Acquaintance Ratings of the Big Five Personality Traits: Incremental Validity Beyond and Interactive Effects With Self-Reports in the Prediction of Workplace Deviance

Donald H. Kluemper, Benjamin D. McLarty, and Mark N. Bing

Online First Publication, September 8, 2014. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037810

CITATION
Acquaintance Ratings of the Big Five Personality Traits: Incremental Validity Beyond and Interactive Effects With Self-Reports in the Prediction of Workplace Deviance

Donald H. Kluemper
University of Illinois at Chicago

Benjamin D. McLarty
Louisiana State University

Mark N. Bing
University of Mississippi

It is widely established that the Big Five personality traits of conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability are antecedents to workplace deviance (Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007). However, these meta-analytic findings are based on self-reported personality traits. A recent meta-analysis by Oh, Wang, and Mount (2011) identified the value of acquaintance-reported personality in the prediction of job performance. The current investigation extends prior work by comparing the validities of self- and acquaintance-reported personality in the prediction of workplace deviance across 2 studies. We also hypothesized and tested an interactive, value-added integration of self- with acquaintance-reported personality using socioanalytic personality theory (R. T. Hogan, 1991). Both studies assessed self- and acquaintance-rated Big Five traits, along with supervisor-rated workplace deviance. However, the studies varied the measures of workplace deviance, and the 2nd study also included a self-rated workplace deviance criterion for additional comparison. Across both studies, the traits of conscientiousness and agreeableness were strong predictors of workplace deviance, and acquaintance-reported personality provided incremental validity beyond self-reports. Additionally, acquaintance-reported conscientiousness and agreeableness moderated the prediction of workplace deviance by interacting with the corresponding self-reported traits. Implications for personality theory and measurement are discussed along with applications for practice.
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The Big Five personality framework (Costa & McCrae, 1992), using self-reports for its measurement, is widely accepted in the organizational sciences and predicts numerous organizational outcomes (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002). Despite extensive research in personality and social psychology that observer and acquaintance ratings can provide accurate information about a target’s personality (Hofstee, 1994; Kolar, Funder, & Colvin, 1996), little organizational research has utilized such an approach to personality measurement until recently. A meta-analysis by Oh, Wang, and Mount (2011) revealed that other ratings of personality predict job performance and provide incremental validity beyond self-reports. Additional work by Connelly and Hulsheger (2012) supports these findings with respect to task performance. However, research to date has yet to simultaneously evaluate self- and acquaintance ratings of personality with respect to the prediction of workplace deviance—a specific and vital component of overall job performance (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002).1

Berry and colleagues (Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt, 2012; Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007) have shown that three of the Big Five traits predict workplace deviance. Conscientiousness, agreeableness, and, to a lesser extent, emotional stability demonstrate criterion-related validity in the prediction of workplace deviance, but extraversion and openness do not. This previous work relied exclusively on self-reports of personality. Thus, the current investigation was among the first to examine the rela-

1 For more detailed information about existing findings for acquaintance ratings of personality and job outcomes (e.g., job performance), justification for the exclusion of extraversion and openness in our theorizing, and additional data regarding the dimensions of workplace deviance, see the online supplemental materials.
tionship between acquaintance ratings of personality and deviant behaviors. We sought to contribute to the fields of personality measurement and workplace deviance by examining whether acquaintance-rated personality is useful for predicting deviant behaviors among employees beyond self-reports. We also hypothesized and tested an interactive, value-added integration of self- with acquaintance-rated personality in the prediction of workplace deviance using socioanalytic personality theory (R. T. Hogan, 1991, 2007).

Theoretical Foundation

We used R. T. Hogan’s socioanalytic personality theory to elucidate the unique value of acquaintance-rated personality compared with self-reports. This theory serves to explain how acquaintance-rated personality differs from self-reported personality and, thus, how acquaintance- and self-reported personality may be integrated into an additive and interactive model for enhanced personality assessment. Socioanalytic theory contends that self- and observer ratings of personality capture information about different, yet related, aspects of the individual. Self-ratings are a measure of identity, which is the internal dynamics that impact the individual’s future behavior. Observer ratings, however, capture an individual’s reputation. Identity can be used to explain behavior and concerns why someone behaves a certain way, whereas reputation concerns what an individual does (R. T. Hogan, 2007). Identity is “the core and bedrock of each person’s psychological being, and the primary means by which each person guides and interprets his or her life” (R. T. Hogan, 2007, p. 9). Because self-reports of personality measure one’s identity, they likely include information about motives, feelings, behaviors, and future intentions (R. T. Hogan, 1991) that may or may not ultimately be reflected in the actions performed by the individual in question. R. T. Hogan (2007, p. 9) argued that accurate identities are difficult to study in a rigorous manner “largely because they are so subjective and even fanciful.”

Alternatively, reputation concerns what an individual does (R. T. Hogan, 2007). Reputation is based on one’s past behavior, and thus, perceptions of reputation largely capture past performance. This perspective means that an acquaintance’s evaluation of a target’s personality, which is based largely on the acquaintance’s perception of that target’s reputation, is derived from hindsight about that target’s past behaviors rather than from a prediction of the target’s future behavior. Thus, acquaintance ratings of an individual’s personality rely on that individual’s actions along with trace artifacts of those actions (e.g., a highly organized desk, word of mouth, and so on). Consequently, acquaintance ratings of personality, by virtue of being primarily behavioral assessments, may be more predictive of future behaviors than identity-based self-reports because past behaviors tend to predict future behaviors (R. T. Hogan, 1991; Mount, Barrick, & Strauss, 1994). R. T. Hogan (2007, p. 9) asserted that “reputation is easy to study: we simply ask the peer community to describe an actor using a standardized reporting format.”

This dual perspective of personality assessment provides alternative views about the validity of personality traits with respect to predicting valuable workplace outcomes. Self- and acquaintance-reported personality are not overly redundant, but they are related meaningfully and mutually important for predicting future actions (Oh et al., 2011). The target’s self-reported personality (based in identity) and the acquaintance’s ratings of the target’s personality (based in reputation) provide valid, different, and potentially complementary assessments of personality to predict resulting behavior, such as deviance. Further, socioanalytic theory (R. T. Hogan, 1991, 2007) provides a theoretical framework for the ability of acquaintance-ratings to account for unique incremental variance beyond self-ratings (but not necessarily vice versa), as socioanalytic theory posits that acquaintance ratings are not only unique conceptually from self-reports but may provide more robust prediction of workplace outcomes.

