

An explorative study regarding the relationship between the Light Triad of personality, counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behaviour

Romascanu Marius Constantin

Lecturer, National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Faculty of Communication and Public Relations, Bucharest, Romania

ORCID ID:0000-0002-5943-8360

Email: marius.romascanu@comunicare.ro

Stanescu Dan Florin

Associate Professor, National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Faculty of Communication and Public Relations, Bucharest, Romania

ORCID ID:0000-0001-8188-903X

Email: dan.stanescu@comunicare.ro

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.19275/RSEP153>

Article Type: Original/Research Paper

Article History

Received: 10 March 2023 Revised: 25 May 2023 Accepted: 28 May 2023 Available Online: 1 June 2023

Keywords: light triad, personality, CWB, OCB.

JEL classification: M50, M500

Citation: Romascanu, M. C., Stanescu, D. F. (2023). An explorative study regarding the relationship between the Light Triad of personality, counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behaviour, *Review of Socio-Economic Perspectives*, 8(2), 19-28.

Copyright © The Author(s) 2023 This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract

The research aims to explore the relationships between the Light Triad of personality, Counterproductive Work Behaviors, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. This study is based on a quantitative, cross-sectional, and correlational design. The sample consists of 115 participants (89 females and 26 males) aged between 22 and 45 years ($M=28.33$, $AS=10.14$). The participants were invited to answer a series of research instruments: the Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C, Spector et al., 2006), the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C, Fox et al., 2012), and the Light Triad Scale (LTS, Kaufman et al., 2019). The results indicate significant negative correlations between the Light Triad and Counterproductive Work Behaviors ($\rho=-.255$, $p<.01$) and significant positive correlations between the Light Triad and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors ($r=.283$, $p<.01$). Finally, the practical implications, the limits of research, and future research directions are discussed.

1. Introduction

In the last decades, personality research has focused mainly on the dark side of personality, with a very limited number of studies on the positive side. In 2002, Paulhus and Williams introduced the concept of the “Dark Triad” of personality (i.e., Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy). Since then, more than 500 articles on dark personality traits have been published in over 150 journals (Dinic & Jevremov, 2019).

While expanding research on the Dark Triad continues, the positive side of personality – the Light Triad, was first conceptualized in 2019 by Kaufman, Yaden, Hyde, and Tsukayama. This new conceptualization can contribute to the detailing and enriching of the personality profile and, applied in an organizational context, it can establish new correlations with a large array of organizational behaviors.

In this respect, unlike task performance, which is predicted, among others, by general intelligence, the level of knowledge, skills, and abilities, extra-role performance, or organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), which significantly contributes to organizational development, shows a clear connection with personality (Chiaburu et al., 2011).

Although task performance is usually the primary criterion in the context of personnel selection, research indicates that workplace deviance is one of the most detrimental behaviors to organizational success (Dunlop & Lee, 2004).

Therefore, counterproductive workplace behavior (CWB) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) are two frequently studied forms of active and volitional behavior. These forms of extra-role behavior that could harm organizations (i.e., counterproductive behaviors) or support progress (i.e., civic behaviors) were, until recently, treated separately and considered opposites in terms of the causes and consequences associated with each (Sackett, 2002).

The propensity to act deviant at work is not limited to a particular workplace but, similar to organizational citizenship behaviors, crosses tasks, jobs, and work environments (Podsakoff et al., 2009). This concern is due to both the acuteness of the presence of undesirable behaviors in the workplace and their considerable impact on personal and organizational outcomes (Griffin & Lopez, 2005).

2. Literature review

2.1. Light Triad of personality

One of the most influential theories of socially undesirable personality traits is the Dark Triad of Personality, conceptualized by Paulhus and Williams (2002). Comprising three dimensions (i.e., Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and Subclinical Psychopathy), the Dark Triad has been included in much empirical research, with a large number of studies dedicated to correlating its characteristics with a variety of psychosocial outcomes (Dinic & Wertag, 2018; Koladich & Atkinson, 2016, Paulhus, 2014). A few years ago, a fourth dark trait - sadism - was added to the Dark Triad, forming a Dark Tetrad (Paulhus, 2014).

