

Raelin, Joseph A.

Article — Accepted Manuscript (Postprint)

Three scales of professional deviance within organizations

Journal of Organizational Behavior

Suggested Citation: Raelin, Joseph A. (1994) : Three scales of professional deviance within organizations, Journal of Organizational Behavior, ISSN 1099-1379, Wiley, New York, Vol. 15, Iss. 6, pp. 483-501,
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030150602>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/268659>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Three Scales of Professional Deviance within Organizations

A Paper By

Joseph A. Raelin

Professor

Wallace E. Carroll School of Management

Boston College

Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

j.raelin@neu.edu

The final definitive version of this paper was published in
Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 15, No. 6, 1994, pp. 483–501

By John Wiley & Sons

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/job.4030150602/abstract>

Copyright © 1994 by John Wiley & Sons

All Rights Reserved

Three Scales of
Professional Deviance within Organizations*

ABSTRACT

Salaried professionals may exhibit organizational deviance when faced with conflict resulting from their mutual role as professional and employee. Some of this behavior may be directly harmful to both the individual and the organization, whereas some may constitute adaptive maladjustments. An earlier study proposed that these deviant behaviors could be organized into Guttman scales. In this article, three such scales were tested for underlying unidimensionality and cumulativeness using scalogram analysis. Not only was the practice of organizational deviance, although not widespread, confirmed, but the scales survived the parameters of the Guttman procedure. A replication of the scales produced sufficient validation for their further development and usage.

* The author would like to thank Edith Lee for her research assistance in the preparation of this manuscript.

THREE SCALES OF PROFESSIONAL DEVIANCE WITHIN ORGANIZATIONS

When salaried professionals (defined as professionals such as teachers, lawyers, accountants, engineers, nurses, or scientists who practice their craft primarily in organizations rather than in private practice) experience conflict in their organizations, they may exhibit deviant behavior, that is, unsanctioned means to accomplish their goals (Merton, 1957, p. 150). Their goals can be either in conformity with or antagonistic to the surrounding culture. According to Hollinger and Clark (1983), deviance in the workplace normally emanates from two nearly counteractive practices of management: 1) lack of sufficient social control devices and 2) lack of commitment-enhancing policies. The authors also operationalized deviance into two categories: property and production deviance. Property deviance or theft was found to be practiced by some technical professionals who not only would be likely to have unrestricted access to materials but also the sophisticated skills needed to use them. Production deviance (the form I shall specifically consider in this article and which will be referred to as organizational deviance), defined as general counterproductive behavior, such as slow or sloppy workmanship, sick-leave abuse, alcohol and drug use at work, or tardiness, was found to be more pervasive.

When faced with untenable work conditions, professionals, besides choosing deviant reactions, always have the option of leaving, although any number of circumstances, such as family considerations, seniority-based benefits, unavailability of alternative jobs, or even inertia, might militate against this choice. So, remaining in the organization is for some an unavoidable decision. In staying, the professional needs to face the conflict, whether personal or professional, in some way. He or she may simply decide to accommodate the situation perhaps by changing his or her expectations to match those of the organization (McKelvey, 1969). Other accommodative measures might be to enrich one's job, try to obtain a favorable transfer, attempt to move into management, and so forth. Managers can too predispose professionals to accommodation by reducing the frequency and severity of conflicting situations. Nevertheless, under unrelenting conflict, some professionals will engage in the only psychological outlet available to them, organizational deviance.

In this paper, based upon the author's prior model of professional deviant/adaptive behavior, an attempt will be made to empirically categorize some 30 behaviors available to professionals faced with organizational conflict. The categorization will seek to characterize these behaviors according to underlying dimension and according to severity. The method to be used to accomplish this categorization will be scalogram analysis.

CONCEPTUAL UNDERPINNINGS:

Conflict has been depicted so far in this paper as the primary instigator of organizational deviance. Although it can arise at many levels (interpersonal, interorganizational, etc.) and for any number of reasons in an organization, here we shall consider the specific conflict which arises out of one's dual role as a professional and as an employee to management. In many instances, there is no role conflict in this situation. Some salaried professionals in particular occupations (e.g., teachers) or in certain circumstances (e.g., academic environments), seem quite willing to commit to their respective organizations. Management can also attempt to merge the goals and procedures of the organization with the standards specified within the profession (Blau, 1968; Lachman and Aranya, 1986; Raelin, 1991). Further, it is possible that under favorable conditions, increasing increments of professional commitment can translate into increasing increments of organizational commitment (Bartol, 1979; Aranya and Ferris, 1984; Wallace, 1993). Yet, associations between organizational commitment and professional commitment tend to be found among "quasi-professional" samples, that is, organizationally dependent professionals, such as accountants, computer scientists, and nurses, whose professional autonomy tends to be circumscribed. For example, the meta-analysis reported in Wallace (1993) uses samples which are predominantly made up of accountants and nonprofessionals, many of whom are also in supervisory or managerial roles. Typically, these quasi or nonprofessionals have access to few outlets outside their organization in which to express their professional commitment.

Studies by Paula Morrow have found professional commitment to be nonredundant with other forms of work commitment, including organizational commitment (see, for example, Morrow and Goetz, 1988). Morrow

and Wirth (1989) confirmed the independent factor structure of professional commitment and reported only a modest correlation ($r = .34$) between professional commitment and organizational commitment even though their sample also included managers. Moreover, some 60% of their respondents had not obtained a Master's degree, an educational qualification many consider to be a base line for professional status.

It appears that, especially with the most "professionalized" of professionals and under reasonably tight bureaucratic constraint, differences between professionals and their managers are likely to ensue because of distinctiveness of role as well as culture. Role differences have been depicted best in the classic cosmopolitan-local construct, wherein the professional is viewed as the cosmopolitan and the manager, as the agent of the organization, the local (see, for example, Gouldner, 1957, 1958, and Blau and Scott, 1962, pp. 64-71). When we look at the cultural differences between managers and professionals, that is, their values, habits, and beliefs, it is apparent that they also come from quite different educational backgrounds and early socialization experiences (see Raelin, 1991, esp. Chap. 3). Professionals tend to be segregated from other students and fields and devote years of study to learn the technical idiosyncracies of their discipline. Managers, in contrast, although nowadays increasingly subjected to a prolonged term of study, nevertheless learn in very active, interpersonal environments and cultivate a style of engagement entailing the resolution of messy problems depicted in case examples.

