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ABSTRACT

THE DARK TRIAD AND COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIORS:
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AS A MODERATOR

Gülerdi, Melis
M.Sc., Department of Psychology
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Yonca Toker
Co-Supervisor: Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer
January 2020, 111 pages

Taking the frequency and cost of the counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) into account, it is crucial for recruiters and leaders in the workplace to understand the mechanisms and factors that facilitate the emergence of CWBs. In addition to the HEXACO model which represents positive personality traits, the Dark Triad (DT) (i.e., Machiavellianism, narcissism, psychopathy) model has been an area of interest in searching for the antecedents of CWBs. In this study, the DT traits and organizational culture (OC) were included in the research to examine the predictors of perceived counterproductive work behaviors (PCWBs). There exists research examining the relationship between the DT and PCWBs. However, using Cameron and Quinn’s (1999) Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) to examine of role of organizational culture (Market, Adhocracy, Hierarchy and Clan) in the DT-PCWBs relationship is relatively new. Hence, the purpose of this study is to investigate the DT-PCWB linkage and the moderating role of OC in this relationship. Data were collected from white-collar employees (N = 308) from ten different sectors through an online survey. The results of regression analyses revealed that, among the DT traits, narcissism and psychopathy significantly
positively predicted composite PCWBs. However, moderation analysis showed that, OC did not moderate any of the hypothesized relationships. The findings, along with the implications, limitations and suggestions for the future studies are discussed.

**Keywords:** Counterproductive Work Behaviors, the Dark Triad, Organizational Culture Assessment Inventory, Organizational Culture, Trait-Activation Theory.
ÖZ

KARANLIK ÜÇLÜ VE ÜRETİM KARŞİTI İŞ DAVRANIŞLARI:
ORGANİZASYONEL KÜLTÜRÜN MODERATÖR İLİŞKİSİ
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Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yonca Toker
Ortak Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer

Ocak 2020, 111 sayfa

analizlerin sonuçları, Karanlık Üçlü kişilik özellikleri arasında narsisizm ve psikopatinin algılanan üretim karşıtı iş davranışları kompozit değişkenini önemli ölçüde yordadığını göstermiştir. Bununla birlikte, düzenleyici değişken analizi, organizasyonel kültürün varsayılmış ilişkileri anlamış bir şekilde etkilemediğini göstermiştir. Bulguların doğurguları, çalışmanın sınırlılıkları ve öneriler tartışma bölümünde ele alınmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Üretim Karşıtı İş Davranışları, Karanlık Üçlü, Kurum Kültürü Değerlendirme Aracı, Örgüt Kültürü, Özellikle Aktivasyon Kuramı.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Overview

Counter productive work behaviors (CWBs) are deliberate actions that harm the organization or its members (O'Boyle, Forsyth, Banks, & McDaniel, 2012). Deviant behaviors include organizational CWB (CWB-O) with a variety of acts that can be directed toward organizations with a common theme of behaviors being harmful to the organization by directly affecting its functioning or property and interpersonal CWB (CWB-I) directed toward employees in a way that would reduce their effectiveness (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). CWB-O actions consist of destroying organizational property, work done incorrectly with purpose, and taking unauthorized work breaks; whereas hitting, insulting, and shouting at a co-worker are forms of CWB-I (Cohen, 2016). Robinson and Bennett (1995) named four categories of CWB as “Four P’s”: production deviance, property deviance, political deviance, and personal aggression. While the first two categories construe CWB-O, the latter two construe CWB-I. Another CWB classification has been developed by Spector and his associates (2006). In this classification CWB is categorized into five dimensions: abuse (harmful and nasty behaviors that affect other people), product deviance (deliberately doing one’s job incorrectly or allowing an error to occur), sabotage (destroying organizational property), theft (illegally taking the personal goods or possessions of another), and withdrawal (avoiding work, being late or absent).

CWB has mostly been studied as a global construct toward a more integrative treatment of the variety of CWBs (Dalal, 2005; Sackett, 2002; Sackett & DeVore, 2001). Complementing the behavior-specific literature of CWBs, it is necessary to
examine the CWBs as a global construct (Sackett, 2002). It has been reported that
different forms CWBs are substantially positive correlated (Sackett & DeVore,
2001). Moreover, it is found that, the correlation between CWB-I and CWB-O
components is .86 (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). This strong positive correlation has
been reported in self-report studies, supervisory ratings and also in studies where
objective measures of CWBs had been used (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). Using self-
report data and supervisory ratings Gruys and Sackett (2003) found that correlations
among CWB categories were positive and ranged from .17 to .71 with an average
correlation of .43 (Gruys & Sackett, 2003). Furthermore, using self-report
measurement, when CWBs categories were combined to generate an overall grand
composite score of CWBs, internal consistency reliability was found to be .92
(Gruys, 1999). In short empirical evidence supports treating CWB as a unitary
construct. Therefore, it can be expected that if a person is showing one type of CWB
at the workplace, other types of CWBs are more likely to be engaged in (Gruys &
dimensions within a category have strong cross-category correlations, aggregated
categories yield an overall CWB measure with internal consistency reliability
between .80 and .90. Therefore, in this study, CWBs was treated as a global
construct in hypothesis testing.

The common characteristics of CWBs are violation of the organizational
interests and causing potential harm and loss for the organization as a whole or for its
members (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). Harassment, incivility and abuse-type behaviors
are also considered to be forms of CWB as they represent interpersonal deviance and
have detrimental effects on mental and physical health of individuals (Lim, Cortine,
& Magley, 2008). Spector and Fox (2005) stated that physical or psychological
forms of abuse vary in terms of their severity and affect work satisfaction of
employees in a negative way. CWBs are ‘extra-role’ behaviors distinct from core
task behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002),
which are too costly for organizations. CWB incidences have been found to be
associated with low productivity, increased insurance costs, lost or damaged
property, increased turnover (Penney & Spector, 2002), and increased dissatisfaction and job stress (Hafidz, 2012). Those actions could be overt, such as aggression and theft, or more covert, passive acts, such as intentionally failing to follow instructions or doing work incorrectly (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001).

Organizational behavior research has focused on intentional behaviors of employees. To be called CWB, actions have to be intentional rather than accidental, independent of the outcomes (Fox et al., 2001). Furthermore, a decision or a choice to engage in a deviant behavior must be planned to harm (Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001). Moreover, to be able to categorize the harmful behavior as CWB, it does not have to end up with an undesirable outcome, the possibility of a detrimental consequence is enough to label that action as CWB. Therefore, according to Fox et al., there is subjectivity in perceiving and engaging in counterproductive behavior. In most of the studies in the CWB literature, CWBs are measured via questions regarding the frequency of engaging in those behaviors (Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Cohen & Diamant, 2019). However, measuring the level of engagement in a sensitive and somewhat intimidating variable is rather complex (Cohen & Diamant, 2019). The CWB scale involves potentially shaming inquiries, hence, it may cause employees underreport the frequency of their engagement in CWBs (Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt, 2012). The reason behind this can be the fear of being caught and punished or not wanting to describe themselves in negative terms (Lee, 1993 as cited in Berry et al., 2012). Although the anonymity is granted when CWBs are measured with self-report, social desirability bias still a potential problem (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Respondents are found to be “faking good,” in return biasing the results (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). In Peterson and colleagues’ (2011) research, there was a significant correlation between faking and self-reported CWB. Presenting oneself under a socially desirable light is highly influential on the deflation of CWB ratings (Berry et al., 2007). Thus, in the literature, rather than measuring the engagement overtly, some researchers take a different perspective by measuring attitudes towards CWBs (e.g., Ağca, 2014; Gruys & Sackett, 2003). In Gruys and Sackett’s (2003) article, the reports of behavior are not asked but
behavioral intentions are asked. The reason behind is that when questions are directed this way, all items become equally applicable to all respondents, no matter what job they are doing or where they are working in, taking into account the context in which the participant would engage in such behaviors if they have had a chance (Gruys & Sackett, 2003). In the literature, there is a strong relationship between attitudes and behavior, suggesting that attitudes are predictive of behaviors as asserted in the Theory of Reasoned Action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). Behaviors are found to be inconsistent as compared to the attitudes toward them as situational factors can decrease or increase the likelihood of performing those acts (Hanisch, Hulin, & Roznowski, 1998 as cited in Dalal, 2005). Employees’ reported attitude toward CWBs and their self-reported actual CWBs are both accurate (Law & Zhou, 2014). Attitude has found to be a significant predictor of future CWBs as it is highly socially controversial (Law & Zhou, 2014). Thus, in the present study, attitudes towards CWBs is measured.

Taking the frequency and cost of CWBs (such as productivity loss, increased insurance costs, lost or damaged property and increased turnover, as well as increased dissatisfaction and job stress) into account, understanding the factors or mechanisms that facilitate emergence of such behaviors is crucial for recruiters and leaders in the workplace. Understanding the CWB antecedents can help organization to take the necessary precautions for such behaviors in the recruitment phase proactively before it becomes a problem (Moore et al., 2012). Berry et al. (2012) also argue that CWBs must be prevented to reduce the negative consequences such as decreased job satisfaction, increased stress, and intentions to quit.

In the literature, researchers have been searching for the potential predictors of CWBs for years. In search for the CWBs, antecedents can be classified into two general categories: external/organizational (e.g., workplace stressors, organizational culture, control system, opportunity to misbehave) and internal/individual (e.g., personality traits, employee attitudes) antecedents of CWB (Spector & Jex, 1998). Certain personality factors and values as individual differences variables have been implicated either in engaging in CWB or attitudes toward such behaviors (Fox,
Among demographic variables, age and tenure were found to be negatively correlated with CWBs (Gruys, 1999; Marcus & Schuler, 2004) whereas education was found to be unrelated with CWBs.

According to the job stress/emotion/CWB framework (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001), in the job context, there are job stressors and CWBs are responses to them as people continuously monitor and appraise the situation they are in. Job stressors stem from perceived threats in the context, causing negative emotions (e.g., anger, anxiety) (Spector, 1998, as cited in Fox et al. 2001). In the literature, job stressors can be counted as role conflict, role ambiguity, interpersonal conflict, and situational constraints (Kahn et al., 1964; Spector, Dwyer, & Jex, 1998). Fox et al. argue that, individuals start with perceiving the situational cues in the environment which arouse negative emotions, leading the individuals to act counterproductively. Individuals shape their behaviors in an acceptable manner, as a result of any alarming cues gathered from the context. Personality appears to be a critical factor in shaping behavior and experiencing CWB in work organizations (Berry, Ones & Sackett, 2007; Zhou, Meier & Spector, 2014).

The focus of this paper will be on both external and internal antecedents of CWB. In the remaining of this chapter, first, the literature on the CWB-personality linkage will be reviewed. Second, a review of the literature on organizational culture as it relates to CWBs will be presented, and the chapter will end with the presentation of the hypotheses of the study.

1.1.1 Counterproductive Work Behaviors and Personality

Personality traits can be described as enduring dispositions and tendencies that make the individual act in certain ways (Phipps, Prieto, & Deis, 2015). Personality affects how individuals attribute and perceive the causes of events and whether they behave aggressively or counterproductively (Spector, 2011). Based on Phipps and colleagues’ study, personality cannot be simplified into one solitary construct, rather, should be acknowledged as a group of attributes distinguishing people from one
another in terms of how they think, feel, and act.

Employees’ traits influence their attitudes toward CWB and how they perceive others’ attitudes about CWBs (Kamp & Brooks, 1991). There are many personality models used in the CWB literature, the Five-factor model (FFM; Costa & McCrae, 1985) being the widely used one (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007). Studies suggest that the Big Five Factors operate as the internal antecedents of CWBs (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001). FFM is composed of extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience. Extraversion/introversion refers to the individuals’ activity and excitement level (John & Srivastava, 1999) and it includes facets of warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, excitement seeking, activity and positive emotions (Phipps et al. 2015). Neuroticism/emotional stability is described as being insecure and worrying and about the inclination to experience negative emotions (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Neuroticism/emotional stability includes anxiety, depression, hostility, self-consciousness, impulsiveness and vulnerability (Phipps, Prieto, & Deis, 2015). Being conscientiousness is about the individual’s ability to plan for the future effectively by being responsible and organized (John & Srivastava, 1999). Those individuals are inclined to follow rules and be achievement-oriented (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Conscientiousness’ facets include competence, order, dutifulness, achievement-striving, self-discipline and deliberation (Phipps, Prieto, & Deis, 2015). Agreeableness/antagonism refers to being cooperative, good-natured and trustful (John & Srivastava, 1999). The facets include trust, compliance, altruism, straightforwardness, modesty and tender-mindedness (Phipps, Prieto, & Deis, 2015). Openness to Experience is described as willingness and interest to gain new experience (John & Srivastava, 1999) and it includes fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas and values (Phipps, Prieto, & Deis, 2015). Conscientiousness, agreeableness, and neuroticism dimensions were found to be correlated with self-ratings of CWB (Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt, 2012). In the meta-analysis of Pletzer, Bentvelzen, Oostrom and De Vries (2019), it was found that conscientiousness accounted for 53.19% and agreeableness accounted for 37.49% of the variance in self-report measure of CWBs. Furthermore, neuroticism accounted for 6.76% of the
variance explained in CWB. However, openness to experience’s (1.30%) and extraversion’s (1.26%) contributions were negligible.

FFM’s limited ability to explain workplace deviance (Salgado, 2002) was thought to be related with the model’s lack of a trait factor related to deception and exploitation (Ashton, Lee, & Son, 2000; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Pletzer et al. (2019) showed that, FFM personality traits accounted for 19.05% of the variance in CWBs. Ashton et al. added the Honesty-Humility factor to the Five-factor model, naming the new model as HEXACO. The sixth dimension of Honesty-Humility’s low levels is defined with harmful actions toward individuals and society in general in the forms of theft, fraud vandalism and workplace counterproductive behavior (Ashton & Lee, 2008). In the Pletzer et al. meta-analysis, HEXACO personality dimensions was found to be explaining 31.97% of the variance in CWBs. Explaining 13% more of the variance in CWBs as compared to FFM dimensions, HEXACO is a useful predictor for workplace deviance (Ashton et al., 2000). Honesty-humility (56.95%) and conscientiousness (32.99%) contributed the bigger portion of the explained variance in CWBs. Agreeableness (5.25%) and emotionality (4.26%) explained relatively smaller percentages of variance, and openness to experience (0.33%) and extraversion’s (0.22%) contribution were too small among the HEXACO dimensions (Pletzer et al. 2019). Thus, when predicting workplace deviance, Honesty-Humility dimension needs to be prioritized.

In the literature, Honesty-Humility (H-H) and the Dark Triad (DT) have been found to be theoretically linked traits in terms of the exploitative behavioral style. Aghababaei et al. (2016) found that H-H factor and composite Dark Triad were significantly negatively correlated with a correlation coefficient of -.59. Similarly, in Book and colleagues’ (2015) study, HEXACO model accounted for 75% of the variance in the Dark Triad variables. Moreover, H-H facets were found to be significantly negatively correlated with the Dark Triad as a unitary construct; the correlation coefficients were -.47 for sincerity, -.32 for fairness, -.24 for greed avoidance and -.47 for modesty. H-H was most strongly predicted by Machiavellianism (-.58), in contrast, narcissism (-.36) and psychopathy (-.36) had
less predictive power (Aghababaei et al., 2016). According to Jonason and McCain, (2012), as the Machiavellianism score increases, sincerity, fairness, sentimentality, social self-esteem and patience diminish; as psychopathy score increases, fairness, modesty, anxiety, dependence, sociability, liveliness decrease; as narcissism increases, fairness greed avoidance, decrease. In contrast, aesthetic concerns, perfectionism, liveliness, boldness and social self-esteem increase as narcissism score increases (Jonason & Mccain, 2012). HEXACO model is found to be significantly explaining the differential Dark Triad traits’ variance (Jonason & Mccain, 2012). Results show that especially the H-H factor in the HEXACO model, accounts for the empirical overlap between the Dark Triad traits (Book, Vieser, & Volk, 2015).

