrawal, and actions against the organization and persons (Penney & Spector, 2005; Spector et al., 2006). Mount, Ilies, and Johnson (2006) argued that the relationship between job satisfaction and workplace deviance is explained by two social psychology theories: social exchange theory and the norm of reciprocity. According to their ideas, unfavorable workplace conditions lead to feelings of dissatisfaction and lower subjective well-being. These negative feelings lead individuals to retaliate against the organization by engaging in deviant workplace activities. The opposite pattern of relations is expected when favorable work conditions are present.

Researchers have recently investigated job satisfaction as a mediator of the links between deviant behavior and other constructs. For instance, Judge and colleagues (2006) found that job satisfaction (and state hostility) mediated the relationship between workplace deviance and supervisor interpersonal justice. Based on this well-established link between satisfaction and deviance, I theorized that general job satisfaction, which may be considered an indicator of well-being that is contextualized to the work setting, will have a negative relationship with workplace deviance. That is, individuals who report high levels of general job satisfaction will engage in fewer deviant work behaviors.

In addition to the expectation that general job satisfaction will influence workplace deviance, I also anticipated that other constructs from the self-concordance model, including goal attainment, need satisfaction and perceived locus of causality, will relate to workplace deviance, but do so in the mediational fashion depicted in Figure 1.
Greguras and Diefendorff (under review) found that perceived locus of causality, goal attainment, and need satisfaction all were positively related to citizenship behaviors in bivariate analyses, but only need satisfaction was uniquely related to citizenship behaviors in analyses testing the full self-concordance model. A similar pattern of findings was revealed for job performance (Greguras & Diefendorff, under review). Given that prior work has demonstrated that workplace deviance is negatively related to job performance and citizenship behaviors (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007), I expected the opposite pattern of relationships to emerge for workplace deviance. Further, past work has largely confirmed the chain of mediation depicted in Figure 1 (Judge, et al., 2006). That is, I expected that locus of causality, goal attainment, and need satisfaction would be negatively related to workplace deviance and that these effects would follow the mediational pattern depicted in Figure 1 and originally proposed by Sheldon and Elliot (1999).

Hypothesis 7: Self-concordance is positively related to goal attainment.

Hypothesis 8: Goal attainment is positively related to need satisfaction.

Hypothesis 9: Self-concordance will interact with goal attainment to predict need satisfaction.

Hypothesis 10: Need satisfaction is positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 11: Well-being is negatively related to workplace deviance.

Alternative Models

Implicit in the hypothesized model depicted in Figure 1 is the idea that several meditational links will be observed. That is, variables within the self-concordance model will relate to workplace deviance through other variables (e.g., job satisfaction will
mediate the need satisfaction and deviance link) with the relations of the distal personality and situational factors being fully mediated by the self-concordance model constructs. This assumes that, for instance, a significant bivariate link between personal mastery and workplace deviance will be fully accounted for by the endogenous variables of goal self-concordance, goal attainment, need-satisfying experiences, and job satisfaction. I expected the same pattern for all exogenous predictors. However, consistent with the general method for testing mediation (e.g., Baron & Kenny, 1986), direct effects and partially mediated effects were examined in alternative models.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Participants were randomly selected from StudyResponse.com (see Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; as an example of published research using this database).

StudyResponse, developed in 2000, consists of a large group of employed individuals who have volunteered to participate in research studies (Stanton & Weiss, 2002). StudyResponse provides a database of potential participants for researchers to access a population different and more diverse than a typical undergraduate student population. StudyResponse’s database includes over 45,000 willing participants with a wide range of occupations and an average tenure of fifteen years (StudyResponse.com). StudyResponse also serves as a ‘remailer’ for researchers in order to ensure higher levels of anonymity (Stanton & Weiss, 2002). In other words, researchers organize and upload the set of measurements to be used to an Internet based survey program such as Survey Monkey. Once this has been completed, the researchers provide the link and other relevant information to StudyResponse, who then provides the link to the randomly selected participants. The data is then sent to the researchers with the researchers never coming into contact with the participants’ email addresses. Researchers are allowed to use this database solely for the cost of the incentives offered and in exchange providing information regarding response rates, types of measurements included and overall length.
of the study. StudyResponse then uses this data to better assess response rate patterns and potential problems (Stanton & Weiss, 2002). Typically the response rate is 10-30 percent (Picollo & Colquitt, 2006; StudyResponse.com), and has been as high as 68.4 percent (Wallace, 2004).

Data was collected from participants on two occasions separated by 4 weeks. On the first measurement occasion, participants completed the MTQ, autonomy, constraints, need satisfaction, and general job satisfaction scales, as well as goal self-concordance and demographics. Participants were asked to write down the goals that they have listed in order to increase recall of these goals at time two. Additionally, participants were reminded to select goals that would be worked on throughout the month and not select goals with immediate deadlines. At time two, participants completed the goal attainment, need satisfaction, general job satisfaction, and workplace deviance scales. The measures of these constructs were separated by one month to help reduce the influence of method bias derived from cross-sectional data collection (e.g., Podsakoff, et al., 2003). The elapsed time also aided in assessing progress towards goal attainment. Data collected at the two time periods were matched by the ID number that was given to participants through studyresponse.com. For each questionnaire, the participants were asked to enter their ID number. The use of this ID number ensured the anonymity of the participants in that the ID cannot be linked back to their email address or name.

For the current study, the original recruitment message was sent out to 1675 individuals and 396 responded to the email and logged into the study (a 23.6% initial response rate). However, only 234 individuals (13.97% of 1675) continued past logging in to begin the survey and completed the initial set of questions that were answered on a
Likert type scale. After this set of questions, participants were asked to list 6 current work goals that could be completed in sixty days. At this point there was a significant level of attrition with only 171 individuals continuing on to complete the entire Time 1 survey. As StudyResponse cannot discriminate between individuals who completed the survey at Time 1 and those that did not, the recruitment email for participation at Time 2 was sent to all 396 who originally logged in at Time 1. Of these individuals, 218 participants responded to the email and logged into the survey at Time 2. However, only 83 continued past the first set of questions where they were asked to recall the goals listed at Time 1 and respond to questions regarding those goals. Of the 83 who completed the section on goals at Time 2, only 54 had complete surveys at Time 1 and Time 2.

