

VU Research Portal

The Role of Individual Differences in the Prediction of Cooperation, Deviance, and Performance

Pletzer, J.L.

2018

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Pletzer, J. L. (2018). *The Role of Individual Differences in the Prediction of Cooperation, Deviance, and Performance*.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

CHAPTER 7

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The five empirical chapters presented in this dissertation deepen our understanding of individual differences in the prediction of behaviors and behavioral outcomes crucial for social and organizational functioning. While all chapters included in this dissertation aimed to achieve this broad goal, they differed with regard to the predictors and outcomes that were examined. Chapter 2 investigated how individual differences in SVO predict expectations of partner cooperation and cooperative behavior in social dilemmas, whereas these same individual differences in SVO were used to predict non-cooperative, norm-violating deviant behavior in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, the focus shifted from the narrow personality facet SVO to broad personality domain scales by examining how these predict levels of workplace deviance. Chapter 5 investigated the effect of age on workplace deviance and examined personality changes and reductions in experienced negative affect across the lifespan as possible mediators. The last empirical chapter of this dissertation analyzed how another important individual difference (i.e., gender) relates to organizational performance. These empirical chapters share significant overlap and carry important overarching implications. In this final chapter, I will explore how the findings from these previous chapters relate to each other and discuss their broader implications. The remainder of this chapter is structured as follows: First, I will briefly summarize the main findings from the five empirical chapters included in this dissertation. Second, I will highlight the theoretical and practical implications of these findings. Third, I will develop ideas for future research. I will end with some conclusive remarks.

Overview of the Main Findings

Chapter 2: SVO, Expectations, and Cooperation

Chapter 2 provides a comprehensive meta-analytic overview of the relations between SVO, expectations, and cooperation in social dilemmas. Beginning with the classic work by Kelley and Stahelski (1970), researchers have been interested in the effect of dispositions on the formation of expected partner cooperation as fundamental building blocks of social cognition (Holmes, 2002). By integrating research from more than half a century, findings demonstrated that prosocials expect significantly more cooperation from others than individualists and competitors, but that the latter two do not significantly differ in expected partner cooperation. These expectations partially mediate the relation between SVO and cooperation in social dilemmas. Importantly, this partial mediation holds for both prosocials and proselves because expectations are associated with increased cooperation independently of an individual's SVO. These findings carry important insights for the study of personality and trust, and for a wide variety of social behaviors, such as voting, recycling, donating to charities, or volunteering.

Chapter 3: SVO and Deviance

Individual differences in SVO do not just predict expectations and cooperation in social dilemmas, but as findings from Chapter 3 indicate also variance in deviant behavior. Results from three studies ($N = 556$) demonstrated that SVO consistently relates to self-reported levels of workplace deviance and predicts responses on two behavioral measures of deviance. As such, proselves were not just more likely than prosocials to indicate that they behave more deviantly at work, but they also disregarded instructions to a larger extent and were more dishonest about their performance to increase their own outcomes than prosocials. Importantly, SVO as a narrow personality facet predicted incremental variance in workplace deviance over and above HEXACO Honesty-Humility. These findings suggest that SVO is a promising narrow personality facet for the prediction and prevention of deviant behavior.

Chapter 4: Personality and Workplace Deviance

Whereas the previous chapter examined how the narrow personality facet of SVO predicts deviant behavior, Chapter 4 examined the relations between the most commonly studied broad personality domain scales (Big Five and HEXACO) and workplace deviance. Results from a meta-analytic integration of 460 effect sizes demonstrated that HEXACO Honesty-Humility is the strongest predictor of workplace deviance out of all eleven broad personality domain scales that were examined ($r = -.404$). Conscientiousness (Big Five: $r = -.281$; HEXACO: $r = -.354$), Agreeableness (Big Five: $r = -.274$; HEXACO: $r = -.161$), Neuroticism (Big Five: $r = .142$) or Emotionality (HEXACO: $r = -.106$), and Big Five Openness to Experience ($r = -.059$) also significantly predict levels of workplace deviance. Overall, the HEXACO domain scales (24.9%) explained more variance in workplace deviance than the Big Five domain scales (17.1%), and researchers and practitioners might therefore want to prioritize the HEXACO personality model when aiming to predict levels of workplace deviance.