Those high in conscientiousness seek to develop and maintain long-term relationships with their employing organization, are rule abiding (Barrick, Mount, & Li, 2013), are concerned with the consequences of their actions (Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw, 2001), and choose words with care in interpersonal exchanges (Goldberg, 1999). Therefore, they are less likely to lose their temper with others at work, thus avoiding interpersonal deviance (Taylor & Kluempner, 2012), and they are more likely to uphold the standards of workplace norms, thus avoiding organizational deviance (Marcus & Schuler, 2004). Self-ratings representing a conscientious identity are based on the job incumbent’s motives, feelings, future intentions, and so forth and relate to why he or she may engage in conscientious behavior (Hogan, 2007). Thus, when responding to the item “I am always prepared” (Goldberg et al., 2006), the respondent may consider what motivated him or her to be prepared, what he or she was feeling when preparing, and whether he or she intends to be prepared in the future, as well as recalling whether he or she is typically prepared. Acquaintance ratings of conscientiousness represent reputation, based on what specific behaviors of the target the acquaintance observed in the past. As such, acquaintance ratings of conscientiousness should be more predictive of deviant workplace behaviors, as past behavior predicts future behavior (Mount et al., 1994). Thus, due to the theoretically distinct nature of acquaintance ratings of a job incumbent’s conscientiousness (i.e., the job incumbent’s reputation) in comparison to self-ratings of conscientiousness (i.e., the job incumbent’s identity), we hypothesized that acquaintance-reported conscientiousness would be (a) predictive of workplace deviance and (b) value added in this prediction above and beyond self-reported conscientiousness.

Hypothesis 1a: Acquaintance-reported conscientiousness will be negatively related to workplace deviance.

Hypothesis 1b: Acquaintance-reported conscientiousness will provide incremental validity in the prediction of workplace deviance above and beyond self-reported conscientiousness.

Those high in agreeableness strive for friendly compliance (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997), attempt to interact harmoniously with others at work (Barrick et al., 2013), and are less likely to lash out (Peters, Godeart, Ballieux, & Heijnen, 2003) because their considerate and tolerant tendencies buffer against such actions (Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004). The need for harmony for those high in agreeableness allow them to
see situations in a more positive light (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996) and are therefore less likely to respond by mistreating others at work (Taylor & Kluemper, 2012). As such, individuals with high levels of agreeableness should be less likely to perform deviant behaviors in comparison to those who are disagreeable. The theoretically distinct nature of acquaintance-rated agreeableness (i.e., reputation) in comparison to self-reported agreeableness (i.e., identity) allows acquaintance-rated agreeableness to be value added in the prediction of workplace deviance above and beyond the corresponding self-report. Thus, acquaintance ratings of a job incumbent’s agreeableness (i.e., reputation for agreeableness) should provide an accurate measure of this trait above and beyond the corresponding self-report (i.e., agreeable identity). As such, socioanalytic theory (R. T. Hogan, 1991, 2007) supports our hypotheses that acquaintance ratings of agreeableness should predict workplace deviance and do so uniquely above and beyond self-reported agreeableness.

**Hypothesis 2a:** Acquaintance-reported agreeableness will be negatively related to workplace deviance.

**Hypothesis 2b:** Acquaintance-reported agreeableness will provide incremental validity in the prediction of workplace deviance above and beyond self-reported agreeableness.

Individuals low in emotional stability react negatively to workplace events (Bolger & Zuckerman, 1995; McCrae & Costa, 1996). This heightened sensitivity leads to negative thoughts and feelings (Fox & Spector, 1999), resulting in interpersonal conflicts with others (Bolger & Schilling, 1991) and other negative behavioral responses (Taylor & Kluemper, 2012). Therefore, higher levels of emotional stability likely lead to decreases in deviant behaviors, as reduced reactivity allows the emotionally stable to avoid negative workplace reactions. Given the distinctiveness of acquaintance-rated emotional stability (i.e., reputation) in comparison to the corresponding self-report (i.e., identity), acquaintance-rated emotional stability will also be value added in the prediction of workplace deviance above and beyond self-reported emotional stability. For example, upon responding to a question such as “I am not easily bothered by things” (an item from Bennett & Robinson, 2007), in which an acquaintance recalls actual behaviors related to whether the job incumbent has been “bothered by things” in prior situations. Therefore, we hypothesized:

**Hypothesis 3a:** Acquaintance-reported emotional stability will be negatively related to workplace deviance.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Acquaintance-reported emotional stability will provide incremental validity in the prediction of workplace deviance above and beyond self-reported emotional stability.

As socioanalytic theory of personality observations explains how self- and acquaintance-reported personality measure different components of the same underlying trait, it may be valuable to consider a further integration of these different measures—specifically, their potential interactive effects in the prediction of workplace deviance. First, socioanalytic theory argues that self-reported personality assesses primarily one’s own identity, whereas acquaintance-reported personality assesses primarily one’s reputation (see R. T. Hogan, 1991, 2007). Given the fact that workplace deviance is a low-base-rate phenomenon (see Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Stewart, Bing, Davison, Woehr, & McIntyre, 2009), a more accurate prediction of its occurrence may be provided by the interaction of self- with acquaintance-reported personality. Specifically, workplace deviance is a low-base-rate occurrence because most employees simply rarely engage in it for a variety of reasons. Therefore, the driver (i.e., a likely cause) behind more elevated occurrences of workplace deviance is often individual differences as previously discussed, but perhaps in a specific pattern of individual differences—when both one’s identity and reputation indicate an absence of a relevant trait—in this case, the specific Big Five traits of conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability (J. Hogan & Holland, 2003).

Specifically, socioanalytic theory suggests that when self- and acquaintance ratings are in agreement and high, then the probability of the trait’s presence in the employee is greatly enhanced. Similarly, when self- and acquaintance ratings are in agreement that the trait is lacking, the probability of the trait’s presence in the employee is greatly decreased. Moreover, it may also be the case that only those employees who are truly lacking in conscientiousness, agreeableness, or emotional stability are the ones who are likely to engage in such low-base-rate deviant behaviors. Thus, if a relevant trait is present at least to some degree, either in the employee’s self-identity (i.e., self-report) or reputation (i.e., acquaintance report), then the employee may be unwilling or unlikely to engage in workplace deviance.

