2018

Strategies Certified Project Management Professionals Use to Prevent Counterproductive Behavior

Lisa Annika Christin Hansson-Vazquez
Walden University

Walden University

College of Management and Technology

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Lisa Annika Christin Hansson-Vazquez

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Tim Truitt, Committee Chairperson, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Dr. Rocky Dwyer, Committee Member, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Dr. Janie Hall, University Reviewer, Doctor of Business Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2018

Abstract

Strategies Certified Project Management Professionals

Use to Prevent Counterproductive Behavior

by

Lisa Annika Christin Hansson-Vazquez

MBA, National University, 2009

MS, Lund University, 2005

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

December 2018

Abstract

Project managers who fail to apply strategies to prevent counterproductive work behavior in information technology projects could negatively affect users, budget costs, timelines, or projects. The purpose of this multiple case study was to explore strategies that project managers used to prevent counterproductive work behavior that put project success at risk. Social learning theory was the conceptual framework for this study. Data were collected through document review of published Project Management Institute (PMI) material as well as semistructured interviews with 10 project managers who were members of a PMI chapter in the southeastern United States, and who held a project management professional certification or an agile certified practitioner certification. Data were analyzed using Yin's methodology and consisted of transcribing, organizing, and coding the interview data, as well as triangulating the interview data in relation to the PMI literature. Five themes emerged from the data: (a) participant communication, (b) proactive planning, (c) personal impact, (d) participant engagement, and (e) issue management. The implications of the study for positive social change include the potential to increase the occurrence of conflict-free and healthy project environments, which could lead to satisfied and motivated project participants resulting in productive and engaged members of the community.

Strategies Certified Project Management Professionals Use to Prevent Counterproductive Behavior

by

Lisa Annika Christin Hansson-Vazquez

MBA, National University, 2009

MS, Lund University, 2005

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

December 2018

Acknowledgments

I want to thank my husband for his unyielding support and encouragement during this DBA journey, as well as our dogs for keeping me company many early mornings. Also, I want to express my gratitude to Dr. Tim Truitt for helping me get back on track and completing the DBA study, as well as to Dr. Rocky Dwyer, Dr. Charlotte Carlstrom, and Dr. Janie Hall for helping me improve the study with their review and feedback.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Section 1: Foundation of the Study

Activities with the purpose of undermining organizational objectives, commonly known as counterproductive work behavior (CWB), are hard for employers to detect before the damage is done (Bowling & Lyons, 2015; Klotz & Buckley, 2013). If management does not take measures to prevent CWB, organizations risk negative financial consequences, such as lost revenue and efficiency (Ahmad & Omar, 2014; Al-A'wasa, 2018; Bowling & Lyons, 2015; Tuna, Ghazzawi, Yesiltas, Tuna, & Arslan, 2016). In a software project setting, CWB can cause project failure resulting in wasted information technology (IT) resources and lost opportunities for organizational growth (Bhoola & Giangreco, 2018; Jørgensen, 2014; Zhang, Luo, Liao, & Peng, 2015). Project managers need strategies to prevent CWB in projects to ensure project success leading to organizational well-being.

Background of the Problem

Failed software projects often have an adverse impact on organizations: the users are not satisfied with delivered functionality; the project exceeded budget and timeline; or the project never completed at all (Jørgensen, 2014). Projects continue to fail on a regular basis despite advances in methodologies for improved project performance (Haji-Kazemi, Andersen, & Klakegg, 2015; Ramazani & Jergeas, 2015). Work behavior not aligned with project objectives, such as CWB, can cause project failure (Pinto, 2014; Sharma, 2018; Zhang et al., 2015). The result of employees deliberately engaging in behaviors harmful to organizational priorities is a decline in efficiency and profitability resulting in corporate financial losses (Ahmad & Omar, 2014; Jørgensen, 2014; Shaffer & Darnold,

2018). Project success is dependent on participants' individual willingness to contribute and to commit to the same objectives driving the project itself (Bhoola & Giangreco, 2018; Müller & Martinsuo, 2015; Verburg, Bosch-Sijtsema, & Vartiainen, 2013; Verner, Babar, Cerpa, Hall, & Beecham, 2014; Zhang et al., 2015).

Problem Statement

Despite continuous improvements in project management methodology, the percentage of failed IT projects in 2011 remained significant with losses in the billions of dollars (Stoica & Brouse, 2014). In 2013, 61% of software projects failed, as they were not completed on time, did not stay within budget, or did not fulfill requirement specifications (López-Martín & Abran, 2015). The general business problem was that a high rate of unsuccessful software projects affects companies' financial sustainability. The specific business problem was that some project managers lack strategies to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this qualitative, multiple case study was to explore strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. The population group constituted of project managers who were members of a Project Management Institute (PMI) chapter in the southeastern United States, and held a project management professional (PMP) certification or an agile certified practitioner (ACP) certification. The project managers must have been involved in at least one software project completed within the last 5 years. The study’s contribution to social change is that because failed software projects are a threat to organizations' financial sustainability,

increased rates of project success will lead to increased employment opportunities and charitable donations to the community.

Nature of the Study

This study on project managers' strategies to prevent CWB from putting project success at risk was a qualitative, multiple case study. In qualitative studies, the focus is on individual experiences from a contextualized perspective (Lyons et al., 2013). Qualitative research subjects influence the direction of the study by the nature of their responses (Fassinger & Morrow, 2013). The qualitative methodology was the ideal choice for this study because I explored PMI project managers' personal experiences with preventing CWB in their projects, and via their responses, the PMI project managers contributed to the discovery of data trends. The quantitative methodology was not appropriate for this study because the intent was to explore personal experiences and not to measure the frequency of variables. The purpose of quantitative research is to measure the frequency of an occurrence or a phenomenon to identify relationships between variables (Rasinger, 2013). Mixed method studies combine quantitative and qualitative methodologies so the researcher can quantify the frequency of variables as well as explore underlying reasons for a specific behavior (McManamny, Sheen, Boyd, & Jennings, 2015). Because this study did not contain any measurement of variables in combination with qualitative exploration, the mixed methodology was not a suitable alternative.

The study had a multiple case study design because I conducted interviews in conjunction with exploring PMI documentation to discover what strategies PMP or ACP

certified project managers use to prevent CWB. The case study design is more flexible than other qualitative designs as it allows for a focus on the individual cases with the support of multiple data sources (Hyett, Kenny, & Dickson-Swift, 2014). In phenomenology, human engagement and consciousness are the focal points for researchers exploring how participants perceive experiences (Tomkins & Eatough, 2013). Phenomenology was not a suitable design for this study as the focus was not on perceived experiences. In ethnography, direct observation of the research subject is the only means of data gathering (Goldstein, Gray, Salisbury, & Snell, 2014; Jerolmack & Khan, 2014). Given that this study used numerous data sources, the ethnographic design was not an appropriate choice. In narrative research, participants' storytelling is the only source of data (Stephens & Breheny, 2013). As data collection for this study did not include storytelling, a narrative research design was not fitting.

Research Question

I used the following research question for this study: What strategies do project managers use to prevent counterproductive work behavior in projects that put project success at risk?

Interview Questions

The interview questions were as follows:

1. In projects, what participant behavior and activity have you experienced that put project success at risk?
2. What strategies have you used to prevent participant behavior and activity that put project goals and success at risk?

3. Which of these strategies worked best and why was it successful?
4. How did you make sure the strategies to prevent counterproductive work behavior worked in the project?
5. When applying the strategies to prevent counterproductive work behavior, what obstacles did you encounter and how did you overcome them?
6. How did project participants react to the implementation of the strategies?
7. Do you have anything else to add about preventing counterproductive work behavior among project participants?

Conceptual Framework

In this study exploring strategies used by project managers to prevent CWB from putting project success at risk, I applied the social learning theory (SLT) as the conceptual framework. Actions classified as CWB are voluntary activities by employees with the purpose to undermine organizational objectives (Bowling & Lyons, 2015; Marcus, Taylor, Hastings, Sturm, & Weigelt, 2016; Martínez-Córcoles & Stephanou, 2017; Sharma, 2018; Tuna et al., 2016). In 1963, Bandura (1972) presented SLT stating that individuals can learn new behavior via modeling, which consists of observation and imitation of others. Furthermore, Bandura claimed that in a mutual affiliation, the surroundings influence the person and the person influences the surroundings. Per Bethards (2014), the SLT's model of observational learning consists of four core components: (a) attention, (b) retention, (c) motor reproduction, and (d) motivation. Miller and Morris (2016) explained the SLT concept as individuals learning new behavior by observing and copying the behavior of other individuals considered role

models. The cognitive state is a vital part of an individual's learning process of new behavior, as the individual will have to be motivated to learn the new behavior (Miller & Morris, 2016).

The SLT was applicable as the conceptual framework for this study because it provides an understanding of why individuals engage in certain behaviors, which will aid project managers in establishing strategies used to prevent CWB in projects. In organizations, individuals are influenced to engage in CWB by observing others profiting from activities not aligned with established business objectives (Priesemuth, Arnaud, & Schminke, 2013). Per the SLT, individuals learn the CWB from organizational role models displaying the unethical behavior (Boddy, 2014; Priesemuth et al., 2013; Sharma, 2018; Wu, 2017). Ignoring CWB will only encourage the activities, and in line with SLT, only facilitate its existence, which threatens organizational performance and success (Boddy, 2014).

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

Assumptions

In a study, assumptions are notions the researcher cannot control and takes for granted as being true without supporting evidence (Lips-Wiersma & Mills, 2014). In this study, the first assumption was that via the PMP and ACP certification, project managers had gained the skills to prevent CWB activities from putting project success at risk. The second assumption was that a multiple case study design was appropriate for an in-depth exploration of the research question with the multiple data sources yielding sufficient material. The third assumption was that the participants spoke and understood English.

The fourth assumption was that participants would provide honest answers and not adjust the responses to what they thought the interviewer wanted to hear.

Limitations

Study limitations are factors that can potentially weaken research findings but are out of the control of the researcher (Henderson, 2016). The first limitation of this study was that the findings might not apply to geographical areas other than the southeastern United States. The second limitation was that the results might not apply to other case settings than a PMI chapter. The third limitation was that the choice of research design might have imposed limitations due to the inherent restrictions of the qualitative case study methodology.

Delimitations

Delimitations are restrictions to the study scope imposed by the researcher (Davis, Golicic, Boerstler, Choi, & Oh, 2013). The first delimitation for this study was that the geographical location of the southeastern United States. The second delimitation was that I only interviewed project managers with PMP or ACP certifications. Project managers without these certifications might have had strategies to prevent CWB in projects, but I excluded them as participants in this study. The third delimitation was that the scope of the study excluded strategies addressing other project management issues than CWB.

Operational Definitions

Counterproductive work behavior: Voluntary and deliberate actions by employees undermining and contradicting organizational goals and objectives (Bowling & Lyons, 2015; Marcus et al., 2016; Martínez-Córcoles & Stephanou, 2017; Tuna et al., 2016).

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore strategies project managers use to prevent CWB that puts project success at risk. It can be difficult to detect CWB before the impact to organizational profitability and efficiency is too severe to remedy (Ahmad & Omar, 2014; Bowling & Lyons, 2015; Klotz & Buckley, 2013; Tuna et al., 2016). The results of this study might add value for project managers and other business leaders as they can apply the strategies to mitigate CWB in their projects and avoid costly project failure.

Contribution to Business Practice

The study might aid project managers and other organizational leaders in preventing CWB activities in projects at an early stage. When the CWB becomes an organizationally accepted norm, it can be destructive to business practices as corrupted employee competencies interfere with productivity (Tuna et al., 2016). In a software project setting, CWB can cause project failure, wasting IT resources and growth opportunities (Bhoola & Giangreco, 2018; Jørgensen, 2014; Zhang et al., 2015). Academic research on strategies preventing CWB can help managers deal with team members whose behavior is threatening project success (Moore & Gino, 2015). The findings of this study might provide insights to project managers struggling with preventing CWB from jeopardizing project success.