The differences in educational experiences between professionals and managers can carry over into the organizational environment, leading to an almost involuntary conflict over expectations. For some professionals, the sheer amount of time devoted to the study of their field results in a certain amount of emotional attachment and commitment. They may prefer to retain the role of individual contributor even under pressures to assume supervisory responsibilities. When these individuals end up in organizations which reward managerial progression only, conflict is bound to ensue.

Although conflict seems to be the main precipitator of organizational deviance, as suggested earlier, there are individual, job, and organizational factors which can moderate not only conflict but, ultimately, the behavioral reactions of salaried professionals. For example, professionals who work in universities, some social service agencies, and certain professional service organizations, such as law, architectural, or accounting firms, and who are granted a fair degree of autonomy in their jobs, are likely to experience less conflict and to

exhibit less professional deviance than those under rigid bureaucratic procedures. Further, reactions to conflicting expectations within the organization can produce cognitive or attitudinal effects before they are behaviorally expressed. These conditions are outlined in a model of professional deviant/adaptive behavior which interested readers are encouraged to consult (see Raelin, 1984).

The focus of the present study is on the response behaviors which were hypothesized in the model to fall on a continuum from adaptive to deviant. Adaptive behaviors are construed as short run maladjustments which are not conventionally accepted in society or by an organization, though they might be indirectly beneficial to one or the other. Deviant behaviors are normally construed as directly harmful to both the individual and the organization. Accordingly, unlike prior discontinuous models of deviance (Parsons, 1951; Merton, 1957; McKelvey, 1969), the model of professional deviant/adaptive behavior suggested that the behaviors could be cumulatively scaled according to degree of seriousness or harm vis-a-vis four career elements: management, job, self, and the career itself. Besides the cumulative proposition, the model also hypothesized a unidimensionality for each of the four career elements. Further, it went on to propose that the behaviors on the scales could be empirically identified and measured for practitioner use - be it for attitude surveys or even career discussions between manager and professional.

The original list of behaviors is shown in Table 1. The table lists the four career elements and the accompanying deviant/adaptive behavior continua with the behaviors arrayed in approximate position along each continuum according to severity. Although there isn't sufficient space to outline a substantiation for each of the behavioral constructs indicated, a flavor for the theoretical identification of the four career elements and some of the inherent behaviors is provided below. Greater depth on each of the behaviors can be found in the literature review in Raelin (1984).

Vis-a-vis Management

The basis for many of these behaviors can be found in Kornhauser (1962) and La Porte (1965) who reported on the strain experienced by professionals in their quest for freedom from the structural constraints imposed by bureaucracy. Demands for greater autonomy and authority can be met by management but only up to a point. Some professionals may never feel satisfied that the organization has provided a sufficiently rule-free

environment in which to carry out their work without constant interference. Some professionals may react to perceived bureaucratic constraints by engaging in excessive rule tropism (Gouldner, 1957). Others may seek outlets for their frustration by attempting to recruit a cadre of fellow naysayers.

Vis-a-vis Job

The professional may react to a conflicting work environment by manipulating the attention paid to the job itself. For example, one can become very busy. "Busyness" in and of itself may not pose any difficulty; indeed, the employee may be working long and hard hours on essential work. Yet, when the professional is no longer available for requisite tasks, overall job performance may suffer. Nevertheless, only when faced with extreme dissonance is the professional likely to alter actual job performance directly since a good deal of one's professional identity is derived from responsible work performance.

Vis-a-vis Self

Some individuals turn inward rather than outward when faced with conflicting expectations. Not all of this behavior is deleterious. The adoption of psychological defense mechanisms, such as rationalization, can in some instances permit greater adaptation to one's work environment. More serious is the strain of burnout. Cherniss (1980) found burnout to be particularly associated with professional work and to have personal and work effects. It is associated, for example, with emotional detachment and an excessive concern with self-interest. It tends, further, to involve a lowering of personal standards as well as a sense of personal responsibility for outcomes.

Vis-a-vis Career

In the last continuum, the behavioral effects from professionals' conflicting expectations and confusion surrounding their roles may be traced to the career itself. To emphasize one's professional identification, which is thought to be challenged by the organization, an initial response may be to strengthen professional allegiance (Lebell, 1980), such as by increasing one's activity in professional associations or by forming closer ties with external professional colleagues. Less adaptive, certainly for the individual and to some extent for

the organization, is the professionals' assumption of premature search activity. This would be defined as persisting in external search independent of the probability of finding a suitable alternative. Finally, in a more deviant reaction, one might flaunt external offers regardless whether the pronouncements of greener pastures are factual or inflated.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCALES

The first test of the model of professional deviant/adaptive behavior must be to ascertain the existence of organizational deviance among salaried professionals and then to categorize, specifically to scale, them as per the model specification. To perform this initial test, data were gathered from an executive search firm of professionals who had written the firm requesting alternative employment. Going back over a 12-month period, all professional applicants were considered according to the following occupational classifications: engineers, financial professionals, lawyers, chemists and other scientists. Since a number of the applicants were professional-administrators, it was decided to include only those who, if they supervised, had responsibilities for under 10 other professionals. These individuals were deemed to have retained their professional identification since that magnitude of supervision is typically indicative of a form of peer control within a professional work group. Further, although the number 10 is somewhat arbitrary, rarely has the author found managers willing to allow their professional teams to exceed this number, from an efficiency perspective. Thus, supervision of more than 10 individuals would tend to indicate control of more than one team, clearly a managerial practice.

