

February 2014

## Restaurant Industry Perspectives on Pro-social Rule Breaking: Intent versus Action

Catherine R. Curtis Ph.D.  
*Oklahoma State University*, [catherine.curtis@okstate.edu](mailto:catherine.curtis@okstate.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/hospitalityreview>

 Part of the [Food and Beverage Management Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Curtis, Catherine R. Ph.D. (2014) "Restaurant Industry Perspectives on Pro-social Rule Breaking: Intent versus Action," *Hospitality Review*: Vol. 31 : Iss. 1 , Article 9.  
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/hospitalityreview/vol31/iss1/9>

This work is brought to you for free and open access by FIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Hospitality Review by an authorized administrator of FIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [dcc@fiu.edu](mailto:dcc@fiu.edu).

---

# Restaurant Industry Perspectives on Pro-social Rule Breaking: Intent versus Action

## **Abstract**

The resounding message extracted from the service literature is that employees serve pivotal functions in the overall guest experience. This is of course due to the simultaneous delivery of personalized service provision with resultant consumption of those services. This simultaneous delivery and consumption cycle is at times challenged by a perceived desire to accommodate guest request that may violate, to a greater or lesser degree, an organizational rule. This is important to note because increased interactions with customers enable frontline employees to have a better sense of what customers want from the company as well as from the company itself (Bitner, et al, 1994). With that platform established, then why are some employees willing to break organizational rules and risk disciplinary action to better service a customer? This study examines the employee personality, degree of autonomy, job meaning, and co-worker influence on an employee's decision to break organizational rules. The results of this study indicate that co-worker influence exerted a minimal influence on employee decision to break rules while the presence of societal consciousness exerted a much stronger influence. Women reported that they were less likely to engage in rule divergence, and significant correlations were present when filtered by years in current position, and years in the industry.

## **Keywords**

rule divergence, pro-social behavior, restaurant, frontline employees

## 1. Introduction

It is generally understood that restaurant servers, like many other service professions, have a high degree of customer contact. This concept, therefore, implies that the quality of service a customer receives from frontline employees is vital to the service experience (Groth & Grandey, 2012). The service literature has reiterated the fact that employees play a critical role in the overall customer experience (Bowen & Ford, 2004; Hartline & Ferrell, 1996; Kelly, 1992). Berry, Carbone, and Haeckel (2002) dissected the service experience into three categories: functional clues, mechanic clues, and humanic clues. Wall & Berry (2007) applied these categories to the restaurant industry defining functional clues as the food itself, along with the precision of service; mechanic clues as the nonhuman environmental components, such as design, layout or lighting; the humanic clues are defined as the behavior of the service employees, “including body language, tone of voice, and level of enthusiasm” (Wall & Berry, 2007, p. 60). According to these categories, a restaurant server would only have direct control of the functional and humanic clues. However, because the frontline restaurant employees have a high degree of customer interaction they are able to adapt their behavior in response to the feedback they are receiving from customers. To this end, frontline employees have a better sense of what customers want from the company, more so than the company itself (Bitner, Booms, & Mohr, 1994). However, because of this knowledge, the employee may be presented with a dilemma; because offering the better service may result in breaking an organizational rule. Breaking an organizational rule usually results in disciplinary action and in some cases, termination. Therefore, the employee is faced with the dilemma whether or not to provide a benefit for a customer despite the fact that the employee may be subject to disciplinary action.

Breaking an organizational rule on behalf of a customer was defined as pro-social rule breaking by Morrison (2006). In order to be pro-social, the rule breaking must occur without any perceived benefit for the self. The purpose of this study was to examine the perspective of pro-social rule breaking for the benefit of the customer and how likely a frontline restaurant employee would permit him or herself to partake. Although, Eddleston, Kidder and Litzky (2002) focused on the customer-contact worker and customer exchange relationships in service and hospitality workers, there is no empirical research explaining the reasons a hospitality employee would consider to committing pro-social rule breaking. We were interested in knowing the reasons why some employees are willing to push the limits on a customer's behalf, breaking organizational rules, thereby chancing disciplinary procedures. Do some employees feel that they have the freedom to make these types of decisions (autonomy)? Are some employees more naturally inclined to commit pro-social rule breaking (personality)? Is it a matter of how much the job means to the individual (job meaning)? How much can co-workers influence the decision to break rules? Therefore, knowing the consequences, it was logical to reflect further upon the reasons employees would participate in pro-social rule breaking in the workplace.