The final sample consisted of 54 employees who worked on average 39.21 hours per week (SD = 14.14). The mean age of the sample was 39.43 years (SD = 10.01) and 63% of the sample reported being female. The sample was 66.7% Caucasian, 3.7% African American, 5.6% Asian American, 1.9% Hispanic, 1.9% American Indian and 20.4% reported being of an ethnicity that was not included on the list.

Measures

The list of measures below was used to assess each of the variables in the hypothesized model.

Workplace Deviance. In order to measure workplace deviance, I used Bennett and Robinson’s (2000) measure. This measure contains 12 organizational deviance items (α = .91; sample item: “Taking an additional or longer break is acceptable at your workplace.”). The measure also contains 7 interpersonal deviance items (α = .90; sample item: “Played a mean trick on someone at work.”). Participants responded to items
assessing the extent to which they have engaged in the activity in the past year using the following scale: 1 = “never”; 2 = “once or twice a year”; 3 = “several times a year”; 4 = “once or twice a month”; 5 = “weekly” (see Appendix for all items).

Consistent with previous research on workplace deviance and similar constructs (i.e., CWB’s), self-report assessments were used (Diefendorff & Mehta, 2007; Fox et al., 2001; Spector et al., 2006). Despite some arguments that the use of self-report measures for assessing workplace deviance can be problematic due to socially-desirable responding, there is significant support for the use of self-report measures over external measures (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Ones, Viswesvaran, & Schmidt, 1993). Researchers suggest that self-report measures of workplace deviance may be more accurate than data found through external reports (Ones, et al., 1993). The reasoning behind this is that most often, external reports only report detected or more visible, easily measured acts of deviance such as absenteeism. In order to reduce the tendency for socially-desirable responding (e.g., Podsakoff, MacKenzi, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), especially regarding workplace deviance; I stressed the importance of accurate and honest responses, as well as assured participants of the anonymity of their responses.

Motivational Traits. In this study I used Kanfer and Ackerman’s short form of the Motivational Traits Questionnaire (MTQ). This survey measures three main dimensions (personal mastery, competitive excellence, and motivation related to anxiety), each with two scales. For personal mastery ($\alpha = .91$) the two subscales include: desire to learn consisting of 8 items ($\alpha = .85$; sample item “I thirst for knowledge.”) and mastery measured with 8 items ($\alpha = .80$; sample item: “I work hard at everything I undertake until I am satisfied with the results.”). Competitive excellence is measured by a
competitiveness scale, containing 6 items ($\alpha = .76$; sample item: “I like to turn things into a competition”) and other referenced goals scale, consisting of 7 items ($\alpha = .80$; sample item: “I strive to do my job better than people I work with”). Lastly, motivation related to anxiety ($\alpha = .93$) consists of two sub-scales; emotionality (9 items, $\alpha = .86$, sample item: “I am able to remain calm and relaxed in stressful situations”) and worry (10 items, $\alpha = .87$; sample item: “I worry about the possibility of failure”). Participants responded to these questions on a 5 point Likert type scale, 1 (very untrue) to 5 (very true).

**Organizational Constraints.** Organizational constraints was measured using Spector and Jex’s (1998) Organizational Constraints Scale (OCS). This eleven item scale asks individuals to indicate the frequency that their jobs are hindered by factors including interruptions and inaccessibility of resources. The current study found an alpha of .89 (see Appendix for items).

**Autonomy.** Self-reported autonomy was assessed with a four-item scale based on items from Hackman and Oldham (1975) and Idaszak and Drasgow (1987) ($\alpha = .92$; sample item: “My job provides the opportunity for independent thought and action”). Participants responded to each statement on a five-point Likert scale (1 = “Strongly disagree”; 5 = “Strongly agree”) (see Appendix for items).

**Self-concordance.** Consistent with previous work measuring self-concordance (Judge et al., 2005, Greguras & Diefendorff, under review), participants were asked to generate six short-term work goals that can be accomplished in sixty days. After generating these responses the participants were asked to answer four items (as developed by Sheldon & Elliot, 1999) for each goal. Each item represents one of the four types of motivation: “I pursue this goal because I believe it is an important goal to have”
(Identified); “I pursue this goal because of the fun and enjoyment it provides” (Intrinsic); “I pursue this goal because I would feel guilty, anxious, or ashamed if I did not” (Introjected); and “I pursue this goal because somebody else wants me to or because the situation demands it” (External). Participants responses were on a 9 point Likert type scale; ranging from 1 (not at all this reason) to 9 (completely this reason). Scores were derived in accordance with Sheldon and Elliot’s (1999) procedure of first calculating an intrinsic score (mean of the identified and intrinsic items; Time 1 $\alpha = .83$; Time 2 $\alpha = .82$) and an extrinsic score (mean of introjected and external items; Time 1 $\alpha = .87$; Time 2 $\alpha = .90$) and then subtracting the extrinsic score from the intrinsic score (see Appendix for items). The current study found an alpha of .80 for overall concordance at Time 1, and an alpha of .73 for overall concordance at Time 2.

**Goal attainment.** Similar to previous research (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999, Judge et al., 2005, Greguras & Diefendorff, under review) participants were asked to recall the six previously set work goals one month after the initial goal setting. Two items were similar to that of Sheldon & Elliot’s (1999) original design: “I have made considerable progress toward attaining those goals” and “I accomplished what I set out to do with those goals.” However, previous research found a relatively low Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha = .68$ in Judge et al., 2005) when using only these two items. Recently, Greguras and Diefendorff (under review) used an additional two items (“I am achieving what I wanted to achieve with those goals” and “I am happy with my progress toward attaining those goals”) resulting in a higher Cronbach alpha of $\alpha = .89$. For this reason, the current study used all four questions and resulted in an alpha of $\alpha = .88$. Participants responded to these questions
on a 5 point Likert scale; 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree (see Appendix for items).