A question remains, though, regarding the nature of professionals who choose to consult an executive search firm rather than or in addition to their own professional associations or through word-of-mouth. Executive search firms clearly represent a more aggressive approach to job search among the professional population. The executive officers of the firm from whom the sample was drawn suggested that such individuals may be more intentional and more organized than the average professional job changer. In other words, their having taken the time to prepare a resume and write a letter suggests not only a commitment to the search process as a

whole but also to the use of an orderly and methodical approach to the process. It may also suggest a breakdown in the candidate's own professional network in facilitating a job change. Nevertheless, the officers of the firm concluded that differences between executive search users and non-users among the professionals with whom they had had contact would be more a question of degree rather than kind. Hence, the sample is expected to be fairly representative of professionals facing role conflict except that the respondents might be more "career-minded" and less confident in their own professional referent group than those in the general salaried professional population.

That the sample pool was drawn from those who had manifested interest in changing employment suggests a problem of selection bias. However, the deviant/adaptive behavior model is especially applicable to professionals who are experiencing conflict in their organizations. Hence, it is useful to have a fair representation of such individuals so that potential deviant reactions can be measured. The data revealed that in fact some 87% of the sample experienced at least some professional role conflict, as measured by a conflicting expectations measure.

Three other features of the sample were helpful in developing the subsequent deviant/adaptive behavior scales: 1) the respondents came from a wide variety of backgrounds, 2) they were associated with different organizations, and 3) they represented different professions.

Data Collection

A questionnaire was prepared corresponding to each of the original behaviors cited in the model of professional deviant/adaptive behavior. For each of the 30 behaviors cited in Table 1 (Absenteeism and Tardiness, and Mental Illness and Physical Illness, though combined in the continua, were subsequently separated for questionnaire purposes), respondents were presented with a question asking them to indicate on a scale from 1 to 9 the frequency or degree to which they engaged in that particular behavior. In the questionnaire, 1 represented "never," and 9, "very frequently." The full set of questions used to evaluate these variables is displayed in Table 2 so that future researchers may continue to experiment with the scales to be developed in this study. (Instructions on scale preparation will follow.) Other questions were included on the

respondents' backgrounds, on their role conflict as professionals within their organizations, and on other dimensions needed for further estimation of the model in subsequent research. The sample selection procedures described above furnished 403 individuals to whom questionnaires were sent along with a letter of purpose which included instructions for insuring complete anonymity of response. The letter was straightforward in pointing out that some of the questions would be sensitive or offensive (since they were assessing deviance), but that given the anonymous administration of the questionnaire, answers could not have any bearing on the executive firm's evaluation of the respondent's qualifications as a job candidate.

From the original 403 letters sent out, 15 questionnaires were sent back due to changed address. Of the 388 remaining, 128 were returned, representing a 33% response rate. Thirteen cases were subsequently rejected due to: 1) the individual could no longer be classified as a professional on the basis of title or no. supervised, or 2) incomplete information. The usable cases thus numbered 115. The 23 respondents who were unemployed were asked to supply answers based on their last job.

The response rate from the survey is lower than many others of this type. However, the familiar devices of follow-up, which tend to produce the higher rates, were expressly rejected in this study in order to grant anonymity. The benefit from this procedure is that the researcher is assured that respondents have answered without ulterior motives which could contaminate the findings from sensitive information.

Sample Characteristics

Respondents were homogeneous on race and sex, 96% being white males. They were well-educated, 53% having a Master's, and 26% a doctorate. Ages ranged from 25 to 68 years; the mean age was 42. The average salary was \$47,000, but respondents indicated a median desired salary in ten years of \$90,000. More than half the sample had a working spouse. The average time of employment was five years and the median two years. The average size of employers was 37,000 employees, the median being, however, 5000, and they were predominantly (84%) in the private sector. Respondents worked on average a 47-hour week and of the 75% who had supervisory authority, they supervised five others, not including secretaries and interns. Nearly half of the sample worked in manufacturing, a quarter were in services, and one-seventh were in the finance,

real estate, or insurance industries. Of the professional occupations represented, 50% were engineers of varying types, 28% were financial professionals, 12% were lawyers, and 9% were different types of scientists. With regard to their professionalism, 75% were members of some kind of professional society or association, 50% held a professional license or certification of some kind, 37% attended at least one professional meeting a year, and respondents read an average of four professional journals regularly, although the mode was two.

RESULTS

Practice of Deviant/Adaptive Behavior

Before proceeding to the scalogram analysis, it would be useful to determine the extent of practice of organizational deviance among this sample of professionals. A review of the frequencies attached to the deviant/adaptive behavior measures displays frequent use of the behaviors, although one could not quite use the word "widespread" to describe their application. A count was made of percentages of respondents indicating that they practiced a particular behavior, even if only infrequently, that is 2 or above. Summing these percentages for all 30 behaviors assessed in the questionnaire produced a combined percentage of 59.7 per cent. Thus, approximately six out of ten respondents practiced some deviant/adaptive behavior.

Another consideration is the extent to which there is a clear demarcation between deviant and adaptive behaviors. Again, deviant refers to behaviors that are clearly harmful to the individual and/or the organization. Adaptive behaviors constitute only maladjustments. For purposes of this study, frequency means were used to indicate the extent of organizational deviance (or the severity) of each of the 30 measures. Put differently, it was assumed that the frequency with which respondents engaged in particular behaviors reflected their location on the deviant/adaptive continuum. Behaviors which were selected rarely (frequently) were considered to be deviant (adaptive). The rationale for this approach is based on a "relativistic," as opposed to a "normative," perspective of deviance (Orcutt, 1983). The former suggests that deviance cannot be defined according to variations from widely shared, stable norms of society but rather according to how social audiences define it. Hence, the act by respondents of refraining from what they might

consider socially undesirable behavior is assumed to reflect the degree of deviance of that behavior.

A normative perspective might lead to different results in some instances. For example, among the behaviors on the original career scale, "putting emphasis on work that is professionally or externally evaluated as opposed to organizationally or internally evaluated" is proposed to be between adaptive and deviant, but closer to adaptive. Less frequent adoption of this behavior would make it more deviant. Yet, the norms of a professional culture sustained by the wider society might point to a low frequency of this behavior as reflecting a responsible act benefiting organizational performance. This paper alternatively takes the view that especially given that the chosen behaviors were originally defined through the literature as potentially maladaptive, only their frequent adoption would make them more socially desirable.