### 2.1 Pro-social Rule Breaking (PRSB) as a body of Knowledge

Pro-social behavior is defined as actions that benefit other people or society as a whole (Twenge, Ciarocco, Baumeister, & Bartels, 2007). It is characterized by assisting the guest in a manner that does not benefit the service agent. What this implies is that there are costs associated with deviating from expected behavior.

Morrison (2006) introduced pro-social rule breaking into the literature after performing three studies to explain the phenomena. In general, employee rule breaking is commonly associated with workplace deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). However, Morrison (2006)

was able to make a distinction between pro-social rule breaking and rule breaking that was self-centered or deviant to the organization. The framework for pro-social rule breaking was derived from a model of positive deviance (Spreitzer & Sonneshein, 2003), leading Morrison (2006) to state that pro-social rule breaking is “any instance where an employee intentionally violates a formal organizational policy, regulation, or prohibition with the primary intention of promoting the welfare of the organization or one of its stakeholders,” (p.6). Therefore, rule breaking that is pro-social has a non-selfish intent, is not done with any self-interest, and there is no sought after benefit for the employee (rule breaker). Examples of pro-social rule breaking include: employees violating rules to improve efficiency, violating rules to help a co-worker, or violating rules to better service a customer (Mayer, Caldwell, Ford, Uhl-Bien, & Gresock, 2007).

## 2.2 Job Characteristics - Influence on Pro-social Rule Breaking Behavior

Morrison (2006) claimed that pro-social rule breaking is more likely to occur when the job provides both: meaning and autonomy, and three individual dispositions of: 1. empathy, 2. proactive personality, and 3. risk taking dispositions are strong. The influence of co-worker behavior was also critical in the decision to participate pro-social rule breaking behavior.

Job meaning is defined as the extent in which an individual feels that the job is meaningful, valuable, and worthwhile (Hackman & Oldham, 1976, p. 256). It is the idea that individuals who possess a strong job meaning put forth more effort in job performance. However, individuals that possess an elevated level of job meaning are more inclined to violate rules in execute job performance. Individuals with an increased sense of job meaning will attempt to make a difference in the workplace (Morrison 2006; Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2003).

Autonomy is the feeling of freedom and independence within a job, accompanied with the responsibility for making decisions to complete the work successfully. Employees who feel

more perceived control and discretion on the job will be more likely to participate in pro-social rule breaking (Morrison, 2006).

If fellow employees have broken a rule, it will increase the likelihood of another employee breaking that rule (Morrison, 2006). In short this mirroring of co-worker behavior demonstrates a “go with the flow” attitude. This propensity to mirror co-worker behavior can be explained by the social information processing approach which states that social influence of co-workers will be swayed by statements heard from others regarding components of the job and acceptance by other co-workers (Salancik & Pfeffer 1978; Zagenczyk, Scott, Gibney, Murrell, & Thatcher, 2010). Therefore, the pressure to conform in the workplace can have substantial influence on an individual’s decision making (Shimko, 1994).

### 2.3 Individual Personality Characteristics and Propensity Toward Pro-social Behavior

Various researchers have posited that an individual’s personality composition can influence a person’s desire to deviate from company norms (Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrack, 2004; Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006). This plausible explanation resulted in the incorporation of the Big Five scale into this study in an effort to determine if the Big Five dimensions coupled with the subscales of autonomy, co-worker behavior and job meaning had an impact upon an individual’s propensity to engage in pro-social rule breaking. In this sense, we could determine if there is an actual profile that is more prone to engage in pro-social rule breaking.