Need Satisfaction. Need satisfaction was assessed using the Basic Need Satisfaction at Work Scale (Deci et al., 2001). This scale consisted of 21 items designed to assess the extent to which the three need satisfying experiences (i.e. autonomy, competence, and relatedness) are being met. A sample item is “I am free to express myself.” Participants responded to these questions on a 7 point Likert type scale (1 = not true at all; 7 = very true). Three scores were calculated, one for each of the three primary, however, consistent with prior research (e.g. Deci et al., 2001, Greguras & Diefendorff; under review) these served as indicators of the latent variable need satisfaction. The estimated reliability of this scale was $\alpha = .88$ (see Appendix for items).

Well-being. Well-being was assessed by measuring job satisfaction using the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Subscale (Cammann, Fichman, Henkins, & Klesh, 1979). This scale consisted of three items with internal consistency reliability of $\alpha = .84$. Participants’ responses were on a 5 point Likert scale (1 = “Disagree Very Much”; 5 = “Agree Very Much”).
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Analytic Strategy

In order to investigate the mediating role of the self-concordance model, path analysis was employed using LISREL 8.3 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993). Path analysis allows researchers to simultaneously test the theoretical causal relationship among a series of variables. By running path analyses for all hypotheses, I was able to assess if the proposed model was consistent with my observed data. For each variable, the mean scale score was used as the indicator. Additionally, the fit of each model was assessed using several indicators including the $\chi^2$ Goodness of Fit statistic, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) (Steiger, 1990), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) (Bentler, 1990), the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) (Bentler, 1995), and the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) (Tucker & Lewis, 1973). In order for a model to be evaluated as a good fitting model, the RMSEA should fall below .08, the SRMR below .10, and the TLI and CFI should be above .90 (Vandenberg & Lance, 2000).

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 reports the means, standard deviations, correlations, and reliabilities for all study variables. As can be seen in this table, consistent with previous work (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Deci, Ryan, Gagne’, Leone, Usunov, Kornazheva, 2001; Gagne, Kostner, & Zuckerman, 2000), job autonomy was significantly, positively related to need
satisfaction ($r = .60, p < .01$) and job satisfaction ($r = .43, p < .01$). Additionally, organizational constraints was negatively related to need satisfaction ($r = -.41, p < .01$) and job satisfaction ($r = -.33, p < .01$) and positively related to organizational deviance ($r = .36, p < .01$), consistent with prior work (Penney & Spector, 2005; Spector & Jex, 1998). Consistent with Hinsz & Jundt (2005), competitiveness was positively related to goal attainment ($r = .41, p < .01$), whereas other referenced goals and motivation related to anxiety were negatively related to need satisfaction ($r = -.45, p < .01; r = -.29, p < .05$; respectively). Other referenced goals also was positively related to interpersonal deviance ($r = .28, p < .05$). Consistent with expectations, the extrinsic motivation component of self-concordance was positively related to both forms of deviance (Interpersonal: $r = .35, p < .05; \text{Organizational: } r = .32, p < .05$).

Table 1. Bivariate Correlations and Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Antimy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizat</td>
<td>ional Constraints</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competitiv</td>
<td>ness</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Goal</td>
<td>Concoance</td>
<td>(Time 1)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Goal</td>
<td>Concoance</td>
<td>(Time 2)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intrinsic</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>(Time 1)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intrinsic</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>(Time 2)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Intrinsic</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>(Time 2)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intrinsic</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>(Time 2)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Goal</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goal</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Goal</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Interperon</td>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Organizat</td>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01
Hypothesized and Alternative Models

I assessed the hypothesized and alternative models using path analysis. To test the Hypothesized Model, only the paths (i.e., relationships) depicted in Figure 1 were estimated, with all other potential relationships among the study variables constrained to zero; additionally, given the finding in prior work that the two forms of deviance are correlated (Dalal, 2005), interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance were allowed to correlate in the model. The test of the hypothesized model (Model A) resulted in a poor fit to the data (see Figure 2). As such, several alternative models were tested based on both theoretical considerations and an examination of modification indices from the results of Model A (see Table 2 for the fit statistics of all models). I referred to the modification indices in order to determine which paths might be freed in order to improve the fit of the model. I also considered whether each of these additional paths was consistent with the underlying theoretical model (i.e., I did not free paths that were inconsistent with the underlying theory). Based on both of these considerations, four paths seemed like viable options for improving the fit. In order to ensure that each path made a significant contribution to the model, the models were run one at a time adding a single path with each consecutive model, resulting in Models B through E. This step-by-step process was used in order to ensure that each successive model not only improved the fit of the model to the data but to also ensure that the added path was significant.

The first alternative model, Model B which allowed competitiveness to directly relate to goal attainment, had significantly better fit than the hypothesized model ($\Delta \chi^2(1) = 11.16, p < .001$). Theoretically, this additional path suggests that competitiveness impacts goal attainment independent of whether the goals themselves are self-concordant.
Figure 2. Hypothesized Model: Model A

Table 2. Summary of Fit Statistics for Hypothesized Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Hypothesized Model (A)</td>
<td>128.96$^*$</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Alternative Model (B)</td>
<td>115.6$^{**}$</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>11.16$^{**}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model A vs. Model B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.16$^{**}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Alternative Model (C)</td>
<td>163.84$^*$</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model B vs. Model C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.94$^{**}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Alternative Model (D)</td>
<td>70.83$^{**}$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>33.01$^{**}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model C vs. Model D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.01$^{**}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Alternative Model (E)</td>
<td>61.20$^*$</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model D vs. Model E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.63$^*$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $N = 163$. RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis index, SRMR = standardized root mean-square residual. $^* p < .05$, $^{**} p < .01$
Additionally, when other referenced goals also was allowed to relate to overall need satisfaction (Model C), the fit significantly improved again ($\Delta \chi^2(1) = 11.96, p < .001$; see Table 2) and other referenced goals significantly predicted need satisfaction ($\gamma = -.47, p < .01$). Model D, which included each of the previously mentioned paths and a path from autonomy to overall need satisfaction, resulted in a significant improvement in fit compared to Model C ($\Delta \chi^2(1) = 33.01, p < .001$). However the best-fitting alternative model, Model E, added paths from need satisfaction to interpersonal and organizational deviance, which fit significantly better than Model D ($\Delta \chi^2(2) = 7.63, p < .05$).