Previous research has shown that individuals who score high on these traits tend to be more arrogant and volatile, and are more likely to engage in antisocial activities and generate social distress. While this research trend has generated a considerable number of findings that allow us to understand the negative aspects of personality, the positive dimensions of mental life and their individual and social consequences have not been consistently investigated (Gerymski & Krok, 2019).

Meanwhile, the positive psychology literature has revealed a large number of positive characteristics that largely determine human functioning (e.g., life satisfaction, positive emotions, personal growth, self-actualization, and forgiveness). This approach proved successful, as it demonstrated that human nature not only revolves around negativity and pathology but also contains a positive, development-oriented side.

Following the direction reflected by this perspective, Kaufman, Yaden, Hyde, and Tsukayama (2019) proposed an antithetical construct of the Dark Triad. Aiming to contrast the dark side of the personality with the light, the authors introduced the term "Light Triad".

Using a large number of different scales that capture the influence of the Dark Triad on a variety of elements (e.g., personality, psychological needs and motives, values, defense styles, worldview, self-esteem and authenticity, relationships, empathy, compassion, styles interpersonal, egoism, aggression, moral judgment, religion, spirituality, self-transcendence, curiosity, and life satisfaction), Kaufman and his collaborators (2019) developed the Light Triad Scale (LTS). The Light Triad scale reflects a caring, selfless attitude that can be identified in everyday life. The conceptual meaning of the three factors is deeply rooted in the field of positive psychology, reflecting a generally optimistic view of people (Gerymski, & Krok, 2019).

The Light Triad consists of three dimensions: Kantianism, Humanism, and Trust in Humanity. The idea was not to create a construct that was just a reverse-coded version of the Dark Triad (Gerymski & Krok, 2019), but to outline a conceptual orientation that allows for the measurement of positive aspects of personality.

Kantianism is based on Immanuel Kant's second formulation of his categorical imperative, which imposes as a moral condition of actions, treating people with dignity and respect, relating to them as deserving human beings, without degrading them and without he treated them as "means" to ends, but as ends in themselves. Humanism is about appreciating the dignity and worth of each individual. Trust in humanity is characterized by belief in the fundamental goodness of people (Kaufman et al., 2019).

Kantianism, Humanism, and Trust in Humanity represent the potential strengths of humanity and capture the tendency to move from a negative approach to human nature to a positive one, emphasizing constructive and ethical interaction. The Light Triad factors also reflect the ability to resist, to a great extent, the thoughts and desires that lead people to engage in selfish, volatile, and hostile behaviors.

About two decades ago, Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000, apud Lukic & Zivanovic, 2021) promoted positive psychology as a pathway of research in the field of psychology with an emphasis on human strengths and virtues. This orientation took shape in the context of the predominance of a "negative tendency" to approach the individual, with a disproportionate emphasis on psychopathology, to the detriment of the individual's potential development perspective (Maddux, 2002).

2.2. Counterproductive Work Behavior

Describing employees as active and proactive tends to have a positive connotation (Frese & Fay, 2001). However, as Spector and Fox (2002) point out, people can be active and take the initiative in many ways, including negative behaviors, called counterproductive work behaviors. Research on counterproductive workplace behaviors has proliferated in recognition of the financial, personal, and organizational costs associated with counterproductive behavior (Kelloway et al., 2010).

The concept's most well-known and comprehensive definition is provided by Spector and Fox (2002, p. 271), who describe it as emphasizing its purpose: "is that behavior intended to harm the organization or members of the organization." Building on Kaplan's (1975) notion of organizational norms, Robinson and Bennett (1995) defined workplace deviance as behavior that voluntarily and consciously violates organizational norms, thereby threatening the well-being of members and the organization in assembly. Thus, according to this framework, workplace deviance is not defined in terms of moral standards, but rather by reference to deviations from formal norms as prescribed in norms, procedures, and policies. Furthermore, this approach states that to be considered deviant, a behavior must at least have the potential to harm either the organization or its members, excluding a violation of good manners.