In addition to the Big Five Factors and HEXACO model which represent positive personality traits, recently, the Dark Triad model (Cohen, 2016; O’Boyle et al., 2012) has been an area of interest in searching for the antecedents of CWB. Examining the link between personality and CWBs can also be done using the aberrant personality framework or especially the DT (i.e., Machiavellianism, narcissism, psychopathy) which is a relatively new research area. Furthermore, some concerns have arisen related to the predictive validity of positive personality frameworks, such as the FFM, as they relate to CWBs. The FFM traits appear to explain from 5 to 10% of variance in CWBs (Wu & Lebreton, 2011). Hence, as a flourishing area of personality research, DT offers some new avenues to examine, explain, and predict CWBs (Jonason & O’Connor, 2017). It has been found that, after controlling for the FFM dimensions, Psychopathy and Machiavellianism each uniquely accounted for variance in taking shortcuts at work. Examining the incremental validity of DT traits, Scherer et al. (2013) found that above FFM, psychopathy predicted, both the intention to commit CWBs in the future and self-reported CWB in the team context.

In the following section, the traits of the DT (Machiavellianism, narcissism and psychopathy), DT-FFM links, and the probable ways they are related to CWBs are discussed.
1.2 The Dark Triad

Smith and Lilienfeld (2013) defined the DT (i.e., psychopathy, narcissism, and Machiavellianism) as the constellation of three theoretically singular, at the same time empirically multidimensional constructs that are known to be interpersonally maladaptive. The three dark traits are clearly positively related such that, Machiavellianism and narcissism co-vary by .39, psychopathy co-varies with Machiavellianism by .59 and with narcissism by .51 (O’Boyle et al., 2012). Yet, the correlations are moderate, meaning that each of the three constructs is distinct enough to make the partitioning into three trait types (Jones & Paulhus 2011), representing a differential side of a dark personality (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). According to Wu and Lebreton (2011), DT can be thought of as a dispositional fingerprint which is a profile enabling identification the person’s degree of Machiavellianism, narcissism or psychopathy. Paulhus and Williams (2002) are the researchers coining the term DT, which is about sharing a tendency to be callous, selfish, and malevolent in interpersonal dealings.

Machiavellians share a tendency to use manipulative strategies and deception, have disregard for conventional morality, and display a cynical view of human nature. Callousness, egocentricity, lack of interpersonal affect are their key characteristics (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Jacobwitz and Egan (2006) defined Machiavellians as people who use manipulative tactics to be beneficial for themselves and who are more interested in themselves without feeling any concern for their victims. Machiavellians believe and act on the gullibility of others and do not consider others’ rights and behave manipulatively (O’Boyle et al., 2012). In their meta-analysis, O’Boyle and colleagues found that, Machiavellians think they are more successful than others and the only way to achieve that goal is to find flaws in rules where they achieve things without difficulty. Furthermore, as ‘social chameleons,’ they take on the attitudes and behaviors of others and at the same time, manipulate and change the situations to their favor (Hurley, 2005). Machiavellians are good at impression management and often that is the reason for them to be
selected for high power positions because they appear to be strong, assertive leaders (Slomski & Partyka, 2012). Their skill in successful manipulation of people in social situations may stem from their ability to recognize the target’s emotional cues of vulnerability. They then exploit their target and move on with no feelings of empathy or guilt (Austin, Farrellly, Black, & Moore, 2007). The reason why they are good at impression management and can climb the ladder of success with relative ease may be their sense of detachment and lack of emotional involvement with others (Geis & Christie, 1970). Their impulsivity and irresponsibility are the reason for not considering the negative consequences of their actions on others (Wu & Lebreton, 2011). They show anti-social behavior, lie to others to gain whatever they want, show willingness to exploit others and are morally disengaged in their acts (Wu & Lebreton, 2011).

Why do they act as if there will not be any detrimental consequences for themselves and for others? Geis and Christie (1970) suggested that, individuals high in Machiavellianism perceive others as less cooperative and generous in comparison with those low in Machiavellianism. This perception makes them less likely to help in emergency situations (Geis & Christie, 1970) and shape their behaviors accordingly. According to Kessler and colleagues (2010), the people around Machiavellians experience abuse and manipulation at workplace. Machiavellians’ goal orientation sets the stage for them to show verbal forms of CWB (Wu & Lebreton, 2011). Furthermore, when they meet with an obstacle on the path of their goals, their CWBs take a more highly aggressive form (Cohen, 2016). It can be inferred that, Machiavellians’ first and foremost focus will be on the goal and the prize such that they can be blinded by them to the extent that they leave out the people around them. Their focus is on their own plans not taking into account others (Geis & Christie, 1970). Machiavellians do not feel the supervisory responsibility at all (Zettler, Friedrich, & Hilbig, 2011). Zettler et al. also suggest that, as the focus is on goals, perceived control over situations and others are more likely to be seen in high Machiavellians. They show interpersonal forms of CWBs (e.g., mistreatment of co-workers and betrayal) more than other forms (O’Boyle et al, 2012). Individuals
with Machiavellianism perceive academic incivility as appropriate and they behave
in this way more frequently (Turnipseed & Landay, 2018). Academic incivility is a
tool for them to get what they wish for. According to Pletzer and colleagues (2019),
in parallel with conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), similar to
conscientious people, Machiavellians also avoid resource losses and try to obtain
more. Their goal orientation may be a reminder of FFM’s Conscientiousness.
Conscientious people, on the contrary want to stay away from deviant acts as those
behaviors take away their resources which are otherwise going to be spent on
achieving work tasks (Pletzer et al., 2019). Taking a look at the association between
FFM and Machiavellianism turns out to be negative for Agreeableness ($r = -.47$) and
Conscientiousness ($r = -.34$); positive for neuroticism ($r = .12$) (Paulhus & Williams,
2002). They do not act on their goals in the same respect with people high in
conscientiousness, but being also low in agreeableness suggests they do not make
any collaborations in their path to achieve goals.

Narcissists have an inflated view of self, delusions of grandeur, self-promotion
and engagement in attention-seeking behaviors (O’Boyle et al., 2012). There are two
types of narcissism discussed in the literature: Grandiose (overt) and Vulnerable
(covert) narcissism. Grandiose narcissism is characterized by high self-esteem,
charm, disregard for criticism, entitlement, dominance and exploitativeness, whereas
vulnerable Narcissists are much more hostile, depressed, with low-self-esteem, more
defensive and their grandiosity is more fragile. Narcissists’ fantasy life includes
controlling others, success stories, and get admiration by others; they desire to be
rewarded and reinforced by others (Morf & Rhodenwalt, 2001). Those high on
narcissism are more likely to make extreme internal, global, and stable attributions in
the face of success than individuals lower on narcissism (Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995).

In the literature, narcissism is highly correlated with impulsiveness (Jones &
Paulhus, 2011), furthermore, as CWBs are characterized with impulsive behaviors,
(Marcus & Schuler, 2004), it may be suggested that CWB and narcissism are
narcissists’ rebelliousness and grandiose belief that they are special can be a
determinant of behaving inconsiderately to others. Cohen further argues that their willingness to manipulate others is the reason why they show their superiority over others (Cohen, 2016). A negative view of others makes them more willing to dominate and exploit others (Paulhus & Williams, 2002), and seeing themselves as highly important (Raskin & Hall, 1981). Therefore, when an opportunity arises for them to be able to outshine others, they engage in all types of interpersonal directed CWBs (Cohen, 2016).

What would increase the likelihood of narcissists to experience anger and then engage in CWBs is their heightened sensitivity to criticism and ego-threat when placed in a competitive situation or placed “on stage” (Spector, 2011; Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). Narcissistic individuals’ engagement in a greater number of severe CWB-I, than those low in narcissism can be explained by the theory of threatened egotism and aggression (Penney & Spector, 2002). Being oversensitive to threats to self-esteem makes those individuals experience negative emotions and even damaging outbreaks (Grijalva & Newman, 2015). In turn, they possess a need to exert control over others (Kealy & Ogrodniczuk, 2011). Narcissism is found to be not only a significant predictor of CWB including voluntarily harming the organization and all the stakeholders (Spector et al., 2006), but also the dominant predictor among the three DT traits (Grijalva & Newman, 2015).

Psychopathy is labelled as a personality disorder, presumed to be seen in 1% of the general population (Hare, 2016). In the literature, two kinds of psychopathy have been defined. Primary psychopathy is more about having high grandiosity, more instances of lying and lack of remorse. Secondary psychopathy is related to impulsivity and lack of responsibility. Psychopathy is composed of an arrogant, manipulative and deceitful interpersonal style, a deficient affective experience (inability to feel empathy/remorse) and an impulsive, thrill-seeking and irresponsible behavioral (criminal acts) style (Cooke & Michie, 2001; Hare & Neumann, 2008). A disregard for other people and societal norms and belief that rules do not apply to them and they deserve a special treatment make psychopaths display self-promoting
behaviors (LeBreton, Binning & Adorno, 2006). Interpersonally, they are often skilled impression managers, who are glib and charismatic.

Psychopaths believe that they do not have to abide by the moral, ethical, legal and social principles of the society, and they are above those principles (Ying & Cohen, 2018), making them rarely experience guilt, shame and regret. They are also commonly associated with emotional coldness and anxiety (Hare, 2003), enabling them to carefully plan and execute crimes even though they often act impulsively. According to Rogstad and Rogers (2008), as they lack global empathy, they are unable to recognize the feelings and emotions of others. Those aspects are thought to be leading factors for them to engage in CWBs (Harrison, Summers, & Mennecke, 2016). Cohen (2016) reported that psychopaths were more likely to engage in CWBs to a greater extent than non-psychopaths. Psychopathy is associated positively with CWB-I, such as distracting others from their agendas (Wu & Lebreton, 2011). According to Galperin, Bennett and Aquino (2011), psychopathy is harmful for the productivity of the organization as they are not good at cooperating with the other employees.

According to Lee and Ashton (2005), the DT traits share the possession of a grandiose sense of self-importance, manipulation and exploitation. Such individuals also share a degree of selfishness and they put much more importance on their needs as compared to others (O’Boyle et al., 2012). O’Boyle et al. found that, if investigated separately, Machiavellians’ view of gullibility of others and lack of concern for others were the reason for leading them to antisocial behavior. Narcissists’ antisocial behavior were found to be stemming from their inflated self-view, desire to self-promote and attention-seeking behaviors (O’Boyle et al., 2012). Psychopaths’ disregard for norms are found to be the main focus for the reason for behaving antisocially (O’Boyle et al., 2012). Although all three DT traits share some degree of malevolency affecting interpersonal relationships, those were labelled as three different personality constructs based on the degree of social averseness (Paulhus & Williams, 2002).

Individuals with these traits value rewards, are likely to overlook their
obligations and rules of reciprocity, and they lack emotional commitment to others (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Furthermore, they use every means to achieve their goals because they see others as resources to be used to fulfill their needs (Jonason & Webster, 2012). How they achieve their goals is different though. In getting what they want, Machiavellians are likely to use charm and seduction, narcissistic individuals tend to invoke feelings of responsibility in others to get help in situations where no one needs to help them, and psychopaths use charm and coercion (Black, 2013). Moreover, empirical evidence suggests that those possessing these traits use the same types of influence tactics without tailoring their method to their target (Black, 2013). Jonason investigated how individuals with DT use their manipulative strategies at work to climb the corporate ladder. These researchers found that Psychopaths and Machiavellians were using direct and hard manipulation (e.g., threats), whereas narcissistic individuals and Machiavellians were using softer strategies (e.g., offering compliments). O’Boyle and colleagues (2012) found that, disguising their true intentions, while Machiavellians and psychopaths used superficial charm, narcissists were likely to act humble to be praised by others.

Apart from just concealing the true-self, individuals with DT traits commonly use self-deception for ego protection purposes. For example, after backstabbing a co-worker at workplace, a narcissistic person can justify his/her behaviour as an act of conforming to the rules of an aggressive workplace (O’Boyle et al., 2012). The use of exploitation and lack of empathy for others are the common features of the three DT constructs (Rauthmann, 2012).

In the literature, the direct effects of the DT on CWB has been the area of interest (Cohen, 2016; Wu and LeBreton, 2011). A positive relationship exists between each of the DT dimension and CWB (O’Boyle et al., 2011), making them considered as employee with DT. A significant portion of the variance in CWB is found to be explained by DT in the O’Boyle and colleagues’ study (2012). In the meta-analysis of O’Boyle and colleagues’ (2012), it was found that, the three DT traits were positively correlated with CWB with average correlations of .20, .35 and .06 for Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy, respectively. Each DT trait
has a stronger correlation with CWB-I than CWB-O. The importance of DT’s role in understanding antecedents of CWB is also revealed in O’Boyle and colleagues (2012) study in which, like previous study, DT explained 28% of variance in deviant actions at workplace, with the domination of narcissism and Machiavellianism, explaining 53% and 32% of variance in CWB, respectively.

In another meta-analysis, narcissism’s two facets were related to CWB differentially (Grijalva & Newman, 2015). Entitlement facet was positively related to CWB, on the other hand, the leadership facet was negatively related to CWB (Grijalva & Newman, 2015). Psychopathy’s correlation with CWB was somewhat different than the other two dark traits (O’Boyle et al., 2012). Whereas, Machiavellianism and narcissism were positively related to CWB, psychopathy’s positive relationship with CWB was weaker than the remaining dark traits (O’Boyle et al., 2012). The researchers attributed the results to the suppressor effect. However, according to Jonason and Tost (2010), Machiavellianism and Psychopathy are correlated with low self-control. Low self-control is negatively and strongly correlated with CWB and can be counted as the strongest internal predictors among others (Marcus & Schuler, 2004; Zettler et al, 2011). Machiavellians and individuals with psychopathy traits are impulsive and prefer short-term gains (Jonason, Li, Webster & Schmitti 2009), enabling them gain as much as resources as they can from a friend without an emotional commitment or investing much time (Jonason & Kavanagh, 2010).

The social-exchange perspective (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) underlies the link between DT and CWB (O’Boyle et al, 2012) as DT violates the basic assumptions of a ‘fair-exchange’ relationship leading to deviant acts. According to Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005), the bond between individuals can be strengthened if valuable rewards are given. Trust between partners is necessary for the belief that the exchange will be fulfilled in the long run. Moreover, an affective attachment with a sense of loyalty, support and concern for each other is also essential to form a relationship (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). In this respect, individuals with DT have different views of others. Machiavellians do not believe they will be paid back
for their effort at work (Gunnthorsdottir, McCabe, & Smith, 2002). Narcissistic people believe they are far better than anyone else such that, they override any rules of reciprocity (Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, & Elliott, 2000). Psychopaths do not please others or not emphatic as they are insensitive (LeBreton, Binning, & Adorno, 2006). Therefore, in parallel with the literature, it is hypothesized that, the Dark Triad would facilitate the positive perceptions towards CWBs.

Hypothesis 1. DT factors will significantly positively predict PCWB.

Hypothesis 1a: Machiavellianism will significantly positively predict CWB.

Hypothesis 1b: Psychopathy will significantly positively predict CWB.

Hypothesis 1c: Narcissism will significantly positively predict CWB.