Implications for Social Change

Academic researchers have described CWB in different ways (Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Fontaine, et al., 2015; Tuna et al., 2016). Regardless, its consequences

affect organizations and individuals alike (Resick, Hargis, Shao, & Dust, 2013). The results of this study might indirectly lead to positive social change as a healthy project environment leads to happy and motivated participants, resulting in more productive and engaged members of the community. When employees deliberately engage in behaviors harmful to their organization, corporate efficiency and profitability decline, leading to financial losses and workforce reductions (Ahmad & Omar, 2014). A work environment that is accepting of CWB activities such as aggression, conflict, and sabotage, is harmful to workers' motivation and cognitive well-being (Tuna et al., 2016). The stress of an unhealthy, uncertain work situation may put a strain on employees' personal relationships resulting in family breakups and financial struggles. For individuals engaged in a project, a healthy work climate free of CWB activities may lead to more time volunteering and other activities supporting their local community.

A Review of the Professional and Academic Literature

This literature review is the result of an exploration of peer-reviewed articles and business books relating to the research question of what strategies project managers use to prevent CWB from putting project success at risk. The conceptual framework for the examination of the research question consists of the SLT. There is a gap in the literature for strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects. I did not find any literature directly addressing the research question. To conduct a comprehensive review of the literature covering the research topic, I expanded the search to include all terms that describe deliberate actions employees take with the purpose of undermining organizational goals. Researchers use the terms *counterproductive*, *deviant*, and *unethical*

to describe behavior that in some way is contradictory to organizational policies and norms as well as harmful to organizational objectives (Hollinger & Clark, 1983; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Shoss, Hunter, & Penney, 2016). The literature review covers CWB as well as unethical or deviant behavior consistent with CWB activities. I only included the references in which the researcher(s) used the terms *deviant* or *unethical work behavior* to describe CWB activity.

The literature review begins with an overview of SLT as the conceptual framework for the proposed study, followed by a review of the PMI's role in academic research. The literature review continues with an analysis of CWB as well as CWB in projects. The section for CWB in projects includes coverage of strategic misrepresentation, optimism bias, and risk management. After that, the literature review addresses theories and concepts relevant to the study of CWB: (a) normalization of deviant behavior, (b) transactional and transformational leadership theory, (c) social exchange theory, (d) attribution theory, (e) social disorganization theory, and (f) social control theory.

I retrieved articles from the following academic databases: Business Source Complete, Google Scholar, ProQuest Central, PsycINFO, Sage Journals, Science Direct, Academic Search Complete, Taylor & Francis, Emerald Management, and EBSCO Open Access. Search words used included *project, project management, social learner, risk, social learning theory, social exchange theory, attribution theory, transformational leadership, optimism bias, planning fallacy, CWB, behavior, deviant, transactional, transformational, counterproductive, and strategic misrepresentation.* In the study, there

are 281 works cited, of which 267 (95.0%) are peer reviewed, and 234 (83.3%) are published within the required 5-year range between 2014 and 2018. In the literature review, there are 136 works cited, of which 128 (94.1%) are peer reviewed, and 116 (85.3%) are published within the required 5-year range between 2014 and 2018.

Conceptual Framework: Social Learning Theory

In this study, I used the SLT as the conceptual framework for exploring what strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects. In SLT, human behavior is the result of continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioral, and environmental elements (Bandura, 1972). Per SLT, this means that individuals learn a certain behavior by observing and imitating others (Hanna, Crittenden, & Crittenden, 2013; Hartmann & Dorée, 2015; Horsburgh & Ippolito, 2018). Bandura developed the theory of social learning while researching how to cure phobias (Bandura, 1978). Bandura (1978) realized the influence of observing and modeling in the learning process of a specific behavior. The core concept of SLT includes the interaction between the individual and the social context in which the behavior is displayed (Hanna et al., 2013). The idea of SLT is that individuals engage in observational learning within a social context by displaying positive reactions to a specific behavior (Bethards, 2014). According to SLT, individuals can learn both positive and negative behavior through observation (Hu, Hung, & Ching, 2015). By understanding how individuals learn a behavior, project managers can strategize how to prevent CWB in projects.

There are four core components in the SLT's model of observational learning: (a) attention, (b) retention, (c) motor reproduction, and (d) motivation (Bethards, 2014).

Bandura (1978) theorized that a person watches a specific behavior, remembers the behavior, and mimics the behavior, and the environment responds to the behavior. If the response is positive and rewarding, the person is more inclined to repeat the behavior (Bandura, 1978). If the response is negative and punishing, the person is less likely to replicate the behavior (Bandura, 1978). When understanding what motivators drive CWB, project managers can better prevent the behavior in projects.

In project management, the concept of social learning can be a tool for understanding what went wrong in a project and how to prevent it from happening again (Hartmann & Dorée, 2015). Social interactions and practices trigger social learning, manifested in project-based organizations as the individual and social context of a project (Hartmann & Dorée, 2015). Social interaction is the basis for social learning (Brunstein, Jaime, Curi, d'Angelo, & Mainardes, 2015). Hartmann and Dorée (2015) stressed that project managers gathering cross-project knowledge should not treat individual projects as isolated islands and instead focus on the overall social context within the project community sharing organizational goals, practices, and resources. According to Hartmann and Dorée, the social learning aspect is ideal for project managers wanting to learn from past projects. By examining the reasons for past project failures, project managers can gain important knowledge to ensure success in future projects.

In social learning, individuals gain new ways of thinking and acting by imitating others (Brunstein et al., 2015). Little of human knowledge derives from personal experience; to survive, individuals would learn from each other via instruction or imitation (Bossan, Jann, & Hammerstein, 2015). Per SLT, individuals learn by observing

and imitating views and behavior of role models (Resick et al., 2013). By copying role models with the most successful result, social learners are likely to experience the same positive consequences (Bossan et al., 2015). Individuals can learn all types of behavior via the concepts of SLT (Miller & Morris, 2016). By exploring CWB-preventing strategies through the lens of SLT, I got an in-depth understanding of the research topic.

Several researchers have applied SLT in their studies. Brown, Treviño, and Harrison (2005) used SLT as the conceptual framework for studying ethical leadership. Per SLT, ethical leaders motivate positive employee behavior by being an inspiring role model (Brown et al., 2005; Ferreira, 2017; Gill, Lapalme, & Séguin, 2014; Wu, 2017). The SLT concept of modeling entails that individuals learn behavior through observation, imitation, and identification (Bandura, 1972; Brown et al., 2005; Wu, 2017). Employees look to managers for ethical guidance in work-related matters (Kalshoven, van Dijk, & Boon, 2016). Reinforcement of ethical standards and ethical decision-making are two means via which leaders can make an impact on employees' moral principles (Kalshoven et al., 2016). In accordance with SLT, employees with ethical leaders should be less likely to engage in behavior undermining organizational goals (Kalshoven et al., 2016). On the other hand, unethical behavior displayed by managerial role models will encourage employees to mimic the conduct of their leaders (Ben Sasson & Somech, 2015). Employees can learn CWB from peers as well as leaders.

The leadership capabilities of a project manager can influence team behavior and create a project climate encouraging or discouraging of CWB. Strategies to prevent CWB may include the leadership characteristics of the project manager. Wu (2017) argued that

a decrease in CWB under the influence of ethical leaders does not necessarily lead to increased levels of ethical employee conduct. In a study on ethical sales behavior, Wu suggested that the ethical climate in an organization might function as a mediator between ethical leadership and the moral conduct of the sales personnel. Belschak, Den Hartog, and De Hoogh (2018) looked at ethical leaders' ability to manage employees with CWB tendencies and found that high levels of ethical leadership reduced the frequency of CWB activities. Ferreira (2017) used SLT to explain how ethical leadership influences job embeddedness moderated by unethical peer behavior. Job embeddedness refers to employees' sense of attachment to an organization and their willingness to stay with the employer (Ferreira, 2017). Perceived unethical conduct by coworkers has a negative impact on ethical leaders' ability to inspire high levels of job embeddedness (Ferreira, 2017). Ferreira's study solidified the relationship between SLT and employee attachment. Employees model moral behavior by observing both managers and peers (Ferreira, 2017). Deviant work behavior affects everyone in an organization (Gunia & Kim, 2016). An ethical organizational climate promotes ethical employee behavior (Ferreira, 2017; Wu, 2017).

Project Management Institute and Academic Research

Created in 1969, the PMI is one of the largest, global professional organizations working for the standardization and education of project management (Bredillet, Tywoniak, & Dwivedula, 2015; Pinto & Winch, 2016). Through certification programs, professional organizations often educate their members on industry best practices (Bredillet et al., 2015; Escoffery, Kenzig, & Hyden, 2015). PMI is continuously involved

in academic research to enhance the field of project management (Bendoly, Perry-Smith, & Bachrach, 2010; Escoffery et al., 2015; Mahaney & Lederer, 2006; Molena & Rovai, 2016; Poston & Richardson, 2011). Researchers have used interviews to consult PMI members for their expertise (Mahaney & Lederer, 2006; Marion, Richardson, & Earnhardt, 2016; Sheffield & Lemétayer, 2013). Sheffield and Lemétayer (2013) studied environmental factors indicative of project success in a software development context by interviewing experienced PMI project managers. In addition, researchers have reviewed PMI documentation to help answer their research questions (Byrne, Keys, Schaffer, & Solic, 2014; Daniel & Daniel, 2018; Gray, 2005; Kutsch & Hall, 2009; Marion et al., 2016; Porananond & Thawesaengskulthai, 2014). Through case studies related to the PMI, qualitative researchers have explored various project management topics such as project program roadmaps (Byrne et al., 2014), project risk management (Porananond & Thawesaengskulthai, 2014), and academic project management programs (Poston & Richardson, 2011). Academic researchers have relied on the expertise of PMI members to explore and explain issues facing project management professionals.

Counterproductive Work Behavior

Researchers have noted the need for means to prevent CWB and reduce its impact on projects and organizations (Ahmad & Omar, 2014; Al-A'wasa, 2018; Dittes, Urbach, Ahlemann, Smolnik, & Müller, 2015; Dwivedi et al., 2015; Pinto, 2014; Talet, Mat-Zin, & Houari, 2014). In the social context of a team, project managers create and nourish environments in which shared worldviews trigger predictable behavioral patterns working towards a common goal (Aronson, Shenhar, & Patanakul, 2013). The results of

this study might provide project managers with strategies to prevent CWB in their projects. By preventing the CWB, project managers can address the activities and diminish the impact on project success.

IT projects continue to fail on a large scale despite research efforts to find explanations and solutions (Standing, Standing, & Kordt, 2016; Stoica & Brouse, 2014). Because of the potential for financial losses, organizations have an interest in reversing the trend of unsuccessful IT projects and CWB (Dittes et al., 2015; Dwivedi et al., 2015; Shoss et al., 2016; Talet et al., 2014). The effects of CWB are harmful to organizations and its members because of the negative impact on their financial and emotional well-being (Al-A'wasa, 2018; Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Barbaranelli, & Farnese, 2015; Sharma, 2018). Activities classified as CWB can target the organization as well as its members with for example theft, substance abuse, sabotage, workplace violence, retaliation, aggression, rudeness, and absenteeism (Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Barbaranelli, et al., 2015; Hu et al., 2015; Marcus et al., 2016; Matta, Erol-Korkmaz, Johnson, & Biçaksiz, 2014; Shoss et al., 2016). Amongst all behaviors potentially classified as CWB, the common factor is the harmful effect rather than the motivational factor (Marcus et al., 2016; Shoss et al., 2016). By preventing CWB, project managers can take steps to mitigate the effects of the behavior on the project and the organization as a whole.

In a study on employee theft, Hollinger and Clark (1983) used the terms *counterproductive behavior* and *deviance* interchangeably. Hollinger and Clark distinguished production from property deviance behavior. Production deviances include

tardiness, substance abuse, and wasting resources, whereas theft and sabotage are examples of property deviance (Hu et al., 2015; Marcus et al., 2016). To explain the CWB phenomenon and its internal structure, researchers have developed several models using various dimensions (Marcus et al., 2016). Per Shoss et al. (2016), researchers are trying to understand who engages in CWB enactments and when. Robinson and Bennett (1995) categorized deviant behavior into four areas: (a) production deviance, (b) property deviance, (c) political deviance, and (d) personal aggression. Directed towards co-workers, political deviance manifest itself through favoritism and blaming, whereas personal aggression has an undertone of violence expressed via harassment, abuse, and assault (Hu et al., 2015). Bennett and Robinson (2000) presented a two-category model of organizational deviance versus interpersonal deviance. Spector et al. (2006) used a five-dimensional model to explain CWB activities: (a) abuse, (b) production deviance, (c) stealing, (d) withdrawal, and (e) sabotage. Gruys and Sackett (2003) presented a model with 11 factors for explaining the relationship between various CWB activities: (a) stealing, (b) destroying property, (c) misusing information, (d) misusing resources, (e) unsafe behavior, (f) attendance, (g) quality of work, (h) alcoholism, (i) substance abuse, (j) inappropriate verbal activities, and (k) inappropriate physical activities.