The Big Five personality dimensions are not a representation of a specific theoretical perspective; instead, it presents personality in a common framework composed of five factors reflected in an individual’s personality (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). The five factors are known as: 1: Extraversion, 2: Agreeableness, 3: Conscientiousness, 4: Neuroticism, and 5: Openness. The first factor Extraversion, describes sociability, and the traits commonly associated

with this dimension are: assertiveness, talkativeness, and other types of positive emotions (Barrick & Mount, 1991; John et al., 2008). The second factor, Agreeableness, focuses on pro-social conduct and the traits of warmth and modesty (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). The third factor, Conscientiousness, can be described as those that are committed to appropriate task and goal behavior (John et al., 2008). Those individuals possessing traits of dimension are seen as dependable and organized. Neuroticism, the fourth factor, is also sometimes called Emotional Stability. This factor is different from the others in the sense that it contrasts emotional stability with negative emotionality, describing feelings of anxiety or nervousness and prototypical traits like depression and embarrassment (John et al., 2008). Lastly, the fifth factor, Openness, has also been called Openness to Experience (McCrae & Costa, 1987). This factor has been classified as the most difficult to identify (Barrick & Mount, 1991) because it is coupled with mental and experiential life (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998; John et al., 2008). The traits defined in this factor are intelligence and artistic sensitivity (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

#### 2.4 Research Questions

In an attempt to understand the factors influencing restaurant employee propensity to deviate from organizational rules, the following questions were addressed:

- R<sub>1</sub>. What is the pro-social rule breaking profile (PRSB profile) for this group of restaurant servers?
- R<sub>2</sub>. Are there significant differences in pro-social rule breaking behavior (PRSB) when respondents are classified by demographic variables?
- R<sub>3</sub>. Which BFI personality indicators are commonly displayed by these restaurant servers?
- R<sub>4</sub>. Are there significant differences on BFI indicators when respondents are classified by demographic variables?
- R<sub>5</sub>. Using the stepwise regression procedure, what combination of job characteristics, BFI indicators, and demographics influence pro-social rule breaking behavior?

### **3. Methodology**

#### 3.1 Measurement items and analysis

The administered survey consisted of two scales and one service scenario. The initial portion of the survey measured the five subscales that comprise the Big Five Inventory, (BFI): extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991).

The BFI is a 44-item self-report measure of personality in the five traits previously mentioned.

Rather than using a single adjective in this measure, one or two prototypical trait adjectives serve as the core item with descriptions to clarify each item (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). Sample items include, “is helpful and unselfish with others” or “can be moody”.

Next, the participants were given a short scenario to read based on the earlier work of Morrison (2006) with the participant contemplating whether or not to break an organizational rule: accepting expired coupons on behalf of the customer. In general, within the restaurant industry, servers may provide less attention to those customers bearing coupons because many of those diners have been known to undertip for service (Lynn & Withiam, 2008; Maynard & Mupandawana, 2009). Therefore, the effort to be pro-social is at the risk of being short changed on a tip. Scenario content was checked for appropriateness and clarity by a panel of academics and industry professionals. After reading the scenario, participants answered six questions that measured the likelihood of breaking the described rule. Based on the earlier work of Morrison (2006), the researchers manipulated the variables of job meaning, autonomy, and co-worker behavior. This generated eight versions of the scenario, presenting eight different experimental conditions. The eight conditions presented all possible combinations of the three manipulated independent variables: autonomy (high or low degree of influence) and co-worker influence (yes or no), job meaning (high or low degree of influence).



### 3.2 Sampling

The administered survey consisted of two scales and one service scenario. The initial portion of the survey measured the five subscales that comprise the Big Five Inventory: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). Next, the participants were given a short scenario to read based on the earlier work of Morrison (2006) with the participant contemplating whether or not to break an organizational rule on accepting expired coupons on behalf of the customer (see Appendix A). In general, within the restaurant industry, servers may provide less attention to those customers bearing coupons because many of those diners have been known to undertip for service (Lynn & Withiam, 2008; Maynard & Mupandawana, 2009). Therefore, the effort to be pro-social is at the risk of being short changed on a tip. Scenario content was checked for appropriateness and clarity by a panel of academics and industry professionals. After reading the scenario, participants answered six questions that measured the likelihood of breaking the described rule. Participants also answered three questions on the perceived realism of the scenario and two questions that measured whether or not the participant believed that rule breaking was considered to be pro-social or self-interested. The findings of the Morrison (2006) study identified three influencers of rule breaking: (a) personal enhancement of one's job performance, (b) collegial support of co-worker's job performance, or (c) a compelling desire to enhance the customer's experience.