Chapter 5: Age and Workplace Deviance

The fifth chapter of this dissertation provided a meta-analytic overview of the relation between age and workplace deviance ($r = -.088$, $k = 135$). Results demonstrate that this negative relation can be explained with socio-emotional selectivity theory (Carstensen, 1992) and with the neo-socioanalytical model of personality change (Roberts & Wood, 2006). According to the former, individuals select into more positive and meaningful situations as they get older and should therefore experience less negative affect. As such, negative affect partially mediated the relation between age and workplace deviance. According to the latter, personality slightly changes across the adult lifespan (Roberts et al., 2006) and these age-related changes in Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism also partially mediated the relation

between age and workplace deviance. As far as I know, this meta-analysis is the first study that provides an empirical test of the underlying mechanisms for the relation between age and workplace deviance, and findings suggest that organizations could reap a competitive benefit by hiring more older employees when the reduction of deviant workplace behavior is of interest.

Chapter 6: Gender and Firm Performance

The last empirical chapter of this dissertation integrated contradictory findings about the relation between female representation on corporate boards and financial performance of organizations (e.g., Lückerath-Rovers, 2011; Mahadeo, Soobaroyen, & Hanuman, 2011; Pathan & Faff, 2013; Van Ness, Miesing, & Kang, 2010), and thereby provided a test of the *business case* for diversity, which postulates that increased diversity will be associated with performance benefits. Results demonstrated that female representation on corporate boards and firm financial performance do not correlate with each other ($r = .01$, $k = 20$). In other words, the increased representation of females on corporate boards is neither associated with a decrease or with an increase in firm financial performance. Although these results do not support the business case of gender diversity, they suggest that gender diversity on corporate boards should be promoted for ethical reasons: If female candidates are equally qualified as male candidates, females should be given priority in promotion decisions for corporate boards.

Theoretical Contributions and Implications

The findings of these five empirical chapters summarized above provide several theoretical contributions and implications that were discussed in the respective chapters. Here, I want to explore the overarching, broad theoretical implications of these findings pertaining to research on personality as a predictor in organizational psychology. Importantly, the overall findings suggest that individual differences are useful in explaining differences in behavior between individuals. Except for the last empirical chapter of this dissertation, all chapters examined how personality relates to behavior, and three of these empirical chapters examined the relation between personality and workplace deviance. While Chapter 3 examined how the narrow personality facet of SVO relates to deviant behavior, Chapter 4 and 5 investigated the relation between the two most commonly used broad personality frameworks (i.e., Big Five and HEXACO) and workplace deviance. Overall, these results emphasize that personality is a strong predictor of workplace deviance (Berry et al., 2012, 2007; Salgado, 2002).

One theoretical implication of this dissertation for the study of personality pertains to the fact that narrow personality facets are useful when predicting workplace deviance (Hastings & O'Neill, 2009). Results of Chapter 3, for the first time, demonstrate that the narrow facet of SVO significantly predicts self-reported and behavioral deviance, and that it explains

incremental variance over and above HEXACO Honesty-Humility. In other words, the findings of this chapter introduce SVO as a useful narrow facet to the organizational psychology literature. Especially when the prediction of behaviors that influence multiple individuals is of interest, SVO promises to be a facet that deserves more attention as a predictor because it captures dispositional preferences in such interdependent situations. In addition, these results answer a call for more research about the predictive validity of personality facets that are not part of the Big Five personality model for workplace deviance (O'Neill & Hastings, 2011).

However, not only narrow facets are useful when predicting organizational behavior. Results of Chapter 4 provide valuable insights for studies in which broad personality domain scales are used to predict levels of workplace deviance. Notably, this chapter is the first to meta-analytically test the relations between the HEXACO domain scales and workplace deviance, and to compare it to the relations between the Big Five domain scales and workplace deviance. For the most part, the differences in correlations with workplace deviance between the two personality models under investigation were in the expected direction and therefore reflected conceptual differences between the two personality models. Big Five Agreeableness correlated more strongly with workplace deviance than HEXACO Agreeableness, most likely because Big Five Agreeableness captures variance associated with HEXACO Honesty-Humility, which was the strongest predictor of workplace deviance. As expected, the relation between HEXACO Emotionality and workplace deviance was negative, probably because individuals scoring high on Emotionality combine high levels of anxiety and fearfulness with a strong need to form bonds with others. The relation between Big Five Neuroticism and workplace deviance was positive, which suggests that the positive association of the anger facet with workplace deviance was stronger than the negative relation of the irritability and anxiety facets. Overall, these results support the conceptual differences between the Big Five and the HEXACO personality model, and thereby provide criterion-related validity for both.