With respect to conscientiousness, one should accept the premise that it is a prosocial trait (J. Hogan & Holland, 2003). As conscientiousness represents, in part, the degree to which one is reliable and dependable in interactions with others, it has inherently prosocial aspects. Consequently, as workplace deviance is to a large extent the antithesis of prosocial behavior, those whose identity contains self-perceptions of being reliable, dependable, hardworking, and so on, as indicated by their self-reports, are very likely unwilling to engage in workplace deviance, because to do so would violate their identity and self-concept and engaging in such deviant behaviors would be entirely inconsistent with a prosocial and conscientious self-concept. For example, it would be very difficult for one to perceive oneself as hardworking, and thus very difficult to maintain a conscientious identity, were one to be “putting little effort into his or her work” (an item from Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Consequently, those whose self-report indicates a conscientious identity are not predicted to engage in acts of workplace deviance.

Likewise, if one’s reputation according to one’s acquaintances is that of being dependable, hardworking, reliable, and so on, then one is unlikely to have developed a behavioral repertoire that is conducive to behaving in a deviant manner. Socioanalytic theory suggests that a well-known behavioral repertoire leads to one’s reputation, which is largely captured via acquaintance-reported personality. Consequently, when one’s acquaintance indicates that that individual is dependable, hardworking, and so on, that conscientious reputation is manifested in the acquaintance report in part because the target job incumbent does not engage in workplace deviant acts viewable or detectable by others. Therefore, when acquaintance-reported conscientiousness is high, there
should be little to no elevation in workplace deviant behaviors across varying levels of self-reported conscientiousness, meaning across varying levels of one’s conscientious identity. This lack of a relationship between self-reported conscientiousness and workplace deviance when acquaintance-reported conscientiousness is high is represented by the solid horizontal and depressed line in Figure 1. Further, engaging in uncommon acts of workplace deviance frequently, or to an elevated degree, is only likely to occur under the condition of the uncommon combination of a lack of conscientiousness in both one’s identity and one’s reputation, meaning when both self-reported and acquaintance-reported conscientiousness are low. This condition is shown in Figure 1 with the dashed line, which represents the condition in which the acquaintance report of conscientiousness is low and thus leads to ever-increasing levels of workplace deviance as self-reported conscientiousness decreases. Thus, this condition results in the negative relationship between self-reported conscientiousness and deviance when acquaintance-reported conscientiousness is low and indicates that highly elevated levels of deviance are really only predicted to occur among those whose identity and reputation combine to indicate a severe lack of conscientiousness. Therefore, we hypothesized:

Hypothesis 1c: The negative relationship between self-reported conscientiousness and workplace deviance will be moderated by acquaintance-reported conscientiousness such that this negative relationship will become more negative as acquaintance-reported conscientiousness decreases.

Agreeableness occurs within a social context and is, by definition, being prosocial toward others (J. Hogan & Holland, 2003). Again, as acts of workplace deviance are the antithesis of prosocial behavior, when one’s identity includes self-perceptions of being kind, caring, friendly, and courteous toward others, as indicated by a high level of self-reported agreeableness, one is very unlikely to say “something hurtful to someone at work” (Bennett & Robinson, 2000, p. 360) as doing so would violate one’s agreeable identity. Furthermore, if the acquaintance-rated agreeableness for an employee indicates that he or she has a kind, caring, and friendly reputation, then that employee is unlikely to have the behavioral repertoire needed for engaging in acts of workplace deviance.

Consequently, if one has an agreeable reputation gained by being prosocial toward others, and hence receives high ratings of agreeableness from an acquaintance, then one is very unlikely to engage in deviant acts, even when one may be overly self-critical of one’s own agreeable identity and thus low on self-reported agreeableness. Thus, when acquaintance-rated agreeableness is high, there should be little to no elevation in workplace deviance across varying levels of self-reported agreeableness, as represented by the solid, horizontal, and depressed line in Figure 1. Further, if one’s reputation is that of being disagreeable (i.e., the dashed line in Figure 1), there is a corresponding increase in acts of workplace deviance as one’s identity becomes less agreeable, leading to the negative relationship between self-reported agreeableness and workplace deviance when acquaintance-reported agreeableness is low. As such, we hypothesized:

Hypothesis 2c: The negative relationship between self-reported agreeableness and workplace deviance will be moderated by acquaintance-reported agreeableness such that this negative relationship will become more negative as acquaintance-reported agreeableness decreases.

The final prosocial trait is that of emotional stability (J. Hogan & Holland, 2003). If one is emotionally stable, calm, cool, and collected in the face of work stressors, then one tends not to overreact under stress, and that prevents unsocial behavior because overreactions are often somewhat antisocial. For example, “los[ing] one’s temper while at work” (an item from Bennett & Robinson, 2000), which those lower in trait emotional stability have the proclivity to do, could cause them to occasionally insult colleagues or make demeaning comments toward them. Thus, low levels of emotional stability can generate antisocial behavior. Consequently, if one’s identity is composed of strong self-perceptions of being stable, calm, and collected when under pressure, then one should avoid acts of deviance when workplace stressors do arise to maintain an emotionally stable identity. Additionally, if the acquaintance-rated emotional stability for a job incumbent indicates that he or she is highly stable, calm, and collected even under stressful conditions, then that incumbent is unlikely to have the unstable emotional temperament that manifests itself in deviance. For example, when an acquaintance indicates that a person is emotionally stable, that indication is based in part on the fact that the person does not lose his or her temper while at work and thus has a reputation of being calm and collected. Consequently, if one has an emotionally stable reputation as indicated by high acquaintance ratings, then one is very unlikely to engage in workplace deviance, even when under work stress and even when one may be overly self-critical about one’s own emotionally stable identity and thus low on self-reported emotional stability. Therefore, when acquaintance-rated emotional stability is high, there should be little to no increase in workplace deviance across varying levels of self-reported emotional stability, as represented by the solid horizontal line in Figure 1. Consequently, uncommon elevated levels of workplace deviance should only be seen under the uncommon combination of a lack of emotional stability in both one’s identity and reputation and thus when both self- and acquaintance-reported emotional stability are low, as depicted at the top of the dashed line in Figure 1. In this vein, we hypothesized:

Hypothesis 3c: The negative relationship between self-reported emotional stability and workplace deviance will be
moderated by acquaintance-reported emotional stability such that this negative relationship will become more negative as acquaintance-reported emotional stability decreases.