To measure personality traits, the Big Five Inventory (BFI) (John, Donahue, & Kentle 1991), was used. The BFI is a 44-item self-report measure of personality in the five traits previously mentioned. Rather than using a single adjective in this measure, one or two prototypical trait adjectives serve as the core item with descriptions to clarify each item (Benet-

Martínez and John 1998). Sample items include, “is helpful and unselfish with others” or “can be moody”. Reliability for each of the scales in the BFI was over the minimum of .5 and is at, above or close to the acceptable level of .7 (Nunnally, 1978). The resulting coefficient  $\alpha$  for each of the scales of the BFI ranged from .63 to .81.

The dependent variable in this study was pro-social rule breaking. It was measured using six items from the pro-social rule breaking scale developed by Morrison (2006). The coefficient  $\alpha$  for the pro-social rule breaking scale was .79. Exploratory factor analysis using maximum likelihood estimation was used to extract factors from the variable data, and completed this in four iterations. The six items from the pro-social rule breaking scale loaded on to one factor which was capable of explaining 68% of all the variable variances. The factor loadings ranged from .39 to .90 (see Table 2). The survey concluded with the collecting of demographic variables including gender, position, years on the job, and years in the industry.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Profile of Respondents

Participants were frontline restaurant employees (N=305) from thirteen stores of a nationally branded restaurant chain located in the southeastern United States. Participation was voluntary in this study and each participant received a token of appreciation in the form of a pen. More than half of the participants (55%) were between ages 21-30. Approximately 44% of the participants had been on the job for 1-3 years and approximately 33% had worked in the industry for 3-6 years. The survey was administered while the servers were on premise but had not yet engaged their first table of the evening.

## 4.2 Discussion of Results

### Pro-social Rule Breaking Profile (R<sub>1</sub>)

The findings for the first research question were based on the basic underlying dimensions of pro-social rule breaking (PRSB) as applied to the hospitality industry. The construct of pro-social rule breaking behavior is based on the work of Morrison (2006). In that study, Morrison indicated that the construct of pro-social rule breaking is comprised of six elements (Table 1). The analysis of Morrison's (2006) pro-social rule breaking individual items yielded that "how likely to violate" had the highest Mean rating along with the greatest standard deviation, and the item of "probability to violate" was the least prevalent at a Mean rating of 2.72 with a standard deviation of 1.29. One of the key points is that there is an obvious gap between "intent to violate" versus "appropriateness of engaging in violation of a rule."

-Insert Table 1 about here-

For the purposes of the present study, the dependent variable of pro-social rule breaking was subjected to exploratory factor analysis. This procedure was used to determine if this array mimicked the Mean rating profile and to arrive at a composite pro-social rule breaking variable for the purpose of further statistical analysis.

Exploratory factor analysis using maximum likelihood estimation was used to extract factors from the variable data, and completed in four iterations which resulted in a coefficient  $\alpha$  for the pro-social rule breaking scale of .79. It should be noted that the six pro-social rule breaking items loaded on to one factor which in turn accounted for 68% of all the variable variances. The factor loadings for these individual PRSB items ranged from -.39 to .90 (see Table 2). It is interesting to note that the aggregated responses indicate that these restaurant servers expressed a moderate level of pro-social rule breaking which was similar trend as noted

by Morrison's (2006) although the respondents in that study represented a variety of supervisory jobs in guest relations, financial analyst, project supervisors and from a variety of industries such as entertainment, telecommunications, health care, education, and financial services. The key difference is that Morrison focused on nonsupervisory, first-line managerial, and middle management positions across a variety of job classifications.