Table 3 lists the means and standard deviations of the original deviant/adaptive behavior variables in the same sequential order as theoretically listed in Table 1. Table 4 is then created to disclose the most deviant and the most adaptive of these variables, using a mean of less than 2 to represent outright deviances and a value of more than 4 to represent adaptive behaviors. According to Table 4, it appears that the model correctly classified the most deviant behaviors and some of the most adaptive behaviors as well. It would be expected that the relative position of each behavior would be adjusted by the empirical results, but especially on the deviant side, the actual results are a reasonably good fit with the predicted positions. The only behavior on the deviant side somewhat out of line is "refusal to implement," which on the theoretical continuum was depicted as midway between deviant and adaptive. Two behaviors not listed in Table 3 with relatively low means but originally depicted as adaptive are rationalization ($x = 2.27$) and "busyness" ($x = 2.62$). Respondents see these behaviors as conceivably more deviant than originally hypothesized. Finally, it is interesting to note that behaviors from all four original continua are represented in the most deviant and adaptive behaviors of Table 4.

Guttman Scaling

The original study of professional deviant/adaptive behavior proposed that the non-accommodative behavioral reactions of professionals faced with conflicting expectations could be scaled in terms of their

severity. In this study, in order to empirically examine the scalar proposition, it was necessary to determine whether the professional deviant/adaptive behaviors could be cumulatively ordered.

To perform this kind of analysis, scalogram analysis using the Guttman procedure (see Edwards, 1948; Anderson, 1966; and Nie et al., 1975) was applied. Guttman scaling attempts to analyze the underlying operating characteristics of items of a potential scale in terms of their unidimensionality and their cumulativeness. It is the second characteristic, cumulativeness, which really distinguishes Guttman from other scales. Accordingly, items are arranged on a scale such that respondents who reply positively to a difficult item will always respond positively to a less difficult item. Readers can see that Guttman is a perfect device for estimating deviant/adaptive behavioral scales since adaptive behaviors are assumed to precede deviance, and deviant behaviors are thought to represent a last resort after other behavioral options have been tried. In other words, deviance is defined according to this empirical format as a gradual practice which only occurs after adaptive behaviors have failed to satisfy whatever motives the individual uses to face professional-organizational conflict.

The determination of which variables to place on which scales, i.e., the determination of unidimensionality in this study, began with the theoretical ordering proposed in Table 1. It was subsequently shaped by a factor analysis and by the Guttman procedures described as follows. The variables were initially clustered upon examination of a full factor matrix after varimax rotation. Although the items on the proposed self-scale hung together quite well on the same factor, the items proposed for the other three scales split up into different factors. Some of the items were re-clustered if they demonstrated significant individual inter-correlations. In order to achieve some parsimony of scaling, items were deleted if they were found to be responsible for a sizable number of individual scaling errors, if their inclusion detracted from the overall scaling parameters, or if they were isolated as single factors.

Those familiar with Guttman scales also know that pass-fail cutting points must be assigned. To a certain extent, one must rely on some trial-and-error in this task, although a close examination of item means facilitated this process. Moreover, the Guttman evaluating procedures are sufficiently stringent so that one can only go so far in judiciously manipulating the items and cutting points. Consequently, in this study the final order of the scales held up quite well under varying cutting point assignments. The final, and what is

proposed as the optimal, solution produced three instead of four scales, the original management and job scales having been consolidated into a new work scale. The self scale remained relatively intact, and the career scale was re-formulated to indicate deviant/adaptive behaviors related to one's professional involvement and was labelled the "professional scale."

Displayed in Table 5, 18 of the 30 behaviors survived the analysis. All three scales satisfy the principal Guttman criteria of unidimensionality and cumulativeness. In each case, the coefficient of reproducibility, measuring the extent to which the respondent's scale is a predictor of one's response pattern, is above the conventional .9. In a perfect scale, the responses of a respondent to all of the items can be reproduced from knowledge of his or her rank position alone. Individuals with nonscale patterns are first given the rank positions of the most similar perfect scale types. An error is then simply a response made which would have been wrongly predicted on the basis of assigned position. Hence, the coefficient of reproducibility (Rep) is:

$$\text{Rep} = 1 - \frac{\text{total no. of errors}}{\text{no. of items} \times \text{no. of nonmissing respondents}}$$

A Rep of .9 or better means that of all the responses, of all of the respondents to all of the items, no more than 10 percent corresponds to errors of reproducibility.

The other parameter of the scales shown, the coefficient of scalability (Scal), is above the suggested .6, except for the professional scale where it is at .59. This coefficient is derived by the formula:

$$\text{Scal} = \frac{\text{pi}}{1 - \text{mmr}} \quad \text{where:}$$

mmr = minimum marginal reproducibility, or the summation of the maximum marginals for each item divided by the total number of responses

pi = percent improvement, or the difference between the Rep and the minimal marginal reproducibility

The coefficient of scalability is a true measure of a scale's cumulativeness and unidimensionality.

Scale means indicate the degree of difficulty of each scale and may be interpreted as an overall measure of deviancy for the scale. Hence, the work scale appears to be the most "deviant," followed by the self scale, and then the professional scale. Inter-correlations among the scales ranged from .45 to .47 and, in the replication to be reported next, ranged from .20 to .54, the latter between the work and self scales.

The behaviors are ordered such that the more difficult or more deviant items appear on the left-hand side, whereas the least difficult, or what has been referred to as the "adaptive" behaviors, appear on the right-hand side. Individual item means and scale cutting points are also shown. Although the adaptive behaviors are still considered detrimental, any professional or manager reviewing the scales should understand that as one moves to the left on the scale, the behaviors gradually become more counterproductive. Further, given the criterion of cumulativeness, individuals who engage in any given behavior can be expected also to have tried (or certainly to have considered to be personally available) the behaviors to the right of that behavior.