Theoretically, these paths suggest that need satisfaction relates to workplace deviance independent of the influence of job satisfaction. However, even though the fit of Model E was significantly better than other models, it still did not achieve good fit by commonly accepted standards (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The inability to find a good fitting model may be due, in part, to the small sample size and the relatively large number of paths examined. This issue is returned to in the discussion of the study limitations. Tests of the hypothesized and additional paths from Model E (see Figure 3) are discussed below.

Tests of Hypotheses

Figure 3 presents the path coefficients for Model E. None of the situational and individual level variables significantly related to goal self-concordance [personal mastery ($\gamma = .09, ns$); competitiveness ($\gamma = .14, ns$); other referenced goals ($\gamma = -.23, ns$); motivation related to anxiety ($\gamma = -.05, ns$); organizational constraints ($\gamma = .08, ns$); autonomy ($\gamma = .04, ns$)]. As a result, Hypotheses 1a, 2, 3, 4, 5a, and 6, respectively, were not supported. Also, Personal Mastery was not significantly related to goal attainment ($\gamma = -.08, ns$), providing no support for Hypothesis 1b.
Hypothesis 7 predicted that goal self-concordance would significantly predict goal attainment; however, this path was nonsignificant ($\beta = -.10, \text{ns}$), thereby failing to support this hypothesis. Organizational constraints was significantly related to goal attainment ($\gamma = .29, p < .05$); however, the sign was the opposite of what was predicted, with higher levels of organizational constraints being associated with higher levels of attainment. Therefore, Hypothesis 5b was not supported. Additionally, goal attainment did not significantly predict need satisfaction ($\beta = .16, \text{ns}$), nor was this relationship moderated by goal self-concordance ($\beta = -.08, \text{ns}$). Therefore Hypotheses 8 and 9, respectively, were not supported. Supporting Hypothesis 10, need satisfaction was significantly related to job satisfaction ($\beta = .65, p < .01$), such that higher levels of need satisfaction coincide with higher levels of job satisfaction. Hypothesis 11 predicted that
job satisfaction would be negatively related to workplace deviance. However, job satisfaction was not significantly related to organizational deviance (β = .06, ns) and it did not significantly predict interpersonal deviance (β = .06, ns). Therefore, Hypothesis 11 was not supported. In sum, Hypotheses 1a, 1b, 2, 3, 4, 5a, 5b and 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, were not supported. However, Hypothesis 10 was supported with need satisfaction being a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

Model E included several paths that were not in the Hypothesized Model (Model A). Specifically, competitiveness was positively related to goal attainment (γ = .43, p < .01), such that the more individuals are predisposed to strive to perform better than others, the more likely they are to report attaining their goals. Other referenced goals was negatively related to overall need satisfaction (γ = -.47, p < .01), such that the more individuals are predisposed to be motivated by comparisons with others, the lower their overall need satisfaction. Additionally, job autonomy was positively related to need satisfaction (γ = .60, p < .01), consistent with findings in the self-determination theory literature (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Deci, Ryan, Gagne’, Leone, Usunov, Kornazheva, 2001; Gagne, Kostner, & Zuckerman, 2000). Finally, need satisfaction was a significant negative predictor of both interpersonal and organizational deviance (γ = -.43, p < .01; γ = -.45, p < .01; respectively), suggesting that individuals who report low levels of psychological need satisfaction in the domains of autonomy, relatedness and competence are more likely to report engaging in both forms of workplace deviance.

**Exploratory Analyses**

In an attempt to more fully examine the potential role of goal self-concordance in my theoretical model, several exploratory analyses were performed. Recall that the
hypothesized model used data collected at two time periods with goal self-concordance assessed at Time 1 and goal attainment assessed at Time 2, with both assessments being matched on goal content (i.e., participants had to report the same goal in open-ended responses). Also, consistent with prior research on self-determination theory (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999; Bono & Judge, 2003; Greguras & Diefendorff, under review), goal self-concordance was operationalized as a difference score between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In following analyses I explore three additional models that utilized different operationalizations of goal self concordance, including (a) Time 2 goal self-concordance, (b) Time 1 goal self-concordance operationalized as an interaction between the intrinsic and extrinsic components, and (c) Time 2 goal self-concordance operationalized as an interaction between the intrinsic and extrinsic components. Path analysis was used to test the exploratory models with a focus on testing both the originally Hypothesized Model (Model A) and the Final Model (Model E; see Table 3 for the fit statistics of exploratory models).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model A</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model C</th>
<th>Model D</th>
<th>Model E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>125.05 **</td>
<td>60.74 *</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>152.74 **</td>
<td>87.91 **</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>137.53 **</td>
<td>78.20 **</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Summary of Fit Statistics for Exploratory Models

I. Exploratory Model 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>$\Delta^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta$df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model A</td>
<td>125.05 **</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>64.31 **</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model E</td>
<td>60.74 *</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>64.31 **</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model A</td>
<td>152.74 **</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>64.83 **</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model E</td>
<td>87.91 **</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>64.83 **</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model A</td>
<td>137.53 **</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>59.27 **</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model E</td>
<td>78.20 **</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>59.27 **</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=165; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR = standardized root-mean-square residual. * p < .05; ** p < .01