-Insert Table 2 about here-

### Relationship of Demographic Variables and Pro-social Rule Breaking (R<sub>2</sub>)

Morrison (2006) revealed that gender had a significant difference upon the likelihood to participate in pro-social rule breaking whereby females were less likely to partake in pro-social rule breaking. Gender was tested using an independent samples t-test and revealed a significant difference in the means between males ( $M=.3283$ ,  $s.d.=.8849$ ), and females ( $M=-.2037$ ,  $s.d.=.9657$ ;  $t(259.962)=4.910$ ),  $p<.01$ . Also, in contrast to Morrison's findings (2006), the current study found that industry work experience exerted a statistically significant impact upon pro-social rule breaking.

### Big Five Personality Characteristic Profile and Impact on PRSB (R<sub>3</sub>)

The finding that Agreeableness, a BFI item, was the most common personality dimension for this sample of restaurant workers is consistent with existing literature. Studies that used five factor inventories in samples of hotel workers (Kim, Shin, & Umbreit, 2007; Silva 2006) and restaurant workers (Kim, Shin, & Swanger, 2009) were consistent with this study's findings that Agreeableness is the most prominent of the five factors of personality in hospitality employees. Conscientiousness was the second most prominent dimension, which was also consistent with the hospitality literature (Kim et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2007; Silva, 2006). Extraversion was the third most prominent of the five personality dimensions, followed by Openness, and then

Neuroticism, which was consistent with recent studies using five factor inventories (Kim et al. 2009; Kim et al. 2007).

While examining the Big Five and pro-social rule breaking it was found that Conscientiousness had the most impact on pro-social rule breaking (Beta=  $-.228$ ,  $p=.004$ ). The negative direction of the relationship indicates that the more conscientious an individual is, the less likely the individual will participate in pro-social rule breaking. Conscientiousness has been shown to be a valid predictor in across many occupational groups for job performance and focuses on the accomplishment of tasks (Barrick & Mount 1991). Individuals that convey traits from this dimension have a strong sense of purpose and obligation in their work and perform better than those that do not possess these qualities (Barrick & Mount, 1991). In this study's investigation of pro-social rule breaking, it may be suggested that these individuals may possess a stronger sense of compliance to follow organizational procedures. This is a premise that is supported in earlier organizational research by Brief and Motowidlo (1986).

-Insert Table 3 about here-

Neuroticism also revealed a small negative relationship with pro-social rule breaking (Beta=  $-.116$ ,  $p=.022$ ). Again, the negative direction reveals that the more neurotic an individual is the likelihood to participate in pro-social rule breaking decreases. This is understandable as neurotic individuals tend to lack emotional intelligence which would guide them in their ability to read others' emotions, needs and wants (Newsome, Day, & Catano, 2000).

#### Relationship of Demographic Variables with Big Five Personality Indicators (R<sub>4</sub>)

According to Benet-Martínez and John (1998) gender differences have been small in Big Five inventories and the factor structures replicate across gender equally with the exception of Neuroticism and Agreeableness, which is generally slightly higher in females. In the present

study, there was a statistically significant difference in Neuroticism, males ( $M=2.2199$ ,  $s.d=.74710$ ), and females ( $M=-2.4608$ ,  $s.d=.9657$ ;  $t(303)=-2.690$ ,  $p=.008$ ). The differences in the means was small ( $\eta^2=.023$ ) which is consistent with the literature (Benet-Martínez & John, 1998). The difference that is not consistent with literature is the statistical significance with Openness, males ( $M=3.8863$ ,  $s.d=.54881$ ), and females ( $M=-3.7440$ ,  $s.d=.3131$ ;  $t(303)=2.247$ ,  $p=.025$ ). However, the differences in the means was small ( $\eta^2=.016$ ).