Robinson and Bennett (1995) presented a comprehensive, two-dimensional typology in which any behavior that fits the definition can be categorized and differentiated from other deviant actions. The first dimension of deviant behaviors – severity – classifies them as minor or severe. Some deviant behavior such as having conversations instead of completing tasks would be classified as a minor deviant act. Other incidents, such as physical assault, would be classified as serious. The second dimension of deviant behaviors is aimed at the target, so the behavior can be harmful to an individual's well-being, in which case interpersonal deviance occurs, or it can affect the organization, in which case organizational deviance is identified. Combining these two dimensions results in four quadrants that form the basis of the classification of deviant behavior: deviance from production (i.e. low severity, organizational target, e.g. leaving early or too many breaks), deviance from property (i.e. high severity, organizational target, e.g., theft or embezzlement), political deviance (i.e., low severity, interpersonal target, e.g., gossip or unfair competition), and personal aggression (i.e., high severity, interpersonal target, e.g., verbal abuse or sexual harassment).

Another distinction is made by Bowling and Gruys (2010), who consider whether actions contravene legal regulations (e.g., theft, assault, drug use) or not (e.g., lateness, slow work pace, waste of time). This dimension captures a potential fear of legal sanctions and the social stigma associated with law-breaking behaviors and may cause most people to avoid engaging in illegal behaviors.

Researchers have also considered hostile versus instrumental aggression (Bushman & Anderson, 2001). While hostile aggression involves the infliction of harm itself, instrumental aggression captures the use of aggression to obtain benefits. Spreading a rumor about a co-worker, an action initiated to harm that person, is an example of hostile aggression. On the other hand, spreading a rumor about a rival colleague so that the one who started the rumor increases his chances of success at the expense of the colleague is an example of instrumental aggression.

2.3. Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The idea of extra-role behavior and the study of its impact on the effectiveness of organizations can be attributed to researchers Katz and Kahn (1966, apud Spik, 2018), who argue that there are three ways in which employees can contribute to organizational well-being. One of these forms was called innovative and spontaneous behavior, concerning the performance shown beyond the demands of the role, to fulfill organizational functions. The manifestation of extra-role performance includes cooperative attitudes, protecting the organizational system, continuous professional development, and creating a favorable image of the organization in the external environment (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006).

Organ (1988, apud Mahdiun, Ghahramani, & Sharif, 2010, p. 4) defined organizational citizenship behaviors as "individual discretionary behaviors that are not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that, as a whole, promote the effective functioning of organization".

Bolino and Turnley (2003) discovered two common characteristics of organizational citizenship behaviors: they are not directly applicable (i.e. they are not technically necessary as a requirement for the performance of tasks) and they are embodiments of additional, extra-role efforts that organizations need their workforce to be successful. According to the two authors, examples of organizational civic behaviors are the following: voluntary assistance to colleagues, professional development, compliance with company rules (even when no one is checking), promoting and protecting the organization, and maintaining a positive and tolerant attitude about inconveniences at work.

Bolino, Turnley, and Bloodgood (2002) defined organizational citizenship behavior as employees' willingness to go beyond formal workplace requirements to help each other, to subordinate their interests to organizational ones, and to genuinely care about the organization's activities and overall mission.

Organ and his collaborators (2006) conducted a comprehensive study on research related to the dimensions of the construct and established the existence of the following types of organizational citizenship behaviors: *organizational compliance* is identified by actions such as: following the rules and regulations of the organization, even when the violation of the regulations could not be observed by anyone, and using only a fraction of leave when possible; *endurance*, which refers to going through difficult situations without complaints, to displaying a positive attitude, regardless of the context; *civic virtue* is revealed by participating in decision-making processes that concern the organization and supporting the administrative function of the organization, such as participating in meetings that are not mandatory and engaging in the process of organizational change; *helping behavior* includes altruism, maintaining a non-conflictual organizational climate, and offering support; *individual initiative* stands out through the voluntary assumption of new responsibilities and tasks that support the well-being of the company, encouraging others to adopt a similar behavior, identifying effective ways of completing tasks; *organizational loyalty* involves promoting the organization in the external environment and protecting it against criticism from people outside the company; *personal development* is achieved through voluntary activities to develop knowledge and skills to increase task performance.