Regardless if the CWB manifests itself towards the organization or individuals, it is widely agreed that a stressful work environment functions as a trigger for the behavior (Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Barbaranelli et al., 2015; Golparvar, 2016; Meier & Spector, 2013; Pinto, Dawood, & Pinto, 2014; Shoss et al., 2016). Meier and Spector (2013) described the trigger factors as work stressors placing individuals in a vicious cycle in

which CWB activities harm both the target for the adverse behavior and the individuals conducting them. Repercussions for the CWB actions could generate additional work stressors, which in turn escalates the situation and continues the cycle (Meier & Spector, 2013). Meier and Spector stressed the reciprocal relationship between work stressors and CWB as a factor to consider when examining employee behavior. Deviant behavior, expressed via CWB actions, is a way for employees to release tension and avoid emotional exhaustion (Golparvar, 2016). On the other hand, the individuals being the target for CWB can experience stress and job dissatisfaction, increasing the negative consequences for an organization (Cohen, 2016). Activities classified as CWB constitute a threat to organizational as well as individual well-being (Cohen, 2016). Project managers may consider stress as a factor to look for when preventing CWB in projects.

Matta et al. (2014) studied how significant work events can trigger CWB activity as well as how perception and negative feelings can feed into the response. Matta et al. found that events involving employee and managers caused a high level of negative response. The employee's perception of the event as fair or unfair influences the CWB response (Matta et al., 2014). Al-A'wasa (2018) studied the relationship between organizational justice dimensions and CWB with results showing that high levels of perceived unfairness in the organization triggered CWB. Examples of organizational injustice included unfair distribution of financial incentives and management neglecting to involve employees in work-related decisions impacting their job responsibilities (Al-A'wasa, 2018).

The approach to use both situational and personality factors to predict CWB enactments incorporate organizational constraints as well as individual coping styles (Shoss et al., 2016). Shoss et al. (2016) studied styles to cope with disengagement as a motivational explanation for CWB triggered by a stressful work environment. Coping strategies are addressing either the stressor causing the problem or the negative emotion brought on by the stressor (Shoss et al., 2016). Individuals can negate the emotional response to a stressor by engaging in retaliation, withdrawing from the situation involving the stressor, or conserving resources and efforts (Shoss et al., 2016). Shoss et al. used self-assessments in their study allowing the researchers to evaluate how participants perceive their CWB engagement and emotional response. However, Shoss et al. recognized the usage of participants' perceptions as the only data source as a limitation to the study. Still, there are uncertainties if others can accurately gauge an individual's behavior and perceptions because those persons are tainted themselves by their personal bias and perceptions (Shoss et al., 2016).

The degree to which an individual fits into the work environment can have an impact on the likelihood of CWB activity (Harold, Oh, Holtz, Han, & Giacalone, 2016). Harold et al. (2016) described the person-environment (P-E) fit as a motivational factor for CWB. Environmental fit includes several organizational elements such as the organization itself, the supervisor, and the work team (Harold et al., 2016). Employees can experience a high fit with some elements and a low fit with other elements simultaneously (Harold et al., 2016). Harold et al. stated that a low P-E fit causes frustration, which turns into CWB activities. To prevent CWB, Harold et al. suggested

targeted interventions as a mean to address the organizational elements with a low P-E fit factor.

By targeting stress factors, project managers can mitigate the effects of CWB. Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Barbaranelli et al. (2015) conducted a study on how self-efficacy can mitigate the effect of a stressful work environment and reduce the likelihood of CWB. Not all individuals react the same way when exposed to work stressors (Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Barbaranelli et al., 2015). Personal characteristics such as self-efficacy can mitigate the effects of stress triggers and the negative feelings caused by the stressful environment (Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Barbaranelli et al., 2015). Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Barbaranelli et al. found that individuals with a high sense of capability and perseverance during adverse work conditions are less likely to engage in CWB activities. Employees with the perception that they can cope with negative feelings are less prone to engage in destructive behavior (Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Barbaranelli et al., 2015). Ng, Lam, and Feldman (2016) found in their study on gender differences in CWB that women were less likely to engage in deviant work activities. However, in the study, the differences in intensity and frequency between men and women were only slight indicating that gender is not a strong predicative factor for CBW engagements (Ng et al., 2016). Ng et al. supported their findings with self-reporting as well as non-self-reporting data sources. Another mitigating factor for CWB activities is an individual's level of emotional intelligence (Karim, Bibi, Rehman, & Khan, 2015). Karim et al., (2015) suggested emotional intelligence development training as a mean to reduce CWB engagement amongst employees.

Another perspective on what triggers CWB is the connection with organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB). Yam, Klotz, He, and Reynolds (2017) looked at self-perception and deviant behavior from an entitlement perspective. Employees, who felt obliged by their employer to engage in OCB, got a sense of entitlement justifying deviant behavior towards the organization (Yam et al., 2017). OCB is positive employee behavior contributing to organizational improvements and considered the opposite of CWB (Bolino & Klotz, 2015; Ng et al., 2016). Bolino and Klotz (2015) presented five factors explaining why OCB can lead to CWB: (a) resource depletion, (b) moral licensing, (c) injustice and anger, (d) citizenship pressure, and (e) impression management. Lim and Loosemore (2017) explored the relationship between perceived justice and OCB in a project context and found that perceived injustices could trigger CBW activities. Particularly the perception of interpersonal injustice could trigger project participants to engage in CWB activities (Lim & Loosemore, 2017). The interpersonal aspect refers to how individuals consider themselves treated with respect and courtesy (Lim & Loosemore, 2017). Schulte-Braucks, Baethge, Dormann, and Vahle-Hinz (2018) suggested that individuals engage in CWB as a coping strategy when conducting work deemed unnecessary or unreasonable. When asked to perform tasks they do not agree with, employees feel stress and use CWB to restore a sense of justice (Schulte-Braucks et al., 2018).

Activities classified as CWB can be encouraged via peers and managers. As a role model for employees, managers can both inspire and prevent CWB (Ben Sasson & Somech, 2015; Brown et al., 2005; Kalshoven et al., 2016; Wu, 2017). When studying

the impact of ethical leadership on deviant work behavior, Kalshoven et al. (2016) found that ethical leadership could inspire unethical conduct if the behavior benefits the organization. Kalshoven et al. theorized that employees might rationalize deviant behavior by believing their actions are in accordance with organizational expectations. In a study on organizational silence, Monzani, Braun, and van Dick (2016) established that authentic leadership could lead to decreased deviant work behavior by encouraging employees to report issues to management. Organizational silence refers to employees not reporting work situations violating individual, ethical, or judicial standards (Monzani et al., 2016).

Just a few individuals, not all members of an organization, cause most actions of CWB (Gunia & Kim, 2016). Still, when news of deviant work behavior becomes public knowledge, it implicates everyone associated in some way with the organization (Gunia & Kim, 2016). For example, the child molestation scandal at Penn State University damaged the reputation of the university impacting even employees not involved with or aware of assistant couch Sandusky's abusive behavior (Gunia & Kim, 2016). Gunia and Kim (2016) referred to the employees not involved with CWB as the nondeviants. In a study exploring how CWB affects the nondeviant members of an organization, Gunia and Kim concluded that the non-offending employees responded by working harder only if the level of organizational identification is high. The consequences of CWB affect all members of an organization, making the need for preventative measures imperative.

Psychological characteristics can influence CWB tendencies (van Zyl & de Bruin, 2018). Palmer, Komarraju, Carter, and Karau (2017) studied the relevance

between CWB and the dark triad traits narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. These three personality traits manifest themselves in aggressive and manipulative behaviors, expressed in an organizational context via CWB activities (Belschak et al., 2018; Cohen, 2016; Palmer et al., 2017). Narcissistic persons regard themselves as superior to their surroundings whereas psychopaths lack empathy and Machiavellian persons strive to manipulate others (Belschak et al., 2018; Cohen, 2016; Palmer et al., 2017). In many instances, researchers group narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy under the terms *corporate* or *successful psychopathy* (Cohen, 2016). For individuals with these personality traits, CWB is a mean to control and dominate the social context in a work setting (Palmer et al., 2017). Palmer et al. showed that the perception of a supportive organization works as a mitigating factor to CWB, even for employees with the dark triad personalities.

Cohen (2016) stated that there is still little understanding of the relationship between dark traits and CWB. To bridge the gap, Cohen presented a model of mediating and moderating factors between dark traits and CWB. The mediating factors are perceived organizational politics and perceived accountability (Cohen, 2016). The moderators are political skill, organizational transparency, organizational politics, and organizational culture as well as climate (Cohen, 2016). The moderating constructs restrain the relationship between the mediating factors and CWB (Cohen, 2016). Yıldız, Alpkan, Sezen, and Yıldız (2015) identified moral disengagement as the moderator between Machiavellianism and deviant workplace behavior. Castille, Buckner, and Thoroughgood (2018) studied the relationship between Machiavellianism and unethical

employee behavior protecting an organization's public image. Castille et al. found that individuals with Machiavellian traits had a higher tendency to engage in activities violating ethical standards but protecting the organization's positive reputation.

Blickle and Schütte (2017) focused on psychopathy in the workplace and identified self-centered impulsivity as a dark trait directly linked to CWB targeting the organization. Individuals with self-centered impulsivity are prone to disregard rules and avoid responsibilities (Schütte et al., 2016). In individuals with little education and low levels of intrapersonal influence, the psychopathic trait of fearless dominance is a strong predicative factor for CWB activities (Blickle & Schütte, 2017). Persons with the fearless dominance trait are self-centered and put their needs before anyone else's (Schütte et al., 2016). Galić and Ružojčić (2017) found that self-control could mitigate aggressive tendencies resulting in individuals holding themselves back from engaging in CWB activities.

In contrast to intentional CWB brought on by the dark traits narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy, there may be individuals who are unaware that their behavior is counterproductive (Hu et al., 2015). When being the norm in an organizational setting, unintentional CWB activities become part of the everyday routine (Hu et al., 2015). If employees are constantly late, avoid responsibility, spread rumors, and so forth without any repercussions, the CWB actions become accepted, and other employees will mimic the behavior (Hu et al., 2015).

Another group of personality traits that researchers have examined in correlation with CWB is the big five-factor model: (a) extraversion (sociable, outgoing), (b)

agreeableness (empathic, pleasant), (c) conscientiousness (organized, dependable), (d) neuroticism (tense, negative), and (e) openness (curious, open-minded) (Ferreira & Nascimento, 2016; Le, Donnellan, Spilman, Garcia, & Conger, 2014). Le et al. (2014) found that the big five personality traits assessed in adolescence could predict CWB in adulthood. Per Le et al. (2014), adolescent agreeableness and conscientiousness were the two traits most related to CWB engagements later on in life. Ferreira and Nascimento (2016) found that agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism related to CWB amongst Brazilian workers.

Counterproductive Work Behavior in Projects

From a project management perspective, CWB can jeopardize project success. Failed projects can provide valuable lessons for improving the chance of success in future projects (Dunkley & Franklin, 2017). One aspect of the project management field is to improve the rate of project success, or rather the prevention of project failure (Anthopoulos, Reddick, Giannakidou, & Mavridis, 2016). For decades, researchers have attempted to understand why projects fail (Janssen, van der Voort, & van Veenstra, 2015; Jørgensen, 2016; McConnell, 1996; Nelson, 2007; Padalkar & Gopinath, 2016). At conferences and in seminal papers, researchers have discussed how to improve the success rate of software implementations (Dwivedi et al., 2015). Yet over time, the same factors continue to cause failure in software projects: lack of management support, shortcomings in project participants, unfamiliar technology, scope creep, and inadequate project management practices (Jørgensen, 2016).

Project participants have a tremendous impact on projects. Nelson (2007) categorized classic project mistakes causing failure into four categories: (a) people, (b) processes, (c) product, and (d) technology. Among those categories, people and processes were more often cause for the failure than product or technology (Nelson, 2007). Project success is dependent on individual effort, making people a relevant factor for the project outcome (Standing et al., 2016). Uncontrolled problem project participants are one of the people factors putting projects at risk (Dwivedi et al., 2015; Wang, Kunc, & Bai, 2017). Issues with project participants can trigger CWB activity in IT projects, increasing the risk for project failure (Zhang et al., 2015). Conflicts between personal and professional lives may negatively impact the behavior of project participants, and indirectly project performance (Xia, Zhong, Wang, & Tiong, 2018). Bhoola and Giangreco (2018) emphasized that conflicts in a project may not all be problematic if the team reaches a successful solution through collaboration and agreement. However, conflicts centered around relational issues between project participants can be a risk to project success (Bhoola & Giangreco, 2018).