-Insert Table 4 about here-

For the present study, the findings for years in the industry and Big Five personality dimension revealed one statistically significant relationship. The Kruskal-Wallis test was utilized for these data as the assumptions for MANOVA were violated. Conscientiousness and years in the industry, were statistically significant  $X^2(4, N=301)=16.164$ ,  $p=.003$ . To examine this relationship further the Mann Whitney test was performed. The results of this test indicated that there is a difference in conscientiousness levels as categorized by length of industry experience,  $z=-2.36$ ,  $p<.05$ . Those workers with less than one year of experience had an average rank of 30.76 and those workers with more than 9 years of experience had an average mean rank of 46.64. This procedure indicates that those who have worked in the industry for most of their employment years seem to have an enhanced set of work expectations relative to what needs to be done on the job better, and therefore what is acceptable by management, versus those who are newer to the industry and have less than one year of server experience.

Using the stepwise regression procedure, what combination of job characteristics, BFI indicators, and demographics influence pro-social rule breaking behavior? (R<sub>5</sub>)

To determine if the job characteristics of job meaning, autonomy, co-worker behavior, and the Big V personality dimensions had any predictive influence upon pro-social rule breaking,

a multiple regression procedure was conducted. The demographic variables of gender and industry experience were also included in this model. The model suggested that this group of independent variables in the regression procedure explained 12.1% of the variation in pro-social rule breaking  $F(10, 290) = 3.992, p < .01$ .

After an examination of the confidence intervals around the b weights, the variables Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and gender included zero as a probable value, indicating that a value of zero was probable. Likewise, the b weights for gender, years of industry experience and BFI-Conscientiousness were also statistically significant, while the other independent variables entered do not reveal any statistical significance. Moving forward, this implies that the results for BFI-Conscientiousness, industry experience, and gender should be retained in the specified model.

Inspection of the Beta weights revealed that a standardized unit change in Y with respect to gender (Beta = -.187) was higher than a standardized unit change in Y with respect to Conscientiousness (Beta = -.172). To check for potential problems with multicollinearity, the VIF was consulted for the predictors and was not an issue as the VIF for all predictors did not exceed 10.00. Further inspections of the plot of the standardized residuals against the predicted values revealed that there were no nonlinear trends or heteroscedasticity. Therefore, the distribution of the standardized errors was indicative of normality.

In summary, Table 5 shows the means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and correlations among the study variables. As shown, participants reported, on average, a moderate likelihood of rule breaking. There were significant correlations between pro-social rule breaking and gender, with women reporting that they were less likely to participate, and significant correlations with years in the current job, and years in the industry. The most prominent

personality dimension for this group of hospitality employees was Agreeableness with a reported Mean of 4.27. Conscientiousness was the second most prominent dimension with a Mean rating of 4.15.

-Insert Table 5 about here-

## 5. Conclusion

There are three major conclusions emanating from this study. First, restaurant servers in this study indicated a moderate likelihood of pro-social rule breaking on the behalf of a customer, with males being more likely to partake; second, the most prominent personality dimension in this sample of frontline restaurant workers is Agreeableness; lastly, the best predictor for not engaging in the act of pro-social rule breaking is governed by the concept of Conscientiousness.

From a managerial perspective the findings of this study implies that restaurant operators can select and then place individuals who are more inclined to engage in pro-social rule breaking, in accordance with company parameters, by using Big Five personality instrument as a placement instrument. This assumption implies that if high guest satisfaction scores are important and leaders truly feel that the “guest is always right,” hiring individuals with a high degree of Agreeableness would be best. If the leader wants rules followed to perfection and not be just guidelines they should hire for Conscientiousness.

## 6. Managerial Implications and Further Research

This study has implications for researchers as well as managers in the industry. The results from this study suggest that restaurant managers to some degree may be able to encourage pro-social behavior from their employees. Managers can have an element of control within the hiring process with the aid of a personality assessment tool. However, managers must take



caution while educating and training their employees to understand that some gestures that are beneficial to the customer may be dysfunctional for all other parties. Not all managers may desire their employees to act upon pro-social rule breaking. However, if there is an organizational rule that is constantly being broken, managers should evaluate the worthiness of that rule (Morrison 2006; Shimko 1994).