I. This model replaced Time 1 goal self-concordance with Time 2 goal self-concordance
II. This model was run with Time 1 intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and their product term included as predictors of goal attainment.
III. This model was run with Time 2 intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and their product term included as predictors of goal attainment.
The first alternative model replaced Time 1 goal self-concordance with Time 2 goal self-concordance to examine whether goal self-concordance measured at Time 2 might be more strongly related to subsequent model variables than was self-concordance measured at Time 1. Results from analysis of the hypothesized model revealed poor fit to the data ($\Delta \chi^2(47) = 125.05, p < .01$; RMSEA = 0.15; SRMR = 0.16; TLI = 0.36; CFI = 0.61). Additionally, the path from Time 2 self-concordance to goal attainment was non-significant ($\beta = -.01, ns$). Similar to the results using Time 1 self-concordance, Model E ($\chi^2(52) = 60.74, p < .05$; RMSEA = 0.081; SRMR = 0.086; TLI = 0.83; CFI = 0.91), with the additional alternative paths, fit better than the hypothesized model ($\Delta \chi^2(3) = 64.31, p < .01$). Interestingly, self-concordance at Time 2 significantly predicted need satisfaction in this model ($\beta = .19, p < .05$).

The second exploratory model examined the components of the goal self-concordance variable, and their interaction, as separate predictors. A concern with the self-concordance variable is that it is calculated as a difference score with extrinsic motivation being subtracted from intrinsic motivation. Edwards (1994) argued against the use of difference scores since many times it confounds the effect of each component of the measure, thereby concealing possible independent effects. The use of a difference score implies that the effect of each component is equal and opposite in sign, an assumption that often is not tenable. In order to test whether the effect of goal self-concordance was obscured because of the use of a difference score in its calculation, intrinsic and extrinsic ratings were kept separate with the calculation of an interaction term between them added to the model.
Path analysis was then run with Time 1 intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and their product term included as predictors of goal attainment. For Model A, results show that none of these terms were significant predictors of goal attainment (intrinsic: $\beta = -.03, \text{ns}$; extrinsic: $\beta = .10, \text{ns}$; product term: $\beta = .01, \text{ns}$), and the model had poor fit to the data ($\chi^2(49) = 152.74, p < .01; \text{RMSEA} = 0.16; \text{SRMR} = 0.16; \text{TLI} = 0.27; \text{CFI} = 0.57$). Interestingly, personal mastery’s prediction of intrinsic motivation was marginally significant ($\gamma = .28, p < .10$), and other referenced goals significantly predicted extrinsic motivation ($\gamma = .39, p < .05$). An additional path analysis was run with intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and their product term with the addition of paths from alternative Model E. Again, none of these variables predicted goal attainment (intrinsic: $\beta = -.10, \text{ns}$; extrinsic: $\beta = .05, \text{ns}$; product term: $\beta = .06, \text{ns}$), however, the fit of the model was significantly better than the hypothesized model ($\Delta\chi^2(5) = 64.83, p < .01; \chi^2(54) = 87.91, p < .01; \text{RMSEA} = 0.11; \text{SRMR} = 0.098; \text{TLI} = 0.68; \text{CFI} = 0.83$). Modification indices for this model also suggested that a model allowing the extrinsic motivation component of self-concordance to predict both interpersonal and organizational deviance would significantly improve fit, with both paths being significant.

The third exploratory model examined the Time 2 self-concordance components and their product term as separate variables. Applied to Model A, the fit of this model was poor ($\chi^2(49) = 137.53, p < .01; \text{RMSEA} = 0.15; \text{SRMR} = 0.16; \text{TLI} = 0.37; \text{CFI} = 0.63$). The fit was similarly poor for the Model E, ($\chi^2(54) = 78.26, p < .01; \text{RMSEA} = 0.089; \text{SRMR} = 0.093; \text{TLI} = 0.76; \text{CFI} = 0.87$), though it was better than Model A ($\Delta\chi^2(5) = 59.27, p < .001$). This model revealed the only significant relationship between the self-concordance variables and goal attainment. Specifically, it was found that
intrinsic motivation significantly predicted goal attainment ($\beta = .31, p< .05$), such that the goals that are more intrinsically motivated at Time 2 have higher levels of attainment at Time 2. Extrinsic motivation and the product term remained non-significant in this model (Extrinsic: $\beta = .17, ns$; Product term: $\beta = .00, ns$). Additionally, competitiveness predicted intrinsic motivation at Time 2 with marginal significance ($\gamma = .30, p < .10$).
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The current study found very little support for the hypothesized model, though several significant bivariate results were consistent with expectations (e.g., organizational constraints was correlated with organizational deviance and job satisfaction). Further, the exploratory analyses yielded some interesting findings that may prove useful for future theorizing about the linkages between personality and situational antecedents, self-concordance model variables, and workplace deviance.

Linking Situational and Individual Difference Variables to Goal Self-Concordance

In the hypothesized model, no individual difference or situational variables significantly predicted goal self-concordance. This finding was surprising given that prior work has demonstrated links of individual difference variables, such as neuroticism and core self-evaluations, with self-concordance or autonomous goals (Judge, et al., 2005; Houser-Marko & Sheldon, 2006; Sharah, Henrich, Blatt, Ryan, & Little, 2003). Although low power is a potential explanation for the lack of significant results (I return to this point in the limitations section), another possible reason for the nonsignificant findings could have to do with the operationalization of goal self-concordance.