It should be noted that the survey instrument measures perception of behavior rather than behavior per se. This may constitute an inferior method of deriving behavioral scales compared to direct observation of behavior. However, in this instance, direct observation of these socially undesirable behaviors may not only have been impossible but also might have contained as much subjectivity as the self-reports. Further, the extreme care given to the issue of anonymity renders substantial confidence in the respondents' answers to this set of sensitive questions.

REPLICATION

A replication of the original study was conducted to begin the process of establishing validity parameters for the three scales of professional deviant/adaptive behavior. The replication sample was drawn from three classes of mature students attending the part-time MBA program at the author's host institution. Again,

only professionals who had no or limited supervisory responsibilities (<10 subordinates) were queried.

Eight-four usable questionnaires were processed. Compared to the original sample, respondents from the replication sample were younger (average age being 33), more gender-diverse (43% female), were employed by somewhat smaller employers (average size of 21,000 employees), were slightly more diversified by industry with the largest representation being from financial services (41%), and supervised fewer people (of the 42% who supervised, they supervised on average just three others). They were also somewhat more deviance-inclined as 73% compared to 60% indicated that they practiced some deviant/adaptive behavior. However, like the original sample, they were predominantly white (92%), had an average salary of \$44,000 (\$3,000 less than the original sample, not inflation-adjusted), worked for their employer for five years, and represented predominantly the engineering (36%) and finance professions (52%), though these percentages are nearly reverse from the original.

The respondents of the replication survey were administered a questionnaire containing among a variety of items the exact same set of questions on deviant/adaptive behaviors as were posed to the original respondents. As in the first instance, respondents were asked to indicate on a scale from 1 to 9 the degree to which they engaged in a particular behavior. These data were submitted to scalogram analysis. The results display a reasonable replication of the original three scales. Each survived intact with the same order and number of variables. The only change was a slight adjustment in the cutting points in each scale. The coefficients of reproducibility were .96, .91, and .90 respectively, the work scale coefficient showing improvement over the original. Unfortunately, two of the scalability coefficients fell below .60. These coefficients were .74, .51, and .52 respectively. Although the latter coefficients are disappointing, they are sufficient to explore the discriminant validity of the scales.

Included in the replication questionnaire were a number of items designed to test for the discriminant properties of each of the scales. Table 6 displays correlations with a select list of these discriminant constructs. The reported variables were constructed from established scales and each was tested for adequate factor structure and reliability.

From the model of professional deviant/adaptive behavior, we know that conflict in the work environment can lead to deviant reactions. In the replication study, a set of conflict measures were constructed

from Hackman and Lawler's Job Diagnostic Survey (1971). The JDS can measure both need strength of as well as satisfaction with particular job dimensions, such as, task significance, task identity, challenge, growth, autonomy, and feedback. Need strength is defined as the individual's desire to obtain a particular job quality from his or her work. The replication's conflict measures were computed as the difference between the respondent's need strength and actual satisfaction on the respective job dimension. Any conflict arising from these work-related constructs could lead to deviant reactions. In fact, particular conflict dimensions could be predicted to be associated with particular deviant reactions. Hence, task significance and task identity conflict would most likely be associated with work deviance, challenge and growth with self deviance, and autonomy and feedback with professional deviance.

The results, shown in Table 6, only partially support these predictions. Conflict over task significance did not significantly correlate with work deviance but did with self deviance. Given that task significance may represent a form of self-efficacy, since it was defined as the feeling of worthwhile accomplishment, it nevertheless represents a reasonable, though unexpected, finding. There was not sufficient conflict over task identity to conduct a further correlational analysis, but the need strength task identity variable did correlate significantly and negatively with work deviance. This suggests that one's desire to do the "whole" job can possibly counteract work deviance.

The correlations for challenge and growth conflict with self deviance were .18 and .20 respectively but only significant at the .1 level, thus not reported in Table 6. However, they were totally uncorrelated with the two other deviance forms. Finally, conflict over feedback, an important professional predisposition representing the need to find out how one is doing, was associated with professional deviance but autonomy conflict was not. The latter result is disappointing given the professional's historic obsession with autonomy. Yet, recent studies have cautioned that there are different facets of autonomy which appeal to professionals (Bailyn, 1985; Raelin, 1989), and the present measure entailed a more comprehensive treatment of autonomy including, for example, autonomy over goals as well as procedures. The autonomy measure did correlate, however, with the self scale. These results point to some imprecision in the conflict discriminant variables to differentiate among the three forms of deviance.

Turning to the personality measures, it was expected that self-esteem, sensitivity to criticism, and

depressed mood at work would correlate most strongly with self deviance. Self-esteem might serve to dampen the need to resort to deviant reactions whereas sensitivity to criticism could serve to heighten use of these behaviors. Depression at work, meanwhile, could serve as a sufficient reaction to leave those affected without either the need or personal resources to react in an adaptive or deviant manner. The results generally sustained the foregoing predictions. Self-esteem and sensitivity to criticism (both from Rosenberg, 1965) were significantly correlated with self deviance, although each was additionally correlated with a separate form, and depressed mood at work (from Quinn and Shepard, 1974) was highly correlated with self deviance. The latter also registered a high negative correlation with the work scale, suggesting a possible substitution effect for deviance not only in private behavior but in one's work environment.

Two organization-wide constructs, participative decision making and organizational identification, were expected to dampen the need for work deviance. Both the former (from the Survey of Organizations by Taylor and Bowers, 1972) and the latter (from the Organizational Climate Questionnaire by Litwin and Stringer, 1968) were in fact negatively correlated with work deviance, but were equally and more strongly negatively correlated with self deviance. Participative decision making was also negatively correlated with professional deviance.