Also, based on the results of the present study it is recommended that a different individual difference variable is tested with pro-social rule breaking. The ethical decision making process appears to be a logical choice because the employee must weigh the options and benefits for all involved parties. Furthermore, organizational culture and climate are other constructs that could be measured with pro-social rule breaking. One suggestion may be to test different districts or regions within one brand/company to see if the culture is consistent and supportive of pro-social rule breaking.

## References

- Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44 (1), 1-26.
- Benet-Martínez, V. & John, O.P. (1998). Los cinco grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish or English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75 (3), 729-750.
- Berry, L. L., L. P. Carbone, & Haeckel, S.H. (2002). Managing the total customer experience. *Sloan Management Review*, 43 (3), 85-89.
- Bitner, M.J., Booms, B.H. & Mohr, L.A. (1994). Critical service encounters: The employee's viewpoint. *The Journal of Marketing*, 58 (4), 95-106.
- Bowen, J.C. & Ford, R.C. (2004). What experts say about managing hospitality service delivery systems. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16 (7), 394-401.
- Brief, A. P. & Motowidlo, S.J. (1986). Pro-social organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11 (4), 710-725.
- Colbert, A.E., Mount, M.K., Harter, J.K., Witt, L. A.; Barrick, M.R. (2004) Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (4), 599-609.
- Eddleston, K. A., Kidder, D. L. & Litzky, B. E. (2002). Who's the boss? Contending with competing expectations from customers and management. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16 (4), 85-95.
- Groth, M. & Grandey, A. (2012). From bad to worse: Negative exchange spirals in employee-customer service interactions. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2 (3), 208-233.
- Hackman J. R. & Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15, 250-279.
- Hartline, M.D. & Ferrell, O.C. (1996). The management of customer-contact service employees: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Marketing*, 60 (4), 52-70.
- Judge, T. A., LePine, J.A., Rich, B.L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: Relationship of the narcissistic personality to self- and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91 (4), 762-776.
- John, O. P., Donahue, E.M. & Kentle, R.L. (1991). *The "Big Five" Inventory: Versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley CA: University of California Berkeley Institute of Personality and Social Research.

- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P. & Soto, C.J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big-Five trait taxonomy: History measurement and conceptual issues. In O. P. John R. W. Robins and L. A. Pervin Eds. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 114-158. New York NY: Guilford Press.
- Kelly, S.W. (1992). Developing customer orientation among service employees. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 20 (1), 27-36.
- Kim W., K.H., Shin. & Swanger, N. (2009). Burnout and engagement: A comparative analysis using the Big Five personality dimensions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28 (1), 96-104.
- Kim H.J., K.H. Shin & Umbreit, W.T. (2007). Hotel job burnout: The role of personality characteristics, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26 (2), 421-434.
- Lynn, M. & Withiam, G. (2008). Tipping and its alternatives: Business considerations and directions. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 22, 328-336.
- Mayer, D. M., J. Caldwell, R. Ford, M. Uhl-Bien, and A. Gresock . 2009. Should I serve my customer or my supervisor? A relational perspective on pro-social rule breaking. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management Philadelphia.
- Maynard, L.J. & M. Mupandawana. (2009). Tipping behavior in Canadian restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28 (4), 591-603.
- McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (1), 81-90.
- Morrison, E.W. (2006). Doing the job well: An investigation of pro-social rule breaking. *Journal of Management*, 32 (1), 5-28.
- Newsome, S., Day, A.L. & Catano, V.M. (2000). Assessing the predictive validity of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29 (6), 1005-1016.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw- Hill.
- Robinson, S.L. & Bennett, R.J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multi-dimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (2), 555-572.
- Salancik, G.R. & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23 (2), 224-253.
- Shimko, B. W. (1994). Breaking the rules for better service. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 35 (4), 18-22.
- Silva, P. (2006). Effects of disposition on hospitality employee job satisfaction and commitment. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18 (4), 317-328.