**Study 1**

**Method**

**Participants and procedures.** Data were collected from three sources: acquaintances, job incumbents, and supervisors. In advance of the study, the acquaintances (students at a large public university in the southern United States) were asked to personally contact a job incumbent they knew well to verify that the incumbent was willing to participate in the study and to ask the incumbent to personally contact his or her direct supervisor. Acquaintances received extra credit for rating the Big Five traits of a job incumbent. Cases of duplicate e-mail and IP addresses across the acquaintance, incumbent, or supervisor were eliminated from the sample, as were ratings in which the incumbent was the parent of the acquaintance. Further, acquaintances answered a screening question (“How well do you know this person?”) on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (very little) to 5 (very well). Only acquaintances who indicated knowing the target well (4) or very well (5) were included in subsequent analyses, eliminating 16 respondents. This yielded 391 acquaintance-ratings; 48% of these acquaintances were males whose average age was 21.18 (SD = 3.50) years. Job incumbents were contacted directly by the researchers to complete self-ratings of the Big Five. Incumbents, of whom 84% responded, were employed in a diverse array of positions. Of these incumbents, 40% were male, with an average age of 31.05 (SD = 12.56) years, an average of 12.98 (SD = 6.98) years of organization tenure. Approximately 2 weeks later, job incumbents’ supervisors were contacted directly by the researchers and asked to complete an assessment of their respective subordinates’ workplace deviance; 233 (71%) of the supervisors responded. Of these supervisors, 45% were male, and they averaged 42.24 (SD = 12.12) years of age and 10.85 (SD = 9.23) years of organization tenure.

**Measures.**

**Acquaintance-rated Big Five traits.** The Big Five was measured using the 50-item International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; Goldberg et al., 2006), modified to be rated by acquaintances. Respondents indicated the extent to which each item accurately described the incumbent on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Alphas for all study variables are satisfactory and are reported in Table 1.

**Self-rated Big Five traits.** Job incumbents completed the unaltered 50-item IPIP (Goldberg et al., 2006) self-report measure of the Big Five.

**Workplace deviance.** Supervisors’ ratings of incumbent workplace deviance were measured with Stewart et al.’s (2009) 15-item scale consisting of the subscales for production deviance, interpersonal aggression, and property deviance. Respondents indicated the frequency with which incumbents engaged in each of the behaviors in the past year on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (daily).

**Results and Discussion**

We first sought to demonstrate evidence of construct validity using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) techniques. Following recommendations of Landis, Beal, and Tesluk (2000), parcels were formed using the single-factor (SFA) method, consisting of three parcels for each personality construct and production deviance and two parcels for interpersonal aggression and property deviance (see upper half of Table 2). The hypothesized model was the baseline trait model with 10 personality constructs (i.e., self- and acquaintance-reported Big Five traits) and three supervisor-reported workplace deviance constructs, which demonstrated a reasonable fit to the data: χ²(550) = 833.679, comparative fit index (CFI) = .94, and root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .05. This produced a significantly better fit than any other model. For
another check on the construct validity of these data, we tested for second-order method (i.e., source) factors. We first tested for a second-order self-report method factor by specifying the Big Five self-report first-order trait factors as being indicators of a second-order self-rating source factor (see Table 2, Study 1, Method Factor: Self). We then tested for a second-order acquaintance-report (i.e., other-report) method factor by specifying the Big Five other-report first-order trait factors as being indicators of a second-order other-rating source factor (see Table 2, Study 1, Method Factor: Other). Results indicate that both of these source method-factor models significantly decreased goodness of fit in comparison to the baseline trait model, and testing them simultaneously in the same model also did not improve goodness of fit. Therefore, we determined that our 1-factor baseline trait model achieved adequate properties of construct validity. To provide further evidence of construct validity, Table 1 forms a multitrait, multimethod matrix (MTMM; Campbell & Fiske, 1959) with the Big Five serving as traits crossed with self- and acquaintance-report methods. An examination of this MTMM reveals that the average same-trait/different-method correlation (.44) is greater than the average different-trait/different-method correlation (.14) and average different-trait/same-method correlation for self-reports (.30) and acquaintance-reports (.33), thus providing evidence of convergent and discriminant validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959).

With regard to acquaintance-rated personality, conscientiousness (H1a), agreeableness (H2a), and emotional stability (H3a) were proposed to predict workplace deviance. As shown in Table 1, acquaintance-rated conscientiousness (r = .37, p < .05), agreeableness (r = .23, p < .05), and emotional stability (r = .25, p < .05) correlated with aggregated workplace deviance. Thus, Hypotheses 1a, 2a, and 3a were supported. It should be noted that self/other convergent validity (i.e., self/other agreement) was the lowest for conscientiousness and agreeableness, allowing greater opportunity for incremental validity (see Table 1). As shown in Step 2a of Table 3, acquaintance-rated conscientiousness (ΔR² = .09, p < .05) agreeableness (ΔR² = .03, p < .05), and emotional stability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Δχ²</th>
<th>Δdf</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 1: Null</td>
<td>Baseline Trait Model</td>
<td>13 Factors: 10 Personality &amp; Three Deviance</td>
<td>5005.315</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>11 Factors: 10 Personality &amp; One Composite Deviance</td>
<td>833.679</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>10 Factors: Con Combined &amp; One Composite Deviance</td>
<td>995.962</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>10 Factors: Agr Combined &amp; One Composite Deviance</td>
<td>1404.049</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>10 Factors: ExtSt Combined &amp; One Composite Deviance</td>
<td>1208.358</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5</td>
<td>10 Factors: Ext Combined &amp; One Composite Deviance</td>
<td>1253.887</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 6</td>
<td>10 Factors: Open Combined &amp; One Composite Deviance</td>
<td>1202.663</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 7</td>
<td>Seven Factors: SR Personality Combined &amp; One Composite Deviance</td>
<td>1096.297</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 8</td>
<td>Seven Factors: AR Personality Combined &amp; One Composite Deviance</td>
<td>1881.335</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>1047.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Listwise-deleted N = 212 for Study 1; listwise-deleted N = 203 for Study 2. All models are compared with their respective baseline (i.e., trait) models for Studies 1 and 2, which are found directly below the null models. RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; CFI = comparative fit index; SR = self-rated; AR = acquaintance-rated; Con = conscientiousness; Agr = agreeableness; EmSt = emotional stability; Ext = extraversion; Open = openness.