2.4. Previous empirical studies

Organizational citizenship behaviors are essential for effective organizational functioning because they increase managerial and executive productivity and strengthen the organization's ability to attract and retain the best employees (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Research on the predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors has focused, in particular, on personal factors (Bourdage et al., 2012) and less on contextual factors, although the organizational environment, as a whole, as well as concrete elements of it, can influence the occurrence of organizational citizenship behaviors.

Studies conducted to capture the social reality of the construct have associated it with certain traits and values, such as prosocial personality (Penner, Midili, & Kegelmeyer, 1997), orientation towards others (Meglino & Korsgaard, 2004) and empathy (Joireman et al., 2006).

People with high scores on the Light Triad traits tend to be empathetic, compassionate, cooperative, and forgiving, and strive to maintain high-quality relationships with others. They also tend to be highly concerned with how their actions may affect others and therefore pay close attention to their behaviors so as not to be viewed as aggressive (Kaufman et al., 2019).

According to Kaufman and colleagues (2019), the Light Triad is associated with more positive and optimistic attitudes, higher levels of personal growth, quality of life, and well-being. Research has shown that psychological well-being, which consists of positive traits, has contributed to social and emotional development, helping to understand other people and their social environment, especially understanding what is good and worth setting as a goal (Schmid & Muldoon, 2015). Therefore, the Light Triad provides a deeper insight into

how people understand ethically and socially caring and compassionate values and behaviors (Gerymski & Krok, 2019).

Furthermore, research has shown that individuals with certain positive personality traits can control their behaviors when experiencing negative work events and are less likely to be triggered by transient emotions (Malik et al., 2020). For example, Sulea and colleagues (2013) found that individuals who scored high on Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Emotional Stability were less likely to engage in counterproductive work behaviors in response to abusive supervision.

In another study, Yang and Diefendorff (2009) demonstrated that the positive relationship between negative emotions and counterproductive work behaviors directed at coworkers is weaker for individuals who score high on Agreeableness.

The light triad weakened the relationship between abusive supervision and evil creativity, as well as the relationship between psychological contract violation and evil creativity. These results suggest that individuals high in the Light Triad are less likely to use evil creativity to cause intentional harm to others in response to abusive supervision and psychological contract violation. Moreover, the Light Triad moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and malevolent creativity through a perceived breach of the psychological contract (Malik et al., 2020).

The actions of individuals possessing positive personality traits are less likely to be influenced by negative work events and emotions, and there is a tendency to seek more constructive ways to deal with undesirable situations at work (Yang & Diefendorff, 2009; Sulea et al., 2013).

Starting from the main findings presented in the reviewed literature, the following research questions are outlined:

RQ1: What relations could be observed between the Light Triad of personality and counterproductive work behavior (CWB)?

RQ2: What relations could be observed between the Light Triad of personality and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)?

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

This study is based on a quantitative, cross-sectional, and correlational design. The sample consists of 115 participants (89 females and 26 males) aged between 22 and 45 years ($M=28.33$, $AS=10.14$). Regarding the educational level, 14 are graduates of upper secondary education, 74 people had completed their university education, and 27 respondents had their postgraduate studies.

3.2. Instruments

The questionnaires designed to evaluate each of the variables were uploaded together with the informed consent to the Google Forms platform and distributed on social networks (i.e. Facebook), being available for completion for one month, bringing together 143 items, with an approximate duration of 20 minutes.

Counterproductive Work Behavior Checklist (CWB-C, Spector et al., 2006) integrates the vision of researchers Robinson and Bennett (1995) who differentiated the counterproductive behaviors manifested in the workplace according to their target (i.e. organizational vs. interpersonal) and the classification made by Spector and his collaborators (2006), which includes abuse, deviance of production, sabotage, theft, and withdrawal, managing to overlap the typologies. Thus, abuse falls within the scope of counterproductive interpersonal behaviors, the other four being deviant behaviors aimed at the organization.