The characteristics of the project setting can be a factor for CWB. Projects are a temporary gathering of individuals working together to accomplish a specific task during a specific period (Ligthart, Oerlemans, & Noorderhaven, 2016; Tyssen, Wald, & Heidenreich, 2014). Within IT and software engineering, projects are common due to the temporary nature (Soomro et al., 2016). As a vital factor in IT project success, the team climate is a reflection of the accepted, informal behavioral norm (Tyssen et al., 2014;

Zhang et al., 2015). If the deviant behavior is accepted, the team climate does not represent the official, organizational objectives (Zhang et al., 2015).

How project participants work together has an impact on project success. One of the strengths of a project team is the gathering of individual expertise with the purpose to solve the issue at hand collectively (Savelsbergh, Poell, & van der Heijden, 2015). Effective interpersonal interaction is vital for a successful collaboration within a project team (Savelsbergh et al., 2015). Pinto and Patanakul (2015) brought attention to the impact of narcissism in project champions on project success. Project champions have a key role in supporting a project when interacting with the stakeholders and the rest of the organization (Pinto & Patanakul, 2015). Because the project champion role is integral to project success, detrimental personal characteristics such as narcissism can negatively affect project governance causing project failure (Pinto & Patanakul, 2015). Soomro et al. (2016) extended the potential impact of individual personality traits on project success to include all project participants within a software engineering context. Even the project manager's emotional resources can have an impact on project success (Gallagher, Mazur, & Ashkanasy, 2015). The leadership style of the project manager is influential to the performance level of the project participants (Gallagher et al., 2015). Bhoola and Giangreco (2018) stressed the importance of emphatical capabilities as a mean for project managers to successfully engage with project participants and build relationships. An emotional skill set, including empathy, is a key factor for a successful IT project manager (Bhoola & Giangreco, 2018).

Ligthart et al. (2016) studied how the temporariness of projects affects participant behavior and found that it enabled a sense of operational flexibility and urgency. The time aspect caused a sense of urgency as well as time pressure to complete the task on time (Ligthart et al., 2016). Participants displayed the flexible behavior through compromises and consent (Ligthart et al., 2016). Dittes et al. (2015) distinguished between intentional and unintentional CWB, as employees are not always aware that they are not following company policy. Bringing awareness to practices can reduce unintentional behavior causing harm to projects (Dittes et al., 2015). Per Naess, Andersen, Nicolaisen, and Strand (2015), there is a fine line between intentional and unintentional CWB in projects as desirable outcomes can guide deliberate strategic misrepresentation and oblivious optimism bias. Actions of strategic misrepresentation are deceptive in nature, whereas optimism bias is a manifestation of delusion (Winch & Leiringer, 2016).

Strategic Misrepresentation

Intentional misrepresentation of project artifacts is contradictive to organizational objectives. For the longest time, strategic misrepresentation has been standard in projects taking place in the public sector, yet not openly discussed (Flyvbjerg, 2014). The trend is changing, as a public discussion about the phenomena is underway triggering actions from governments to take steps to stop runaway project costs (Flyvbjerg, 2014). Private investors in public projects make their own forecasts, challenging the project managers' models (Flyvbjerg, 2014). Flyvbjerg (2014) explained that project managers face stakeholders with different estimations than their own during the planning phase.

Intentional misrepresentation of project documentation and reporting can take place at any stage in a project (Pinto, 2014). Consulting firms competing to win project contracts often submit low estimates in the bidding phase knowing that additional funds will be required once the project is underway (Eik-Andresen, Landmark, & Johansen, 2015; Pinto, 2014). In projects, consultants provide expertise the client is lacking, making the client depending on the consultants being realistic in their proposals (Pinto, 2014). Once a project has already started, it is more likely the supporting organization will continue to provide funds to complete the project (Pinto, 2014).

Naess et al. (2015) studied issues with traffic forecasting in infrastructure projects. When asked directly about strategic misrepresentation in a questionnaire, few participants willingly admitted to deliberately manipulating estimates (Naess et al., 2015). Naess et al. contributed the low occurrence levels to participants' unwillingness to portray themselves negatively. However, when asked about practices related to strategic misrepresentation that could lead to erroneous forecasting, a higher percentage of the participants gave affirmative responses (Naess et al., 2015). The respondents included in these practices approving projects already unofficially selected, satisfying stakeholders, and compensating for bias in other areas of the project planning (Naess et al., 2015). Naess et al. contributed economic or political reasons for deliberately accepting or ignoring incorrect estimations. Naess et al. recommended more transparency and less complexity in the estimation process as means to discourage strategic misrepresentation in projects. Once the project has started, assumptions about exaggerations from a scheduling perspective can cause unrealistic timelines: project managers assume team

members will exaggerate time estimates; as well as top management not agreeing with the schedule presented by the project managers (Pinto, 2014). If organizational practices are too complex to adhere and perceived as a hinder, employees are more likely to by-pass them (Dittes et al., 2015). However, if employees are part of establishing the practices and get a chance to provide their opinions, deviant behavior is less likely to occur, as the employees feel part of the process (Dittes et al., 2015).

Optimism Bias

Optimism bias is a CWB activity as its effects can be harmful to an organization's financial well-being. As a CWB in projects, optimism bias can cause project failure (Locatelli, Mancini, & Romano, 2014; Naess et al., 2015), as participants tend to promote positive outcomes rather than negative ones (Pinto, 2014). Bias is relevant for researchers evaluating the project implementation process, as human behavior affects every aspect of a project implementation (Wang et al., 2017). Optimism bias manifests itself in the overestimation of positive results or underestimation of negative results (Stingl & Geraldi, 2017; Taylor, Brice, & Robinson, 2016). The optimistic behavior is common in projects with large budgets because of the amount of money involved (Flyvbjerg, 2014). Consultants tend to downplay risks, as they want the client to give them the project contract (Pinto, 2014). During the planning phase, in which decision-makers are considering funding a project, the cost is underestimated to make the project attractive (Eik-Andresen et al., 2015). Planning fallacy is a manifestation of optimism bias where project managers and other participants make project plans intentionally too optimistic with the purpose to secure funding (Eik-Andresen et al., 2015). When reviewing project

plans during the planning phase, managers' optimism bias may prevent them to see flaws in the project (Féris, Zwikael, & Gregor, 2017). Because of managers' optimism regarding project performance, managers approve faulty project plans when they should not have (Féris et al., 2017).

Project participants are jeopardizing project success when believing their project is less at risk despite indications of the contrary (Pinto, 2014). Participants tend to think that if the negative outcome has not happened in the past, it will probably not happen in the future either (Taylor et al., 2016). In failing projects, project participants display optimism bias by assuming additional resources or increased commitment will ensure project success (Meyer, 2014).

Project decision makers are often too confident in their own ability to influence project outcomes (Meyer, 2014; Rolstadås, Pinto, Falster, & Venkataraman, 2015). Meyer (2014) categorized optimism bias into two areas: in-project bias and post-project bias. When participants know the cost to reach project completion will be greater than the original estimation, but believe in their ability to deliver the project on time and budget, they display in-project optimism bias (Meyer, 2014). Project participants display post-project optimism bias when they believe the project will provide better returns for business users than initially thought, regardless of ability to substantiate the claim (Rolstadås et al., 2015). Project participants with optimism bias tend to acknowledge evidence supporting a positive outcome while ignoring evidence indicating a negative outcome (Taylor et al., 2016).

Taylor et al. (2016) suggested the cause for the optimism bias behavior be a lack of sufficient knowledge needed to do an accurate risk evaluation. To counter optimism bias, researchers recommend taking the outside-view perspective, which entails looking at past projects as indicators for future risk, cost, and performance estimations rather than considering the particulars of the current project (Dutta & Bose, 2015; Shmueli, Pliskin, & Fink, 2016). Shmueli et al. (2016) found the outside-view approach especially beneficial for mitigating the effects of optimism bias in software development projects. If project managers do not identify and address the behavior in time, optimism bias may have a devastating impact on projects and organizations (Eik-Andresen et al., 2015; Taylor et al., 2016).

Risk Management

Activities classified as CWB constitute a risk that project managers need to address in their efforts to bring projects to success. The inability to reverse the trend of unsuccessful IT projects can cause financial strain on an organization (Dwivedi et al., 2015; Talet et al., 2014). Deviant work behavior can also be a costly experience for organizations (Dittes et al., 2015). A way to control the cost is to control the risks associated with deviant behavior in projects (Dittes et al., 2015). How project managers anticipate and assess risks is essential for project success (Fabricius & Büttgen, 2015). Overconfident project managers diminish the likelihood of risk scenarios actually happening and what the impact would be to project success (Fabricius & Büttgen, 2015). The lack of preparation for what needs to happen if a risk scenario is taking place could be the cause for the project failing (Fabricius & Büttgen, 2015). Project managers

estimating the risk impact instead of just the risk probability are better equipped to minimize harmful impact to project success caused by CWB (Fabricius & Büttgen, 2015). Trust between project participants is another relevant factor to handle risk situations without jeopardizing project success (Swärd, 2016).

Consulting firms downplay risks, as their intent is to win a project contract (Pinto, 2014). In contractor-client relationships, differences in risk perception open up for one party to take advantage of the other party (Pinto, 2014). However, if the consulting firm is engaged in a long-lasting, multi-project relationship with the client, the consultants are motivated to act in the client's best interest (Pinto, 2014). Still, the client's organizational attitude for risk-taking affects the likelihood for projects succeeding or failing regardless of the actions of the consulting firm (Arashpour, Wakefield, Lee, Chan, & Hosseini, 2016). Instead of viewing project risks as accidents, project managers should anticipate and plan for risk scenarios as if they are certain to occur (Liu & Tsai, 2016). In a perfect scenario, the estimates for completing a project on time, on budget and within scope should suffice for a project manager to deliver a successful project (Allen, 2015). In reality, risk elements affecting the timeline, cost, or scope in the project context will pose a threat to project success (Allen, 2015). Managing risks is a challenging, yet crucial, task for project managers to ensure project success (Allen, 2015). Here follows an account of concepts and theories pertinent to the topic of CWB.

Normalization of Deviant Behavior

When members of an organization accept CWB as a standard norm, it can be a challenging task for project managers to find strategies preventing the activities. Deviant

work behavior constitutes actions violating organizational directives jeopardizing the well-being of the employer as well as employees (Yıldız et al., 2015). In a study on employee theft, Hollinger and Clark (1983) applied the terms *counterproductive behavior* and *deviance* interchangeably. Deviant work behavior can be costly for an organization due to, among many things, decreased productivity and damaged reputation, all resulting in loss of profits (Yıldız et al., 2015). Deviant work behavior happens in all types of organizations (Zhang et al., 2015).

In 1996, Vaughan used the term *normalization of deviant behavior* to describe the organizational culture at NASA causing the Challenger disaster (Hall, 2016; Pinto, 2014; Price & Williams, 2015). Challenger was a space shuttle that exploded in 1986, 73 seconds after take-off (Hall, 2016; Pinto, 2014). Investigators identified leaking O-rings on the rocket booster as the reason for the explosion; the O-rings came loose after take-off, piercing the fuel tank, thus causing the explosion (Hall, 2016; Pinto, 2014). NASA and the contracting firm had known about the faulty O-rings for several years, but the error had become an expected occurrence despite the engineers applying a solution for the issue (Hall, 2016; Pinto, 2014). Hall (2016) described a conference call with representatives from the managerial and engineering teams taking place the evening before the Challenger launch. The engineers expressed concerns over whether the O-rings were holding up in the cold temperatures on the launch pad, referring to damaged O-rings in an incident taking place a year before under the same freezing weather conditions (Hall, 2016). The managers dismissed the engineers' concerns referring to the lack of

proof of how the faulty O-rings would affect the mission given that the errors had been present for several years; hence the launch moved forward (Hall, 2016).