*p < .05.*
Table 3
Hierarchical Regression Results for Studies 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Study 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor-rated deviance</td>
<td>Self-rated deviance</td>
<td>Supervisor-rated deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1a</td>
<td>SR Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>22.09*</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2a</td>
<td>SR Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>17.72*</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1b</td>
<td>AR Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>31.87*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2b</td>
<td>AR Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>8.52*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>SR Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>19.02*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>AR Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>25.92*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>AR Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>11.39*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>SR Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>4.87*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>7.04*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>AR Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>SR Agr × AR AGR</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>9.05*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>8.08*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>SR Emotional Stability</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>7.68*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>AR Emotional Stability</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>14.87*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>SR Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>6.89*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>SR Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>SR Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>SR Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>SR Agreeableness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Interactions use an a priori 1-tailed test. Study 1: $N = 233$, $df = 231$ in Step 1, 230 in Step 2, and 229 in Step 3. Study 2: Self-rated deviance $N = 230$, $df = 228$ in Step 1, 227 in Step 2, and 226 in Step 3. Study 2: Supervisor-rated deviance $N = 224$, $df = 222$ in Step 1, 221 in Step 2, and 220 in Step 3. $\beta =$ Standardized regression coefficient. SR = self-rated; AR = acquaintance-rated; Con = conscientiousness; Agr = agreeableness; EmSt = emotional stability.

$* p < .05$

$(\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .05)$ demonstrated incremental validity beyond their self-rated counterparts. Thus, Hypotheses 1b, 2b, and 3b were fully supported.

Hypotheses 1c, 2c, and 3c posited that each of the acquaintance-reported traits of conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability would interact with their respective self-rated traits to predict workplace deviance such that low levels of both self- and acquaintance-rated personality would yield higher levels of deviance. As suggested by Bing, LeBreton, Davison, Migetz, and James (2007), to increase statistical power, we used a one-tailed test for our interactions because they were predicted a priori. As shown in Step 3 of Table 3, significant interactions for conscientiousness ($\Delta R^2 = .06$, $p < .05$) and agreeableness ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $p < .05$) were found in predicting workplace deviance. As Figure 2 shows, the highest level of supervisor-reported deviance was obtained when both self and acquaintance ratings of conscientiousness and agreeableness were low, and the observed pattern clearly matched the predicted pattern in Figure 1. Simple slopes analyses showed that the slopes of the lines were statistically significant ($p < .05$) when acquaintance-reported conscientiousness and agreeableness were low. The slopes were not significant when acquaintance-reported conscientiousness and agreeableness were high ($p = .36$, and $p = .70$, respectively). Thus,
Hypotheses 1c and 2c were fully supported. No interaction effect was found for emotional stability. Thus, Hypothesis 3c was not supported.

As shown in Table 4, an omnibus model including all three interaction terms simultaneously shows that only conscientiousness was statistically significant. Thus, including multiple personality trait interactions simultaneously may yield limited benefit beyond a single self-acquaintance trait interaction.

**Study 2**

**Method**

**Participants and procedures.** In Study 2, we used the same methods as in Study 1, with the exception of the measure of workplace deviance. Study 2 extended Study 1 with an additional job incumbent survey administered approximately 2 weeks after assessing job incumbent self-rated personality. This subsequent survey assessed incumbent-reported deviance, using a different measure than in Study 1. After eliminating 34 respondents for not knowing the job incumbent well or very well, there were 306 acquaintance respondents, of whom 44% were male and averaged 20.92 ($SD = 2.20$) years of age. There were 259 job incumbents (85% response rate), with 230 (88%) responding to the second job incumbent survey. Of these, 43% were male, and they averaged 37.03 ($SD = 14.30$) years of age, 18.00 ($SD = 13.15$) years of job experience, and 7.93 ($SD = 8.96$) years of organization tenure. There were 224 (71%) of the job incumbents’ supervisors who completed an assessment of their subordinates’ workplace deviance. Of these supervisors, 57% were male, and they averaged 44.06 ($SD = 12.75$) years of age and 12.96 ($SD = 10.21$) years of organization tenure.

**Measures.**

**Self-rated and acquaintance-rated Big Five traits.** These were identical to Study 1’s. Alphas for all study variables are satisfactory and are reported in Table 5.

**Self-rated and Supervisor-rated workplace deviance.** Self- and supervisor ratings of workplace deviance were assessed with the 19-item Bennett and Robinson’s (2000) measure consisting of subscales for individual and organizational deviance. Respondents
indicated the frequency of the deviant behaviors in the past year on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (daily). Supervisor-rated items were altered to reference the job incumbent.

Results and Discussion

As before, to demonstrate evidence of construct validity, we used CFA. Three parcels were again created for each personality construct, while self- and supervisor-reported workplace deviance items measuring interpersonal and organizational deviance were aggregated into parcels using the SFA method to form four separate workplace deviance constructs. The hypothesized model (baseline trait model: see the lower-half of Table 2) had a reasonable fit to the data—$\chi^2(727) = 1093.279$, CFI = .93, and RMSEA = .05—and produced a significantly better fit than any other model—

Table 5
Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for Study 2 Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AR Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.48</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. AR Agreeableness</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.50</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. AR Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. AR Extraversion</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SR Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SR Agreeableness</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SR Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SR Extraversion</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SR Openness</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Self-reported Deviance</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Supervisor-reported Deviance</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 306 for acquaintance-rated (AR) personality, 259 for self-rated (SR) personality, 230 for self-rated deviance, and 224 for supervisor-rated deviance. Average AR and SR same-trait correlation (underlined in bottom left box) is .44. Average AR and SR different-trait correlation (not underlined in bottom left box) is .13. Average SR variable intercorrelation (bottom right triangle) is .26. Average AR variable intercorrelation (top left triangle) is .33. Correlations at or above .12 are statistically significant at $p < .05.$
model. Again we tested for second-order method (i.e., source) factors. Table 2 indicates that both self- and acquaintance-source factors yielded significantly worse fit than the baseline trait model, even when they were included simultaneously in the same model, providing further evidence of construct validity. As in Study 1, the correlations table (Table 5) forms a MTMM matrix, with the Big Five serving as traits crossed with self- and other-report methods to determine convergent and discriminant validity. This MTMM reveals that the average same-trait/different method correlation (.44) is greater than the average different-trait/different-method correlation (.13) and average different-trait/same method correlation for self-reports (.26) and acquaintance-reports (.33), thus providing evidence of convergent and discriminant validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959).