The questionnaire contains 45 self-reported items and asks respondents to select the answers that reveal the frequency of the stated behaviors, using a five-point Likert scale, where 1 represents "Never" and 5 represents "Daily." The total score of the scale is obtained by the sum of the answers.

The scale showed excellent reliability scores (Cronbach): CWB-O (toward organization) $\alpha=.89$, CWB-I (toward individuals) $\alpha=.95$, and for the composite score CWB the score was $\alpha=.95$.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C, Fox et al., 2012) is a 20-item scale aiming at measuring self-reported extra-role behaviors. Respondents are asked to choose the answers that correspond to the frequency of manifestation of the stated behaviors, using a five-point Likert-type scale, where 1 represents "Never" and 5 signifies "Daily".

The total score of the scale is obtained by the sum of the answers. It is also possible to calculate the score for each of the two dimensions: civic behaviors directed to and for the benefit of the organization and those directed to and in helping colleagues at work.

The Cronbach alpha internal consistency index of the tool showed the following values: Organization-centered Civic Behavior $\alpha=.77$, Person-centered Civic Behavior $\alpha=.92$, and for the Organizational citizenship behaviors as a whole the index was $\alpha=.93$.

The Light Triad Scale (LTS, Kaufman et al., 2019) was recently developed and is intended to assess people's orientation, authentically and lovingly, and contains 12 items, four assigned to each of the three dimensions, as follows: Kantianism (i.e. treating people as ends and not means), Humanism (i.e. appreciating the dignity and worth of people), Trust in humanity (i.e., trust in the fundamental goodness of people).

The evaluation of the items is self-reported and requires the respondents, using a five-point Likert-type scale, where 1 represents "Strongly Disagree" and 5 signifies "Strongly Agree", to express the extent to which each statement describes them. The total score of the scale as well as the score of each facet is calculated as the mean of the assigned items.

Regarding the Cronbach alpha internal consistency index, in the present study, the following values were obtained: $\alpha=.80$ for the Light Triad scale, $\alpha=.61$ for Kantianism, $\alpha=.79$ for Humanism, and $\alpha=.70$ for Trust in humanity.

4. Results

After collection, the data were analyzed using SPSS 26.0 (IBM Corporation, 2019). Furthermore, being aware that the study is based on self-report questionnaires, to avoid the possible impact of common method bias Harman's single-factor test was performed (Tehseen, Ramayah, & Sajilan, 2017). As recommended by Podsakoff and colleagues (2003), all items corresponding to selected variables were loaded into an exploratory factor analysis to check whether one factor can explain the majority variance. The results indicated that the first factor accounted only for 27.24% of the variance.

Means, standard deviations, and normal/abnormal distribution for all the study variables are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the study variables

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis		
			Statistic	Std. Err.	Statistic	Std. Err
CWB	63.86	20.454	2.697	.226	7.843	.447
CWB-O	33.37	10.328	1.741	.226	3.191	.447
CWB-I	27.47	10.506	3.467	.226	12.329	.447
OCB	66.92	15.713	-.144	.226	-.486	.447
OCB-O	16.29	4.360	-.076	.226	-.525	.447
OCB-I	50.63	11.799	-.183	.226	-.382	.447
Light Triad	48.58	6.370	-.433	.226	-.390	.447
Kantianism	16.37	2.627	-.705	.226	.413	.447
Humanism	16.90	2.503	-.385	.226	-.835	.447
Trust in humanity	15.31	3.065	-.843	.226	1.111	.447

The analysis of the skewness and kurtosis scores displays an abnormal (nonparametric) distribution of data for all CWB scales and normal distribution for OCB and Light Triad scales.

To answer the previously mentioned research questions, the corresponding Spearman or Pearson bivariate correlation was calculated, both between the composite scores of the selected variables and between the sub-dimensions of each scale.