When deviant behavior turns into the norm, unexpected events gradually become expected and accepted (Hall, 2016; Pinto, 2014). The term normalization of deviant behavior is referring to how individuals inside an organization little by little become accustomed to and accepting of risky and destructive behavior; a pattern of conduct they would otherwise not tolerate (Edwards, 2017; Haji-Kazemi et al., 2015; Hall, 2016). Employees get used to common deviant behaviors and fail to see them as counterproductive (Hu et al., 2015). Regularly exposed to deviant behavior, individuals will eventually mimic the actions and engage in CWB themselves (Hu et al., 2015). Deviant behavior could include illegal actions with serious, legal repercussions for the organization (Bradshaw, 2015). In a corporate environment accepting of deviance, employees overlook or misinterpret signs of danger that could have catastrophic consequences (Reiman, Rollenhagen, Pietikäinen, & Heikkilä, 2015).

Over time, organizational members grow insensitive to deviant tendencies due to the lack of direct consequences for the behavior; individuals are getting away with deviant behavior (Price & Williams, 2015). If project participants perceive a lack of accountability for CWB, the motivation to engage in such conduct increases (Pinto, 2014). Dittes et al. (2015) suggested that employees would be less likely to engage in deviant behavior if they were aware of the negative consequences on a personal and an organizational level. Individual benefit is a significant motivator for engaging in deviant behavior (Dittes et al., 2015). In the example with NASA, management considered it a

waste of resources to look into a permanent fix for the leaking O-rings, seeing as many previous flights displaying the same error had ended successfully (Hall, 2016). The problem with the leaking O-rings had become an expected issue accepted by management (Hall, 2016). Pressure to carry out the launch according to schedule created a project culture in which spending time on expected issues, such as the leaking O-rings, was not encouraged or prioritized (Hall, 2016).

The normalization of deviant behavior occurs in all types of industries (Bradshaw, 2015; Price & Williams, 2015). In project management, the gradual acceptance of deviant behavior manifests itself in scope adjustments and changes to control documentation (Pinto, 2014). It is the gradual acceptance of expected negative results. As organizations gradually drift away from established practices and embrace deviant results as the new norm, the acceptance of corporate misbehavior grows as well (Pinto, 2014). Employees develop bad, unsafe habits in organizations where deviant behavior has become the normal (Edwards, 2017). Factors contributing to the normalization of deviance include lack of resources, pressure to deliver, untested technology triggering false alerts, and intolerance of disagreeing opinions (Reiman et al., 2015).

It is a difficult task transitioning an organization back from accepted deviance to following established policies and practices once again (Price & Williams, 2015). Awareness of the concept normalization of deviant behavior is fundamental for all preventative efforts (Price & Williams, 2015). When deviant behavior is the norm, the organizational leadership shows a high level of tolerance for CWB (Edwards, 2017). To transform the organizational culture, the leadership has to show that deviant behavior no

longer is accepted and such activities have severe consequences (Edwards, 2017). When implementing these changes, organizational leaders have to be considerate of the human aspect, so people are on board with dropping old habits and creating new, safe routines (Edwards, 2017). Organizational leaders, such as project managers, need to create an environment where CWB is not accepted.

Transactional and Transformational Leadership Theory

The leadership abilities of project managers are influential to project participant behavior and CWB. In projects, participant commitment and team building are essential for successful results (Aga, Noorderhaven, & Vallejo, 2016; Tyssen et al., 2014). In a study on the impact of transactional and transformational leadership styles in projects, Tyssen et al. (2014) found that both leadership styles are successful in soliciting commitment in participants, but transformational leaders are more effective. Aga et al. (2016) identified team building as a mean for transformational project managers to inspire participants to work towards a holistic goal resulting in project success. The project manager's leadership style is a key factor to project success (Aga, 2016; Aga et al., 2016).

How project managers lead the project team can be a factor for CWB. Transactional leaders manage their teams through supervision and control elements (Aga, 2016). By setting expectations and rules, transactional leaders can enforce compliance from their subordinates as well as monitor performance (Aga, 2016; Masa'deh, Obeidat, & Tarhini, 2016; Zhu & Kindarto, 2016). In transactional leadership theory, reward and punishment are tools used to direct followers to complete their task, which in turn, will

lead to a successful result (Aga, 2016; Masa'deh et al., 2016; Tyssen et al., 2014). In contrast, transformational leaders influence the participants to take ownership for their own work as well as build a vision benefiting both individual and project (Tyssen et al., 2014). The transformational leadership theory constitutes four general aspects: (a) idealized influence, (b) intellectual stimulation, (c) inspirational motivation, and (d) individualized consideration (Aga et al., 2016; Masa'deh et al., 2016). Leaders with idealized influence easily attract dedicated followers who identify themselves with the persona of the leader (Aga et al., 2016; Masa'deh et al., 2016). Intellectual stimulation refers to a leader's ability to make followers identify issues as well as find solutions, whereas inspirational motivation manifests itself in visions shared by the leader encouraging followers to take on challenges (Aga et al., 2016; Masa'deh et al., 2016). Individualized consideration constitutes the leader's personal attention and support to each follower (Aga et al., 2016; Masa'deh et al., 2016).

Project managers influence their teams by the manner in which they motivate the participants. A transactional leader monitors the project participants' completion of tasks as a way to ensure progress and success, whereas a transformational leader aligns the participants' goals with the project objectives to motivate individuals (Aga et al., 2016; Tyssen et al., 2014). In project teams with high tenure diversity, transformational leaders are especially successful in motivating individual participants to perform their best (De Poel, Stoker, & Van der Zee, 2014). Through team building activities, project participants learn about project goals as well as everyone's area of responsibility, while enhancing their skill set in communication, collaboration, and problem-solving (Aga et

al., 2016). Per Aga et al. (2016), all these factors lead to increased project success. Nevertheless, the transactional leadership style can also promote project success through the punish-and-reward attribute (Aga, 2016). Aga (2016) found that a clearly defined project goal along with rewarding encouragement, allowed transactional leaders to lead projects to success.

Zhu and Kindarto (2016) proposed that leadership style and decision structure are predicative factors for success in IT projects. Per Zhu and Kindarto, transactional leadership represents a hierarchical decision structure whereas transformational leadership constitutes a participative approach to management. In a study of government IT projects in Indonesia, the transformational leaders proved themselves more efficient in achieving project success in comparison with leaders applying a transactional style (Zhu & Kindarto, 2016). Shao, Feng, and Hu (2016) questioned the notion to apply the same leadership style throughout the life cycle of an enterprise resource system. Instead, Shao et al. suggested a combined model with a transformational leadership style during the planning phase and a transactional approach during the implementation stages. During the assimilation phase after go-live as well as the extension phase for the next steps, Shao et al. proposed to apply a combination of the two leadership styles to achieve a successful result for the enterprise resource system. Afshari and Gibson (2016) acknowledged that both the transactional and transformational leadership styles could promote positive employee behavior. However, due to the popularity of the transformational approach, researchers have neglected to explore how transactional leaders achieve employee engagement, motivation and successful results (Afshari & Gibson, 2016; Aga, 2016.)

Masa'deh et al. (2016) studied the impact of transformational leaders on job performance including the occurrence of CWB. Masa'deh et al. found that transformational leaders have a strong correlation with positive job performance levels and thus fewer instances of CWB. Mekpor and Dartey-Baah (2017) explored how transactional and transformational managers can influence employee participation in OCB and CWB. Both leadership styles have a positive impact on OCB, with the transformational approach having a slightly stronger correlation (Mekpor & Dartey-Baah, 2017).In regards to CWB, transformational managers are less likely to have employees engaging in deviant behavior comparison with transactional managers (Mekpor & Dartey-Baah, 2017). However, there are instances where transformational leaders might trigger CWB responses from their employees by causing perceived injustices (Brimecombe, Magnusen, & Bunds, 2014). Individuals are more prone to engage in CWB if the leader is unable to steer them towards a common goal (Brimecombe et al., 2014). Aga (2016) stressed the importance of a well-defined, well-communicated project goal as a factor with a strong link to project success.

Depending on how the CWB manifests itself, project managers can, through different leadership styles, mitigate the impact from putting project success at risk. What leadership style is the most efficient to handle CWB, may depend on the organizational context. Martínez-Córcoles and Stephanou (2017) found that in a military context with high levels of standardization and routinization, transactional leaders were very successful in establishing a safe environment with little deviant behavior regarding following safety procedures and engaging in risky activities. On the other hand, Sechudi

and Olivier (2016) established how the transformational leadership style increased the engagement of OCB in a South African military unit. Low levels of OCB can lead to CWB (Bolino & Klotz, 2015). Belschak, Den Hartog, and Kalshoven (2015) showed that transformational leaders are better equipped to handle employees with Machiavellian traits via work autonomy and individual motivation aligned with organizational objectives.

Social Exchange Theory

When SLT theorists explain behavioral learning through observation, motivation, and modeling, advocates of the social exchange theory emphasize individual perception as a driving factor for learned behavior. Per the social exchange theory, individual perceptions and attitudes shape how a person behaves (Yıldız et al., 2015). Perceptions form attitudes that in turn form behavior (Yıldız et al., 2015). Social exchanges between individuals rely on the notion that past actions resulting in rewards will yield the same response in the future (Beauregard, 2014; Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2014; Rupp, Shao, Jones, & Liao, 2014). People will repeat behavior with a previously rewarding outcome (Beauregard, 2014; Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2014). However, when persons perceive themselves as mistreated, they will reciprocate with the same behavior towards the source of their ill-treatment (Beauregard, 2014; Hunter & Penney, 2014). Per the social exchange theory, individuals do a cost versus reward evaluation before deciding to engage in a social exchange (Aubé & Rousseau, 2014). If the perception is that the rewards precede the costs, the individual will engage in the social exchange (Aubé & Rousseau, 2014).

In a workplace, individuals can have social exchanges with their team members, their supervisor, or with the organization itself (Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2014). A negative employee perception of the managerial ethical standards may cause deviant work behavior (Beauregard, 2014; Yıldız et al., 2015). In a project team setting, individuals evaluate the level of personal reward before collaborating with team members (Aubé & Rousseau, 2014). When CWB occurs within a project, team members perceive collaboration as a threat to individual success and advancement (Aubé & Rousseau, 2014). The perceived costs of collaborating with team members trump the benefits (Aubé & Rousseau, 2014). As with SLT, the motivational aspect is relevant for learning a new behavior per the social exchange theory.

The social exchange aspect can enlighten the relationship between CWB and psychological characteristics. Yıldız et al. (2015) used the social exchange theory to explain how moral disengagement is the mediator causing careerism, relativism, and Machiavellianism to result in destructive deviant work behavior. Moral disengagement refers to individuals' ability to ignore their own moral standards by convincing themselves that ethical norms do not apply to their person in a particular context (Eriksson, 2016; Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Fontaine et al., 2015; Yıldız et al., 2015). Careerism is the tendency to seek career progression through other means than performance (Yıldız et al., 2015). Relativism refers to an individual's inclination to ignore general moral norms when making ethical decisions (Yıldız et al., 2015). Persons with Machiavellian characteristics are manipulative, callous, and self-centered with little interest in the need of others (Yıldız et al., 2015). Yıldız et al. suggested that the level of

moral disengagement in an individual can be a predicative factor for how likely it is that a person engages in deviant work behavior. Fida, Paciello, Tramontano, Fontaine et al. (2015) found that employees use moral disengagement to cope with stressful events or perceived wrong-doings without compromising their own moral framework. Unlike SLT where individuals imitate observed rewarding behavior, the social exchange theorists stress the cognitive inclination to disregard individual moral standards as a coping mechanism for CWB.

Also applying the social exchange theory, Chernyak-Hai and Tziner (2014) looked at perceived organizational distributive justice and climate as factors predicting CWB. Distributive justice refers to how employees experience the organization in terms of fair and just treatment, adequate support and information as well as ample recognition and rewards (Beauregard, 2014; Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2014). Organizational climate is the social environment manifested in a workplace via norms, policies, and standards (Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2014). When employees perceive their organization as just and ethical, they were less likely to engage in CWB (Beauregard, 2014; Chernyak-Hai & Tziner, 2014; Rupp et al., 2014). Per the SLT, individuals get CWB tendencies from observing peers and managers engaging in rewarding behavior contradicting to organizational goals without repercussions. On the other hand, the social exchange theorists emphasize the perception of unfairness as a driving factor for CWB.