Finally, two constructs, time in position and professional commitment, were expected to be negatively associated with professional deviance. As regards the former, the long-established negative relationship between seniority and cosmopolitanism was expected to carry over into a lowered need to exhibit deviant professional behavior. Further, the greater one's professional commitment, the less likely the need to resort to professional deviance. The first prediction was supported by the data, but the second was not, although professional commitment was found to be highly and negatively correlated with the other two forms of deviance. This result might be explained in two ways. First, the professional commitment scale, which was derived from Morrow and Wirth (1989) might have, as these authors conjectured, as equally indicated work commitment as professional commitment. Contrarily, the depressed negative professional deviance correlation might have resulted from one's professional commitment having been frustrated by organizational demands.

DISCUSSION

The findings from the replication study, though not conclusive, lend sufficient support for the further development of the scales of professional deviant/adaptive behavior. The three scales were reproduced using Guttman scalogram analysis and were shown to have some discriminating power.

Further research, be it to continue the validation of the scales or to use them to investigate professional behavior in organizations, is urged. The appendix to this article provides scoring instructions, using the replication study's new cutting points, to help researchers reconstruct the scales. For those attempting further replications, be advised that since the original scale development, there has been growing criticism of the use of Guttman scalogram analysis. The essence of the criticism is that Guttman scales do not recognize probabilistic processes in item responses (Hambleton and Swaminathan, 1985) and hence do not allow for such considerations as item weighting or guessing. However, scalogram applications persist, be they in marketing research (Dickinson and Kirzner, 1986); health care (Travis and McAuley, 1990), travel research (Um and Crompton, 1987), as well as in professional behavior (Bullard and Snizek, 1988). Researchers also seem intent on improving Guttman scaling procedures, for example, through such devices as latent class analysis (Feick, 1989) and LSA, longitudinal scalogram analysis (Hays and Ellickson, 1990).

Regarding validation efforts, researchers might continue to establish convergence by administering the questionnaire to different professional groups in different settings. Furthermore, as this study used self-reports as a basis for discerning the practice of deviant/adaptive behavior, other studies might attempt to assess their incidence using peer or managerial assessment and then determine if these different methods converge.

In establishing discriminant validity, researchers need to be careful not to lump the scales together since they were designed to represent different behavioral reactions. Unfortunately, the replication reported here did not demonstrate clear differentiation among the three forms of deviance. In fact, self deviance was found to represent nearly a generalized expression of alienation. Professional deviance was found to be the least differentiable. Attempts should be made to associate other more reliable behavioral constructs, such as opportunities to attend professional society meetings or to publish papers, with the professional deviance

scale.

Turning to the consideration of the types of research questions to pursue using these scales, a number come to mind: is there a threshold of professional conflict above which behavioral responses turn to outright deviance; are the deviancy scales transferable to all salaried professional groups or even to nonprofessional occupations and which professionals in which organizations are prone to exhibit which kinds of responses; is turnover related to a particular set of deviant responses; which behaviors or behavioral sets are most strongly related to individual and organizational performance; to what extent are the findings generalizable across cultures.

Further research is needed to establish how management and professionals themselves can cope with professional deviant/adaptive behavior. The behaviors on the work scale seem to have the most potential for organizational harm, whereas those on the self scale seem to have the most potential for personal harm. Policies which attempt to uphold the dignity of the salaried professional as a person of self-worth, as an employee who is valued for his/her contribution to both job and organization, and as a professional fully committed to both profession and organization, appear to have a high likelihood of countering deviant reactions.

CONCLUSION

This study has created three scales of professional deviance within organizations which, based on a model of professional deviant/adaptive behavior, cumulatively orders behaviors in terms of their deviance. The most deviant responses, such as unethical practices, failure to uphold secrets, flaunting of external offers, poor performance, and absenteeism/tardiness, are resorted to by few professionals. Although most professionals face conflict in their organizations as a direct result of their professionalism, they tend to exhibit adaptive behaviors. Adaptiveness, though not necessarily problem-solving or accommodative in nature, at least does not cause inordinate harm to the professionals themselves or to their organization. However, the potential is always present for the behavior extending to the point of deviance.

References

- Anderson, R.E. A computer program for Guttman scaling with the Goodenough technique. Behavioral Science, 1966, 11, 235.
- Aranya, N. and Ferris, K. R. A reexamination of accountants' organizational-profession conflict. The Accounting Review, 1984, 59, 1-14.
- Bailyn, L. Autonomy in the industrial R&D lab. Human Resource Management, 1985, 24, 129-146.
- Bartol, K. M. Professionalism as a predictor of organizational commitment, role stress, and turnover: A multidimensional approach. Academy of Management Journal, 1979, 22, 815-821.
- Blau, P. M. A formal theory of differentiation in organization. American Sociological Review, 1968, 73, 453-467.
- Blau, P.M. and Scott, W. R. Formal organizations: A comparative approach. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing, 1962.
- Bullard, J. H. and Snizek, W. E. Factors affecting the acceptability of advertisements among professionals. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 1988, 16, 57-63.
- Cherniss, C. Staff burnout. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980.
- Dickinson, J. R. and Kirzner, E. Priority patterns of acquisition of financial assets. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 1986, 14, 43-49.

Edwards, A. L. On Guttman scale analysis. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1948, 8, 313-318.

Feick, L. F. Latent class analysis of survey questions that include don't know responses. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1989, 53, 525-547.

Gouldner, A. W. Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1957 and 1958, 2, 281-306 and 444-480.

Hackman, J. R. and Lawler, E. E. Employee reactions to job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 259-286.

Hambleton, R. K. and Swaminathan, H. Item response theory: Principles and applications. Boston: Kluwer, 1985.

Hayes, R. D. and Ellickson, P. L. Longitudinal scalogram analysis: A methodology and microcomputer program for Guttman scale analysis of longitudinal data. In N. J. Castellan, Jr. (ed.), Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 1990, 22, 162-166.

Hollinger, R. C. and Clark, J. P. Theft by employees. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1983.

Kornhauser, W. Scientists in industry. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962.

Lachman, R. and Aranya, N. Job attitudes and turnover intentions among professionals in different work settings. Organization Studies, 1986, 7, 279-293.

La Porte, T. R. Conditions of strain and accommodation in industrial research organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1965, 10, 21-37.