The positive associations between Machiavellianism, psychopathy, narcissism and CWB are found to be moderated by situational factors, for instance, in O’Boyle and colleagues’ study (2012), authority and culture of the workplace were found to be the moderators of the relationships between the DT and CWB.

Intergroup collectivism is used as the particular dimension of culture in searching for the moderation effect. In a culture with high intergroup collectivism (IGC) in which cohesiveness, relatedness among peers and loyalty are the common features (House et al., 2014), importance is given for reciprocity, not tolerating the violations of social-exchange by the individuals with DT traits (O’Boyle et al., 2012). In another study, LeBreton, Shiverdecker and Grimaldi (2018) found that narcissism and CWB relationship got weaker in cultures where IGC was higher, however, this did not apply to Machiavellianism and Psychopathy’s link with CWB, illustrating that the nature of the relationships between DT and CWBs may be more complex than it appears.

Contrasting individualistic and collectivistic cultures, Robertson et al. (2016) found that culture played a role in shaping and perceiving the DT traits as ‘dark.’ In non-western or so-called collectivistic cultures, deviant actions can be welcome. For instance, in collectivistic cultures, individuals with Machiavellianism and narcissism manipulate their peers by provoking feelings of responsibility (Robertson et al., 2016). Robertson et al claim that from the sense of duty and group norms, provoking
feelings of responsibility may be acceptable in such cultures as compared to individualistic ones. It can be inferred that some behaviors may or may not be desirable in specific contexts, like specific organizational cultures the employee works in. If the ‘people make the place’ (Gardner et al., 2012), specific types of personalities would fit into specific types of organizational cultures for them to be able to adapt to the context they are in.

1.3 Organizational Culture: Overview

The topic of organizational culture has been a research area in over 4,600 articles since 1980 (Hartnell, Ou & Kinicki, 2011). The reason behind is the perception that organizational culture affects individual, group and organizational behavior (Hartnell, Ou & Kinicki, 2011). According to Schein (1992), organizational culture is a set of shared meanings, assumptions, values, and norms, being a guidance for employee behavior within an organization via explicit structures and conventions. According to Cameron and Quinn (2011), culture is composed of symbols, values, procedures and approaches characterizing an organization. Researchers have defined organizational culture as a shared construct among members (Glisson & James, 2002), influencing employee behavior and attitudes (Smircich, 1983) at individual and group levels (Detert, Schroeder, & Mauriel, 2000). Organizational culture enables adaptation to the environment and internal circumstances by presenting solutions for problems and for management improvement to enhance functioning and development (Lacatus, 2013). The founder has a crucial role in establishing the organizational culture by attributing and reflecting their personality on the mission, strategy and structure which will be in turn drawn by the members of the organization (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2012).

In the organizational culture literature, there is a similar concept called organizational climate, which is a group of attributes for the organization and all the subsystems related to it (Cohen, 2016). An organization’s climate can be inferred by looking at the interactions between the organization and its subsystems (Cohen,
Climate is more of a topic of psychology, whereas culture is seen as anthropology’s subject (Reichers & Schneider, 1990). In terms of similarities between the two concepts, they are found to deal with similar problems (Denison, 1990), such as how the organizations’ behavioral characteristics affect individual level behaviors and how the individual’s behavioral tendencies shape the general organizational characteristics. The other similarity is, their level of analysis of behavior is organizational level (Denison, 1990) and the topics they cover. In terms of the difference between culture and climate, it has been found that, climate deals with individual and organizational culture value fit, on the other hand, culture measures the type of expectations in the company themselves (Schwartz & Davis, 1981). Whether the organizational culture and climate should be differentiated or integrated has been an area of interest. The literature suggests that, the two concepts should be treated as one without assuming that the two concepts overlap (Schneider, Ehrhart & Macey, 2013; Kaptein, 2011). Hence, in this study, culture and climate will be used interchangeably.

To minimize the high turnover costs, organizations try to find new ways to improve their recruitment process (Tracey & Hinkin, 2008). Dineen and Soltis (2011) suggested that, to retain a workforce, high-levels of person-organization fit (P-O fit) is necessary. P-O Fit is related to the needs-supplies perspective (Cohen, 2016) in which fit occurs only after the organization satisfies needs, desires and preferences of employees. P-O Fit literature suggests that employees prefer to be in work contexts similar to their traits and core values (Wang, Begley, Hui & Lee, 2012). Their inclination to engage in behaviors that their job dictates is strongly influenced by the culture and context they work in which those behaviors either are inhibited or facilitated (Wang, Begley, Hui & Lee, 2012). It is advantageous for individuals to realize their goals related with their jobs in the organizations. In search for the P-O Fit, trait activation theory (Tett and Burnett 2003) proposes that, personality only is not enough to have a behavioral effect in the context, rather trait-relevant cues will activate those effects. Thus, situations are treated as moderators between personality and expressions in the workplace (Tett and Burnett 2003). In
Wagley and colleagues (2012) article, it is proposed that, culture should moderate personality and job performance. Innovation and outcome-oriented cultures are used as moderators in the relationship between one of the FFM traits, conscientiousness and job performance (Wang, Begley, Hui & Lee, 2012). It has been found that, the variability in the predictive power of conscientiousness on employee behaviors is accounted for by the contextual variables such as time pressure, learning contexts (Wang, Begley, Hui & Lee, 2012) in innovative and outcome oriented cultures. In other studies, an interaction between conscientiousness and outcome oriented culture also resulted in a significant effect on organizational performance (Miron et al., 2004) suggesting outcome oriented culture serves as a fertile land for this type of people with the opportunity to express themselves. Overall, organizations prioritize different aspects of performance based on their organizational culture.

Over the years, in the examination of organizational culture, many approaches have been composed (Detert, Schroeder, & Mauriel, 2000). Hofstede (1980) developed a framework to be able to compare and contrast the culture and values of an organization. Charles Handy (1993) had created the four-type culture model to assess organizational culture and at the same time effectiveness. Denison and Mishra (1995) examined organizational culture attributes under two categorizations, internal integration and external orientations of organizations. Internal integration is composed of involvement and consistency, whereas adaptability and mission constitutes external orientations of the organization. With numerous culture types, it has been challenging to summarize all findings to make reliable interpretations. The competing values framework is an alternative approach to measuring organizational culture (CVF; Cameron, Quinn, DeGraff, & Thakor, 2006; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). This framework has been used in the literature as a solid taxonomy in analysing the relationship between organizational effectiveness and organizational cultures (Hartnell et al., 2011). In the present study the competing values model is used in examining the moderating role of culture in the DT-PCWBs relationship.
1.3.1 Competing Values Framework

CVF is a widely used organizational culture framework in the literature (Ostroff et al., 2003). Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) are the founders of CVF, which had been derived from Campbell’s 30 organizational effectiveness criteria (Hartnell, Ou & Kinicki, 2011). According to Cameron and Quinn (2011), with 30 effectiveness indicators on three dimensions, forming four main clusters, CVF serves as a tool to measure the aspects people value about an organization. The first one is the focus dimension (horizontal axis in Figure 1) which is about internal (internal orientation, unity integration) and external (external orientation, rivalry and differentiation) effectiveness criteria (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Organizational independence and organizational coherence are at the extremes of this spectrum (Gardner et al., 2012). For instance, Hewlett-Packard was well known for having harmonious attributes like having “HP way” of doing things, however on the other end of the spectrum Toyota was recognized for their global vision with local action as by doing so helps them compete in the market globally and locally (Gardner et al., 2012). The second one is the structure dimension (vertical axis in Figure 1) which is related with flexibility and dynamism on one end of the spectrum and stability and control on the other (Hartnell et al.). Gardner and colleagues (2012) viewed governmental companies and university mechanisms as being on the stable end but companies like Nike, Microsoft on the dynamic end. The third dimension is means-ends, which represents the effective behaviors in those culture types, derived from values and beliefs (Hartnell et al., 2011). Gardner and colleagues (2012) used CVM (Cameron & Quinn, 2011) as it has been found to be incorporating the cultural dimensions found by other researchers.

As it is shown in Figure 1, CVF is composed of four cultural categories: Clan, hierarchy, adhocracy, and market.
Figure 1. The competing values framework


Clan culture is internally oriented and flexible. The structures and relations in this organization type is based on trust, commitment, open communication and collaboration. In this culture, through collaboration, people do things together and affiliation, membership and support are valued highly (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). Behaviors that are rewarded here are participation, involvement, teamwork orientation and open communication. When deciding on a topic, consensus is sought. Clan cultures generate a friendly working environment such that people share their personal lives and daily hassles with each other along with job related topics. With co-workers and managers, the work environment feels like an extended family. Employees think of their leaders as a mentor, or even as parent-like individuals. The
organization gives importance to the long-term development of individual thus increasing high cohesion and morale at all levels. To be able to gain success, the first and foremost concern should be on the people and the internal climate.

Hierarchy Culture is internally oriented and structured by control mechanisms. In this culture type formality and structure are overemphasized. Employees try to meet the expectations with their clarified roles and responsibilities. Doing things right is expected and sought. People act according to the rules and procedures. Being a good effective leader in this culture can be achieved via being a coordinator and organizer, or by being a manager. The strategy of an organization characterized by a hierarchy culture is to run the organization smoothly and with special attention on control, order, stability, predictability, and efficiency. What holds everyone together is the formal rules and policies.

Adhocracy Culture is reflected in an externally oriented, flexible, dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative workplace. Such cultures value growth, variety, and autonomy. Calculated risk taking is welcomed. An effective leader is visionary, innovative, and risk-orientated in this culture. Organizational glue is the commitment to experimentation and innovation. The attention is on new knowledge, products, and/or services. What is important is always being ready for change and being able to meet new challenges and expectations. The organization’s strategy is on rapid growth and acquiring new resources. An employee can be successful by producing unique and innovative products.

Market Culture is externally oriented and run by control mechanisms and a workplace where results are valued. Leaders are hard-driving producers and competitors. Being tough and demanding are necessary in such an environment and market to compete with other organizations. The glue that holds the organization together is an emphasis on winning. Their strategy is on competitive actions and achieving stretch goals and targets. Employee success is defined to the extent that they help the organization to increase market share and market penetration. Being the winner in the competition and to be the market leader are important characteristics.

The members of an organization are not affected by different workgroup
climates in the same way. In one study, it has been found that, the limit of CWB and personality relationship is set by the workgroup or organizational culture (Bollmann & Krings, 2016). According to Bollmann and Krings (2016), there are two types of cultures: high compliance climate vs high relational climate. High compliance climate (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1996) is a climate where compliance with organizational rules is highly important. Individual members are likely to anticipate social and self-sanctions for CWB and, in turn, are less likely to engage in CWB (Bollmann & Krings, 2016). In a high relational climate (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1996), group members care about one another and are considerate of each other. In this type, individual group members try to maintain the well-being of the group, thus social relations are valued much more than self-interest. In fact, this aspect indirectly decreases the likelihood that employees will engage in CWB. If employees feel that the climate fosters team spirit or friendliness, CWB and unethical behaviors are manifested less (Bollmann & Krings, 2016). Barker (1993) mentions that, workgroups can facilitate CWB through behavioral norms of aggression or norms of tolerance for aggression. Socio-cognitive theory of moral agency (Bandura, 1991) suggests that different workgroup climates increase or decrease CWB. Devonish (2013) argued that benevolent climates, characterized by interpersonal harmony, team spirit, and friendliness, are likely to prevent CWBs.

Person-organization fit must be well understood for the individuals with DT traits in selecting and recruiting them to the right jobs and right organizations. As they are good at impression management and self-monitoring (Paunonen, Lönnqvist, Verkasalo, Leikas, & Nissinen, 2006), especially in a short job interview, the recruiter may not have the chance to observe the deviant actions and problematic tendencies (Harms, Spain, & Hannah, 2011). Thus, investigating the moderating effect of organizational culture is essential.

### 1.3.2 Cultures Nurturing the Dark Triad

In the literature, attention is paid on the situational factors in exploring the relationship between counterproductive work behaviors and the DT (Agarwal &
Farndale, 2017; O’Boyle, Forsyth, Banks & McDaniel, 2011) and analyzing how organizational conditions and situations will have an impact on the display of DT behavior and in turn reduce or enhance the CWBs. Trait-activation theory (TAT) (Tett & Guterman, 2000) explains the relationship between personality trait and behavior. According to TAT, personality traits are responses to the situational demands (Tett & Guterman, 2000). Tett and Burnett (2003) assert that intentions stem from relevant personality traits. When individuals enter a situation, based on situation-trait relevance, the traits which are situation-specific become aroused (Geukes et al., 2012), shaping the behavioral outcomes in that specific context. TAT has its roots from person-situation interactionist perspective in which this interaction affects the personality’s behavioral expressions (Agarwal & Farndale, 2017). There are social and task demands coming from peers, clients, supervisors and the task itself which are in turn triggering the personality to express itself as behavioral outcomes (Tett & Burnett, 2003). A number of studies have explored the DT-CWBs relationship using TAT as the conceptual framework (e.g., Agarwal & Farndale, 2017, Guerkes et al., 2012; Rehman & Shahnawaz, 2018). In the present study TAT is adapted as the conceptual framework as well.

Counterproductive work behaviors related with the DT can be attenuated or inhibited by differential situational conditions and constraints (Tett & Burnett, 2003). Palmer (2017) suggested that perceived organizational support, a contextual variable, may act as a buffer for the individuals high in Machiavellianism, narcissism and psychopathy in the reduction of CWBs. Similarly, O’Boyle et al. (2012) argued that DT and CWB linkage is moderated by the culture. Focusing on the association between perceived work environments and the DT, perceived organizational climate is found to have a critical role in DT – CWB relationship (e.g., Jonason, Wee, & Li, 2015). It has been found that their work places give opportunities to individuals with DT to gain power (competition), status (prestige) and control (restrictions) (Jonason et al., 2015). Moreover, the DT has been found to be positively related with individuality and competitiveness such that, if individuals with DT are in an environment which fosters competitiveness and individuality, they are more likely to
engage in harmful actions (Jonason, Li, & Teacher, 2010). In the literature, the DT-CWB linkage is thought to be rooted in a more organizational perspective (Eissa et al., 2018). The organizations that solely focus on their bottom-line (profits, performance targets, stock prices) and prioritize bottom-line results, may give the impression or the message that the bottom-line outcomes are more important than anything else (Eissa et al., 2018). Bottom-Line Mentality (BLM) is a win-lose mentality that makes the person to attain the outcome prioritized by the organization by specific attitudes and behaviors, no matter their behavior harms others (Greenbaum, Mawritz, & Eissa, 2012). Employees who behave in line with the organization’s bottom-line are rewarded for reaching performance targets (Piccolo et al., 2012). As long as those behaviors are the norm, organizational cultures with hostile work environments increase the likelihood of engaging in CWBs (Mawritz et al., 2012). Competitiveness is more likely to be seen in those cultures compared to cooperation to secure the bottom-line outcomes (Greenbaum et al., 2012).