Acquaintance-rated conscientiousness (H1a), agreeableness (H2a), and emotional stability (H3a) were proposed to predict workplace deviance. As Table 4 shows, acquaintance-rated conscientiousness predicted incumbent- (r = .37, p < .05) and supervisor-rated (r = -.24, p < .05) deviance. Agreeableness predicted incumbent- (r = -.37, p < .05) and supervisor-rated (r = -.29, p < .05) deviance. Emotional stability predicted supervisor-rated deviance (r = -.20, p < .05), but not incumbent-rated deviance. Thus, Hypotheses 1a and 2a were supported, while 3a was partially supported. As shown in Step 2a of Table 3, acquaintance-rated conscientiousness demonstrated incremental validity in the prediction of incumbent- (ΔR² = .07, p < .05) and supervisor-rated (ΔR² = .03, p < .05) deviance. Again, self/other convergent validity (i.e., self/other agreement) was the lowest for conscientiousness and agreeableness, allowing greater opportunity for incremental validity. Acquaintance-rated agreeableness also demonstrated incremental validity for incumbent- (ΔR² = .04, p < .05) and supervisor-rated (ΔR² = .04, p < .05) deviance. Acquaintance-rated emotional stability did not demonstrate incremental validity. Thus, Hypotheses 1b and 2b were fully supported, while Hypothesis 3b was not supported.

Recall that Hypotheses 1c, 2c, and 3c posited that the acquaintance-reported traits of conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability would interact with their respective self-rated traits to predict workplace deviance. In Step 3 of Table 3, significant interactions were found for conscientiousness in predicting incumbent-rated deviance (ΔR² = .01, p < .05), and for agreeableness in predicting incumbent- and supervisor-rated deviance (ΔR² = .02, and ΔR² = .03, both p < .05, respectively). These interactions were highly consistent with the predicted pattern, and thus only one is shown. In Figure 2, the highest level of self-reported deviance was obtained when both self- and acquaintance ratings of agreeableness were low. Simple slopes analyses showed that the slopes were statistically significant (ps < .05) when acquaintance-reported conscientiousness and agreeableness were low. The slopes were borderline or nonsignificant when acquaintance-reported conscientiousness (p = .30) and agreeableness were high (p = .05, and p = .40, for incumbent- and supervisor-rated deviance, respectively). No interactions were found for emotional stability, and no interaction was found for conscientiousness with respect to supervisor-rated deviance. Thus, Hypotheses 1c was partially supported, 2c was fully supported, and 3c was not supported. The omnibus model in Table 4 shows that only the agreeableness interaction was statistically significant. Thus, once again, including multiple personality trait interactions simultaneously in an omnibus model may yield limited benefit.

**General Discussion**

Both studies described here draw from the socioanalytic theory of personality (R. T. Hogan, 1991, 2007) to investigate the relationships between self- and acquaintance ratings of conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability with workplace deviance. Study 1 focused on supervisor-rated deviance using Stewart et al.’s (2009) measure. Study 2 replicated and extended the findings of Study 1 using the Bennett and Robinson’s (2000) deviance measure, with self- and supervisor ratings, thus enhancing the findings’ generalizability. Further, the use of data from three different referent sources (acquaintances, job incumbents, and supervisors) and self-ratings of personality and deviance separated into time-lagged survey administrations serve to reduce some of the common method variance concerns in research that relies exclusively on self-reports of deviance (Fox, Spector, Goh, & Bruursema, 2007; Stewart et al., 2009).

Results from both studies confirm prior research (e.g., Berry et al., 2007) by showing that all three traits of interest (conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability) measured by self-reports are significantly negatively correlated with both self-rated and less-studied supervisor-rated deviance (see Berry et al., 2007; 2012). With respect to our first set of hypotheses, acquaintance ratings consistently predicted deviance, with the exception of emotional stability in predicting self-reported deviance in Study 2. Further, the magnitudes of the relationships between acquaintance ratings of personality with deviance were comparable to those found for self-rated personality. Thus, in general, if only one measure of personality can be obtained, either source may yield similar results. However, acquaintance ratings may serve as a superior choice when attempting to guard against issues of common method variance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003) that may occur when personality and deviance are obtained from the same source, or when self-reports are not practical.

Because identity and reputation (R. T. Hogan, 1991, 2007) differ in terms of what aspect of personality is assessed, our second set of hypotheses stated that acquaintance ratings of personality would provide incremental validity beyond corresponding self-ratings in predicting deviance. Our results confirm that unique variance in deviance can be explained by acquaintance ratings of personality. For conscientiousness, the incremental contribution of acquaintance ratings was generally the strongest, ranging from 3% to 9% in additional variance explained. The incremental contribution for agreeableness ranged from 3% to 4%. For emotional stability, the incremental validity results were mixed, with a 3% gain in variance explained in Study 1, but no gain in Study 2. Thus, our results indicate that when using acquaintance ratings of personality in an additive model of prediction beyond self-ratings, acquaintance-rated conscientiousness yields moderate to substantial gains, while agreeableness yields moderate gains.

Our final set of hypotheses extends the integration of self- and acquaintance ratings of personality beyond unique effects to include an interactive model. Specifically, when a criterion-relevant, prosocial personality trait is absent in both the employee’s identity (i.e., self-report) and reputation (i.e., acquaintance report), then the employee is more likely to engage in deviance. For conscientiousness, our results
yield a consistent pattern of interactive effects across different deviance measures and referent sources. For agreeableness, interactions again demonstrated a pattern consistent with our proposed interactive model of self- and acquaintance ratings. Emotional stability, however, consistently showed no interactive effects. The persistent replication of interaction results for conscientiousness and agreeableness across both studies provides strong evidence that self and acquaintance ratings of criterion-relevant personality traits not only provide unique incremental validity to the prediction of deviance but also yield additional predictive power when viewed in an interactive fashion. As such, self- and acquaintance-rated conscientiousness and agreeableness are not merely substitutable but combine both additively and interactively in the prediction of deviance.