Although personality is assumed to be a relatively stable individual difference, small changes across the adult lifespan do occur (Roberts et al., 2006). When examining the relation between age and workplace deviance, results provided meta-analytic evidence for these small changes in personality and confirmed the prediction based on the neo-socioanalytical model of personality change that these personality changes mediate the negative relation between age and workplace deviance. The same holds for socio-emotional selectivity theory (Carstensen, 1992), based on which it was hypothesized and found that reductions in experienced negative affect mediate the negative relation between age and workplace deviance. As such, results of

this chapter also provide support for the neo-socioanalytical model of personality change and for the socio-emotional selectivity theory (Carstensen, 1992; Roberts & Wood, 2006).

Practical Contributions and Implications

The findings of the five empirical chapters also highlight several contributions and implications to improve social, organizational, and societal functioning. Many of these implications have already been discussed in these chapters, but on the following pages I will highlight the two most important overarching practical implications. First, I will discuss practical implications pertaining to the promotion and advancement of social behaviors in various areas of life, such as when aiming to promote cooperative behavior between individuals or groups or when trying to avoid the occurrence of workplace deviance. Second, I will discuss several practical implications for the use of individual differences in organizational behavior and in job selection situations. When discussing these implications, I will try to bridge the gap between the topics of the individual chapters and to use findings from one chapter to inspire implications for the area of research of another chapter.

The Promotion of Cooperative Behavior

Findings of Chapter 2 demonstrate that the relation between SVO and cooperation in social dilemmas is partially mediated by expectations of partner's cooperation. One interpretation of this finding is that an individual's own dispositions (SVO) are projected onto someone else (expectations), which, in turn, facilitates the influence of these dispositions on behavior (cooperation). Importantly, social projection is not limited to dispositional differences in cooperative preferences or in personality traits more generally, but can be applied to various perceptions about the self that are then projected onto others and subsequently result in a certain behavior. For example, social projection influences decision-making of financial brokers (Lee & Andrade, 2011), adolescent alcohol consumption (Marks, Graham, & Hansen, 1992), or perceptions of political polarization (Van Boven, Judd, & Sherman, 2012). Hence, the following implications might also apply to such diverse areas.

However, if the goal is to promote cooperative behavior between individuals and if cooperative dispositions are projected onto others, one important issue to address is how cooperative behavior can be promoted among those individuals who are not cooperatively predisposed. In other words, how can cooperative behavior be promoted among individuals with dispositional preferences for selfish behavior? One promising avenue would be to align the goals of social and selfish individuals to reduce the conflict of interest (Smith, 1979). For organizations, this could mean that performance goals are articulated on a team-level and are contingent on the successful achievement of everyone in the team. Such an alignment of goals

for individuals with different cooperative dispositions, or an adoption of cooperative goals within teams (Tjosvold, Yu, & Hui, 2004), might increase intragroup cohesion and the occurrence of mutually helpful behavior (e.g., OCBs), decrease the occurrence of workplace deviance, and overall facilitate group performance by diminishing competitive behavior between individual employees. However, such structural changes to “payoff matrices” are often hard to accomplish or to implement in real life due to practical or political limitations, and in such instances the same measures that are then taken to promote cooperation in social dilemmas might also be useful in organizational settings: punishment for defection and rewards for cooperation (Balliet, Mulder, et al., 2011; Buckley et al., 1974). Such interventions might not only directly foster cooperative behavior between individuals, but might also affect the expectation that other individuals cooperate as well, which might exert another facilitating effect on cooperative behavior. One example of the implementation of these principles in the business world and in organizational psychology is transactional leadership, according to which desired behavior should be rewarded and undesired behavior should be punished by leaders (Bono & Judge, 2004; Eagly et al., 2003).

Another practically important finding of Chapter 2 is that expectations and cooperative behavior are aligned for prosocials and for proselves. In fact, this indicates that once the expectation arises that others cooperate, individuals are more likely to show cooperative behavior irrespectively of their cooperative dispositions. Whenever a certain desirable behavior needs to be promoted, messages or appeals should be framed in such a way that the expectation arises that other individuals are already behaving in the desired way. For example, when the occurrence of workplace deviance has reached problematic levels in a certain organization, it could be prevented by messages to employees that elicit the expectation that others are also refraining from acting deviantly (e.g., “90% of all employees did not act deviantly last week”) as opposed to highlighting the share of individuals who are acting deviantly (e.g., “10% of employees acted deviantly last week”). Fostering cooperative and social actions in such a way could be applied to various other desirable behaviors, such as volunteering, voting, recycling, making donations, or the promotion of organizational citizenship behavior.