Among the DT, Machiavellianism’s complexity at the workplace must be better understood (Jonason et al., 2014). This personality trait needs to be analyzed with caution without simply categorizing it as good or bad (O’Boyle et al., 2012). Machiavellianism must be viewed as behavioral strategies for contextual problems in the workplace (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Zhao, Xiao, Mao and Liu (2018) found that, role conflict increases CWB with the moderation of emotional exhaustion. It is found that, Machiavellianism acts as a moderator in this relationship between role conflict and emotional exhaustion in which as Machiavellianism score increases, this relationship gets weaker for the employee (Zhao et al., 2018). Moreover, Machiavellianism is found to be a moderator between role conflict and CWB via emotional exhaustion, dampening the relation as the score increases (Zhao et al., 2018). In the literature, those individuals have been criticized for the lack of emotional involvement, however, in scenarios and organizational culture necessitating staying calm under high degrees of stress, this quality may help such individuals maintain their emotional resources (Zhao et al., 2018). Empirical evidence suggests that being better in coping with work-related stressors,
Machiavellianism may have a buffering effect. Christie and Geis (1970) define such individuals as good manipulators even though they are in a competitive situation requiring them to handle an urgent decision-making. These individuals may handle situations rationally and respond actively (Sendjaya et al., 2016). In short, cultures with a competitive atmosphere and conflicting situations on a daily basis may make a person high on Machiavellianism shine among others. The reported findings are in parallel with the TAT framework.

Prosocial behaviors are expected in the organizations which help organizations maintain a positive image (Castille, Buckner, & Thoroughgood, 2018). The positive image can sometimes be achieved by violating ethical norms, for instance by concealing the damaging information about the firm and misinterpreting the truth. Personality factors and organizational conditions help the birth of the unethical pro-organizational behaviors (UPB) (Castille et al.). UPB is a contribution to an organization’s interests, although there is a volition of ethical codes and guidelines. Organizational culture can foster UPB by signaling that those actions are accepted and rewarded, persuading the employee to act unethically with respect to organizational goals. In order to protect the image of the firm, Machiavellians tend to engage in UPB willingly (Castille et al). Therefore, for the organizational benefit, pinpointing Machiavellian employees as “bad apples” should be avoided as they become the employees being sought in the job market. A more complete understanding of their relationship with the context needs to be developed.

Chirumbolo (2015) found that the three DT traits moderated the positive relationships between time-related work stress (i.e., stress that originates from believing in there is not enough time to complete job tasks) and CWB as a means to reduce additional resource depletion (Clercq, Haq, Azeem, & Haq, 2018). Individuals with Machiavellianism and psychopathy get rid of the frustration that comes with time-related work stress by causing harm to the organization (Wu & LeBreton, 2011; Spector and Fox, 2005). The organizational culture with harsh schedules, can ‘cause’ the ‘dark’ personalities to feel the right for deviant acts as they think the ends justify the means (Austin et al., 2007).
Castille, Buckner and Thoroughgood (2018) study shows that Machiavellians pursue their interests while sacrificing others and organizations. Machiavellians engage in opportunistic behaviors, thus they choose organizations with greater opportunities to gain wealth, power and status (Castille, Kuyumcu, & Bennett, 2017). Machiavellians achieve higher relative status by means of undermining their peers (Castille et al., 2017). In line with TAT, they see their co-workers as threats and they are motivated to undermine their peers when they work in an organization with resource constraints (Castille et al., 2017). The resource constraints generate competition in the organization and enable the Machiavellians to achieve higher status and at the same time damaging the organization (Duffy et al., 2006 as cited in Castille et al., 2017). Considering the type of organizational culture in which Machiavellians may be harmful for the organization and others, Pilch and Turska (2015) examined Competing Values Framework (CVF) and Machiavellianism’s effect on bullying behavior. Being bullied was found to be positively correlated with perceptions of hierarchy culture (Pilch & Turska, 2015). Moreover, Machiavellianism was found to be a significant moderator between hierarchy cultures and being bullied. Hierarchy cultures are the ones where bullying acts are seen the most, probably because of an overemphasis on control, formality, and position based nature of the system (Pilch & Turska, 2015). Jonason, Wee, and Li (2015) suggest that Machiavellians recognize their workplace as competitive as a result of their power orientation. As TAT suggests, Machiavellians look for situational cues in the work place to see whether they fit in with their level of self-interest, need for control and need for status (Eissa et al., 2018). The organizations’ perceived bottom-line mentality serve as a moderator in the relationship between Machiavellianism and CWBs in a way that, Machiavellians think their harmful behaviors are acceptable in such a context, decreasing the likelihood of suppressing their harmful behaviors (Eissa et al., 2018). Thus, the hypothesis is as follows,

**Hypothesis 2.** The association between Machiavellianism and PCWB will increase as the level of hierarchy culture increases.
Narcissists are not necessarily unproductive in the workplace, there is a chance that they can excel in their roles when they are in authority positions (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell & Marchisio, 2011). Even in some cases, narcissism is beneficial not only for themselves but also for the organization as a whole (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007). Chatterjee and Hambrick (2007) conducted research with CEOs to examine narcissism affecting the firm strategy and performance. Their research indicates that, narcissism is positively related to strategic dynamism and grandiosity, number and size of acquisitions, triggering performance in extremes. Narcissist CEOs are in favor of actions that are bold and visible choices that are in turn catch attention easily. They do not comply with the status quo and engage only in incremental actions but bold and visible ones, results in again in extremes –big wins or big losses-. However, their acts do not result in better or worse outcomes in comparison with firms with non-narcissist CEOs (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007). In Zhang et al (2017) study, if CEOs with Narcissistic traits are good at impression management to be perceived as humble in the eyes of their subordinates, they are more likely to be effective leaders in creating a culture of innovation and improving company performance. This may be attributed to the narcissism, among the three DT constructs, having the highest empathic potential (Wai & Tiliopoulos, 2012). This empathetic capacity is practical for their admiration-seeking behaviors and ensures the ability to perceive the emotions of others (Wai & Tiliopoulos, 2012). In Ham, Seybert and Wang’s (2013) study, CEO narcissism is related with higher overinvestment, excessive research and development, merger and acquisition expenditures, illustrating that, in a market culture, where aggressive growing is encouraged, narcissists may thrive.

While people with narcissism are more likely to glorify their creative capacity, the actual creative performance is not different from non-narcissists (Goncalo et al., 2010). When they are given the chance to show their ideas to others, their self-esteem and eagerness result in increased level of creative performance (Goncalo et al., 2010). In adhocracy cultures in which creativity is being valued, they may thrive realistically. Depending on what the culture dictates as beneficial for the organization
as a whole, some maladaptive behaviors (e.g., risk taking, social boldness, and supremacy strivings) may be seen as beneficial, but a curvilinear relationship can be expected (Grijalva, Harms, Newman, Gaddis, & Fraley, 2015), in which a midrange level of narcissism leads to a greater effectiveness as compared to low or high levels of narcissism. Narcissism is conceptualized as a “mixed blessing” (Fatfauta & Ramzi, 2019. It has not only adverse qualities like dominance and hostility, but also beneficial sides like charm and popularity (Smith et al., 2018). When narcissism is examined, above and beyond the good vs bad debate, it is better working on an “it depends” perspective (Smith et al., 2018).

According to Chatterjee and Hambrick (2007), narcissism is valuable in a highly dynamic industry in which the required qualities include boldness and breakthrough changes, idea generation, and risky actions are welcomed. On the bright continuum, leaders with this trait are “not only risk takers willing to get the job done, but also charmers who can convert the masses with their rhetoric” (Maccoby, 2004). Those type of individuals are called productive Narcissists with a great vision and their followers are being mobilized toward a common goal with the leader (Maccoby, 2004). Thus, the hypothesis is as follows,

**Hypothesis 3.** The association between narcissism and CWB will will increase as the level of adhocracy culture increases.

Based on the TAT framework Geukes et al. (2012) suggest that individuals with narcissism depends on the positive public evaluation or the admiration by others. It is found that narcissism and public self-consciousness predict high-pressure performance but not low-pressure performance (Geukes et al.). They interpret the situation in a positive way as they expect admiration and positive evaluation by others (Elliot & Trash, 2001). They are likely to flourish in contexts where they have the chance to break records, defeat competitors or be successful in the eyes of a large group of people (Elliot & Trash, 2001). They are sensitive to reward and punishments coming from the organization, thus they are more likely to change accordingly (Jonason & Jackson, 2016). These behaviors are in parallel with a market culture in which relying on the feedbacks coming from the clients or the
sector and being adaptive for a high-pressure climate are necessary. Thus, I hypothesize the following.

**Hypothesis 4.** The association between narcissism and CWB will increase as the level of market culture increases.

Individuals with psychopathy have behavioral tendencies which are in correlation with their organization’s financial damage and at the same time organization’s members’ emotional damage (Boddy, 2015). In the literature, psychopathy is examined in a triarchic model with boldness, meanness and disinhibition of psychopathy (Neo, Sellbom, Smith, & Lilienfeld, 2018). They have found that, meanness and disinhibition have positively predicted CWB and unethical decision-making, however, boldness, as a positive aspect of psychopathy leads to the use of soft tactics of influence, adaptive leadership and team play and negatively predicted passive leadership (Neo et al.). Boldness also signals the Psychopathy’s positive side more such that, they are much more skilled in concealing their negative side and behave harmoniously while interacting with others (Neo et al.). Psychopathy also has an adaptive as individuals with these characteristics are likely to be superior in persuasiveness, public communication, and crisis management (Lilienfeld et al. 2012). According to the researchers, attention should be paid to the distinction between ‘boldness’ and ‘badness’ when making assumptions that psychopathy is a ‘dark’ trait. In the study of Schütte and colleagues (2016), psychopathy and its two dimensions’ relationship with company performance and CWB and proactive behavioral tendencies for the company are examined. Fearless dominance (seeking and getting attention, resilient to stress with no social fear, engaging in self-promotion behaviors; O’Boyle et al., 2012) and self-centered impulsivity (thrill seeking, lack of diligence, pursuing means to satiate needs immediately; Schütte, Blickle, Wihleri & Frieder, 2016) are found to be the dimensions of Psychopathy (Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005). Finding support from socio-analytic theory (Hogan & Shelton, 1998), socially skilled individuals, even with aberrant personality traits, can translate their motives into purposeful and successful actions, attenuating maladaptive behaviors (Schütte et al.). Individuals
with fearless dominance can successfully translate their desire to get ahead of others in such a manner that can be perceived by their colleagues as if they are less engaging in CWB-I and more engaging in behaviors in supporting the organization as a whole (Schütte et al.). According to Zettler and Solga (2013), depending on the organization, the culture, the rules and regulations, a moderate level of Psychopathy trait can be beneficial in the organization in giving support to coworkers, securing interest in negotiations successfully, and promoting individual interests. In some instances, psychopaths’ behaviors may be viewed as consistent with the mission and vision of the overall organization and they may even be regarded as good corporate citizens (Wilson, 2010). Thinking about the environments they can excel in, or at least do not show their negative side, as their authority level increases their tendency to engage in CWBs decrease (O’Boyle et al., 2012). As they climb the career ladder, they can better control their impulsivity and antisocial behaviors. Boddy (2011) states that, psychopaths are likely to flourish and even excel in a political environment. In political environments, the performance appraisals are carried out by objective measures such that, they are not directly linked to external and objective performance indicators. In such environments, they can hide their insufficient effort level. In such environments, bullying and aggression (forms of CWB) can in fact be an effective way of achieving goals (Cohen, 2016). In those political environments, top management focuses only on outcomes, ignoring how the employee has achieved those ends. If the results are not calculated with regard to other employees and the competition is being valued, then it is not surprising in those types of cultures, CWBs (e.g., bullying and aggression) will be more accepted and even rewarded (Cohen, 2016). Agarwal and Farndale’s (2017) study proposes that, psychopaths are more likely to engage in impulsive acts with risk such as mergers and acquisitions or other behaviors as a response to the immediate stimuli. In line with TAT, rising levels of ascendancy in the work place can be expected to moderate the relationship between psychopathy and CWBs (Blickle, Schütte, & Genau, 2018). Psychopaths are found to perceive their organizations as competitive (Jonason, Wee, & Li, 2015). Thus, I hypothesize the following,
Hypothesis 5. The association between Psychopathy and CWB will increase as the level of market culture increases.

Similar to individuals with positive traits, those with dark personality traits, are likely to choose environments where they can flourish and are attracted to cultures that allow them to operate freely (Cohen, 2016). The reviewed literature suggests that individuals who score high on any element of the DT may be willing to engage in unethical behavior; however, the question remains under what circumstances they will actually do so. The proposed study aims to examine the conditions in which employees with DT personality traits are likely to engage in CWBs. That is, this study will examine the role of organizational culture in facilitating (or perhaps inhibiting) the DT-CWBs linkage. Pinto, Leana, and Pil (2008) suggest that, ethical culture does not show whether or not an organization is corrupt. But, it shows the extent to which the culture promotes ethical or unethical behavior. In some organizations, there is a culture that encourages employees to perform any type of behavior, that could be classified as deviant, in order for the employee to be regarded as successful (Wardi & Wiener, 1992). However, as the culture dictates those behaviors, those so-called deviant actions will eventually become normative (Vardi & Wiener, 1992).

In the following section the aim and the proposed model are presented.

1.4 Aim of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the DT and perceived counterproductive work behavior relationship with the moderation of the organizational culture. The reviewed literature suggested positive relationships between DT personality attributes and CWBs (Cohen, 2016). I believe, as emphasized by Spain et al. (2014), the observed relationships can get stronger or weaker depending on the context, or organizational culture the employee works in (Spain et al., 2014). Individuals with DT personalities feel more comfortable in a work setting that has much to offer to them in terms of their need for prestige and
resources (Cohen, 2016). The following hypotheses are formed based on the aforementioned arguments. In all the hypotheses, Organizational Culture is expected to moderate the association between DT and Perceived Counterproductive Work Behaviors. Figure 2 depicts the hypotheses of the study.

**Figure 2. The proposed model.**
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METHOD

2.1 Participants

The survey package was sent to approximately 600 potential respondents, through different channels such as Social Media (LinkedIn, Instagram and so forth) and e-mail lists. Participation was voluntary and a total of 308 employees had completed the surveys, however some of the data were deleted since participants provided the same rating for the whole scale, suggesting careless responding. Thus, as a result, data were collected from 275 private and public sector employees from different cities of Turkey. In terms of gender distribution of the participants, while 61.8% (N = 170) were male, 38.2% (N = 105) were female. In terms of age distribution, 147 participants’ (53.5%) age ranged between 19 and 30, 83 participants’ (30.2%) age ranged between 31 and 40, 32 participants’ (11.6%) age ranged between 41 and 50, 11 participants’ (4%) age ranged between 51 and 60, and two participants’ (.7%) age was above 60.

All participants were white-collar workers with full-time jobs. Participants were from 10 different sectors such as IT (software and services, technology hardware and equipment, semiconductors and semiconductor equipment), finance (banks, diversified financials, consumer finance, capital markets, insurance), industrial (aerospace and defense, building products, construction and engineering, electrical equipment, machinery, trading companies and distribution), consumer discretionary (automobiles and components, household durables, leisure products, textile, apparel and luxury goods consumer services, retailing), consumer staples (food and staples retailing, food products, beverages, tobacco, household and personal products), health care (health care equipment and services, pharmaceuticals, biotechnology and life sciences), energy (energy equipment and services, oil, gas and
consumable fuels), communication services (telecommunication services, media and entertainment), materials (chemicals, construction materials, containers and packaging, metals and mining, paper and forest products) and utilities (electric, gas, water, independent power and renewable electricity producers). More detailed information concerning the demographic characteristics of the participants are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

*Demographics of Categorical Variables in the Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Management &amp; PMO</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Scale</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Scale</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-Scale</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 years</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50 years</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100 years</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100 years</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months - 1 year</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Instruments

In this study, an online survey with four sections was administered to the participants. The survey was distributed through Google Forms, an online questionnaire tool, and it included measures of Counterproductive Work Behavior (Appendix D), the Dark Triad (Appendix E), Organizational Culture (Appendix F) and demographic information form (Appendix G).