Traditionally, goal self-concordance is calculated as a difference score (e.g. Bono & Judge, 2003; Greguras & Diefendorff, under review; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999), a method for operationalizing constructs that has received much criticism (e.g., Edwards,
An alternative to the use of difference scores is to use the two component scores (intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation) as separate variables, and when the variables are predictors, to also include the product of the two components as a predictor. Examining extrinsic and intrinsic motivation as separate variables revealed that personal mastery was a significant positive predictor of intrinsic motivation and that other referenced goals was a significant positive predictor extrinsic motivation. Individuals higher in personal mastery are highly motivated to learn new tasks and accomplish goals (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000). As such, these individuals are more likely to pursue goals that they are interested in and identify with, and, as a result, report higher levels of intrinsic motivation for their goals. On the other hand, individuals high in other referenced goals are motivated by comparisons with and expectations of other people (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000); therefore, these individuals are more likely to feel that their goals are not internally derived, but rather come from an external source. These effects are consistent with what would be expected theoretically, but were obscured by the use of a difference score to operationalize self-concordance.

When examining the relationships of personality variables with the self-concordance component scores at Time 2, these previously mentioned relationships were non-significant, but competitiveness significantly predicted intrinsic motivation. Consistent with expectations, individuals high in competitiveness, who are motivated to outperform those around them, were more likely to report that their goals were more internally derived. The distinctive pattern of relationships for competitiveness and other referenced goals suggest that, although they can be combined into a broader concept of competitive excellence (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000), each may have distinct contributions.
to the perceptions of the locus of one’s goals. As competitiveness is closely related to
approach motivation, whereas other referenced goals is a mixture of both approach and
avoidance motivation (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000), it is not a far stretch to see how they
would differentially influence the extent to which goals are perceived as being
intrinsically versus extrinsically derived.

The current study found some interesting relationships for the situational
antecedent of organizational constraints. As expected, organizational constraints was
negatively related to need satisfaction and job satisfaction in bivariate analyses. The
more one encounters barriers to progress, the less one’s needs are satisfied and the lower
one’s satisfaction with the job. However, contrary to what was expected, organizational
constraints was positively related to goal attainment. As this was a very unexpected
result, the reasons for this relationship are not entirely clear. However, one possible
explanation may be derived from Gollwitzer and Wicklund’s (1985) self-completion
theory. According to this theory, individuals become committed to an identity, which can
be associated with one’s occupation (e.g., lawyer, politician). In order to experience
completeness in one’s identity, individuals pursue goals that display characteristics
consistent with this identity (Gollwitzer & Wicklund, 1985). However, when one’s goals
and, by extension one’s identity, are threatened, as would be the case with organizational
constraints at work, one may experience self-definitional incompleteness (Gollwitzer and
Wicklund, 1985). Experiencing self-definitional incompleteness motivates individuals to
bolster their threatened identity by engaging in behaviors relevant to that identity. For
instance, Brunstien and Gollwitzer (1996) found that after receiving negative feedback
related to their professional identity, individuals had higher levels of performance on
tasks that were related to that identity. In the current study, it may be the case that the presence of organizational constraints may have threatened individuals’ valued work identities, leading them to actually be more motivated to attain their goals. However, this theoretical explanation is highly speculative and is not entirely consistent with the fact that organizational constraints was positively related to workplace deviance and negatively related to job satisfaction. As such, future research on the organizational constraints and goal attainment relationship is needed.

*Linkages Within the Goal Self-Concordance Model*

The goal self-concordance model suggests that more self-concordant goals lead to higher levels of attainment and higher levels of attainment lead to greater need satisfaction (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998; 1999). Significant relationships between goal self-concordance and goal attainment were not found in this study, nor was there a significant relationship between goal attainment and need satisfaction. Additionally, self-concordance did not interact with goal attainment to predict need satisfaction. However there was a significant link between need satisfaction and job satisfaction, as expected.

Among all of the exploratory analyses, support for the link between goal self-concordance and goal attainment was found only in a model in which concordance was operationalized by its components, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, at Time 2. In this case, intrinsic motivation positively predicted goal attainment, as would be expected by theory (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999) and prior research (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998; Bono & Judge, 2003).

One possible explanation for the nonsignificant relationship between goal self-concordance and goal attainment might be that the current study had a relatively short
time frame separating the two data collections. Indeed, the two data collection periods were only four weeks apart, at most, and possibly shorter for some participants. As data collection periods lasted up to two weeks, it was possible for a participant to complete the survey at the end of week 2 for the first data collection and at the beginning of week 1 for the second data collection. For a participant in this scenario, the data collection periods would have been only three weeks apart. Additionally, individuals were asked at Time 1 to describe goals they were pursuing over a sixty-day time frame. As a result, they may not have had time to attain, or even expected to attain, the goals described at Time 1 by the time the Time 2 attainment measure was completed, four weeks later. Examination of previous self-concordance studies reveals an interesting pattern of results with regard to the time frame between data collections. Greguras and Diefendorff (under review), who also failed to find a significant relationship between goal self-concordance and goal attainment, had three weeks between the measures. In contrast, Sheldon and Elliot’s (1999) original study spanned several months and found self-concordance to significantly predict goal attainment. Bono and Judge (2003) also found a significant self-concordance and goal attainment relationship using a time span of 8 weeks. It seems that in order to observe an effect of self-concordance on goal attainment, a longer duration between the assessments may be needed. Or perhaps the issue may be that the time frame of the goals identified at Time 1 should match the timing of the two measures. For instance, a 4 week spread between the two measures may be reasonable as long as the goals described at Time 1 also pertain to the same 4 week period.

In regards to other aspects of the self-concordance model, the current study did not find goal attainment or the interaction between self-concordance and goal attainment
to be significant predictors of need satisfaction. These finding are inconsistent with prior work (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999) which found that attainment of intrinsically derived goals led to higher levels of need satisfaction than attainment of extrinsically-derived goals. Although statistical power may have contributed to this non-significant effect, the magnitude of these relationships do not suggest much of an effect was present (see Figure 3). The lack of an observed relationship for self-concordance could once again be due to the mismatch in the timeline for the goal and goal attainment measures. Participants may not have had high levels of attainment to report, leading to a restriction of range, which made the detection of a relationship with need satisfaction more difficult to observe.