Individual Differences in the Prediction of Organizational Behavior

Individual differences are often used to predict organizational behavior, and especially personality questionnaires are commonly used to select the most suitable applicants in job selections settings (Ones et al., 2007). The results of this dissertation highlight three important overarching implications for organizational behavior and job selection.

First, results of two chapters of this dissertation demonstrate that the two most often studied and most easily observable demographic characteristics – age and gender – either do not relate to the outcome (i.e., gender and organizational performance) or relate negatively to an undesired outcome (i.e., age and workplace deviance). Importantly, gender and age discrimination (i.e., sexism and ageism) are still common in hiring decisions (Ahmed et al., 2012; Duncan & Loretto, 2004; Finkelstein et al., 1995; Finkelstein, King, & Voyles, 2015; Lamont, Swift, & Abrams, 2015), and the current results provide evidence indicating that discrimination should not just be actively prevented for ethical reasons, but also for performance-based reasons. In fact, based on the current results, older individuals and women – two groups that are often discriminated against in the workplace – should be given priority in hiring and promotion decisions when equally qualified, especially when the goal is to decrease levels of workplace deviance and to foster gender equality in influential positions (i.e., on corporate boards). In addition, increasing age is associated with a wide variety of other desirable outcomes, such as higher levels of organizational citizenship behavior or lower levels of tardiness and absenteeism (Ng & Feldman, 2008), and increased gender diversity can also result in a wide variety of desirable outcomes if managed correctly (e.g., van Knippenberg et al., 2004).

Second, results of Chapter 3, 4, and 5 demonstrate that personality is a strong predictor of workplace deviance. In fact, the HEXACO domain scales explain almost one quarter of the entire variance in workplace deviance. These findings can be used to advocate the use of personality questionnaires in job selection settings, especially for jobs in which problems with deviant employees have occurred in the past. The usefulness of personality questionnaires to predict workplace deviance is further highlighted by the fact that the prediction of behaviors such as workplace deviance or organizational citizenship behaviors enjoys an advantage over the prediction of core task performance: it is not limited to a specific job, but spans across tasks and work environments (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Thus, the current findings can be used to improve social and organizational functioning in basically all areas and organizations. However, the current results also suggest that practitioners interested in the prediction of applicants' proneness to workplace deviance should not only rely on broad personality measures, but should also be aware of the benefits of narrow personality facets, such as SVO. Especially in job selection situations, relying on narrow facets is more efficient and might signal to applicants that the employed tests are relevant to the job (Ashton, Paunonen, et al., 2014; Hastings & O'Neill, 2009).

Third and finally, findings from all five empirical chapters can be interpreted in light of trait activation theory (Tett & Burnett, 2003). Trait activation theory argues that certain individual differences (e.g., personality traits) can be activated or inhibited by situational characteristics. In other words, individuals express certain personality traits more strongly when environmental influences activate these traits. This opens two interesting possibilities for the implementation of trait activation theory: 1) some environments might be better suited for individuals with certain traits, and 2) environments can be designed in such a way that the expression of certain desirable traits is facilitated.

Regarding the first point, organizations might hire individuals with different personality traits for different jobs. Whereas it is certainly desirable for all organizations to hire individuals who score high on Honesty-Humility, Conscientiousness, and Agreeableness, and who are prosocial when the avoidance of workplace deviance is of interest, other personality traits might be crucial depending on the job. Adjusting required personality profiles to the job in question will result in higher levels of person-job or person-organization fit (Caldwell & O'Reilly III, 1990), which, in turn, is associated with a wide variety of desirable outcomes (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). For example, for medical doctors it might be crucial to be highly conscientious, whereas someone working in marketing should score higher on Extraversion and Openness to Experience. Such a weighing of required personality profiles would certainly be beneficial for organizations.