2.2.1 Short Version of Dirty Dozen Scale

For measuring the Dark Triad (DT), Turkish version of the Dirty Dozen scale,
which had been originally developed by Jonason and Webster (2010) and translated by Satıcı and colleagues (2018) to Turkish, was used. There are 12 items rated on a 9-point Likert-type scale (1 = totally disagree; 9 = totally agree). Internal consistency coefficients of the sub-scales are over 0.70; .79 for Machiavellianism, .71 for Psychopathy and .87 for narcissism (Satıcı et al., 2018). Furthermore, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis was conducted by Eraslan and colleagues (2015) and the results suggested that ($\chi^2$ (51) = 145.16, $p < .001$, CFI = .96, RMSEA = .07, 90% CI (.05, .08)) the three factor structure was a better representation of the DT construct as compared to the single factor structure.

In the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha for the overall scale was .88 and it was .78 for Machiavellianism, .60 for Psychopathy, and .92 for narcissism. Higher scores on the scale indicated higher levels of DT. The alpha coefficient for the psychopathy subscale was lower than the expected cut-off .70. The psychopathy scale originally had four items. When the item 1, which is “I tend to lack remorse” is deleted, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient increased to .71. Thus, the item was deleted, leaving the psychopathy scale with three items.

Two confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted on the DT scale to assure the three factor structure of the scale and decide whether the composite DT score or the scores on the three subscales (i.e., Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and narcissism) should be used in the present study.

First a single factor solution was tested. Results suggested a poor fit. That is, the items of the DT were not satisfactorily represented by a single factor [S-B $\chi^2$ (45) = 346.94, $p < .001$, CFI = .77, RMSEA = .16, 90% CI (.14, .17), Rho = .88.]. To investigate whether a three-factor structure representing the Dark Triad would fit the data better another confirmatory factor analyses was conducted. Results suggested a relatively better fit than the single factor model [S-B $\chi^2$ (41) = 130.90, $p < .001$, CFI = .93, RMSEA = .09, 90% CI (.07, .11), Rho = .93]. As a result, a decision was made to use the DT scale as having three separate factors.
2.2.2 Perceived Counterproductive Work Behavior Scale

For measuring perception of counterproductive work behaviors by the employees, CWB Checklist (CWB-C) developed by Spector, Fox, Penney, Bruursema, Goh, and Kessler (2006) (see Appendix). The scale originally consisted of 45 items, afterwards was reduced to 32 items (Spector et al., 2006). The CWB-C was translated and adapted to Turkish by Öcel (2010). This version had been used in this study with 37 items by adding five items derived from a different CWB scale (Ağca, 2014). In Ağca’s (2014) study, the items had been selected to gather information on sucker effect, sharing classified company-related information with third parties, excessive usage of the Internet during work hours, neglecting orders of the supervisor, and using company resources for private needs (Bilgiç, Algı, Aydın, Ağca, Selvi, & Yüce, 2010). In Spector and colleagues’ study, the participants were instructed to rate the frequency of engaging in the following actions in their present jobs. In this study, the intention was to evaluate the level of perceived counterproductive work behavior of the employees. Thus, participants were asked to indicate the degree to which the corresponding item or behavioral examples were harmful to the employees or the company as a whole (Ağca, 2014). Perceived CWB (PCWB) Scale was rated on a 6-point Likert type scale (1 = Not harmful at all; 6 = Very harmful). Higher scores on this scale indicates that participants perceive CWB as more harmful, hence the scores were reverse coded in the current analyses. After the reverse coding, higher scores indicated that participants perceive CWB as less harmful. Although the scale had originally five subscales as abuse toward others, production deviance, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal (Spector et al., 2010), in the current study the PCWB was used as a composite score for each participant. The unweighted composite score was calculated by taking the mean of items. Spector and colleagues (2010) reported Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .42 to .81. Test-retest coefficient of the Turkish version of the scale was .92, Cronbach’s alpha was .97 and split-half reliability coefficient was .95 (Öcel, 2010). The reported Cronbach’s alpha
in Ağca’s (2014) study was .96. In the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is .94.

2.2.3 Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI)

For measuring Organizational Culture, Turkish version of the OCAI, which is originally developed by Cameron and Quinn (1999) and translated to Turkish by Çalışır (2008), was used. The OCAI consists of six dimensions (i.e., dominant characteristics, organizational leadership, organizational glue, management of employees, strategic emphasis, and criteria of success). Six items tapping into those six dimensions are used to identify the current culture and the preferred culture. In the original version, the scale is filled by the respondents twice, first thinking about their current organizational culture, then by visualizing an organization in which they want to work at. However, in the current study the scale was filled out by the respondents only once since the goal was to understand the employees’ perception of their current culture. In this scale each item has four alternatives, a, b, c and d and those alternatives refer to clan, adhocracy, market and hierarchy cultures, respectively. The OCAI is an ipsative scale in which a total of 100 points is distributed among the four culture alternatives for each item; higher scores representing higher levels of that culture being perceived in the organization. In the Turkish version of the OCAI, Cronbach’s alpha for the clan, adhocracy, market, and hierarchy culture types are .77, .69, .79, and .78, respectively (Çalışır, 2008). In the current study Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for clan, adhocracy, market, and hierarchy cultures are .81, .85, .79, and .81, respectively. The results show that the instrument being used is reliable.

2.2.4 Demographic Information Form

The demographic information form presented in the last part of the survey consisted of questions regarding gender, age category, sector, department, position,
education level, tenure in the company, total tenure, company size, and age of the company.

2.3 Procedure

After receiving the approval from the METU Human Subjects Ethics Committee, the survey package was administered through a reusable link created by Google Forms itself. The inclusion criteria for this study were being a white-collar worker in an organization and working in a full-time job. The link for the survey was shared via e-mail lists, Social media app’s instant messaging systems and LinkedIn with different companies and people, located in Ankara and Istanbul. The survey package was sent to approximately 600 potential respondents, and the responses were recorded through Google Sheets automatically. Participants were provided with informed consent forms first in which confidentiality of their responses and the voluntary nature of the participation were emphasized. All participants received the scales in the same order; the Counterproductive Work Behavior scale, the Dark Triad Scale, the Organizational Culture Survey, and finally, the demographic information form. At the end of the survey participants were debriefed.
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RESULTS

3.1 Data Screening

Three hundred and eight participants responded to the online questionnaire. The data were screened for random responders and outliers. Sixteen participants were deleted as they did not state their organizational sector or they were high school students, they were working in NGOs or working as freelance, etc.

At first, the data were checked to see whether there were scores outside the expected ranges. No out of range value was identified. There were no missing cases/values either since the program used to form the online survey did not allow for missing values. Next, multivariate outliers were checked using Mahalanobis distance (MD) statistics. Based on the Chi-square table, with seven predictors ($df = 7$, $p > .001$), the cut-off score for MD was found to be 24.32. A total of seventeen participants’ distribution of data were found to be significantly different than other scores. Those participants’ data were deleted and weren’t included in the analyses. Moreover, multicollinearity or additivity assumption were checked to see whether each variable adds something separate to the analysis. Although there were no correlations higher than .70, to be on the safe grounds the correlations between Clan and Adhocracy (.604, $p < .01$) and Machiavellianism and narcissism (.541, $p < .01$) were checked. Having Tolerance greater than .1 and Variance Inflation Factor lower than 10, all variables meet the multicollinearity rule and none of the variables were dropped.

As a next step, multivariate normality assumption was checked. The Shapiro-Wilk test of normality was used to investigate the assumption. Data was not normally distributed ($W = .95$, $p < .01$) and the null hypothesis was rejected showing that the distribution of data was statistically significantly different than a normal distribution.
However, as the sample size is greater than 30 \((N = 275)\), violation of normality is not a major problem according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Furthermore, data were found to meet linearity assumption based on the normal P-P plot of regression standardized residuals showing that the data is close to the linear regression line. Homogeneity of variances and a homoscedasticity assumptions were met as well. After the data screening phase, the analyses were conducted on the remaining 275 participants.

### 3.2 Descriptive Statistics

Cronbach’s Alpha values and descriptive statistics concerning study variables are presented in Table 2. As can be seen, results showed that most of the scales had high levels of Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients \(\alpha_{PCWB} = .94, \alpha_{DT} = .89, \alpha_{Machiavellianism} = .78, \alpha_{Psychopathy} = .71, \alpha_{Narcissism} = .92, \alpha_{Clan} = .81, \alpha_{Adhocracy} = .85, \alpha_{Market} = .79, \alpha_{Hierarchy} = .82\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach’s M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCWB</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>91.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. N = 275. PCWB = Perceived Counterproductive Work Behavior, 1 = Very Harmful; 6 = Not harmful at all. DT = Dark Triad, 1 = Totally disagree; 8 = Totally agree. OCAI = Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument, each of the six items is rated four times representing four culture types of clan, adhocracy, market, and hierarchy using an ipsative scale (i.e., for each item 100 points is distributed among the four culture alternatives); higher scores represent higher levels of that culture being perceived in the organization.

Bivariate correlations for the study variables are presented in Table 3. CWB had significant negative correlations with total tenure ($r = -.12, p < .05$), tenure in the company ($r = -.14, p < .05$), and age of the company ($r = -.18, p < .01$). Likewise, DT had significant negative correlations with total tenure ($r = -.29, p < .01$), age category ($r = -.24, p < .01$), and tenure in the company ($r = -.22, p < .01$). Machiavellianism had significant negative correlations with total tenure ($r = -.25, p < .01$), age category ($r = -.24, p < .01$), and tenure with the organization ($r = -.21, p < .01$). Psychopathy had significant negative correlations with age category ($r = -.23, p < .01$), position ($r = -.19, p < .01$), tenure in the company ($r = -.22, p < .01$), total tenure ($r = -.28, p < .01$), education ($r = -.13, p < .05$), and age of the company ($r = -.15, p < .05$). Narcissism had significant negative correlations with age category ($r = -.15, p < .05$), tenure in the organization ($r = -.14, p < .05$) and total tenure ($r = -.22, p < .001$). Clan culture had significant negative correlation with size of the company ($r = -.18, p < .01$). Adhocracy had a significant positive correlation with position in the company ($r = .14, p < .05$) and significant negative correlations with the size of the company ($r = -.19, p < .01$) and the age of the company ($r = -.13, p < .05$). Finally, Hierarchy culture had significant positive correlations with age ($r = .12, p < .05$), size of the company ($r = .31, p < .001$), age of the company ($r = .26, p < .001$), and total tenure ($r = .12, p < .05$).
Table 3

Pearson correlation coefficients between study variables

<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. PCWB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DT</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Machiavellianism</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Psychopathy</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Narcissism</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clan</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adhocracy</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Market</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hierarchy</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gender</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Age Category</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Education Level</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Position</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Tenure Company</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Total Tenure</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Size</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Company Age</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 275., * p < .05, ** p < .01. Gender Male = 1, Female = 2. Age Category 19-30 = 2, 31-40 = 3, 41-50 = 4, 51-60 = 5, 61-70 = 6. Education Level Bachelor’s Degree = 1, Master’s Degree = 2. Position Junior = 1, Middle = 2, Senior = 3. Tenure in the Company 0-6 months = 1, 6 months-1 year = 2, 1-5 years = 3, 5-10 years = 4, 10-20 years = 5, more than 20 years = 6. Total Tenure 0-6 months = 1, 6 months-1 year = 2, 1-5 years = 3, 5-10 years = 4, 10-20 years = 5, more than 20 years = 6. Size Small-scale = 1, Medium-scale = 2, Large-scale = 3. Age of the Company 0-19 years = 1, 20-40 = 2, 50-100 = 3, more than 100 years = 4.
3.3 Hypothesis Testing

The current study investigated whether DT, Machiavellianism, psychopathy and narcissism predict attitudes towards CWB, and the potential moderation effect of organizational culture on these associations. Hierarchical regression analyses using SPSS 25.0 was used to test Hypothesis 1. Model 1 of the PROCESS Macro for SPSS 25.0 was used to conduct the moderation analyses being hypothesized. In the analyses, Machiavellianism, psychopathy and narcissism were the independent variables, hierarchy, market and adhocracy cultures were the moderators and attitudes towards CWB was the outcome variable. Moreover, in all analyses, the demographic variables which were the tenure in the company and the age of the company were controlled for as they were correlated with the CWB attitudes. Higher levels of tenure in the company and age of the company were associated with lower levels of positive attitudes towards CWB. An alpha level of .05 was used to test statistical significance in all analyses.

It was expected that, as Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and narcissism levels increased, attitudes towards CWB would get more positive as indicated by higher scores on the variable. Control variables were entered first. In step two, the three subscales of DT (Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and narcissism) were entered into the equation. The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at stage one, tenure in the company and age of the company accounted for 4% of the variance in attitudes towards CWB ($F (2, 272) = 5.58, p < .01, R^2 = .04$). The analysis shows that tenure in the company did not significantly predict CWB attitudes ($\beta = -.09, t(272) = -.136, p > .05$), however age of the company did significantly predict CWB attitudes ($\beta = -.15, t(272) = 2.45, p < .05$). Introducing Machiavellianism, psychopathy and narcissism into the model explained an additional 13% of variation in CWB attitudes ($\Delta R^2 = .13, F (5, 269) = 10.76, p < .001$). Machiavellianism did not significantly predict CWB attitudes ($\beta = .04, t(269) = .50, p > .05$). However, psychopathy ($\beta = .24, t(269) = 3.56, p < .01$) and narcissism ($\beta = .16, t(269) = 2.39, p < .05$) significantly predicted CWB attitudes. Together the five predictors accounted for
17% of the variance in CWB attitudes.

Hypothesis 1 was also tested treating DT as a single factor for exploratory purposes. Again the control variables were entered in Step 1 and DT in step 2. DT explained an additional 11% of the variance in CWB attitudes ($\Delta R^2 = .11, R^2 = .15, F (3,271) = 16.06, p < .001$). DT significantly predicted CWB attitudes, ($\beta = .34, t(271) = 5.97, p < .001$). Moreover, age of the company was still a significant predictor of CWB attitudes ($\beta = -.14, t(271) = -2.30, p < .05$). Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

The the standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$), t-values and $R^2$ values for the full model are reported in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Company</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Age</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-2.45*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 DT Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Company</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the Company</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-2.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>3.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.39*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 DT Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Company</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Age</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-2.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>5.97**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 275$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the association between CWB attitudes and Machiavellianism would be stronger in cultures of hierarchy. All statistical results are shown in Table 5. According to the results, the main effect of Machiavellianism was positive and significant on CWB attitudes ($b = .09, SE = .02, p < .001$, 95% CI = .05, .13). The main effect of hierarchy culture was not significant. Also, the
moderation effect was not significant in the analysis. As a result, Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Moreover, it had been found that, age of the company which was a covariate in the model had a significant negative effect on CWB attitudes ($b = -0.09$, $SE = 0.03$, $p < 0.01$, 95% CI = -0.15, -0.02).

Table 5

*Simple moderation model for Machiavellianism and hierarchy culture on CWB attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Company</td>
<td>-0.02 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI -.07, .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the Company</td>
<td>-0.09** (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI -.15, -.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>.09** (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI .05, .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI -.00, .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism*Hierarchy</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI -.00, .00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ .11**

$F$(df, df) 6.34 (5, 269)

$X-W R^2_{change}$ .00

$F$(df, df) 1.14 (1, 269)

*Note. $N = 275$. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$.*

Hypothesis 3 stated that the association between CWB attitudes and narcissism would be stronger when the organization the employee works in is characterized by
an adhocracy culture. Results of analysis testing this hypothesis are shown in Table 6. According to the results, the main effect of narcissism was positive and significant on CWB attitudes \( (b = .07, SE = .01, p < .001, 95\% CI = .04, .09) \). The main effect of adhocracy culture was not significant. Also, the moderation effect was not significant in the analysis. As a result, Hypothesis 3 was not supported. Moreover, it had been found that, age of the company which was a covariate in the model had a significant effect on CWB attitudes \( (b = -.08, SE = .03, p < .05, 95\% CI = -.15, -.02) \).