Guay et al. (2016) used the social exchange theory to explore the relationship between the big five-factor model of personality traits, organizational commitment, and CWB. The personality characteristics are extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness,

neuroticism, and openness (Le et al., 2014). Guay et al. aimed to fill a gap in the literature about how the big five personality traits influence deviant behavior in a workplace, particularly exploring the role of organizational commitment as mediator. A low level of commitment to the organization is an indicator of a prowess for CWB (Guay et al., 2016). Guay et al. suggested the social exchanges in a workplace cultivate and enforce organizational commitment, thus motivating employees to engage in positive work behavior and aligning with organizational objectives. Of the five traits, agreeableness and conscientiousness showed a negative relationship with deviant work behavior via organizational commitment (Beauregard, 2014; Guay et al., 2016).

The organization may not always be the target for employees engaging in CWB. Hunter and Penney (2014) showed that employees dealing with difficult customers are likely to direct their CWB activities towards the customers and not the organization. In accordance with the social exchange theory, employees with less interaction with demanding clients are less prone to engage in deviant actions against the clients (Hunter & Penney, 2014). The core concept of the social exchange theory is individuals' perception of themselves, their surroundings, and the social context in which they find themselves as an influence for CWB. In comparison, the SLT focus on CWB as a learned behavior from observing others benefit from specific activities despite the counterproductive nature.

Attribution Theory

Advocates of the attribution theory explain individual behavior as a result of cognitive predisposition towards a specific outcome. Researchers applying the attribution

theory look at individuals' tendency to explain success or failure in a specific event as an indicator for future performance expectations in for example a project management context (Chen & Mykletun, 2015; Standing et al., 2016; Zuber, 2015). The two attribution styles - optimistic and depressive - are indicative of an individual's predisposition for job performance and satisfaction (Standing et al., 2016). The attributions of a person influence the feelings and behavior of others within a team (Chen & Mykletun, 2015). The attribution theory can explain why some individuals engage in CWB when exposed to negative events (Raman, Sambasivan, & Kumar, 2016; Zuber, 2015. In comparison, SLT contributes the social learning aspect to all individuals regardless of cognitive penchants.

There are three elements of the attribution theory: (a) personal or situational causality, (b) controllability of the behavior, and (c) mitigating circumstances explaining the behavior (Wated & Sanchez, 2015; Zuber, 2015). The causality aspect of the attribution theory manifests itself in an internal or external cause for an event to take place (Wated & Sanchez, 2015). A person causes internal attributions, whereas circumstances tribute to external attributions (Wated & Sanchez, 2015). Per the attribution theory, if a person is the cause for the event, and the person is in control of his or her behavior with the absence of mitigating circumstances, then the person is responsible for the deviant behavior (Zuber, 2015).

Standing et al. (2016) proposed to apply the attribution theory when exploring the impact of individual emotions and behaviors on project success. Project participants with depressive attribution styles tend to experience a self-serving bias where a negative

attitude affects other team members' levels of motivation and performance resulting in project failure (Standing et al., 2016). Because attributions are self-perceptions, there will always be a degree of personal bias to consider (Zuber, 2015). Similar to the social exchange theory, the attribution theory emphasizes the relevance of individual perception as a driving factor for CWB. Individuals may fail to recognize their own involvement and fault in project failures and place the blame on situational instead of personal factors (Zuber, 2015). In order to prevent deviant work behavior, management should encourage an organizational climate in which CWB activities do not lead to further CWB activities (Zuber, 2015). In addition, members of the organization should receive training to bring awareness to personal bias in a CWB situation in an effort to control deviant work behavior (Zuber, 2015). Unlike the social exchange theory and the attribution theory, SLT does not contribute individual perceptions as a reason for a new behavior. Theorists applying the SLT stress observation, imitation, and motivation as a basis for engaging in new behavioral patterns.

Social Disorganization Theory and Social Control Theory

The concept of social disorganization theory includes environmental explanatory factors as the reason for behavioral tendencies. Davis and Holland-Davis (2015) used the social disorganization theory to apply a structural explanation to CWB. Often used to explain criminality, Davis and Holland-Davis extended the application of the social disorganization theory to address organizational conditions triggering counterproductive activity. Per the social disorganization theory, characteristics of a community can affect the likelihood of deviant behavior (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015; Emerick, Curry,

Collins, & Fernando Rodriguez, 2014). Communities with a low-income, transient, and racially heterogeneous population are more likely to have a higher crime rate (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015; Klein, Allison, & Harris, 2017). Broken home situations is another influential factor causing social disorganization (Klein et al., 2017). These factors cause social disorganization, which leaves the population more vulnerable to the influence of deviant behavior (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015; Emerick et al., 2014; Klein et al., 2017). Unlike the social disorganization theory, SLT does not factor in societal parameters in the social learning concept.

Davis and Holland-Davis (2015) suggested that the same conceptual framework used to account for crime rates in communities could explain deviant behavior in a corporate context. By identifying characteristics affecting the organizational climate, Davis and Holland-Davis applied a social context in the research for what motivates deviant workplace behavior. Workplace marginality, high turnover, and employee heterogeneity lead to workplace disorganization, which prevents an organization to recognize and address CWB (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015). Marginal jobs have low wages, poor benefits, little career development, inconvenient work schedules, unrealistic workloads, or poor employee appreciation (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015). Workplaces with a high employee turnover struggle to create a committed, connected workforce (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015). In a diverse workforce in terms of age, gender, and race, employees experience different norms and attitudes to deviant work behavior (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015).

In an organizational setting, CWB can have two types of triggers: lack of standards and conflict of standards (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015). The lack of behavioral standards in an organization leaves employees without guidance on how to act at work (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015). A conflict of standards takes place when there is ambiguous communication to employees on how to conduct themselves (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015). Davis and Holland-Davis (2015) pointed out a gap in the existing research on deviant workplace behavior where there has been no previous exploration of the effectiveness in applying informal and formal control elements as means to address CWB. The social disorganization theory and the SLT differ on the aspect of what factors trigger CWB. Supporters of the SLT stress observed behavior with rewarding attributes as an influence for CWB, whereas social disorganization theorists emphasize societal factors and lack of organizational guidance as the driving force behind CWB activities.

Social control theory is another conceptual framework used by researchers to explain why individuals engage in criminal behavior (Donner, Maskaly, & Fridell, 2016; Meer & Tolsma, 2014). Donner et al. (2016) applied the social control theory to explain deviant behavior in law enforcement communities - police misconduct. Police misconduct is an expression of CWB manifested in various behaviors that violate department regulations and ethical standards as well as potentially break the law (Donner et al., 2016). From a juvenile criminological perspective, social control theorists contribute pro-social tendencies to the strength of social control elements such as parents, teachers, and other school representatives (Donner et al., 2016). According to the social control theory, when individuals feel connected to society, they are less inclined to

engage in deviant behavior (Donner et al., 2016; Meer & Tolsma, 2014). Similar to the social disorganization theory, the social control theory contributes societal elements as influential factors for learning new behaviors. Through the lens of SLT, individuals learn new behavior by observing others benefit from their actions.

There are four elements to the social bond between individuals and their community: commitment, involvement, attachment, and belief (Donner et al., 2016). Attachment refers to the extent an individual cares about what others think, whereas commitment represents an individual's perception of having something to lose or not (Donner et al., 2016). The social bonding element of belief represents an individual's faith in rules and regulations, whereas involvement refers to the notion that individuals occupied with pro-social activities have less time to engage in deviant behavior (Donner et al., 2016). Similar to the social control theory, in the social disorganization theory formal and informal control elements are essential to prevent deviant behavior (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015; Meer & Tolsma, 2014). Social networks strengthen the informal control of a community by connecting neighbors with each other creating an attachment (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015). Formal control manifests itself in the social networks' ability to engage public resources such as collaborations with local law enforcement agencies (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015). When the social disorganization theory and the social control theory require social control elements to prevent CWB, theorists applying the SLT emphasize the motivational aspect as a mean to control unwanted behavior. Per the SLT, if the behavior is not beneficial, individuals will not imitate it.

The concept of social bonds functioning as a deterrent to deviant activities is relevant to occupational counterproductive behavior as well (Donner et al., 2016). However, the involvement aspect of social bonding is not applicable as a deterrent to CWB in a workplace setting (Donner et al., 2016). The other elements of social bonding - attachment, commitment, and belief - are still working as constraints of CWB (Donner et al., 2016). Job satisfaction is an example of an indicator of connectedness to the social community that the workplace represents (Donner et al., 2016). Donner et al. (2016) found in their study that police supervisors with a high level of social bonding were less likely to engage in CWB such as running an unauthorized record check, fixing a ticket for a friend or relative, or failing to report excessive use of force. Supporters of the social control theory use social bonding as discouraging tool for addressing CWB, whereas SLT practitioners stress motivation as a way to prevent CWB.

Transition

Section 1 of the study began with a description of the background of the problem, which is that some project managers lack strategies to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. Then, I clarified the problem and purpose statement, followed by an account of the nature of the study and the research question. Subsequently, I listed the interview questions as well as explained the conceptual framework of the study. After the conceptual framework, I covered operational definitions, assumptions, limitations, and delimitations of the study. The subsection significance of the study contained two areas: contribution to business practice and implications for social change. In the review of the

professional and academic literature, I analyzed current literature on CWB and project failure. The review also covered theories and concepts relevant to the study problem.

Section 2 will address the following areas: purpose statement; role of the researcher; participants; research method and design; population and sampling; ethical research; instruments and technique used during data collection; data organization technique; data analysis; reliability; and validity. In Section 3, I will present my findings and demonstrate how they apply to professional practice and implications for social change. Section 3 will end with recommendations for action and further research.

Section 2: The Project

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to identify what strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects. In Section 2, I will address the purpose statement, the role of the researcher, the selection of participants, the choice of research method and design, the data collection and analysis, as well as the reliability and validity of the study.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this qualitative, multiple case study was to explore strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. The population group constituted of project managers who were members of a Project Management Institute (PMI) chapter in the southeastern United States, and held a project management professional (PMP) certification or an agile certified practitioner (ACP) certification. The project managers must have been involved in at least one software project completed within the last 5 years. The study's contribution to social change is that because failed software projects are a threat to organizations' financial sustainability, increased rates of project success will lead to increased employment opportunities and charitable donations to the community.

Role of the Researcher

In this multiple case study, I was the data collection instrument, as I interviewed PMP or ACP certified project managers using semistructured, open-ended questions and reviewed PMI documentation. Case study researchers are directly involved in all aspects of data gathering (Boblin, Ireland, Kirkpatrick, & Robertson, 2013; Yu, Abdullah, &

Saat, 2014) and data interpretation (McCusker & Gunaydin, 2015). For the past 12 years, I have been involved in software projects from a business standpoint as well as an IT perspective. Additionally, my roles in the projects have been both that of a participant and that of a leader. In my current position, I am a manager of a software engineering team responsible for leading development work and projects pertaining to human resources applications. Because I was a business analyst early in my career, my professional skill set includes retrieving information from users via various means and interpreting that data into technical design instructions. In my managerial role, I lead a team of nine employees and contractors, which gives me an insight into the procedures of project management as well as the motivational aspects of leadership. The leadership, data gathering, and analytical abilities served me well as a researcher. My leadership experience allowed me to manage and organize my research project efficiently. My proficiency in collecting information was applicable to the data-gathering phase, and my aptitude for analyzing data was beneficial when reviewing the data and identifying themes.

In this study, the relationship between researcher and participants was limited to being members of the same professional organization, PMI. Dush (2012) argued that researchers could get too close to participants jeopardizing the authenticity of the study because participants' wish to please the researcher, which could result in tainted responses. If the study findings are in line with the researcher's expectations, the results are obvious; but if the conclusions differ slightly or considerably, then the results are interesting or radical (McBeath, 2015). Participants with a close relationship with the

researcher could tailor their responses to avoid harming their personal association (Dush, 2012). To avoid personal bias during the interview, I was aware of my own potential impact on the interview setting and the participant.

I did not consciously apply any personal bias upon the data gathered and analyzed; also, I did not purposely ignore findings not aligned with my expected results. Researchers need to be aware of their own impact on the quest for knowledge, caused by bias derived from personal experience (Berger, 2015). Still, even on an unconscious level, researchers can apply bias when processing information due to cognitive expectations derived from ego and opinions (Lloyd & Schweizer, 2014). As a researcher, I continuously had to evaluate how my position influenced participants as well as analytical conclusions. Known as reflexivity, this exercise of self-evaluation is vital for quality qualitative research (Berger, 2015). Research objectivity is essential for obtaining a realistic, fact-based comprehension of a study subject (Lloyd & Schweizer, 2014).