Regarding the second point, work environments could be designed to facilitate the expression of certain desirable personality traits. For example, if organizations want to foster creative behavior, jobs could be designed more flexibly and communication between employees could be encouraged (Martens, 2011) to enhance the expression of traits related to, for example, Extraversion and Openness to Experience (Feist, 1998). Flexible working hours, open office spaces, or flat hierarchies could be facilitating factors for the expression of desired personality traits related to creative behavior.

To summarize findings from all five empirical chapters with regard to the activated expression of desirable traits, societies and organizations would reap the greatest benefits if they create a climate that reduces age and gender discrimination, that encourages interdependent cooperation, and that facilitates the effects of desirable personality traits, such as Honesty-Humility, Conscientiousness, or Agreeableness, on behavior.

Directions for Future Research

Although the findings of this dissertation emphasize several opportunities to promote social, organizational, and societal functioning, combining the findings from these chapters

highlights several open areas of research that could be addressed in the future. Findings from each chapter can mutually inspire future research ideas.

First, findings of Chapter 2 might suggest that prosocials project their own dispositions onto others, therefore expect higher levels of cooperation in interdependent situations, and subsequently are more likely to cooperate with others. In other words, these findings highlight the possibility that social projection is one underlying mechanism that can explain the relation between SVO and cooperation. Surprisingly, the underlying mechanisms linking personality to organizational behaviors, and especially to workplace deviance, have not been examined in much detail. One study found that the relation between Conscientiousness and OCB is mediated by prosocial values, organizational concern, and impression management (Bourdage, Lee, Lee, & Shin, 2012), but other than that research is scarce in this area. Possibly, individuals scoring high on Honesty-Humility expect others to score high on Honesty-Humility as well (i.e., social projection of honest traits associated with high Honesty-Humility) and refrain from acting deviantly because they do not expect others to behave deviantly. A similar logic could be applied to all (anti-)social behaviors, and has already been shown for the relation between Honesty-Humility and trust, which is mediated by trustworthiness expectations (Pfattheicher & Böhm, 2017). Future research could examine the underlying mechanisms for the relation between personality and organizational behaviors, and especially examine if a social projection account can explain these relations. Possibly, such a social projection process could occur differentially for different personality facets.

Second, Chapter 2 demonstrated that SVO predicts cooperation in social dilemmas, whereas Chapter 3 indicated that SVO predicts deviant behavior across different situations. Taken together, these two findings suggest that cooperative behavior in social dilemmas might relate to deviant behavior. In other words, noncooperative behavior (i.e., defection) in a social dilemma might be conceptually similar to destructive deviant behavior at work. Future research could investigate if behavior in social dilemmas, or in economic games more generally, is predictive of workplace deviance or other organizational behaviors. If so, organizations could use economic games in job selection settings. While such serious games are already extensively studied and used for learning and educational purposes (Wouters, Van Nimwegen, Van Oostendorp, & Van der Spek, 2013), the use of games in job selection is less prevalent. Future research could therefore develop serious games based on social dilemmas that might predict various organizational behaviors.

Third, the current findings highlight several opportunities for future studies at the interface of organizational and personality psychology. For example, the predictive validity of

the Big Five and the HEXACO could be compared for a wide variety of outcomes. While the HEXACO has received widespread attention as a predictor of workplace deviance (see Chapter 4) and of cooperation in social dilemmas (Hilbig et al., 2016, 2013; Thielmann & Hilbig, 2014), it has not been extensively studied as a predictor of other organizational behaviors. Doing so would shed light on the usefulness of the HEXACO in job selection settings, especially when not only the prediction of workplace deviance is of interest, but when personality questionnaires are used to predict a wide variety of organizational outcomes (i.e., job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, work engagement). Another interesting avenue for future research would be to study the relation between personality facets and various organizational behaviors. For example, Hastings and O'Neill (2009) have shown that Big Five facets suppress each other (i.e., for Neuroticism) and that some facets almost explain as much variance in workplace deviance as the broad personality dimension they belong to. However, facet-level prediction of other organizational behaviors has largely been neglected and promises to be a fruitful avenue for future research given the possible benefits, such as increased efficiency and increased explained variance when predicting specific behaviors. Such research could be conducted using both the Big Five and the HEXACO personality model when predicting a wide variety of organizational behaviors, and could possibly be even examined meta-analytically given the abundance of datasets that must exist. The finding that the narrow personality facet SVO predicts levels of workplace deviance also highlights the possibility that other personality facets that are not part of the broad personality models would be useful in the prediction of organizational behaviors as well. For example, risk-taking and seductiveness have already been shown to explain additional variance over and above the Big Five personality traits (O'Neill & Hastings, 2011). In addition, it might be that certain personality domain scales interact with each other. For example, Extraversion moderates the relation between Honesty-Humility and workplace deviance, in a way that high levels of Extraversion strengthen this relation (Oh, Lee, Ashton, & De Vries, 2011). Similar moderations might exist for other personality traits, and certain personality traits might have multiplicative effects on organizational behaviors.