Regarding the first research question - RQ1: What relations could be observed between the Light Triad of personality and counterproductive work behavior (CWB)?, as can be observed in Table 2, a series of negative significant correlations were observed. Thus, the composite score of Light Triad negatively correlates with the composite score of CWB ($\rho = -.255$, $p < .01$). Moreover, the composite score of Light Triad negatively correlates with both CWB-O ($\rho = -.202$, $p < .05$) and CWB-I ($\rho = -.260$, $p < .01$). Similarly, Kantianism showed negative correlations with CWB composite score ($\rho = -.206$, $p < .05$) and with CWB-I sub-scale ($\rho = -.214$, $p < .05$). Humanism showed negative correlations both with CWB composite score ($\rho = -.284$, $p < .01$) and with CWB-O ($\rho = -.230$, $p < .05$) and CWB-I ($\rho = -.306$, $p < .01$). Trust in humanity is the only dimension of the Light Triad showing no correlations with CBW or any of its subdimensions.

Table 2. Correlation matrix Light Triad and CWB

Spearman's rho		CWB	CWB-O	CWB-I
Light Triad	Correl. Coeff.	-.255**	-.202*	-.260**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.030	.005
Kantianism	Correl. Coeff.	-.206*	-.164	-.214*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027	.080	.022
Humanism	Correl. Coeff.	-.284**	-.230*	-.306**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.013	.001
Trust in humanity	Correl. Coeff.	-.151	-.098	-.174
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.107	.298	.063

As for the second research question - RQ2: What relations could be observed between the Light Triad of personality and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)?, the results (Table 3) showed significant positive correlations between Light Triad composite score and OCB composite score ($r = .283$, $p < .01$) and with both OCB-O ($r = .297$, $p < .01$) and OCB-I ($r = .268$, $p < .01$) subdimensions. Moreover, both Humanism and Trust in Humanity subdimensions of the Light Triad showed positive correlations with OCB and its subscales. Hence, Humanism positively correlates with OCB composite score ($r = .306$, $p < .01$) and with both OCB-O ($r = .309$, $p < .01$) and OCB-I ($r = .293$, $p < .01$) dimensions. Likewise, Trust in Humanity showed a positive correlation with OCB composite score ($r = .290$, $p < .01$) and with both OCB-O ($r = .296$, $p < .01$) and OCB-I ($r = .277$, $p < .01$) dimensions.

Table 3. Correlation matrix Light Triad and OCB

		OCB	OCB-O	OCB-I
Light Triad	Pearson Correlation	.283**	.297**	.268**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.001	.004
Kantianism	Pearson Correlation	.058	.081	.047
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.539	.389	.617
Humanism	Pearson Correlation	.306**	.309**	.293**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.001
Trust in humanity	Pearson Correlation	.290**	.296**	.277**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.001	.003

5. Conclusions

Counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior are forms of active and volitional behavior that can harm organizations or support progress. Contemporary organizations have sought new ways to achieve a stable competitive advantage. Reinforcing positive extra-role behaviors is considered one of the most effective strategies for shaping a potential competitive advantage because these types of behaviors serve the good of the organization and cannot be taken over by competitors.

As mentioned, organizational citizenship behaviors refer to those actions undertaken by employees that go beyond the requirements of the job (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). Moreover, they support the social and psychological environment of the organization and, as a whole, promote the functioning of the organization. These actions are typically considered to be less likely to be rewarded by the organization and are more discretionary than task performance. Researchers have become interested in organizational citizenship behaviors because they are considered vital to the performance and viability of an organization (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006).

On the other hand, unlike task performance, the prediction of job-related deviant behavior reiterates certain personal variables and the propensity to act inappropriately in an organizational context is not limited to a specific job, but, similar to organizational citizenship behaviors, crosses tasks, companies, jobs, and work environments (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Researchers' concern regarding counterproductive work behaviors is due to both the exacerbation of undesirable workplace manifestations and their considerable impact on both personal and organizational outcomes (Griffin & Lopez, 2005).

Organizations need to understand what causes employees to exhibit extra-role behaviors, in order to be able to act in the sense of decreasing the chances of registering counterproductive behaviors, but also in the direction of increasing the probability of the appearance of civic behaviors.

