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I’m bad & mad!
Predicting interpersonal sabotage in the workplace

Kendrick Settler & Jana Hackathorn, Ph.D.
Why Investigate Sabotage

- April 2016 Verizon announced over 1,000 customers lost their services due to employee sabotage.
- The annual costs of Sabotage $4.2 to $120 billion
- By predicting sabotage companies can reduce the cost of damages from this type of behavior.
Sabotage

- There are three types of: destroying objects, goods, or machinery, stopping production, or reducing the amount of work being done.
- This research focuses on interpersonal sabotage.

(Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1987), (Dubois, 1979).
Counterproductive Behaviors

Organizational Deviance

- Defined as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms
- Organizational norms are basic moral standards the company makes.

Hostility

- Expressive motivation to release, express one's outrage, anger, or frustration.
- Worker 1 thinks they are overworked therefore, they belittle worker 2 who works different hours.

(Robinson & Bennett, 1995)  
(Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006)
Overall Model

3-Stages

5-variable model

3-Variable model

Replication using different population

Overall Model
Study 1
Methods

- Essay
- Hostility
- Sabotage
- Organizational Deviance
- Demographics
- Social Desirability
Demographics

N = 91

Race
- Caucasian 72%
- African American 14%
- Asian 1%
- Hispanic 1%
- Bi-Racial 6%
- Other 6%

Gender
- Male 29%
- Female 71%

Currently Employed
- Yes 60%
- No 40%
Study 1 Results

- People are more likely to engage in sabotage if they are high in organizational deviance and expression of hostility is present.

\[
\text{Indirect Effect: } 0.20 \text{ CI } [0.38, 0.90]
\]

\[
F(2,88) = 58.00, p < .0001, R^2 = .57
\]
People who engage in organizational deviance are more likely to sabotage if they are high in hostility.

To address Adams (1995) Equity theory, study two looks at expanding the model.
Additional Variables

Organizational Citizenship

- Altruistic behaviors done in the workplace directed towards coworkers or the organization. (e.g. Stayed late to finish up work that had to be done.)

Workplace Fairness

- Assess employees' perceptions of the interpersonal treatment in their work environment.

(Fox, 2011) (Donovan, Drasgow, & Munson, 1998)
Proposed Model

- Workplace Fairness
- Organizational Deviance
- Organizational Citizenship
- Hostility
- Interpersonal Sabotage

Directions:
- Workplace Fairness to Hostility
- Organizational Deviance to Hostility
- Hostility to Interpersonal Sabotage
- Organizational Citizenship to Workplace Fairness
Demographics

N = 163

Race
- Caucasian
- Bi-Racial
- African American
- Asian
- Hispanic
- Other

Currently Employed
- Yes
- No

Gender
- Female
- Male
- Nonbinary
## Correlation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expression of Hostility</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sabotage</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational Citizenship</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>17.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational Fairness</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 163, p < .001** p < .05*
\[ X^2 = 0.43, \ p = 0.363, \ CFI = 0.998, \ RMSEA = 0.023, \ SRMR = 0.039 \]

Results

Note. \( p < 0.05^{**} \) \( p < 0.001^{***} \)
Discussion

- People are more likely to express hostility in a variety of situations that lead to interpersonal sabotage.
  - Anderson's general aggression model
  - Equity Theory
Future Research

• Look at the difference between highly stressful jobs and less stressful jobs when using this model.

• Research should additionally look at programs/trainings to increase fairness and civility to help decrease these risky behaviors.
QUESTIONS?