Lebell, D. Managing professionals: The quiet conflict. Personnel Journal, 1980, 59, 566-572.

Litwin, G. H. and Stringer, R. A. Motivation and organizational climate. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968.

McKelvey, W. M. Expectational noncomplementarity and style of interaction between professional and organization. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1969, 14, 21-32.

Merton, R. K. Social structure and social theory. New York: The Free Press, 1957.

Morrow, P.C. and Goetz, J. F. Professionalism as a form of work commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1988, 32, 92-111.

Morrow, P. C. and Wirth, R. E. Work commitment among salaried professionals. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1989, 34, 40-56.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K. and Bent, D. H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Orcutt, J. D. Analyzing deviance. Homewood, IL: Dorsey, 1983.

Parsons, T. The social system. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1951.

Quinn, R. P. and Shepard, L. J. The 1972-73 quality of employment survey. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social

Research, University of Michigan, 1974.

Raelin, J. A. An analysis of professional deviance in organizations. Human Relations, 1986, 39, 1103-1130.

Raelin, J. A. An anatomy of autonomy: Managing professionals. Academy of Management Executive, 1989, 3, 216-228.

Raelin, J. A. An examination of deviant/adaptive behavior in the organizational careers of professionals. Academy of Management Review, 1984, 9, 413-427.

Raelin, J. A. The clash of cultures: Managers Managing professionals. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1991.

Rosenberg, M. Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Taylor, J. C. and Bowers, D. G. Survey of organizations. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1972.

Travis, S. S. and McAuley, W. J. Simple counts of the number of basic ADL dependencies for long-term care research and practice. Health Services Research, 1990, 25, 350-360.

Um, S. and Crompton, J. L. Measuring resident's attachment levels in a host community. Journal of Travel Research, 1987, 26, 27-29.

Wallace, J. E. Professional and organizational commitment: Compatible or incompatible? Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1993, 42, 333-349.

Table 1
The Continua of Professional Deviant/Adaptive Behavior

ADAPTIVE **DEVIANT**


Vis-a-vis Management	Freedom from procedural constraints More autonomy, authority Professional privileges Retreat to technology	Work-to-Rule Interpersonal sabotage Unethical practices	Refusal to implement Failure to uphold secrets
Vis-a-vis Job	Privacy "Busyness" Bootlegging Boredom	Extended breaks Absenteeism and Tardiness Poor performance	
Vis-a-vis Self	Rationalization Outside interests Apathy and indifference Burnout Alienation Mental and physical illness		
Vis-a-vis Career	Professional allegiance External performance emphasis Premature external search Inadequate internal search	Internal inactivity Flaunting of external offers	

Source: Raelin (1984), p. 422.

Table 2



Questions Used to Evaluate the Deviant/Adaptive Behavior Variables

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Question</u>
<i>Vis-a-vis Management</i>	
Adaptive Behavior	
Freedom from procedural constraints*	I look for ways to free myself from procedural or bureaucratic constraints
Professional privileges*	I request professional privileges, such as the opportunity to participate in professional association meetings, to work exclusively on projects making use of my professional skills, to continue my formal education, etc.
More autonomy, authority*	I demand greater autonomy and/or authority in my work
Retreat to technology [†]	I am inclined to perform tasks beyond those which strictly make use of my technical competence
Refusal to implement	I show little interest in the implementation side of the work that I do
Work-to-Rule*	I do the exact work that is required of me, never more and never less
Interpersonal sabotage	I tend to talk to others in the company about all the things that are wrong here
Failure to uphold secrets	I discuss confidential matters with unauthorized personnel within the organization as well as with those outside the organization
Unethical practices*	I engage in behaviors which essentially serve my exclusive self-interest even when they are unethical
Deviant Behavior	
<i>Vis-a-vis Job</i>	
Adaptive Behavior	
Privacy	I look for ways to achieve greater privacy in my job
"Busyness"*	I am really too "busy" to get to the things that might

	<p>prove more useful to my organization</p> <p>Bootlegging* I engage in projects that will benefit my personal career even though they may not pay off for the company</p> <p>Boredom* I am bored and uninterested in the tasks I have to perform</p> <p>Extended breaks I take extended work breaks</p> <p>Absenteeism* and Tardiness I am absent (late) from work without sufficient cause</p> <p>Poor performance Even though I am capable of doing better, I perform my job below acceptable standards</p>
<p>Deviant Behavior</p>	

Vis-a-vis Self

Adaptive Behavior

	<p>Rationalization* I adapt to my work environment by resorting to excuses or rationalizations</p> <p>Outside interests* I focus my attention on outside interests, such as family, leisure activities, or community affairs, rather than my work</p> <p>Apathy and indifference* I would say that in this organization, I am apathetic and indifferent</p> <p>Burnout* As for my work here, I would say I am "burning out," that is, I am becoming emotionally detached from my job, I no longer feel personal responsibility for outcomes, etc.</p> <p>Alienation* I experience a sense of powerlessness and lack of control over my life and work</p> <p>Mental and physical Perhaps due to the strain of my work, I would say there is something mentally wrong with me (I have physical ailments).</p>
 <p>Deviant Behavior</p>	

Vis-a-vis Career

Adaptive Behavior



Professional allegiance*

I demonstrate a strong allegiance to my profession by becoming active in my professional association, by

forming close ties with professional colleagues outside my organization, etc.

External performance* emphasis

I put more emphasis on work that is professionally or externally evaluated as opposed to organizationally or internally evaluated

Premature external search*

I search for new employment even though the chances of finding an acceptable alternative are unlikely at this time

Inadequate internal search[†]

I choose to look within the organization for career opportunities

Internal inactivity[†]

I become involved in "extra-work" organizational activities, such as committees, volunteer services, etc.

Flaunting of external offers*

I talk to others freely about all the other job offers I could get elsewhere in my field

Deviant Behavior

* These variables are used in preparing the three deviant/adaptive scales. The entire questionnaire or just the questions for these 18 variables may be used in future research. Researchers should randomly re-arrange the questions.