Fourth, the interaction between personality traits and situational characteristics should be studied more extensively. In the introductory chapter of this dissertation, I provided several examples of how the outcome variables of interest (i.e., cooperation, deviance, performance) were affected by individual differences and situational characteristics. Although examining the effect of individual differences on these outcomes by themselves is promising and provides valuable insights for research and practice, investigating how individual differences and situational characteristics interact to determine behavior is crucial. The findings of the empirical

chapters included in this dissertation highlight several such opportunities. For example, Zettler and Hilbig (2010) demonstrated that levels of workplace deviance are unaffected by situational characteristics among individuals scoring high on Honesty-Humility, but change depending on situational characteristics for individuals scoring low on Honesty-Humility. Future research could examine similar interactions for other personality traits and situational characteristics.

Fifth, in the introductory chapter, I explained the connection between the three main outcome variables under investigation in this dissertation (i.e., cooperation, deviance, performance) by suggesting that all three are determined by similar individual difference antecedents. In addition, I suggested that cooperative behavior might be facilitated through social norms, whereas workplace deviance is defined as a violation of norms. Organizational performance might be the results of the adherence to social and organizational norms and of both cooperative behavior between employees and the absence of workplace deviance. Summarizing the findings from all five empirical chapters, one could propose an overarching model that starts with demographic characteristics influencing relatively stable personality traits. For example, Chapter 5 showed that personality changes slightly across the adult lifespan (Roberts et al., 2006), and gender differences in personality have also been observed (Feingold, 1994). Other demographic characteristics, such as the number of siblings an individual has, might also exert small effects on personality. As a next step in the model, personality will influence certain behaviors, such as cooperation or workplace deviance, through different mechanisms (i.e., social projection). As mentioned above, these underlying mechanisms could be studied more elaborately. And ultimately, these behaviors might affect organizational performance. Taking a closer look at the two main behaviors investigated in this dissertation, it becomes apparent that the occurrence of workplace deviance has already been established as an important correlate of (organizational) performance (e.g., Dunlop & Lee, 2004), while the effect of cooperative behavior between employees on organizational performance has received less scientific attention. Future research could examine such an overarching model.

Concluding Remarks

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the predictive validity of individual differences for three behaviors and behavioral outcomes crucial for social and organizational functioning – cooperation, deviance, and performance. Across five empirical chapters, the present dissertation shows that individual differences predict variations in behavior and therefore yields important implications for research and practice (even when findings were nonsignificant as in Chapter 6). Chapter 2 and 3 demonstrated that individual differences in the narrow personality facet SVO predict cooperative and deviant behavior, respectively. Chapter

4 focused on the relations between broad personality domain scales and workplace deviance, and indicated that the HEXACO personality model explains more variance in workplace deviance than the Big Five personality model. Some of these personality domain scales (i.e., Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Neuroticism) mediate the negative relation between age and workplace deviance (Chapter 5). Finally, results of Chapter 6 suggest that female representation on corporate boards is not related to organizational performance. Taken together, these five empirical chapters contribute to the facilitation of cooperative behavior, to the prediction and prevention of workplace deviance, and ultimately to the better understanding of a determinant of organizational performance. Taken together, these findings emphasize the utility of individual differences in the prediction of social and organizational behaviors.

In organizational and social psychology, the occurrence of unethical behavior, cheating, and norm violations is often viewed from the perspective that it is the power of the situation that leads people astray – for the moment or in enduring ways. Stanley Milgram and Philip Zimbardo perhaps provided the strongest evidence for this, but more recent work by Francesca Gino and Dan Ariely underlines this point. The present research shows that in new situations and in enduring organizational contexts, it is not just the power of the situation that leads people to violate norms – or to defect or to perform badly – but that personality matters. This dissertation shows that broad and narrow personality traits and even global features of individuals that are almost always salient in social life, such as age and gender, determine behaviors and behavioral outcomes crucial for social, organizational, and societal functioning.