Table 6

*Simple moderation model for narcissism and adhocracy culture on CWB Attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Company</td>
<td>-.02 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI -.07, .04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the Company</td>
<td>-.08* (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI -.15, -.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>.07** (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI .04, .09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCAI – Adhocracy</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI -.01, .00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism*Adhocracy</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI .00, .00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F(df, df) )</td>
<td>7.29 (5, 269)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-W ( R^2_{\text{change}} )</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F(df, df) )</td>
<td>.09 (1, 269)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 275. * p < .05, ** p < .001. \)

Hypothesis 4 stated that the association between CWB attitudes and narcissism would be stronger when the organization the employee works in is characterized by a market culture. Results of this analysis are shown in Table 7. According to the results, the main effect of narcissism was positive and significant on CWB attitudes.
(\(b = .06, \ SE = .01, \ p < .01, \ 95\% \ CI = .04, .09\)). The main effect of market culture was not significant. Also, the moderation effect was not significant in the analysis. As a result, Hypothesis 4 was not supported. Moreover, it had been found that, age of the company which was a covariate in the model had a significant effect on CWB attitudes (\(b = -.07, \ SE = .03, \ p < .05, \ 95\% \ CI = -.13, -.01\)).

Table 7

*Simple moderation model for narcissism and market culture on CWB attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in the Company</td>
<td>-.02 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI -.08, .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the Company</td>
<td>-.07* (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI -.13, -.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>.06** (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI .04, .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCAI - Market</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI -.01, .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism*OCAI - Market</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI -.00, .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F(df, df))</td>
<td>7.38 (5, 269)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-W (R^2) change</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F(df, df))</td>
<td>.50 (1, 269)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 275. * \(p < .05\), ** \(p < .001\).*

Hypothesis 5 stated that the association between CWB attitudes and psychopathy would be stronger when the organization the employee works in is characterized by a market culture. All statistical results are shown in Table 8. According to the results, the main effect of Psychopathy was positive and significant on CWB attitudes (\(b = .12, \ SE = .02, \ p < .001, \ 95\% \ CI = .08, .16\)). The main effect of market culture was not significant. Also, the moderation effect was not significant in the analysis. As a result, Hypothesis 5 was not supported.
Table 8

*Simple moderation model for psychopathy and market culture on CWB attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in the Company</td>
<td>-.02 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the Company</td>
<td>-.06 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>.12** (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCAI - Market</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy*Market</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F(df, df) )</td>
<td>9.02 (5, 269)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-W ( R^2_{change} )</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F(df, df) )</td>
<td>.12 (1, 269)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 275. * \( p < .05, ** p < .001.\)*
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

4.1 Overview

The aim of the current study was to investigate (a) the predictive effects of the Dark Triad as a unitary construct and the components of Dark Triad, namely, Machiavellianism, psychopathy and narcissism on attitudes towards counterproductive work behaviors, (b) the moderating role of the organizational culture in the Dark Triad-counterproductive work behavior attitudes relationships. In the current study, rather than asking participants whether they have engaged in CWBs, participants were asked to rate the degree to which the presented CWBs are harmful to the organization, employees, and their performances. As suggested by Kamp and Brooks (1991) this was done to gain less socially desirable and more honest responses. The results showed that the Dark Triad as a unitary construct positively predicts attitudes towards CWB. Among the DT traits, only psychopathy and narcissism had a significant positive relationship with CWB attitudes. Machiavellianism was not predictive of CWB attitudes. Finally, the results failed to support the moderating role of organizational culture in the relationship between DT and PCWB.

In the following sections, implications of the findings are discussed first. Next, contributions, limitations and suggestions for future studies are presented.

4.2 Discussion of Findings and Implications

In the current study, the first hypothesis stated that the Dark Triad would be predictive of CWB attitudes. Confirmatory factor analyses on the DT suggested that treating DT as a three-component structure, rather than a single factor structure, fit
the data better. Hence Hypothesis 1 was tested by both treating the DT as a unitary construct and also three relatively independent constructs. The results showed that, DT as a whole, psychopathy, and narcissism but not Machiavellianism predicted attitudes of the participants toward CWBs. More specifically, controlling for the age of the company and tenure in the company, overall, Machiavellianism, psychopathy, and narcissism explained 12% of the variance in CWB attitudes. Specifically, the unique effects of psychopathy and narcissism were significant. That is, individuals higher in psychopathy and narcissism were more likely to have positive attitudes towards CWBs than those lower in psychopathy and narcissism. Moreover, psychopathy had the highest predictive power among the three Dark Triad traits. Current findings are consistent with the findings reported in the literature. Narcissism (Bogart, Benotsch, & Pavlovic, 2004; Penney & Spector, 2002) and psychopathy (Hare & Neumann, 2009) were found to be significant predictors of CWB attitudes. O’Boyle and colleagues (2012) found that, among the three DT traits, narcissism had the strongest relationship with CWB attitudes explaining an extra 9.2% of variance above and beyond FFM (Grijalva & Newman, 2015). So, current findings suggest that individuals with narcissistic and psychopathic tendencies would be more likely to have positive attitudes towards CWBs. Considering the cost of deviant or counterproductive behaviors for work organizations current findings have critical practical implications. Between US$6 billion and US$200 billion were lost annually as a result of CWBs in the organizations (Law & Zhou, 2014). That is, organizations could benefit from selection/screening systems to identify individuals with such dark attributes to prevent that potential cost of having them in their workforce.

Surprisingly, Machiavellianism was not a significant predictor of CWB attitudes. Available empirical evidence suggests that Machiavellianism is positively related to engaging in workplace bullying (e.g., O’Boyle et al., 2012; Pilch & Turska, 2015). It is possible that individuals with Machiavellianism could have been better at manipulating their responses to attitude items than both narcissists and psychopaths as they are already good at manipulating impressions. Alternatively, this finding can be due to the CWB scale being used in the study. In this study the CWB
Checklist was used without separating the CWB-I and CWB-O aspects. In the literature, Machiavellianism was found to have stronger relationships with interpersonal forms of CWB (mistreatment of co-workers and betrayal) than other forms of CWBs (O’Boyle et al., 2012). Therefore, the current finding may have stemmed from not separating CWBs into its major components.

Based on the regression analysis, tenure in the company and age of the company was found to have significant correlations with attitudes towards CWBs. This was the reason why those variables had been chosen as covariates in the moderation analyses. However, when the moderation analysis was conducted, the results showed that tenure in the company did not have a significant effect on attitudes toward counterproductive behaviors in the workplace. This non-significant finding is in line with Ng and Feldman’s (2013) study in which tenure was found to be unrelated with self-ratings of overall CWB (Ng & Feldman, 2013). Yet, the literature on these effects of tenure on CWBs is rather inconsistent. Some studies indicated that organizational tenure was negatively associated with CWB meaning that high tenure was related to less CWB (Ng & Feldman, 2010) among women (Dirican & Erdil, 2016). On the contrary, some studies found a positive association, as long-tenured employees were engaging in more CWB (Glomb & Liao, 2003; Henle, 2005). The results in this study can be due to the categorization of tenure which was divided into six narrow categories, however, in the studies finding significant results, it could be seen that the categorization of tenure was quite different, with three broad categories (i.e. 0-10 years, 11-20 years, 21 and more years). Continuing with the covariates in the hypotheses, age of the company had been found significantly predicting attitudes towards CWB. As the age of the company increased, the employees showed significantly less positive attitudes towards counterproductive behaviors. The tenure in the company and age of the company accounted for 4% of the variance in attitudes towards CWB.

Consistent with the literature, after controlling for age of the company and tenure at the company, the Dark Triad as a single construct explained 11% of the variance in CWB attitudes. According to previously reported findings, the Dark
Triad explained 27% of the variance in CWB attitudes (O’Boyle et al., 2012). Parallel to the results of hypothesis 1a, 1b and 1c, age of the company was a significant negative predictor in explaining CWB, in a way that, the variance it accounted for increased when DT was entered into the analysis. This result can suggest a possible relationship between the DT and age of the company, such that, individuals with DT tendencies shape their behaviors according to the company’s well-grounded rules and regulations.

Several researchers tried to explain why counterproductive work behaviors were seen more frequently in some organizations than in others (Marcus & Schuler, 2004, Robinson & Greenberg, 1998). Organizational culture as a moderator in this relationship might allow for deviant acts (Salin, 2003). In the current study none of the hypotheses suggesting a moderating effect of culture in the DT-CWB relationships was supported. There may be a number of plausible explanations for not finding a moderating effect of culture. One of the explanations could be that due to the measurement of attitudes towards CWBs rather than measuring engagement level of CWBs. The findings were inconsistent with the literature.

4.3 Strengths/Contributions and Practical Implications

The current study contributed to the literature by examining personality and organizational factors’ effect on the perceived counterproductive work behaviors. Asking participants’ perceptions of CWB could have minimized the desirability effect which would be expected if ratings of actual CWB were required. Another contribution of the study is the findings concerning the effects of Dark Triad (as a single factor and as three dimensions) in predicting CWB. This finding supports the Dark Triad literature. The implication is, personality measures could be utilized in recruitment or screening processes. Even though the DT is a relatively new area of research, recruiters may start to use applicant information on the DT traits as an input in their hiring decisions.
4.4 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Studies

The study has some limitations worth mentioning. First of all, although participants were asked to report their perceptions of CWB in their organization to minimize the social desirability effect, participants could still have provided desirable responses. To get a view of the degree to which the respondents might be giving socially desirable responses, a social desirability scale (e.g., the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale - Reynolds, 1982) could be administered in the future studies. Like the CWB scale, the DT scales were also measured with self-report. Machiavellianism and Psychopathy items were also prone to socially desirable responses with the difficulty of attaining honest responses from Narcissist personalities because of their fragile self-esteem. Hence, conditional reasoning tests (James, 1998) could be developed for DT traits and handed to the participants, rather than self-report measures. This might be a reason for failing to support the hypotheses in the study. Also, in the future studies, self-report measures can be supported with peer-ratings and subordinate ratings to have a clearer and realistic understanding of the CWB. Future research can benefit from separating the components of CWBs into CWB-I and CWB-O. Related to this, engagement in CWB was not assessed in this study, rather the perceptions of CWB was examined. Apart from just the intentions, actual CWB should be examined to contribute to the literature and to have some practical implications to be governed in company settings. An alternative for CWB-checklist, such as Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised - NAQ-R of Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers (2009), could have also been used. This study along with the previous studies in the literature, will shed a light on the variables to be examined in the scope of CWB. Based on the findings, companies need to consider applying training programs to increase the knowledge of their employees on CWB, forms of CWB and how those acts harm the organization and its members.

Moreover, a limitation also might be related with the common method bias (CMB) as the data concerning the predictors and the outcome had been collected
from the same participants, all using self-report measures, at one point in time. This is an aspect being somewhat omitted in the Dark Triad literature. In the future studies more attention should be paid on this issue and collect data in different time points, or use measurements other than self-reports.

Another limitation of the study is related to the sample used in this study. The surveys were distributed via social media, therefore, the decision to participate or not was highly dependent on the personal characteristics of the individuals in their helping tendencies. The extent to which the sample was representative of the respondents in the general population is not known.

The final limitation was using the OCAI as the measure of organizational culture. The OCAI’s rating scale was an ipsative one. The literature on ipsative scales presents mixed results concerning their psychometric properties (Eijnatten, Ark, & Holloway, 2015; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). Opponents of the scale are suggesting the use of Likert-type rating scales. Future studies can benefit from Likert versions of the OCAI (Hartnell et al, 2011).
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APPENDICES

A: APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE
B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU


Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz. Çalışma ile ilgili soru ve yorumlarınızı için araştırmacı Melis Gulerdi ile iletişime geçebilirsiniz (e-posta: melis.gulerdi@metu.edu.tr).

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katlıyorum.

Ad Soyad

Tarih

İmza
Öncelikle araştırmamıza katıldığınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Bu araştırma, daha önce de belirtildiği gibi, ODTÜ Endüstri ve Örgüt Psikolojisi Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Melis Gülerdi tarafından Yard. Doç. Dr. Yonca Toker danışmanlığında ve Prof. Dr. H. Canan Sümer eş danışmanlığında yürütülen bir tez çalışmasıdır.

Araştırma amacını, klinik dışı normal popülasyonlarda, düzeyleri kişiden kişiye farklılık gösterebilen bazı olumsuz kişilik özellikleri (Makyevelizm, klinik olmayan Narsisizm ve klinik olmayan Psikopati) ve Üretkenlik Karşıtı İş Davranışları (sabotaj, kaytarma, vb.) arasındaki ili̇şkinin Kurum Kültürü tarafından ne kadar etkilendiğinin incelenmesidir.

Belirtilen kişilik özelliklerinin iş yerlerinde sorunlara neden olan Üretkenlik Karşıtı İş Davranışları ile ili̇şkisi olduğu bilinmektedir. Kurum Kültürü’nün ise, kişilik özellikleri ve bu davranışlar arasındaki ili̇şkiye nasıl etki edeceğini araştırmaktadır.

Bu çalışmadan elde edilecek ilk verilerin 2019 yılının ilk yarısında elde edilmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Elde edilen bilgiler sadece bilimsel araştırma ve yazılarında kullanılabilecektir.

Çalışmanın sağlıklı ilerleyebilmesi ve bulguların güvenilir olması için çalışmaya katılacağınızı bildiğiniz diğer kişilerle çalışma ve ilgili detaylı bilgi paylaşımında bulunmamanızı rica ederiz.

Araştırmının sonuçlarını öğrenmek ya da daha fazla bilgi almak için Melis Gülerdi’ye (e-mail: melis.gulerdi@metu.edu.tr) başvurabilirsiniz.
D: PERCEIVED COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIOR SCALE
ALGILANAN ÜRETİM KARŞİTI İŞ DAVRANIŞLARI ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda, kurularda gözlemlenen iş davranıslarına yönelik bazı ifadeler yer almaktadır. Lütfen bu ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyunuz. Her bir davranışın, kurumun ve çalışanların performansına ne derece zarar verdiğini belirtmeyi düşündüğünüzünü belirtiniz.