When initially agreeing to contribute to a study, participants are not always aware of how that decision could potentially compromise their confidentiality and privacy (Johnson, 2014). As a researcher, I needed to keep the participants safe from harm during the entire study process and to ensure their responses and identities were kept safe. It is a researcher's responsibility to protect the participants and to safeguard their privacy (Johnson, 2014). Only once I had received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Walden University and the PMI chapter, I conducted the study. The purpose of the IRB is to safeguard the rights of study subjects and to ensure the research procedure is not damaging to the participants (McEvenue, Hofer, Lista, & Ahmad, 2016). I followed

the research procedures listed in the Belmont report. The principles included in the Belmont report constitute the foundation for how ethical researchers conduct their work in a responsible way (Marrone, 2016).

When I interviewed the PMP or ACP certified project managers, I followed a predetermined interview protocol to ensure my data were reliable. Even experienced interviewers can benefit from interview protocols to ensure best practices strategies are applied (Benia, Hauck-Filho, Dillenburg, & Stein, 2015). Using a protocol, the interviewers have a quick guide to each step, and they can focus on getting as much information out of the participants as possible (Benia et al., 2015). I started the interview by introducing myself and describing my background. Next, I explained the rules of the interview to the participant. During the main data-gathering phase, I asked open-ended questions without any suggestive insinuations. Before ending the interview, I reminded the participants about their privacy rights. After the interview was completed, I summarized the information shared by the interviewee and asked him or her to confirm I had captured it correctly. Researchers refer to this process as member checking and use it to assure data saturation (Abma & Stake, 2014; Harvey, 2015). In addition to the interviews, I reviewed PMI documentation for what strategies project managers should use to prevent CWB in projects.

Participants

The purpose of this study was to identify the strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects. The participants, whose contributions provided information to explore this research question, were experienced PMP or ACP certified project managers

who were members of a PMI chapter in the southeastern United States. The participants had to have completed at least one software project within the last 5 years. The PMP and ACP certification requirement ensured that the study participants possessed the required experience needed to answer the research question. Professional associations usually offer various ways to educate their members on industry best practices and skills required for professional development including certification programs (Escoffery et al., 2015). Researchers have relied on the expertise of the PMI for exploration of the project management field (Bendoly et al., 2010; Escoffery et al., 2015; Mahaney & Lederer, 2006; Molena & Rovai, 2016; Poston & Richardson, 2011). Project managers with credentials supported by professional associations are enforcing industry best practices (Bredillet et al., 2015). During the last three decades, the PMI organization has grown into a global leadership position concerning project knowledge and has set the standard for university curriculum related to project management (Pinto & Winch, 2016). Because participants selected for this study were PMP or ACP certified, they were qualified contributors for exploring strategies used to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk.

The geographical location of the participants was a PMI chapter in the southeastern United States area. Researchers have used case studies related to the PMI to explore project management topics (Byrne et al., 2014; Porananond & Thawesaengskulthai, 2014; Poston & Richardson, 2011). The case study design is suitable for exploring the experiences of members of a professional organization (Messikomer & Cirka, 2010). To facilitate access to participants, I joined the PMI

chapter, contacted the administrators of the local chapter via email, and explained the purpose of the study. When I received their approval, I asked if an authorized representative of the chapter could send out a notification to the members of the chapter inviting them to participate in my study. The email included my personal contact information, and the interested parties communicated with me directly without the involvement of the PMI chapter. Once I had established the participants' credentials and they had agreed to contribute to the proposed study, I sent them an informed consent form via email.

To facilitate the establishment of a working researcher-participant relationship, I shared details of my professional and academic background already during the initial contact. Additionally, I explained the research question and the reasons why I was interested in studying this topic. By sharing personal details, researchers can build familiarity and rapport with participants, which will assist the process of information sharing (Wang, 2013). Nonetheless, the relationship between researcher and participant is explicit, and its nature can jeopardize the study result by being too personal or too distant (Haahr, Norlyk, & Hall, 2014). The data quality is dependent on the qualitative researcher's ability to balance the researcher-participant relationship while establishing trust within ethical boundaries (Haahr et al., 2014). Limiting personal information to employment and education history is a way to maintain a professional relationship between researcher and participant (Robards, 2013).

Research Method and Design

Beacuse the purpose of this study was to explore CWB preventing strategies via interviews and PMI documentation review rather than via measurements of variable frequency, the qualitative methodology was the appropriate choice. Qualitative researchers focus on the individual lived experiences in a specific context (Lyons et al., 2013), whereas quantitative researchers use statistics to explain relationships between variables (Rasinger, 2013). The study had a case study design, as I used two data sources to study a contemporary business problem in a specific situation. Yin (2013) described a case study as an in-depth exploration of a specific phenomenon in a real-life setting. Multiple data sources allow for a deeper understanding of qualitative research questions (Kaczynski, Salmona, & Smith, 2014).

Research Method

The three choices for research methods were a qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method. The nature of the research question guides what research method and research design are appropriate (Kaczynski et al., 2014). In this study, I used the qualitative research method to explore what strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. In qualitative studies, the intention of the researcher is to gain an in-depth understanding of complex social connections and contextualized lived experiences via inductive reasoning (Bhati, Hoyt, & Huffman, 2014; Kaczynski et al., 2014; Lyons et al., 2013). Qualitative studies have a focus on the depth and quality of the collected data with the purpose of exploring a phenomenon (Anyan, 2013). In this study, I explored the lived experiences of projects managers to

gain an understanding of what strategies they use to prevent CWB in projects, making the qualitative research method the most suitable option. Interviews of a few selected project managers, in conjunction with a review of PMI documentation, allowed me to gain a deep understanding of the phenomena and draw general conclusions applicable to a wider context, hence the selection of the qualitative methodology.

In quantitative studies, researchers achieve objectivity via detachment and distance from the participants, whereas qualitative researchers, aware of their personal bias, engage directly with the individuals in the study (Kaczynski et al., 2014). Quantitative data has a numeric nature because the purpose for quantitative researchers is to explore casual relationships and test hypotheses statistically (Anyan, 2013; Bhati et al., 2014; Kaczynski et al., 2014; Smith, 2014). The quantitative method was not suitable for this study, beacuse I engaged the participants directly with face-to-face interviews to explore their lived experiences and not to test any hypotheses.

Mixed method researchers apply both quantitative and qualitative methods to get the best of both approaches (Cameron, Sankaran, & Scales, 2015; Pluye & Hong, 2014). In a mixed method study, researchers use qualitative means to explore a phenomenon and solidify the findings with quantitative measurements to explain relationships between variables (Zhang, De Pablos, & Xu, 2014). The mixed method approach is suitable when one method does not suffice to gain a conclusive comprehension of the research topic. In this study, the mixed method was not appropriate, because the qualitative method adequately addressed the research question.

Research Design

The research design for this qualitative study was a multiple case study, beacuse I used several data sources to explore what strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects. In a case study, the focus is on one or a few research items in a specific time and place context, and the researcher generalizes the result when using it to explain a larger set of similar items (Baškarada, 2014; Rauch, Doorn, & Hulsink, 2014). The case study is a probing exploration of a specific case within its natural setting (Yin, 2013). Qualitative researchers have applied the case study design in studies on project management, because case studies best highlight underlying reasons for a phenomenon (Lappe & Spang, 2014; Vieru & Rivard, 2014). Abma and Stake (2014) argued that the meaning of experiences varies based on the perspective in which the researcher analyzes them. By using multiple perspectives, or data sources, the case study researcher gets a fuller understanding of the case (Abma & Stake, 2014). In this study, I conducted a multiple case study of what strategies PMP or ACP certified project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. The case setting was a PMI chapter in the southeastern United States. The case study design was appropriate for this study, because it allowed me to explore a contemporary business problem using several data sources, interviews of project managers and review of PMI documentation.

In qualitative studies, data saturation occurs when no more new information emerges, or more often when there are no more resources to investigate (Abma & Stake, 2014). However, the lack of available resources does not necessarily mean the researcher has obtained data saturation (Fusch & Ness, 2015). Regardless of sample size, the

researcher has reached the data saturation point when no new data and no new themes are emerging (Abma & Stake, 2014; Fusch & Ness, 2015). One way to reach the data saturation point is to do member checks for each participant (Abma & Stake, 2014). With member checking, the participants confirm that the researcher has recorded their experiences accurately and that the participants have no more data to share (Harvey, 2015). In this study, I used member checking to ensure no new data or themes were emerging, at which point I considered data saturation obtained. After an interview concluded, I provided the interviewee with a summary to allow him or her to provide additional information, as well as ensure that I did not interpreting anything incorrectly.

Other qualitative research design options were not suitable for this study, because they did not allow for an in-depth exploration of a contemporary business problem in a real-life setting using multiple data sources. In the ethnographical design, observation is the primary source of data (Pfadenhauer & Grenz, 2015; Spencer, 2014), whereas in the study I used interviews and documentation review as data gathering methods. In phenomenological studies, the focus is on exploring cognitive meanings of lived experiences and individual perceptions using primarily interviews (MacKenzie, Baadjies, & Seedat, 2015; Toprak & Genc-Kumtepe, 2014; Ziakas & Boukas, 2014). Because I used multiple data sources in the study, the phenomenological design was not appropriate. Storytelling is the primary data gathering technique in narrative research (Molloy, 2015; Paschen & Ison, 2014; Wang, Koh, & Song, 2015). Because the data gathering technique was not storytelling, the narrative research design was not fitting for this study.

Population and Sampling

The population for this study was project managers who were members of a PMI chapter located in the southeastern United States. To be included as a potential participant, the project manager had to meet the following criteria: (a) have an active PMP or ACP certification and (b) completed at least one software project within the last 5 years. By signing the consent form, participants confirmed that they met the required criteria for the study. Through this population, I strived to investigate what strategies project manager use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk.

For this study, the sampling selection was purposeful as this sampling method is common in qualitative case studies (Gentles, Charles, Ploeg, & McKibbon, 2015). The purposeful sampling method allows for a deliberate selection of participants who are likely to have knowledge or experience of the phenomenon in which the researcher is interested (Bungay, Oliffe, & Atchison, 2016). Additionally, via purposeful sampling, the researcher can ensure the participants are sufficiently diverse (Ford et al., 2016). I purposely selected project managers with PMP or ACP certification who were members of the PMI chapter in the southeastern United States and completed a software project within the last 5 years.

In case studies, the sample size may vary from less than ten participants (Chowthi-Williams, Curzio, & Lerman, 2016) to more than ten interviewees (Abbott, Fuji, & Galt, 2015; Hart & Warren, 2015). In a study, the sample size is an important factor that can affect the reliability level of the results (Tharenou, 2015). Still, large sample sizes do not necessarily increase the level of accuracy in a data set (Morris, Vesk,

McCarthy, Bunyavejchewin, & Baker, 2015). Having fewer than 10 interview participants can be sufficient, because in qualitative research the focus is more on the quality of the data, the wealth of information from the interviewee, and the nature of the study than the size of the study population (Dworkin, 2012; Guest, Namey, & McKenna, 2017; Roy, Zvonkovic, Goldberg, Sharp, & LaRossa, 2015). For this study, I interviewed ten PMP or ACP certified project managers who were members of a PMI chapter in the southeastern United States.

I achieved data saturation when no new data or no new themes were emerging (Fusch & Ness, 2015), and when the findings linked together to form a holistic view of the research topic (Finfgeld-Connett, 2014). In qualitative research, a large sample size with a lot of information may hinder the discovery of data themes and the achievement of data saturation as the data analysis process becomes very complex (Roy et al., 2015). For qualitative researchers, a challenge before even beginning the study is to estimate an adequate sample size that will reach data saturation (Marshall, Cardon, Poddar, & Fontenot, 2013).

For the study, I determined the criteria for study participation based on the objective of the research question. The research question for this study was to explore strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. To be unambiguous, the researcher should explicitly define the criteria for participation, as this will strengthen the validity of the study (Bungay et al., 2016; Gentles et al., 2015). In addition to the inclusion requirements, the researcher should also establish criteria to exclude participants from the study (Ogden, 2014). Yet, inclusion and

exclusion criteria too ardent in nature could be a cause of bias in the study (Lepage et al., 2016). To avoid selection bias and to ensure a diverse study population, the researcher should not exclude otherwise eligible participants perceived to have less relevant information and experience than other more information-rich participants (Crocker et al., 2015).