Despite the valuable findings of this study, it possesses some shortcomings that have to be taken into consideration. One of the main weaknesses of this study is related to the fact the questionnaires were self-reported, and the tendency is to investigate and report attitudes, rather than behaviors (Hughes et al., 2018). In order to tackle this limitation and to avoid the common method bias we have carried out Harman's single-factor test (Tehseen, Ramayah, & Sajilan, 2017). Another issue to be considered is the relatively small sample, which makes the results difficult to generalize and the uneven gender distribution.

Although the researchers identified some personal and organizational antecedents of the aforementioned behaviors, the results of the current study provide additional information through the connections established by the Light Triad. Specifically, the findings highlight that people with high levels of the Light Triad are less likely to engage in counterproductive behaviors, but are more likely to engage in civic behaviors.

However, it should be noted that, unlike dark traits that have emerged from personality research and clinical settings as separate research subjects (e.g. Paulhus & Williams, 2002), the Light Triad appears to be largely a theoretical construct. The authors of the scale constructed the items without relying on any model of prosocial behavior or other clearly conceptually delineated constructs that mark the benevolent and loving orientation towards others but used items from the Dark Triad to establish indicators of benevolent behavior. As the Dark Triad does not represent a full spectrum of evil and antisocial behaviors (Marcus & Zeigler-Hill, 2015), there is a possibility that one set of indicators may not be sufficiently representative of prosocial behavior in general. Thus, the Light Triad scale presents characteristics that are vaguely defined at the conceptual level but narrowly captured at the operational level. Therefore, it seems difficult to fully understand its content and potential facet-level traits that need to be explored in future studies. Future studies on light traits could examine the construct in relation to other benevolent traits (e.g., altruism) to demonstrate that the dimensions of the Light Triad are distinct.

References

- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H. (2003). Going the extra mile: cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(3), 60–71. 10.2307/4165983
- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H. & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 505-522. 10.2307/4134400
- Bourdage, J. S., Lee, K., Lee, J. H., & Shin, K. H. (2012). Motives for organizational citizenship behavior: Personality correlates and coworker ratings of OCB. *Human Performance*, 25(3), 179-200. 10.1080/08959285.2012.683904
- Bowling, N. A., & Gruys, M. L. (2010). Overlooked issues in the conceptualization and measurement of counterproductive work behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(1), 54-61. 10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.03.008