Practical Implications

To illustrate the practical importance of the interactive model, we compared hypothetical selection decisions generated from the interactive model of self-reports, acquaintance reports, and the interaction, with those generated from a simple regression model with self-reports alone. A simple regression, self-report-only model served as the logical baseline for comparison, as self-reports of personality remain the most dominant and popular method for personality assessment in the organizational sciences and human resource practice (Oh et al., 2011). In Study 1, we chose to assess the trait of conscientiousness due to its popularity for selection purposes (Berry et al., 2007). Using a cutpoint of 1.50 on $Y$ predicted for both regression models, the self-report-only model would have led to the hiring of 12 persons with mean levels of actual workplace deviance of 2.0 or higher (at least several times a year). Alternatively, the interactive model led to the selection of six fewer persons who moderately perform workplace deviance. Thus, in Study 1, the interactive model obtained a 50% reduction in “selecting” those engaged in moderate amounts of workplace deviance. For Study 2, we assessed cutpoints using agreeableness. Using a cutpoint of 1.40, of the seven persons in the sample who engaged in workplace deviance several times a year or more, five persons were screened out by the interactive model, whereas only two were screened out by the self-report-only model. Thus, in Study 2, the interactive model achieved a substantial reduction of 60% of this type of frequent workplace deviance behavior. These cutpoint analyses illustrate the practical advantage of using our interactive model over the self-report-only model for making more accurate human resource selection decisions.

There are several useful practical implications of our research. By establishing that acquaintance ratings of personality are predictive of deviant behaviors, we provide practitioners with another reason for obtaining multiple ratings of employee or job candidate personality traits from various sources (e.g., former coworkers, friends, and so on). Assessing conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability from acquaintances provides useful information for hiring professionals as they attempt to determine whether candidates could potentially harm the organization or their coworkers. This issue is particularly salient due to the low base-rate of deviance (see Stewart et al., 2009), such that a more accurate prediction of its occurrence may be provided by combining self- with acquaintance-reported personality. Moreover, an individual’s reputation, based on acquaintance perceptions, is an ongoing process and becomes increasingly more accurate with increased interactions. Therefore, the reputation of an individual’s personality traits in the eyes of supervisors, peers, or customers can be readily available through standardized acquaintance assessment. Thus, managers may wish to consider unconscious and disagreeable reputations when making selection and promotion decisions.

Limitations, Future Research, and Conclusions

Ratings from multiple referents are shown to reduce rater idiosyncrasies, thereby improving reliability and validity (Connelly & Ones, 2010). Although we believe that comparing a single self-rating to a single acquaintance rating provides for a fair test of our hypotheses, multiple acquaintance ratings would have likely yielded stronger validity coefficients. Future research should be conducted to evaluate whether ratings from more than one acquaintance further improves the validity of other-rated personality and deviance assessments. Additionally, our study deliberately asked respondents to identify acquaintances they knew well. Thus, the degree to which an acquaintance knows the target, as well as the nature of the acquaintance (i.e., friends, coworkers, and so on), should be investigated more directly in the future. Self-reports are criticized for their susceptibility to faking when used for selection decisions (e.g., Peterson, Griffith, Isaacson, O’Connell, & Mangos, 2011). However, the extent to which different groups of acquaintances can and do provide socially desirable responses to acquaintance assessments of personality is unknown and should also be investigated. Finally, our study focused exclusively on three Big Five traits as predictors of deviance due to their theoretical relevance. However, future researchers should evaluate a wider range of personality traits beyond the Big Five, investigate differential predictive and incremental validities, and potential interactive effects of these personality traits in relation to a broader range of workplace outcomes (e.g., task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors). However, due to the higher base rate of other job outcomes beyond deviance, the nature of the interaction may take a different form depending on the trait and the specific outcome.

In conclusion, we have provided evidence that acquaintance ratings of personality can predict deviance as well as or better than self-ratings of personality. Further, self- and acquaintance ratings of conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability complement one another, such that acquaintance ratings largely demonstrated incremental validity beyond their respective self-reported counterparts. Finally, both for conscientiousness and agreeableness, self- and acquaintance ratings interacted to improve upon the prediction of workplace deviance. We look forward to future work in this area that further extends this line of research.
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Overview of Research on Acquaintance-Ratings of Personality and Workplace Deviance

The Oh et al. (2011) meta-analysis includes four primary studies (three for some of the Big Five traits) relevant to this discussion of predicting workplace deviance. Of these, two studies are from unpublished raw datasets. One is a conference paper that focuses on self-monitoring but reports no statistics (Parks & Mount, 2005), although the authors indicate that conscientiousness correlates with organizational deviance and agreeableness correlates with interpersonal deviance. The only published study (Yoo, 2007) uses the HEXACO personality inventory, which differs from the Big Five framework (see Ashton & Lee, 2009). The Yoo (2007) study also has substantial methodological issues, including the use of one-item measures of personality traits, and also measures both personality and deviance from the same acquaintances in the same survey, generating a potential same-source common method variance confound. Finally, recent work by Oh, Charlier, Mount, and Berry (in press, available online 2013), which focuses on interactions with self-monitoring, shows statistically significant correlations between acquaintance-rated conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability and workplace deviance. However, it should be noted that none of these studies assessed both self- and acquaintance-rated personality on the same job incumbents. Thus, we investigated both self- and acquaintance-rated personality on the same job incumbents for the Big Five traits in relation to predicting both supervisory and self-reported workplace deviance, and such a study has not been conducted previously to our knowledge.

We contacted In-Sue Oh directly and in so doing we were able to separate out the findings for the Big Five with the workplace deviance criterion for the four studies he meta-
analyzed (Oh et al. 2011) and found the following meta-analytic results (these are operational validities that have been corrected for unreliability in the criterion measure and range restriction on the predictor measure):

Self-Reported Conscientiousness and CWB: -.33
Other-Reported Conscientiousness and CWB: -.54

Self-Reported Agreeableness and CWB: -.38
Other-Reported Agreeableness and CWB: -.22

Self-Reported Emotional Stability and CWB: -.23
Other-Reported Emotional Stability and CWB: -.18

Self-Reported Extraversion and CWB: .03
Other-Reported Extraversion and CWB: .04

Self-Reported Openness and CWB: .06
Other-Reported Openness and CWB: -.18

Here we should note that the operational validities above for the self-reported Big Five come from Berry et al.’s (2007) meta-analysis in the Journal of Applied Psychology, in which
Berry et al. (2007) reported mean true-score correlations, which were then altered to the operational validities above by In-Sue Oh via a personal communication with Christopher Berry on August 13, 2009.