*Linking Self-Concordance and the Antecedent Variables to Workplace Deviance*

In the fully-mediated hypothesized model, only job satisfaction was expected to predict interpersonal and organizational deviance. These links were not supported in the primary model. However, need satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of both interpersonal and organizational deviance such that the more individuals’ psychological needs for autonomy, relatedness and competence were met, the less likely they were to engage in these counterproductive behaviors. These findings suggest an interesting link between self-determination theory and deviance, such that the more an individual has met his/her basic psychological needs, the less likely they are to violate significant organizational norms. Although prior work has found significant positive effects of meeting these needs on well-being, job satisfaction (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Gagne’, Ryan, & Bargmann, 2003), organizational commitment and job performance (Greguras & Diefendorff, in press), the present study suggests that there may be important negative effects of not meeting these needs. These findings are important for
leaders to note as it seems that not allowing for a psychologically satisfying work environment could be damaging to the organization.

Another noteworthy link between the self-concordance model variables and workplace deviance was revealed in the supplemental analyses in which intrinsic and extrinsic motivations were kept separate. In particular, these analyses showed that the pursuit of extrinsic goals was positively related to organizational and interpersonal deviance. However, interestingly there was no correspondingly opposite (beneficial) effect of the pursuit of intrinsic goals. Additionally, it is worth noting that the magnitude of the bivariate relationships between self-concordance and interpersonal ($r = -.22$) and organizational ($r = -.19$) deviance are sufficiently large in magnitude that it is quite likely that low power was partly to blame for the lack of significant results. Nonetheless, it seems that this relationship may be driven by the negative effect of extrinsic motivation more than any beneficial effect of intrinsic motivation. A leader’s awareness of the negative impact of extrinsically derived goals might encourage one to find new ways to communicate the goals of the job and organization (Bono & Judge, 2003).

Another noteworthy finding from the model was that, consistent with previous research, organizational constraints was positively related to organizational deviance (Spector & Jex, 1998; Spector et al., 2006). As suggested by Fox and colleagues (2001), deviant acts directed toward the organization might reflect behavioral reactions to the stress caused by these frustrating impediments.

**Implications for Research and Practice**

The results of this study have implications for self-concordance and workplace deviance research, as well as management practices. Particularly, the findings of the
current study suggest that the operationalization of self-concordance should be carefully considered. Specifically, it may be worth separating the effects of intrinsic motivation from extrinsic motivation on outcome variables, rather than obscuring their distinct effects by using the difference between them as a predictor (Edwards, 1994). Results suggest that some relationships were observed for extrinsic motivation, but not for the combined difference score variable. Additionally, the current study found that several motivational traits significantly predicted the components of self-concordance, but not the self-concordance difference score.

Additionally, the current study suggests that the pursuit of goals for extrinsic reasons may be an antecedent of workplace deviance. Thus, when deciding to engage in deviant acts, individuals may be more likely to do so if they feel forced to pursue work goals or do not identify with the reasons for the goals. However, simply enhancing intrinsic motivation may not remedy this situation, as this was not found to relate to deviance; rather the focus should primarily be on decreasing the belief that one’s goals are externally controlled.

The findings for extrinsic motivation could be very helpful to leaders in organizations, who may strive to align employee goals with the natural interests and values of employees. As it seems that the pursuit of goals for extrinsic reasons can have significant negative implications not only for the individual but also the organization, leaders may benefit from framing goals in such a way that they are easily identified with and internalized. Consistent with this view, Bono and Judge (2003) found that followers of transformational leaders, who may be more likely to better align goals with employee values, were more likely have self-concordant goals. As such, organizations should
consider investing in leadership development programs aimed at improving the way goals are communicated to employees, with an emphasis on decreasing the belief that goals are externally controlled. Such efforts may decrease the likelihood of counterproductive work behaviors.

From the preliminary results presented in this study, I developed a post hoc model for future research (see Figure 4 for the suggested model). As this model was developed post hoc, it serves only as a possible starting point for future research and needs to be empirically tested and compared with other theoretical models before any firm conclusions regarding its validity can be made. The suggested paths in the model were derived from looking at the relationships among study variables that were high in magnitude and were consistent with prior theory (Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). As indicated in Figure 4, autonomy and organizational constraints were identified as relevant situational predictors based on their observed relationships with workplace deviance (see Table 1). Personal mastery and other referenced goals were selected as antecedent individual difference variables based on their links to organizational and interpersonal deviance (see Table 1). Also included in Figure 4 are extrinsic motivation and need satisfaction, as both were related to workplace deviance. Intrinsic motivation also was included in the figure because of its links with the antecedent conditions and the strong support in prior theory for linking it to need satisfaction (Deci, & Ryan, 1985; 2000; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). Further, I proposed in Figure 4 that the situational and individual difference variables will impact workplace deviance through intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and need satisfaction. Although this model is extremely tentative given that it was derived post
hoc from the analysis of a relatively small sample, some of the linkages in it may help to
guide future work in this area.

Limitations and Future Research

One limitation of this study was the small sample size, which was due in part to
attrition. Recall that of the 396 who logged on to take the survey at Time 1, only 54 (13.6
%) ended up completing all of the items across the Times 1 and 2 surveys. With such a
small sample size, the power to detect relationships between variables in the model was
very low. Indeed, many of the observed relationships were relatively large in magnitude,
but did not have enough statistical power to be significant (see Figure 3).

One possible cause of the high attrition might have been tied to the methodology
for assessing goals. Although there was a strong initial response rate, many participants
who started the first survey, failed to continue the survey at the point at which they were
asked to list their goals (40.9 %). As such, this part of the survey may have been
perceived as too effortful or too invasive, leading participants to stop the survey. To remedy this problem, participants in future research may be reminded of the importance of this section of the survey and of the confidentiality of their responses. These problems also may have been compounded by the use of StudyResponse as a tool to collect data. In this platform, participants and researchers have no contact; as a result there was no financial or social cost to not completing the survey. As a result, the motivation for responding to the survey may have been especially low for this sample. In future research, a different recruitment methodology should be considered.