- Spreitzer, G. M. & Sonenshein, S. (2003). Positive deviance and extraordinary organizing. In K. Cameron J. Dutton and R. Quinn Eds. *Positive organizational scholarship: 207-224*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Twenge, J.M., Baumeister, R.F., DeWall, N.C., Ciarocco, N.J., & Bartels, M.J. (2007). Social exclusion decreases pro-social behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92 (1), 56-66.
- Tyler, T. R. & Blader, S.L. (2005). Can businesses effectively regulate employee conduct? The antecedents of rule following in work settings. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48 (6), 1143-1158.
- Wall, E.I. & Berry, L.L. (2007). The combined effects of the physical environment and employee behavior on customer perception of restaurant and service quality. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 48 (59), 59-69.
- Zagenczyk, T.J., Scott, K. D., Gibney, R., Murrell, A.J., & Thatcher, J.B. (2010). Social influence and perceived organizational support: A social networks analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 111 (2), 127-138.

Table 1. Pro-social Rule Breaking Profile

<u>Pro-social Rule Breaking Scale</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>sd</u>
how likely to violate	305	3.19	1.42
violating would be wrong	304	3.03	1.29
feel conflicted about violating	305	3.03	1.25
probability to violate	305	2.98	1.43
how do you feel about violating	304	2.77	1.32
appropriate to violate	305	2.72	1.29

Table 2: Results of EFA of PSRB scale

PSRB Item	Factor Loading	Communality	Eigenvalue	Variance (%)
			4.087	68.118
How likely to violate	.903	.816		
Probability to violate	.901	.812		
How appropriate to violate	.836	.700		
Feel about violating	.868	.754		
Feel conflicted	-.388	.151		
Violating would be wrong	-.746	.556		

Table 3: Results of Regression (N=305)

Variable	B	$\beta$	R <sup>2</sup>	F
Industry Experience				
Gender	-.393	-.177		
Job Meaning	.011	.005		
Autonomy	.155	.072		
Co-worker Behavior	.078	.036		
BFI-Extraversion	.071	.049		
BFI-Agreeableness	.010	.005		
BFI-Conscientiousness	-.441	-.228		
BFI-Neuroticism	-.163	-.116		
BFI-Openness	.031	.015		
			.121	3.992

p<.01

**Table 4: Gender Differences and Big Five**

BFI-Scale		Mean	SD	df	t	Sig.	Eta squared
Extraversion	males	4.0069	.69517	303	-.636	.525	.001
	females	4.0627	.78466				
Agreeableness	males	4.2327	.53843	303	-.996	.320	.003
	females	4.2967	.55058				
Conscientiousness	males	4.0893	.59303	303	-1.592	.112	.008
	females	4.1944	.54027				
Neuroticism	males	2.2199	.74710	303	-2.690	.008	.023
	females	2.4608	.76830				
Openness	males	3.8863	.54881	303	2.247	.025	.016
	females	3.7440	.53131				

**Table 5: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for all Variables**

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. PSRB	2.93	1.09	(.79)										
2. Autonomy	.51	.501	.108										
3. Co-worker behavior	.53	.500	.068	-.004									
4. Job meaning	.51	.501	.016	.016	.008								
5. BFI-E	4.04	.751	.019	.033	-.009	-.085	(.63)						
6. BFI-A	4.27	.546	-.068	.047	-.069	-.072	.131*	(.76)					
7. BFI-C	4.15	.562	-.128	.049	-.036	-.085	.340**	.477**	(.76)				
8. BFI-N	-2.37	-.768	-.052	-.091	.000	.088	-.242**	-.521**	-.506**	(.81)			
9. BFI-O	3.80	.542	.035	-.029	-.046	-.006	.247**	.043	.167**	-.131*	(.69)		
10. Gender	1.62	.487	-.242**	-.075	-.079	.003	.037	.057	.091	.153**	-.128*		
11. Years in current job	2.44	1.10	.185**	.106	.042	-.005	.089	-.114*	.062	.052	.026	.046	
12. Years in industry	3.21	1.22	.179**	.116*	.045	.038	.125*	-.086	.204**	-.019	.115*	-.069	.680**

Scale reliabilities in parentheses on diagonal.

\*.  $p < 0.05$  level (2-tailed).

\*\* .  $p < 0.01$  level (2-tailed)