Using the estimates of \( \rho \) (i.e., the mean true-score correlation) provided in Berry et al.’s (2007, p. 419, table 5) meta-analytic results for the self-reported Big Five in relation to both interpersonal deviance (ID) and organizational deviance (OD) are as follows:

Self-Reported Conscientiousness and ID: -.23
Self-Reported Conscientiousness and OD: -.42

Self-Reported Agreeableness and ID: -.46
Self-Reported Agreeableness and OD: -.32

Self-Reported Emotional Stability and ID: -.24
Self-Reported Emotional Stability and OD: -.23

Self-Reported Extraversion and ID: .02
Self-Reported Extraversion and OD: -.09

Self-Reported Openness and ID: -.09
Self-Reported Openness and OD: -.04
Last, Berry et al. (2012, p. 623 in table 5) also provide some meta-analytic data between self-reports of personality and CWBs when those CWBs are measured with other-reports, rather than with self-reports. These findings are as follows (i.e., these are mean sample size-weighted correlations corrected for unreliability using interrater reliabilities for other-rated CWB and alphas for self-rated personality):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Reported Trait</th>
<th>Other-report CWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequently, it would appear from the meta-analytic data available that extraversion and openness do not provide for very viable predictions of workplace deviance. Out of the total 10 opportunities for these two traits to predict workplace deviance, only in two cases does openness, admittedly, show some potential to predict CWB and/or workplace deviance. For example, in the Oh et al. (2011) data, other-reported openness predicted workplace deviance, but we should note that this relationship of −.18 reported here is an operational validity and has been corrected for both criterion unreliability and predictor range restriction, in addition to being potentially inflated by the Yoo (2007) data in which the target’s openness and workplace deviance were measured via the same source: other report. Thus, empirically, it would appear that it would be advantageous to focus on conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability when predicting workplace deviance rather than on extraversion and openness.
In sum, we find little theoretical rational for the direct influence of extraversion and openness on workplace deviance. As such, we do not present hypotheses for these two traits. However, below we report the regression results for extraversion and openness for those interested in these results.

### Workplace Deviance

Despite being part of the broad domain of job performance, the taxonomy of workplace deviance includes behaviors that are theoretically and empirically distinct from other forms of job performance (e.g., behaviors such as theft, absenteeism, tardiness, rule breaking, property damage, and drug and alcohol use; Campbell, 1990; Sackett & DeVore, 2002), yielding differential relationships with a wide range of predictors. Further, the various forms of job performance are empirically distinct. Specifically, meta-analytic evidence reveals the sample size weighted mean correlation between task performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is .39 for individually directed OCB and .40 for organizationally directed OCB (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). The sample-size-weighted mean meta-analytic correlation between OCB and overall workplace deviance is −.27 (Dalal, 2005). Finally, other research demonstrates that task performance and workplace deviance can be considered distinct. For example, Judge et al. (2006) showed that self-rated deviance correlated with task performance at −.15, while other-rated deviance correlated with task performance at −.36. Additionally, Klueemper, DeGroot, and Choi (2013) report an uncorrected correlation of .30
between task performance and individually-directed workplace deviance, and .54 between task performance and organizationally directed workplace deviance. Thus, workplace deviance is both theoretically and empirically distinct from other workplace outcomes, such as task performance and OCBs. Further, although workplace deviance can be operationalized as a broad construct (as was done in the current article), there may be important differences when operationalized at the dimensional level.

To be thorough, though not hypothesized, we report general results from both studies for the dimensions of workplace deviance. In Study 1, the Stewart et al. (2009) measure includes the dimensions of production deviance, interpersonal aggression, and property deviance. In Study 2, the Bennett and Robinson (2000) measure includes dimensions of individual and organizational deviance. In Study 1, acquaintance-rated conscientiousness generated stronger incremental validity beyond its self-rated counterpart when predicting production deviance ($\Delta R^2 = 10\%, p < .05$) in comparison to interpersonal aggression ($\Delta R^2 = 5\%, p < .05$) and property deviance ($\Delta R^2 = 4\%, p < .05$). In Study 2, acquaintance-rated conscientiousness generated slightly stronger incremental validity when predicting both self-rated ($\Delta R^2 = 6\%, p < .05$) and supervisor-rated ($\Delta R^2 = 3\%, p < .05$) organizational deviance in comparison to predicting self-rated ($\Delta R^2 = 5\%, p < .05$) and supervisor-rated ($\Delta R^2 = 2\%, p < .05$) interpersonal deviance, respectively. In Study 1, interaction effects between self- and acquaintance-rated conscientiousness were stronger for production deviance ($\Delta R^2 = 7\%, p < .05$) than for interpersonal aggression ($\Delta R^2 = 3\%, p < .05$) and property deviance ($\Delta R^2 = 3\%, p < .05$). In Study 2, interaction effects between self- and acquaintance-rated conscientiousness were stronger for self-rated ($\Delta R^2 = 1\%, p < .05$) and supervisor-rated ($\Delta R^2 = 2\%, p < .05$) organizational deviance when compared with self-rated ($\Delta R^2 = 1\%, ns$) and supervisor-rated ($\Delta R^2 = 1\%, ns$) interpersonal deviance, respectively. For agreeableness, incremental validity and interaction results yielded relatively consistent and significant results across the various dimensions of workplace deviance in Studies 1 and 2. Finally, the incremental validity of acquaintance-rated emotional stability beyond self-rated emotional stability in Study 1 was stronger when predicting production deviance ($\Delta R^2 = 5\%, p < .05$) in comparison to interpersonal aggression ($\Delta R^2 = 1\%, ns$) and property deviance ($\Delta R^2 = 1\%, ns$). The remaining incremental validity and interaction results for emotional stability in both studies remained relatively consistent across the dimensions of workplace deviance in Studies 1 and 2. As such, from these findings it would appear that (a) acquaintance-rated conscientiousness is particularly useful for predicting production deviance and organizational deviance, (b) acquaintance-rated emotional stability may be particularly germane for predicting production deviance, and (c) acquaintance-rated agreeableness is consistently valid to a relatively stable degree in the prediction of the various dimensions of workplace deviance.
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