0 - Hiç zarar vermez
1 - Zarar vermez
2 - Pek zarar vermez
3 - Biraz zarar verir
4 - Zarar verir
5 - Çok zarar verir

İşverene ait araç/gereçleri kısıtlı bir şekilde boşা harcama *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hiç zarar vermez                      Çok zarar verir

İşi bilerek yanlış yapma *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hiç zarar vermez                      Çok zarar verir

İzin almadan işe geç gelme *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hiç zarar vermez                      Çok zarar verir

Hasta olduğunu bahane ederek işe gelmeye *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hiç zarar vermez                      Çok zarar verir
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Örgüt mallarına bilerek zarar verme *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Çalışma ortamınızı bilerek kirletme *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşverene ait olan bazı şeyler izinsiz alıp götürme *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşyerine zarar verici söylentiler çıkarma *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Müşterilere ya da tüketicilere karşı kaba ya da çirkin davranış *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İşlerin Gerekeni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çok zarar verir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşlerin Gerekeni</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşlerin Gerekeni</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşlerin Gerekeni</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşlerin Gerekeni</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşlerin Gerekeni</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
İnsanların özel hayatlarıyla alay etme *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Çok zarar verir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

İşyerine ait bazı araç-gereçleri izin almadan eve götürme *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Çok zarar verir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gerçekte çalışılından daha fazla saat için mesai ücreti almaya çalışma *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Çok zarar verir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

İzin almadan işverene ait parayı alma *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Çok zarar verir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

İşyerindeki diğer çalışanları yok sayma *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Çok zarar verir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sektör Olsun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendisinden dolayı bir başkasını suçlama</td>
<td>hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td>çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İşyerindeki insanların tartışmaları çıkarma</td>
<td>hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td>çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İşyerindeki birine ait bir şey izinsiz alma</td>
<td>hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td>çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İşyerindeki herhangi birini sözöl olarak aşağılama</td>
<td>hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td>çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İşyerindeki birine uygunsuz el kol hareketleri yapma</td>
<td>hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td>çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İşyerindeki insanları itip kakarak korkutma *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşyerindeki insanları sözel olarak tehdit etme *</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Çok zarar verir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşyerindeki herhangi birine kendisini kötü hissettirecek açık sıcak şeyler söyleme</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Çok zarar verir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşyerindeki birinin kötü duruma düşmesine yol açacak bir şeyler yapma *</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Çok zarar verir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşyerindeki birine onu utandıracak sevimsiz şakalar yapma *</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Çok zarar verir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
İzin almadan herhangi birinin özel eşyalarını (mektup, çekmece) karıştırma *

0 1 2 3 4 5

Hiç zarar vermez ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ Çok zarar verir

İşyerindeki birini itme ya da vurma *

0 1 2 3 4 5

Hiç zarar vermez ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ Çok zarar verir

İşyerindeki biriyle dalga geçme ya da ona hakaret etme *

0 1 2 3 4 5

Hiç zarar vermez ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ Çok zarar verir

Çalışma arkadaşlarının az çalıştığı düşünüldüğü zamanlarda performansını düşürme

0 1 2 3 4 5

Hiç zarar vermez ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ Çok zarar verir

İşyerinin önemli bilgi ve belgelerini dışarıdan 3. kişilerle paylaşma *

0 1 2 3 4 5

Hiç zarar vermez ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ ◯ Çok zarar verir
İşyerinde internet kullanımından dolayı işi aksatma *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amirin emirlerini uygulamayı ihmal etme *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

İş yerinin olanaklarını özel ihtiyaçlar için kullanma *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiç zarar vermez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çok zarar verir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E: SHORT VERSION OF DIRTY DOZEN SCALE

KARANLIK ÜÇLÜ KİŞİLİK ÖLÇEĞİ

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri okuduktan sonra kardınızı değerlendirme sizin için en uygun seçeneği seçiniz.

0 - Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
1 - Çoğunlukla katılmıyorum
2 - Katlimıyorum
3 - Bazen katılmıyorum
4 - Kararsızım
5 - Bazen katılyorum
6 - Katılıyorum
7 - Çoğunlukla katılyorum
8 - Kesinlikle katılyorum

Kendi amacına ulaşmak için başkalarını yönlendirme eğilimindeyim. *

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum Kesinlikle katılyorum

İstediğimi elde etmek için hileye veya yalana başvururum. *

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum Kesinlikle katılyorum
Amacına ulaşmak için yağışlık yaparım. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendi çıkarlarını doğrultusunda başkalarını kullanma eğilimindeyim. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yaptıklarından pişmanlık duymam. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Davranışlarının ahlaki olup olmamasını umursamam. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duyarsız veya katı yürekli olma eğilimindeyim. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Başkalarını küçümseme eğilimindeyim. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle katılıyorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dışlerinin bana hayran olmasını isterim. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle katılıyorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Başkalarının dikkatini üzerine çekmek isterim. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle katılıyorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prestij veya statü peşinde koşarım. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle katılıyorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Başkalarından özel ilgi beklerim. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kesinlikle katılmıyorum</td>
<td>Kesinlikle katılıyorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F: ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE ASSESSMENT INVENTORY (OCAI)

KURUM KÜLTÜRÜ DEĞERLENDİRME ARACI

Bu bölümdede, Organizasyonel Kültürün altı ana boyutunu değerlendirilmektedir. Cevaplarınızı ile, kurumunuzun nasıl işlediğine ve enu karakterizye eden değerleri dair bir resim sunmuş olacaktır.

Doğru ya da yanılı organizasyon kültürü olmalıdır gibi, bu sorular için doğru ya da yanılı cevaplar yoktur. Bu nedenle, ortaya çıkan sorunun mümkün olduğuna gerçek yanıtlandılması için sorular doğru ve objektif cevaplar vermeye çalışınız.

Sizden beklenen, bağlı bulunduğunuz kurumu değerlendirmekken şirketin bütününe göz önünde bulundurmanız olacaktır.

Bu enkett alt soruyu oluşturacaktır. Her sorunun dört alternatif bulunmaktadır. Her bir alternatifin kurumuzda ne kadar benzediğine bağlı olarak bu dört alternatif arasında 100 puanı bölüştürünüz. Kurumunuz en çok benzeyen alternatifde daha fazla puan veriniz.

Örneğin, birinci soruda eğer A alternatifin kurumunuzda fazla sayıda benzediğini, B ve C alternatiflerinin biraz benzediğini, D alternatifinin ise en az benzediğini düştüyorsunuz; A seçeneğine 55 puan, B ve C seçeneklerine 20’ser ve D seçeneğine ise 5 puan verebilirsiniz. Elde edilen toplam istendiği gibi 100 olmasa olmalıdır.

Her soru için toplamın 100 puan eşit olduğundan emin olunuz.

1. Şirketimin Hakim Özellikleri

Her bir alternatifin kurumunuzda ne kadar benzediğine bağlı olarak bu dört alternatif arasında 100 puanı bölüştürünüz. Kurumunuz en çok benzeyen alternatifde daha fazla puan veriniz.

Her soru için toplamın 100 puan eşit olduğundan emin olunuz.

A. Çalıştığım şirket çok kişisel bir yerdir, geniş bir aile gibidir. İnsanlar kendileri ile ilgili pek çok şey paylaşabilir.

Short answer text

:::

B. Çalıştığım şirket çok dinamik ve girişimci bir yerdir. İnsanlar riski göze alarak hareket etmeye, risk almaya can atarlar.

Short answer text
C. Çalıştığım şirket sonuç odaklı bir yerdir. En önemli kaygı işin tamamlanmasıdır. İnsanlar rekabetçi ve başarı odaklıdır.

D. Çalıştığım şirket kontrollü ve yapışal bir yerdir. Resmi yöntemler insanların yaptıklarını yönetir.

2. Şirketimde Organizasyonel Liderlik

Her bir alternatifin kurumunuza ne kadar benzediğine bağlı olarak bu dört alternatif arasında 100 puanı bölüştürünüz. Kurumunuza en çok benzeyen alternatife daha fazla puan veriniz.

Her soru için toplamın 100 puan eşit olduğundan emin olunuz.

A. Çalıştığım şirketteki liderlik genel olarak yol gösterme, kolaylaştırma ve öğretme konularında örnek olma şeklinde algılanır.

B. Çalıştığım şirketteki liderlik genel olarak girişimcilik, yaratıcılık ve risk alma konularında örnek olmak şeklinde algılanır.

C. Çalıştığım şirketteki liderlik genel olarak saldırgan, sonuç-odaklı olma özelliklerini ortaya koyar.
D. Çalıştım şirketke liderlik genel olarak koordine etme, düzenleme ve verimlilik konularında örnek olmak şeklinde algılanır.

Short answer text

3. Şirketimde Çalışanları Yönetmek

Her bir alternatifin kurumuza ne kadar benzeğini bağlı olarak bu dört alternatif arasında 100 puanı bölüştürünüz. Kurumuza en çok benzezen alternatifle daha fazla puan veriniz.

Her soru için toplamın 100 puanı eşit olduğundan emin olunuz.

A. Çalıştım şirketke yönetim stili, takım çalışması, fikir birliği ve katılım olarak nitelendirilir.

Short answer text

B. Çalıştım şirketke yönetim stili, bireysel risk alma, yaratıcılık, özgürlük hareket etme ve farklılaşma olarak nitelendirilir.

Short answer text

C. Çalıştım şirketke yönetim stili, siki rekabetçilik, yüksek hedefler ve başarı olarak nitelendirilir.

Short answer text

D. Çalıştım şirketke yönetim stili, istihdam güvenliği, kurallara uyunluk, tahmin edebilme ve tutarlılık olarak nitelendirilir.

Short answer text
4. Organizasyon Birliği

Her bir alternatifin kurumunuza ne kadar benzediğine bağlı olarak bu dört alternatif arasında 100 puani bölüştüriyınız. Kurumunuza en çok benzeyen alternatifle daha fazla puan veriniz.

Her soru için toplamın 100 puana eşit olduğundan emin olunuz.

A. Çalıştığım şirketi bir arada tutan, sadakat ve karşılıklı güvendir. Şirkete bağlılık yüksektir. *

Short answer text


Short answer text

C. Çalıştığım şirketi bir arada tutan, başarmak ve hedeflere ulaşmaktadır. * Saldırırganlık ve kazanma ortak konulardır.

Short answer text

D. Çalıştığım şirketi bir arada tutan, resmi kurallar ve ilkelere dayanır. Düzgün işleyen * bir organizasyonu idame etirmek önemlidir.

Short answer text

5. Şirketimde Önem Verilen Stratejiler

Her bir alternatifin kurumunuza ne kadar benzediğine bağlı olarak bu dört alternatif arasında 100 puani bölüştüriyınız. Kurumunuza en çok benzeyen alternatifle daha fazla puan veriniz.

Her soru için toplamın 100 puana eşit olduğundan emin olunuz.
A. Çalıştığım şirket çalışanların gelişimine önem vermektedir. Yüksek güven, açık olma ve katılımcılık süreklidir.

Short answer text

B. Çalıştığım şirket yeni kaynaklar elde etmeye ve yenilikler yaratmaya önem vermektedir. Yeni şeyler denemeye ve yeni fırsatlar araştırmaya değer verir.

Short answer text

C. Çalıştığım şirket rekabetçi davranışlara ve başarıya önem vermektedir. Zor hedeflere ulaşmak ve pazarda kazanma arzusu hakimdir.

Short answer text

D. Çalıştığım şirket sürekli ve istikrara önem verir. Verimlilik, kontrol ve düzgün işleyiş önemlidir.

Short answer text

6. Şirketimde Başarı Kriteri

Her bir alternatif kurumunuzla ne kadar benzediğine bağlı olarak bu dört alternatif arasında 100 puani böülüştüreniz. Kurumunuz en çok benzeşen alternatifde daha fazla puan veriniz.

Her soru için toplanan 100 puana eşit olduğundan emin olunuz.

A. Çalıştığım şirkette başarının temelinde insan kaynakları, takım çalışması, çalışan bağlılığı ve insanların ilgi alanlarının gelişimi olduğu düşünülür.
B. Çalıştığım şirkette başarının temelinde en eşsiz ve yeni ürünler sahip olma yatırımındır. Şirket ürün lideri ve yaratıcıdır.

C. Çalıştığım şirkette başarının temelinde pazarda birinci olma ve rakipleri geçme yatırımındır. Pazar lideri olmak kritik faktördür.

D. Çalıştığım şirkette başarının temelinde verimlilik yatırımındır. Güvenilir teslimat, düzgün zamanlama ve düşük maliyetli üretim çok kritiktir.
1. Cinsiyetiniz: ( ) Kadın ( ) Erkek ( ) Diğer
2. Yaşınız:
3. Eğitim Seviyeniz: ( ) İlköğretim ( ) Lise ( ) Ön lisans ( ) Lisans ( ) Y. Lisans
4. İş Türünüz: ( ) Tam Zamanlı ( ) Yarı Zamanlı ( ) Freelance
5. Sektörünüz:
6. Departmanınız:
7. Pozisyonuz:
8. Bu kurumda geçirdiğiniz toplam süre:
9. İş hayatında geçirdiğiniz toplam süre:
10. Kurumuzda çalışan kişi sayısı:
11. Kurumunuzun kuruluş yılı:
BÖLÜM 1

GİRİŞ


ÜKĠD çoğunlukla alt boyutlarına odaklanmadan, bütünsel bir yapı olarak ele alınmaktadır (ör. Dalal, 2005; Sackett, 2002). ÜKĠD’nin alt boyutları arasındaki korelasyonun her zaman pozitif olduğu bulunmuştur (Sackett ve DeVore, 2001). Ayrıca kuruluş ve kişilere yönelik üretim karşıtı davranışlar arasındaki korelasyonun da oldukça kuvvetli (r = .86) olduğu belirtilmektedir (Bennett ve Robinson, 2000). Bunlara ilaveten, ÜKĠD boyutlarının, ÜKĠD’nin bileşim puanını oluşturduğuunda, iç tutarlılık katsayısının .92 olduğu bulunduştir (Gruys, 1999). Tüm bunlar, bu kavramın alt boyutlarına odaklanılmadan da ele alınabileceğine işaret etmektedir.

ÜKĠD, ilgili alan yazında yapılmış sıklığına ilişkin sorularla ölçülür (Bennett ve Robinson, 2000; Cohen ve Diamant, 2019). Hassas bir değişkeni sıklık skalası üzerinde değerlendirmek oldukça karmaşıktır (Cohen ve Diamant, 2019). ÜKĠD öz bildirim ile anonim ölülmesine rağmen, sosyal beğenirlik sonuçların tarafsızlığını kaçırmaz olarak etkilemektedir (Bennett ve Robinson, 2000). Kendisini sosyal
beğenilir bir şekilde sunmak, ÜKĠD değerlendirme puanlarının azalması üzerinde oldukça etkilidir (Berry vd., 2007). Bu nedenle, alan yazında bazı araştırmacılar, ÜKĠD’nin özen beyana dayalı yapıma siklığını ölçmek yerine, ÜKĠD’na karşı tutumları ölçmeyi tercih etmektedirler (ör. Ağca, 2014; Gruys ve Sackett, 2003).


ÜKĠD’ünün öncülü olarak ele alınmaktadır (Fox, Spector ve Miles, 2001). Pletzer, Bentvelzen, Oostrom ve De Vries’in (2019) meta-analizinde, sorumluluk, ÜKĠD’ünün %53.19’unu, uyumluluk ise %37.49’unu açıklamıştır. Ayrıca, ÜKĠD’ndaki varyansın nevrotizm %6,76'sını, deneyime ilişkin (%1.30) ve dışadönüklük (%1.26) açıklamıştır.


Narsistler intihar sanıları ve dikkat çekme dürtüleri sahip sahip (O’Boyle ve ark., 2012). Narsistlerin fantezi hayatı bağımsızca kontrol etmeyi, bağımsızca tarafından hayranlık duyulmayı içerir; bağımsızca tarafından ödüllendirilmek isterler (Morf ve Rhodenwalt, 2001). ÜKİD’nin narsizizm ile pozitif olarak ilişkili olduğu söylenebilir (Michel ve Bowling, 2013). Bağımsızca gölgede bırakabilmeleri için bir fırsat ortaya çıktığında, kişilerarası yönendirilmiş her türlü ÜKİD’nin sergilerler.


ÜKİD’nin sırasıyla Makyavelizm, narsizizm ve psikopat için ortalama .20, .35 ve .06 korelasyon gösterdiği, bulunmuştur (O’Boyle ve ark., 2012). Bu nedenle, literatür paralel olarak, Kara Üçlü’nün üretim karşıtı iş davranışına yönelik olumlu tutum sergilemekleri varsayılmaktadır.