- Bushman, B. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2001). Is it time to pull the plug on hostile versus instrumental aggression dichotomy? *Psychological Review*, 108(1), 273–279. 10.1037/0033-295x.108.1.273.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I.-S., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2011). The five-factor model of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1140–1166. 10.1037/a0024004
- Dinić, B. M., & Jevremov, T. (2019). Trends in research related to the Dark Triad: A bibliometric analysis. *Current Psychology*, 1–10. 10.1007/s12144-019-00250-9
- Dinić, B. M., & Wertag, A. (2018). Effects of dark triad and HEXACO traits on reactive/proactive aggression: Exploring the gender differences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 123, 44-49. 10.1016/j.paid.2017.11.003
- Dunlop, P. D., & Lee, K. (2004). Workplace deviance, organizational citizenship behavior, and business unit performance: The bad apples do spoil the whole barrel. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(1), 67–80. 10.1002/job.243
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. R. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85(1), 199-220. 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02032.x
- Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative (PI): An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 23, 133–187. 10.1016/S0191-3085(01)23005-6
- Gerymski, R., & Krok, D. (2019). Psychometric properties and validation of the Polish adaptation of the Light Triad Scale. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, 7(4), 341–354. 10.5114/cipp.2019.92960
- Griffin, R. W., & Lopez, Y. P. (2005). Bad behavior in organizations: A review and typology for future research. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 988–1005. 10.1177/0149206305279942.
- Hughes, D. J., Lee, A., Tian, A. W., Newman, A., & Legood, A. (2018). Leadership, creativity, and innovation: A critical review and practical recommendations. *Leadership Quarterly*, 29(5), 549-569. 10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.03.001
- IBM Corp. Released 2019. IBM SPSS Statistics for Macintosh, Version 26.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.
- Joireman, J., Kamdar, D., Daniels, D., & Duell, B. (2006). Good citizens to the end? It depends empathy and concern with future consequences moderate the impact of a short-term time horizon on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1307-1320. 10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1307
- Kaufman, S. B., Yaden, D. B., Hyde, E., & Tsukayama, E. (2019). The light vs. dark triad of personality: Contrasting two very different profiles of human nature. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 467-467. 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00467
- Kelloway, E. K., Francis, L., Prosser, M., & Cameron, J. E. (2010). Counterproductive work behavior as protest. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(1), 18-25. 10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.03.014
- Koladich, S. J., & Atkinson, B. E. (2016). The dark triad and relationship preferences: a replication and extension. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 94, 253–255. 10.1016/j.paid.2016.01.023
- Lukic, P., & Zivanovic, M. (2021). Shedding light on the light triad: Further evidence on structural, construct, and predictive validity of the light triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 178(3), 110876. 10.1016/j.paid.2021.110876
- Maddux, J. E. (2002). Stopping the "Madness": Positive psychology and the deconstruction of the illness ideology and the DSM. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 13–25). Oxford University Press.
- Mahdiuon, R., Ghahramani, M., & Sharif, A. R. (2010). Explanation of organizational citizenship behavior with personality. *Procedia, Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 178-184. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.069
- Malik, O. F., Shahzad, A., Waheed, A., & Yousaf, Z. (2020). Abusive supervision as a trigger of malevolent creativity: Do the light triad traits matter? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 41(8), 1119–1137. 10.1108/LODJ-09-2019-0386
- Marcus, D. K., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2015). A big tent of dark personality traits. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 9(8), 434-446. 10.1111/spc3.12185
- Meglino, B. M., & Korsgaard, A. (2004). Considering rational self-interest as a disposition: Organizational implications of other orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 946-959. 10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.946
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequence*. Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Toward a taxonomy of dark personalities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science: A Journal of the American Psychological Society*, 23(6), 421-426. 10.1177/0963721414547737
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(6), 556–563. 10.1016/s0092-6566(02)00505-6

- Penner, L. A., Midili, A. R., & Kegelmeyer, J. (1997). Beyond job attitudes: A personality and social psychology perspective on the causes of organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Performance*, *10*(2), 111-131. 10.1207/s15327043hup1002_4
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879–903. 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, *26*(3), 513-563. 10.1177/014920630002600307
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(1), 122–141. 10.1037/a0013079
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(2), 555–572. 10.2307/256693
- Sackett, P.R. (2002). The structure of counterproductive work behaviors: Dimensionality and relationships with facets of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *10*(1), 5–11. 10.1111/1468-2389.00189
- Schmid, K., & Muldoon, O. T. (2015). Perceived threat, social identification, and psychological well-being: The effects of political conflict exposure. *Political Psychology*, *36*(1), 75–92. 10.1111/pops.12073
- Spector, P.E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, *12*(2), 269–292. 10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00049-9
- Spector, P.E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*(3), 446-460. 10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005
- Spik, A. (2018). Good soldiers in organizations-heroes, actors or victims-recent trends in research on organizational citizenship behavior. *Zarządzanie*, *45*(3), 131-141. 10.12775/AUNC_ZARZ.2018.039
- Sulea, C., Fine, S., Fischmann, G., Sava, F. A., & Dumitru, C. (2013). Abusive supervision and counterproductive work behaviors: The moderating effects of personality. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, *12*(4), 196. 10.1027/1866-5888/a000097
- Tehseen, S., Ramayah, T., & Sajilan, S. (2017). Testing and controlling for common method variance: a review of available methods. *Journal of Management Sciences*, *4*(2), 142–168. 10.20547/jms.2014.1704202
- Yang, J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). The relations of daily counterproductive workplace behavior with emotions, situational antecedents, and personality moderators: A diary study in Hong Kong. *Personnel Psychology*, *62*(2), 259-295. 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01138.x.