On a related note, another limitation of the study was that in only 51.9% of the time were participants able to recall all six goals at Time 2 that they had listed at Time 1. Participants were instructed at Time 1 to write down and keep track of the goals that they listed as they would have to answer questions regarding these goals in four weeks, but this did not seem to be especially effective in facilitating recall. One way that future studies could address this issue would be to remind each participant of his or her Time 1 goals at the time they are asked to complete the survey at Time 2. This procedure would eliminate the need to rely participant recollection of their stated goals.

A third limitation of the study was the relatively short time frame between the two measurement periods and the lack of correspondence between the time frame presented in the first goal measure and the actual time frame between the goal and goal attainment measures. Future studies should employ a longer span of time between the two points of measurement (e.g., eight weeks or longer), which may allow participants to have a better sense of progress and attainment of these goals. This extended time frame may also allow for goal self-concordance to affect levels of goal attainment. Alternatively, it may be that
simply matching the timeframe of the goals assessed in the self-concordance measure with the assessment of goal attainment would result in more valid measurement.

A fourth limitation was that all of the data collected were self-report, possibly resulting in inflated correlations due to same source bias (Fox et al., 2001). Despite this concern, I feel that self-report was the most appropriate methodology for the variables that were used. To combat possible method bias, the data was collected at two points, with predictor variables collected approximately four weeks prior to the criterion variables. Another concern with using this methodology is that participants might report lower than accurate levels of deviant behaviors and respond in a more socially desirable manner (Lee, 1993). In fact, other researchers have argued for the use of non-incumbent measures of deviant behaviors such as organizational records or supervisor reports (Sackett, Burris & Callahan, 1989). However, some researchers suggest that this measurement of deviance is no more accurate than self-report (e.g. Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Vardi & Weitz, 2004) as it is only an indicator of the more observable deviant acts. Additionally, non-incumbent measures of deviance have shown to have lower validity than self-report measures (Ones et al., 1993). As such, I feel that self-report was the most appropriate methodology for the current study.

Conclusion

Although many of the hypothesized relationships were not found to be significant in the full model, results from the exploratory and bivariate analyses were very encouraging. These initial results suggest that some of these relationships might be found to be significant if there were higher levels power. Additionally, the current study
provided an initial starting point in examining the links between self-concordance theory variables and workplace deviance.
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MEASURES

Autonomy Scale (Idaszak and Drasgow, 1987)

1. My job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my work.
2. My job provides the opportunity for independent thought and action.
3. My job lets me be left on my own to do my own work.
4. My job gives me the chance to use my personal initiative and judgment in carrying out the work.

Organizational Constraints Scale (OCS) (Spector and Jex, 1998)

1. Poor equipment or supplies.
2. Organizational rules and procedures.
3. Other employees.
4. Your supervisor.
5. Lack of equipment or supplies.
6. Inadequate training.
7. Interruptions by other people.
8. Lack of necessary information about what to do or how to do it.
9. Conflicting job demands.
10. Inadequate help from others.
11. Incorrect instructions.
Motivational Traits Questionnaire (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2000)

The author of this scale has requested that it not be included in theses, dissertations, or other published works. Please contact Dr. Ruth Kanfer for permission to view the scale.

**Goal Self Concordance**

1. I pursue this goal because I believe it is an important goal to have.

2. I pursue this goal because of the fun and enjoyment it provides.

3. I pursue this goal because I would feel guilty, anxious, or ashamed if I did not.

4. I pursue this goal because somebody else wants me to or because the situation demands it.

**Goal Attainment (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999; Greguras & Diefendorff, 2007)**

1. I have made considerable progress toward attaining those goals.

2. I accomplished what I set out to do with those goals.

3. I am achieving what I wanted to achieve with those goals.

4. I am happy with my progress toward attaining those goals.

**Basic Need Satisfaction at Work (Deci et al, 2001)**

1. I feel like I can make a lot of inputs to deciding how my job gets done.

2. I really like the people I work with.

3. I do not feel very competent when I am at work.

4. People at work tell me I am good at what I do.

5. I feel pressured at work.

6. I get along with people at work.

7. I pretty much keep to myself when I am at work.

8. I am free to express my ideas and opinions on the job.
9. I consider the people I work with to be my friends.

10. I have been able to learn interesting new skills on my job.

11. When I am at work, I have to do what I am told.

12. Most days I feel a sense of accomplishment from working.

13. My feelings are taken into consideration at work.

14. On my job I do not get much of a chance to show how capable I am.

15. People at work care about me.

16. There are not many people at work that I am close to.

17. I feel like I can pretty much be myself at work.

18. The people I work with do not seem to like me much.

19. When I am working I often do not feel very capable.

20. There is not much opportunity for me to decide for myself how to go about my work.

21. People at work are pretty friendly towards me.

Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Subscale (Cammann, Fichman, Henkins, & Klesh, 1979)

1. All in all I am satisfied with my job.

2. In general, I don’t like my job.

3. In general, I like working here.

Workplace Deviance Scale (Robinson and Bennett’s, 2000)

1. Made fun of someone at work.

2. Said something hurtful to someone at work

3. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work,
4. Played a mean prank on someone at work.

5. Acted rudely toward someone at work

6. Publicly embarrassed someone at work.

7. Taken property from work without permission

8. Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working.

9. Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses.

10. Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at you workplace.

11. Come in late to work without permission.

12. Littered you work environment.

13. Neglected to follow your boss’s instructions.

14. Intentionally worked slower than you could have worked.

15. Discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person

16. Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job.

17. Put little effort into your work.

18. Dragged out work in order to get overtime.
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