Hipotez 1. Karanlık Üçlü, üretim karşıtı iş davranışlarını olan tutumu pozitif ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlı şekilde yordayacaktır.
Hipotez 1a: Makyavelizm, üretim karşıtı iş davranışına olan tutumu pozitif ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlı şekilde yordayacaktır.

Hipotez 1b: Psikopati, üretim karşıtı iş davranışına olan tutumu pozitif ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlı şekilde yordayacaktır.

Hipotez 1c: Narşisizm üretim karşıtı iş davranışına olan tutumu pozitif ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlı şekilde yordayacaktır.


Yıllar içinde örgüt kültürünün incelenmesinde birçok yaklaşım oluşmuştur (Detert, Schroeder ve Mauriel, 2000). Bu yaklaşımlardan bir tanesi, Rekabetçi Değerler Modeli’dir (CVF; Cameron, Quinn, DeGraff ve Thakor, 2006; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). CVF, örgütsel etkililik ile kurum kültür arasındaki ilişiği analiz eden bir sınıflandırma sunar (Hartnell ve ark., 2011). Cameron ve Quinn'e (2011) göre, üç ana boyutta 30 etkinlik göstergesi bulunun ve dört ana kültür kümesi (Klan, Adhokrasi, Piyasa ve Hiyerarşı) oluşturan CVF, insanların bir kuruluş hakkında değerlerini ölçmek için bir araç olarak kullanılmaktadır. Birinci boyut, iç (iç yönelim, birlik entegrasyonu) ve dış (diş yönelim, rekabet ve farklılaşma) etkililik kriterleri ile ilgili odak boyutudur (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Örgütsel bağımsızlık ve örgütSEL tutarlılık bu yelpazenin en uç noktasındadır (Gardner vd., 2012). İkincisi, spektrumun bir uçundaki esneklik ve dinamizm, diğer uçundaki stabilite ve kontrol ile ilişkili yapı boyutudur (Hartnell ve ark.). Üçüncü boyut, bu kültür türlerindeki değerler ve inançlardan türetilen etkili davranışları kapsar (Hartnell ve ark., 2011).
Klan kültürü içsel olarak yönlendirilmiş ve esnektir. Bu organizasyon türündeki yapılar ve ilişkiler güven, bağlılık, açık iletişim ve işbirliğine dayanmaktadır. Bu kültürde, işbirliği yoluya insanlar birlikte işler yaparlar ve üyelik, üyelik ve desteği değer verilir (Cameron ve Quinn, 1999).

Hiyerarşi Kültürü, içsel olarak yönlendirilir ve kontrol mekanizmaları tarafından yapılandırılır. Bu kültürde formalite ve yapı aşırı vurgulanmıştır. Çalışanlar, açık rolleri ve sorumlulukları ile beklenmeleri karşılamaya çalışırlar. İnsanlar kurallara ve prosedürlere göre hareket ederler.


**Hipotez 2.** Hiyerarşi kültür düzeyi artışça Makyavelizm ve üretim karşıtı iş davranışları tutumları arasındaki pozitif ilişki de artacaktır.

Chatterjee ve Hambrick’e (2007) göre, narsisizmin, gerekli niteliklerin cesurluk ve atılın değişimleri, fikir üretimi ve riskli eylemlerin karşısında son derece dinamik bir endüstride değerli olabileceği savunulur. Bu tür bireylere büyük vizyonu olan üretken narsisistler denir ve takipçilerinin bu ligde ortak bir hedefe doğru harekete geçirdiği görülmuştur (Maccoby, 2004). Dolayısıyla, hipotez aşağıdaki gibidir,

**Hipotez 3.** Adhokrasi kültür düzeyi arttıkça narsizm ve üretim karşıtı davranışlar tutumları arasındaki pozitif ilişki de artacaktır.

Narsisizm seviyesi yüksek olan bireylerin başkaları tarafından hayranlık ve olumlu değerlendirme bekledikleri için durumu olumlu bir şekilde yorumlamlarını açıklanmıştır (Elliot & Trash, 2001). Rekor kırmak, rakipleri yenmekte veya büyük bir grup insanın gözünde başarılı olma şansına sahip oldukları bağlamında, yüksek performans gösterdikleri görülmuştur (Elliot & Trash, 2001). İçinde bulundukları organizasyondan gelen ödül ve cezalarla karşı hassas olduklarını bu nedenle buna göre değişme olasılıklarının daha yüksek olduğu vurgulanmıştır (Jonason ve Jackson,
2016). Bu davranışlar, müşterilerden veya sektörden gelen geri bildirimlere dayanarak stresli bir kültüre uyum sağlayan bir piyasa kültüre paraleldir. Böylece,

**Hipotez 4.** Piyasa kültürü düzeyi arttıkça narsizim ve üretim karşıtı iş davranışları tutumları arasındaki pozitif ilişki de artacaktır.


**Hipotez 5.** Piyasa kültürü düzeyi arttıkça psikopati ve üretim karşıtı iş davranışları tutumları arasındaki pozitif ilişki de artacaktır.

**BÖLÜM 2**

**YÖNTEM**

Anketler, sosyal medya ve e-posta gibi farklı kanallar aracılığıyla yaklaşık 600 potansiyel katılımcıya gönderilmiştir. Toplam 308 çalışan tarafından anketler tamamlanmıştır, ancak bazı katılımcılar tüm ölçek için aynı değerlendirimeyi yaptıklarından veya dikkatsiz yanıt verdiklerinden bazı veriler silinmiştir. Sonuç
olarak, Türkiye'nin farklı illerinden 275 özel sektör ve kamu sektörü çalışanından veri toplanmıştır. Tüm katılımcılar tam zamanlı işlerde olan beyaz yakalı çalışanlardır. Katılmcıların %61.8'i erkek, %38.2'i kadındır. Yaş dağılımı açısından 147 katımcının (%53.5) yaş 19 ile 30 arasında, 83 katımcının yaş (%30.2) 31 ile 40 arasında, 32 katımcının yaş (%11.6) 41 ile 50, 11 katılımcı arasında değişmektedir. 11 katımcının (%4) yaş 51-60 arasında değişmektedir, 2 katımcının (%.7) yaş 60'ın üzerindedir.
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anlamak için, anket katılımcıları tarafından sadece bir kez doldurulmaktadır. Bu ölçeekte her maddenin dört alternatifi vardır: a, b, c ve d ve bu alternatifler sırasıyla klan, adhokrasi, pazar ve hiyerarşik kültürlerini ifade eder. OCAI, her madde için dört kültür alternatifi arasında toplam 100 puanın dağıtıldığı bir ölçekdir; organizasyonda algılanan kültürün daha yüksek seviyelerini temsil eden daha yüksek puanlar. Anketin son bölümünde sunulan demografik bilgi formu cinsiyet, yaş kategorisi, sektör, bölüm, pozisyon, eğitim düzeyi, şirketeki çalışma süresi, toplam çalışma süresi, şirket büyüklüğü ve şirketin kuruluş yılı ile ilgili sorulardan oluşmaktadır.


BÖLÜM 3

SONUÇLAR

Tabachnick ve Fidell (2007)' in yönergelerine göre veri tarama ve temizleme süreçleri tamamlanmıştır. Eksik veriler veri setinden çıkarıldıktan sonra geriye 275 katılımcı kalmıştır ve analizler bu katılımcıların sağladığı veriler üzerinde yapılmıştır. Kullanılan ölçekler genel olarak kabul edilir düzeyde alfa katsayılara sahiptir (α üretim karşıtı iş davranışları = .94, α Karşılık = .89, α Makyavelizm = .78, α Psikopati = .71, α Narsisizm = .92, α Khan = .81, α Adhokrasi = .85, α Pazar = .79, α Hiyerarşik = .82).
Hipotez 1'i test etmek için SPSS 25.0 kullanılarak hiyerarşik regresyon analizleri yürütülmüştür. Varsayılan düzenleyici değişken analizlerini yürütmek için SPSS 25.0 PROCESS Macro Model 1 kullanılmıştır. Analizlerde Makyavelizm, psikopati ve narsisizm bağımsız değişken, hiyerarşik, pazar ve adhokrasi kültürleri düzenleyici değişken ve İKİD’na karşı tutumlar sonuç değişkeni olarak kullanılmıştır. Tüm analizlerde, şirketeki çalışma süresi ve şirketin yaş kontrol edilmişdir. Şirketteki daha yüksek görev süresi ve şirketin yaş, İKİD’na karşı daha olumsuz tutum düzeyleriyle ilişkilendirilmiştir. Tüm analizlerde istatistiksel anlamlılığı test etmek için .05 alfa düzeyi kullanılmıştır.

Makyavelizm, psikopati ve narsisizm düzeyleri arttıkça, İKİD’na karşı tutumlardaki olumlu bir artış hipotez edilmiştir. Analiz sonuçu, şirketeki çalışma süresinin ve şirketin yaşının İKİD’na karşı tutumların varyansının %4’ünü açıkladığını göstermektedir \((F(2, 272) = 5.58, p < .01, R^2 = .04)\). Analiz, şirketeki çalışma süresinin İKİD’na karşı tutumlarını anlamli bir şekilde yordamadığını göstermiştir \((\beta = -0.09, t(272) = -1.36, p > .05)\), ancak şirketin yaşının İKİD’na karşı tutumları \((\beta = -0.15, t(272) = 2.45, p < .05)\) anlamli bir şekilde yordadığı bulunmuştur. Makyavelizm, psikopati ve narsisizm modele dahil edildiğinde, İKİD’na karşı tutumlardaki varyansın demografik değişiklerin üzerinde %13 açıkladığı \((\Delta R^2 = .13, F(5, 269) = 10.76, p < .001)\) bulunmuştur. Makyavelizm İKİD’na karşı tutumları anlamli bir şekilde yordamamıştır \((\beta = .04, t(269) = .50, p > .05)\). Bununla birlikte, psikopati \((\beta = .24, t(269) = 3.56, p < .01)\) ve narsisizm \((\beta = .16, t(269) = 2.39, p < .05)\) İKİD’na karşı tutumları önemli ölçüde yordamıştır. Beş değişken, İKİD’na karşı tutumlardaki varyansın %17’sini açıklamıştır. Karanlık Üçlü tek bir faktör olarak test edildiğinde ise, Karanlık Üçlü faktörü İKİD’na karşı tutum varyansının %11’ini açıklamıştır \((\Delta R^2 = .11, R^2 = .15, F(3, 271) = 16.06, p < .001)\).

Hipotez 2 test edildiğinde, Makyavelizm ve kontrol değişken ilişkisi pozitif ve anlamli bulunmuştur \((b = .09, SE = .02, p < .001, 95\% CI = .05,. 13)\). Hiyerarşik kültürünün ana etkisi anlamli bulunmamıştır. Ayrıca, düzenleyici değişkenin etkisi analizde anlamli bulunmamıştır. Hipotez 2 desteklenmemiştir. Ayrıca, modelde
kontrol değişken olan şirket yaşının ÜKİD’na karşı tutumlar üzerinde anlamlı ve olumsuz etkisi olduğu bulunmuştur \( (b = - .09, SE = .03, p < .01, 95 CI = -. 15, -. 02) \).

Hipotez 3 test edildiğinde, narsisizmin ÜKİD’na karşı tutumlar ilişkisi pozitif ve anlamlı bulunmuştur \( (b = .07, SE = .01, p < .001, 95 CI = . 04, .09) \). Adhokrasi kültürünün ana etkisi anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Ayrıca, düzenleyici değişkenin etkisi analizde anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Hipotez 3 desteklenmemiştir. Ayrıca, modelde kontrol değişken olan şirket yaşının ÜKİD’na karşı tutumları üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi olduğu bulunmuştur \( (b = -.08, SE = .03, p < .05, 95 CI = -.15, -.02) \).

Hipotez 4 test sonuçlarına göre, narsisizmin ÜKİD’na karşı tutumlar ilişkisi pozitif ve anlamlı bulunmuştur \( (b = .06, SE = .01, p < .01, 95 CI = .04, .09) \). Piyasa kültürünün ana etkisi anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Ayrıca, düzenleyici değişkenin etkisi analizde anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Hipotez 4 desteklenmemiştir. Ayrıca, modelde kontrol değişken olan şirket yaşının ÜKİD’na karşı tutumları üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi olduğu bulunmuştur \( (b = -.07, SE = .03, p < .05, 95 CI = -.13, -.01) \).

Hipotez 5 sonuçlarına göre, psikopatının ÜKİD’na karşı tutumlar ilişkisi pozitif ve anlamlı bulunmuştur \( (b = .12, SE = .02, p < .001, 95 CI = .08, 16) \). Piyasa kültürünün ana etkisi anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Ayrıca, düzenleyici değişkenin etkisi analizde anlamlı bulunmamıştır. Hipotez 5 desteklenmemiştir.

**BÖLÜM 4**

**TARTIŞMA**

Bu çalışmada, psikopatının ve narsisizmin ayrı ayrı ve Karanlık Üçlü’nün tek faktör olarak ÜKİD’ni yordadığı bulunmuştur. Bununla birlikte Makyavelizm ve ÜKİD’na karşı tutumlar arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmamıştır. Şirketin yaşısı ve şirketteki çalışma süresi kontrol edildiğinde, Makyavelizm, psikopati ve narsisizm, ÜKİD’na karşı tutumlardaki toplam varyansın % 12’sini açıkladığı görülmüştür. Psikopati ve narsisizm dereceleri daha yüksek olan bireylerin, psikopati ve narsisizm


Literatürle uyumlu olarak, şirketin yaşını ve şirkette görev süresini kontrol ettiğimizde, Karanlık Üçlü tek faktörü yapılarıyla ÜKĠD’na karşı tutumların toplam varyansının % 11’ini açıklamıştır. Hipotez 1a, 1b ve 1c’nin sonuçlarına paralel olarak, şirketin yaşını ÜKĠD’se karşı tutumları açıklarken, Karanlık Üçlü analize girdiği zaman açıklanan varyansın artmasıyla birlikte önemli bir negatif belirleyici olarak bulunmuştur. Bu sonuç, Karanlık Üçlü ve şirketin yaşını arasında olması bir ilişki önerebilir, çünkü Karanlık Üçlü eğilimi olan bireyler davranışlarını şirketin sağlam temelli kural ve düzenlemelerine göre şekillendirdiği sonucu çıkarılabilir.
Karanlık Üçlü ve ÜKİD’na karşı tutumlar arasındaki ilişkinde kültürün düzenleyici değişken olarak role oynadığını gösteren hiçbir hipotez desteklenmemiştir.


Çalışmanın bir diğer kısıtlılığı, bu çalışmanın örneklemiyle ilgilidir. Anketler sosyal medya aracılığıyla dağıtılmış olup, katılım ya da katılımama kararı, bireyin yardım etme eğilimlerine ve kişisel özelliklerine bağlıdır. Örneklem genel popülasyonındaki katılımcıları temsil etme derecesi bilinmemektedir.
R: TEZ İZİN FORMU/ THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE
Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics
Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR
Soyadı / Surname : Gülerdi
Adı / Name : Melis
Bölümü / Department : Psikoloji Bölümü/ Department of Psychology

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): THE DARK TRIAD AND COUNTERPRODUCTIVE WORK BEHAVIORS: ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AS A MODERATOR

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master ☐ Doktora / PhD ☐

1. Tezin tamami dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.
2. Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two years. *
3. Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months. *

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.
A copy of the Decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature ......................... Tarih / Date .........................