[†] Scoring for these variables was reversed in preparation for scaling.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Deviant/Adaptive Behavior Variables

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Management		
Freedom from procedural constraints	5.69	2.44
Professional privileges	5.06	2.56
More autonomy, authority	4.97	2.35
Retreat to technology	5.57	2.38
Refusal to implement	1.93	1.50
Work-to-Rule	2.17	1.42
Interpersonal sabotage	3.23	2.06
Failure to uphold secrets	1.54	1.12
Unethical practices	1.35	0.85
Job		
Privacy	3.40	2.00
"Busyness"	2.62	1.54
Booieging	3.30	2.12
Boredom	3.06	2.26
Extended breaks	2.01	1.49
Absenteeism	1.37	0.85
Tardiness	1.98	1.60
Poor Performance	1.84	1.40
Self		
Rationalization	2.27	1.87
Outside interests	3.62	1.94
Apathy and indifference	2.41	1.78
Burnout	3.10	2.33
Alienation	3.29	2.45
Mental illness	1.56	1.13
Physical illness	1.87	1.67
Career		
Professional allegiance	3.78	2.36
External performance emphasis	3.65	2.37
Premature external search	4.37	2.89
Inadequate internal search	4.90	2.45
Internal inactivity	4.49	2.24
Faunting of external offers	1.60	1.17

Table 4

The Extreme Deviant and Adaptive Behaviors (n = 115)

<u>Deviant</u>	<u>Means^a</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Adaptive</u>	<u>Means</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
Unethical practices	1.95	0.85	Freedom from procedural constraints	5.69	2.44
Absenteeism ^a	1.97	0.85	Retreat to technology	5.57	2.96
Failure to uphold secrets	1.54	1.12	Professional privileges	5.06	2.56
Mental illness ^b	1.56	1.13	More autonomy, authority	4.97	2.35
Flaunting of external offers	1.60	1.17	Inadequate internal search	4.90	2.45
Poor performance	1.84	1.40	Internal inactivity	4.49	2.29
Physical illness	1.87	1.67	Premature external search	4.37	2.89
Refusal to implement	1.93	1.50			
Tardiness	1.98	1.61			

* Means are derived from Likert scales ranging from values of 1= never engage in a particular behavior to 9 = very frequently engage in a particular behavior

^a Absenteeism and Tardiness were originally combined in the theoretical continuum

^b Mental and Physical illness were also originally combined

Table 5
Guttman Scales of Professional Deviant/Adaptive Behavior

WORK SCALE		Unethical Practices (1.3) ^b		Absenteeism (1.4)		Work-to-Rule (2.2)		"Busyness" (2.6)		Bootlegging (3.3)		Freedom from procedures (5.7)			
Reproducibility =	.94	4a	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2			
Scalability =	.61														
Mean =	2.77	S.D. =		1.08											
SELF SCALE		Flaunting of external offers (1.6)		Rationalization (2.3)		Alienation (3.3)		Apathy (2.4)		Boredom (3.1)		Burnout (3.1)		Outside interests (3.6)	
Reproducibility =	.93	5	5	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Scalability =	.70														
Mean =	3.40	S.D. =		.74											
PROFESSIONAL SCALE		Premature external search (4.4)		External performance emphasis (3.7)		Professional allegiance (3.8)		Professional privileges (5.1)		More authority (5.0)					
Reproducibility =	.92	5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Scalability =	.59														
n =	3.97	S.D. =		1.09											

^aCutting points used for each variable in the scale
^bIndividual item means

Table 6
Correlations to Test for Discriminant Validity of the Three
Deviance Scales Using the Replication Sample

	<u>Work Deviance</u>	<u>Self Deviance</u>	<u>Professional Deviance</u>
Conflict over Task Significance	.08	.38**	-.06
Need for Task Identity	-.27*	-.21	-.20
Conflict over Feedback	.03	.08	.23*
Conflict over Autonomy	-.01	.23*	.06
Self-Esteem	-.16	-.26*	-.24*
Sensitivity to Criticism	.27*	.29**	.14
Depressed Mood at Work	-.44**	-.62**	-.21
Participative Decision Making	-.24*	-.41**	-.23*
Organizational Identification	-.26*	-.46**	-.20
Time in Position	-.06	.04	-.23*
Professional Commitment	-.34**	-.57**	-.14

Key: (for two-tailed Pearson Correlation Coefficients)

* significance < .05

** significance < .01

APPENDIX

SCORING INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE: "PROFESSIONAL DEVIANCE QUESTIONNAIRE"

Note: Each item in the questionnaire is originally scaled from 1 to 9 (no missing values).
The WORKSCALE may assume values from 0 to 6, SELFSCALE from 0 to 7, and PROSCALE from 0 to 5.

Computing the WORKSCALE: (start with WORKSCALE = 0)

If: freedom from	
procedural constraints	GE 2 = +1
bootlegging	GE 2 = +1
"busyness"	GE 3 = +1
work-to-rule	GE 4 = +1
absenteeism	GE 4 = +1
unethical practices	GE 4 = +1

Computing the SELFSCALE (start with SELFSCALE = 0)

If outside interests	GE 2 = +1
burnout	GE 2 = +1
boredom	GE 2 = +1
apathy and indifference	GE 3 = +1
alienation	GE 3 = +1
rationalization	GE 6 = +1
flaunting of external offers	GE 7 = +1

Computing the PROSCALE (start with PROSCALE = 0)

If more authority	GE 2 = +1
professional privileges	GE 2 = +1
professional allegiance	GE 2 = +1
external performance emphasis	GE 3 = +1
premature external search	GE 5 = +1

BIOGRAPHY

JOSEPH A. RAELIN is Professor of Administrative Sciences at the Boston College Carroll School of Management. His research focuses on managerial learning and on the management of professionals, determining, in particular, how to create organizational climates receptive to the mutual goals of managerial proficiency and professional accomplishment. His most recent book is: **The Clash of Cultures: Managers Managing Professionals** (Harvard Business School Press, 1991).