By insisting that the participants were PMP or ACP certified, I ensured that the study participants were experienced project managers. The PMI organization is continuously engaged in research of the project management field (Escoffery et al., 2015; Molena & Rovai, 2016) and its certification programs embody the methodology and procedures produced by the study findings (Bredillet et al., 2015). The PMP or ACP certification ensured the participants had the relevant background to contribute to the study of what strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk.

I interviewed the participants in a private setting where they felt at ease sharing personal experiences. Interviewing, on a one-on-one basis, is a proven method for getting participants to share personal experiences that are private or confidential in nature (Abbott et al., 2015). In a case study by Pallas, Khuat, Le, and Ruger (2015), participants selected the interview locations. In other qualitative studies, the researchers made sure the interview location felt private and safe for the participant, allowing sensitive or personal experiences to be more easily shared (Harris, Boggiano, Nguyen, & Pham, 2013; Johnson & Easterling, 2015)

Ethical Research

An informed consent form is a tool that researchers use to make project participants aware about their rights as study subjects as well as gain consent to partake in the study (Schrems, 2014). The informed consent form used in this study included a brief description of the study topic and sample interview questions as well as what the participants could expect from the researcher regarding expectations, protection, and payment. Once I had established that the participant met the criteria, I emailed a copy of the informed consent form to the participant. Not until I had received an email back that the participant consented, did I schedule the interview.

At any time before the data analysis phase, the participants could withdraw from the study without any repercussions by sending me an email. To build trust between researcher and participant, there should be a clear understanding of the inform consent process as well as the ability to withdraw participation without any harm (Drake, 2013). Upon study completion, each participant will receive the abstract via email.

To protect the confidentiality of the participants, I used code names so no one can deduce their identity. Unique identifiers are a tool to maintain the anonymity of participants (Welsh, Nelson, Walsh, Palmer, & Vos, 2014). After the study completed, I will keep the research data and the participant information confidential. In addition, I did not deliberately fabricate or misinterpret data to fit into the study. As participants are concerned about private and sensitive data falling into the wrong hands, researchers must be protective from both a procedural and practical point of view (Johnson, 2014). I abode by all research requirements per the Walden University IRB. The Walden IRB approval

number is 03-07-18-0317359. I will keep all research data, including audio recordings, on an external hard drive in a locked safe, for 5 years. After the 5 years, I will destroy all research data.

Data Collection Instruments

For this qualitative, multiple case study, I was the primary data collection tool for exploring what strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects. Functioning as human instruments, qualitative researchers are directly involved in the data collection procedure resulting in control of direction and interpretation (Kaczynski et al., 2014). Because qualitative researchers are active agents in the data gathering procedure, data collection methods, such as interviews, provide researchers with the opportunity to get a personal feeling for the participants and their environment (Mansfield, 2014). When qualitative researchers gather data, they strive to establish a personal yet unbiased relationship with the participant (Hedlund, Börjesson, & Österberg, 2015). I engaged directly with the participants of this study to get a personal feeling for their lived experiences as project managers.

For data sources, I used semistructured interviews with open-ended questions (Appendix A) in addition to review of PMI documentation. In case studies, interviews are a common choice of method to gather data, because it helps solidify themes emerging from other sources (Hedlund et al., 2015). For interviews to function as an effective data gathering tool, the researcher should use semistructured, open-ended questions which will allow the participants to share what they feel is important (Hart & Warren, 2015; Riera et al., 2014). One advantage of interviews is that the researcher can ask the participant to

elaborate on vague statements or topics about which the interviewer suspects the interviewee has more to contribute (Gastmyer & Pruitt, 2014; Hart & Warren, 2015).

The interviewer should primarily take a listening role and let the participant freely share what they feel is relevant for answering the questions in order to take best advantage of the open-ended nature of the questions (Gastmyer & Pruitt, 2014; Hart & Warren, 2015; McIntosh & Morse, 2015). The idea behind semistructured interviews with open-ended questions is to get the participants to share their perceptions relevant to the research topic enabling researchers to understand lived experiences (McIntosh & Morse, 2015). In qualitative studies, project management researchers have utilized semistructured interviews as a data-gathering tool (Hodgson & Paton, 2016; Pinto, 2014). In this study, I used semistructured, open-ended interview questions to get project managers to share freely their lived experiences on the strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk.

In addition to interviews, the other data source in this case study was review of PMI documentation. Review of organizational documentation is a common data source in case studies on project management topics (Wiewiora, Trigunarsyah, Murphy, & Coffey, 2013). Data from organizational documentation can constitute a detailed and solid account of a case when used in conjunction with interviews (Gillespie, Dietz, & Lockey, 2014). Besides the actual content, documentation may also reveal details regarding organizational communication strategies as well as organizational self-images (Hungerford, 2014). By using interviews with projects managers and review of PMI documentation, I gained an in-depth understanding of my case study of what strategies

project managers in a PMI chapter use to prevent CWB from putting project success at risk.

Once I received IRB approval from Walden University and the participating PMI chapter, I started collecting data for the study. A representative of the PMI chapter in the southeastern United States sent a request to all members of the chapter to participate in the study. Interested members replied to me directly, and I determined if they met the participation criteria. If the requirements were satisfied, I emailed the participant the consent form for review and signature. The participants returned their signed consent form via email. Once I had received the consent from a participant, I scheduled the interview. Kuah, Wong, and Tiwari (2013) indicated that a well-structured data collection plan could save time and money for the researcher. Stratton (2016) stressed the importance of a well-defined data collection plan for qualitative studies. To ensure academic rigor, the researcher should develop the data collection strategy carefully (Tickle-Degnen, 2013).

Data collection instruments and data analysis strategies are vital components for ensuring reliability and validity in a study (Zhou & Baptista Nunes, 2013). Given its humanistic nature, academic rigor in qualitative research is determined differently than in quantitative studies (Houghton, Casey, Shaw, & Murphy, 2013). Member checking is a common tool for enhancing reliability and validity in qualitative case studies (Houghton et al., 2013). In this study, I ascertained reliability and validity via member checking. After I concluded an interview, I emailed a summary of the transcription to the participant. The participant could determine if my interpretation was in accordance with

his or her own perception of the data provided during the interview. Via member checking, the researcher gets an opportunity to extract more information from the participants by allowing them to review and provide feedback to their own interview summary (Abma & Stake, 2014). Boblin et al. (2013) indicated that member checking increases the credibility of the data and therefore strengthens the reliability and the validity levels of the study.

Data Collection Technique

Once Walden University provided IRB approval, I commenced with the face-to-face interviews using the questions listed in Appendix A. Semistructured interviews are the cornerstone in the data gathering process for quality qualitative research (Campbell & Göritz, 2014; Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013). Interviews are a common mean for collecting data in case studies (De Massis & Kotlar, 2014).

By interviewing the participants face-to-face, I was be able to build a personal relationship with the project managers allowing them to feel comfortable to share their insights on what strategies they use to prevent CWB in projects. Liu and Wang (2015) indicated that respondents are more inclined to provide honest answers during face-to-face interviews. Researchers can provide motivation and clarification to participants via the interaction in face-to-face interviews, (Simmons & Bobo, 2015). The quality of the interview data is heavily dependent on how the researcher and participant interact in person (Chen, Lei, Li, Huang, & Mu, 2015).

The interview locations varied based on the participant's preference. Jhang and Lynch (2015) concluded that the choice of interview location influences the respondent's

willingness to participate. The atmosphere of the location will affect how keen participants are to share private or sensitive details in response to the interview questions (Mellor, Ingram, Abrahams, & Beedell, 2014). Pinsky (2015) indicated that the choice of location is vital for the quality of data provided during the interview.

The interviews with the project managers took up to 60 minutes. Holmberg, Farahani, and Witt (2016) indicated that 30 minutes is the minimum length for semistructured interviews in qualitative studies. Knight, Worrall, and Rose (2015) demonstrated that in semistructured interviews 30 minutes is enough time for participants to share their insights. Though interview times may vary, semistructured interviews average 30 minutes (Chipchase et al., 2014).

I recorded the interview with the participant's permission. Knight et al. (2015) indicated that in qualitative studies recording is a common mean to document the interview. Recording an interview will allow researchers to retrieve details provided by the participant after the session is over (McIntosh & Morse, 2015), and researchers can use the recording to analyze the collected data thoroughly (Drabble, Trocki, Salcedo, Walker, & Korcha, 2015).

The quality of qualitative research depends on the researchers' own ability to stay neutral and unbiased (Chen et al., 2015). Personal bias during interviews is a threat to an academically sound data collection process (De Massis & Kotlar, 2014). Cronin (2014) indicated that in case studies, researchers have to stay unbiased and neutral when gathering data. Because of the human interaction aspect in face-to-face interviews, respondents may be less willing to share opinions they know are controversial or

contradictory to the researcher's own beliefs (Liu & Wang, 2015). Participants may not be truthful in their responses in order to avoid a negative reaction from the interviewer (Liu & Wang, 2015). Simmons and Bobo (2015) indicated that social attitudes might influence interviewees' responses when facing the researcher. To keep the interaction positive, interview participants may attempt to please the interviewer by adjusting their responses (Cronin, 2014). During the interviews with the project managers, I remained unbiased to allow the interviewees to share their insights on the research topic without judgment, thus encouraging honest answers.

Along with interviews, I collected data from published PMI documentation on how project managers can prevent CWB in projects. In case studies, documentation is a common way to corroborate findings from other data sources (De Massis & Kotlar, 2014). Wiewiora et al. (2013) indicated that via organizational documentation the researcher could gain a deeper understanding of the study subject. Qualitative researchers can utilize documentation to solidify a holistic understanding of data gathered from multiple sources (Gillespie et al., 2014). Interviews and review of PMI documentation allowed me to explore the research question from multiple perspectives.

The quality of the data collected via documentation is dependent on the availability of the documents as well as how the researcher determines what documents to include (De Massis & Kotlar, 2014). Gillespie et al. (2014) indicated that case study researchers could be limited to the type of documentation made available by the participating organization. When documentary data contradicts findings from other data sources, the researchers have to consider if additional, unavailable documents could have

yielded a different result (Hungerford, 2014). I reviewed all PMI documentation available to me to get a holistic and honest understanding of the research topic.

Utilizing member checking after a completed interview, I provided each participant with a summarized account of the data provided during their session. This gave the interviewees opportunity to correct any misrepresentation I might have inadvertently stated in the summary. Boblin et al. (2013) stated that member checking strengthens the credibility of a case study by having participants review the researcher's description of the information provided during the interview. Member checking is an important aspect of solidifying study findings (Abma & Stake, 2014). By reviewing a summary of the interview, respondents can confirm that the researcher has accurately depicted their insights (Houghton et al., 2013).

Data Organization Technique

First, I transcribed the interviews using Microsoft Word. Then, I copied the information to Microsoft Excel to organize and code the data. Ose (2016) presented an academically proven process to efficiently organize and code interview data using Microsoft Word and Microsoft Excel. By using basic functionality in easily accessible office programs, researchers can structure, code and analyze qualitative data in a low-cost, simple, yet efficient way (Ose, 2016). Microsoft Office programs are suitable data organization tools for qualitative researchers (De Felice & Janesick, 2015; Moylan, Derr, & Lindhorst, 2015).

With the participant responses transcribed and coded, I organized and categorized the data in reoccurring themes. When analyzing interview data, researchers may

categorize data with similar meaning into main themes with several subthemes for a comprehensive understanding of the information (Ose, 2016). Cooper, Courtney-Pratt, and Fitzgerald (2015) indicated that during the analysis phase researchers continuously develop data categories as additional findings emerge. While building their understanding of the dataset, qualitative researchers may review interview data several times using various theme-based perspectives (Lovatt et al., 2015).

To keep the participants' identities anonymous, I applied unique identifiers while coding the responses: participant 1 as P1, participant 2 as P2 etc. For ethical researchers, keeping respondents' information and responses confidential is crucial (Morse & Coulehan, 2015). In qualitative research, disguising the names of participants is a common way to preserve privacy (Morse & Coulehan, 2015). Reuter, Ludwig, Kaufhold, and Spielhofer (2016) indicated that qualitative researchers might tag responses with unique identifiers as an aid in organizing and safekeeping data. By utilizing identifiers as a way to ensure privacy, researcher can convince hesitant respondents to contribute to the study (Raymond-Flesch, Siemons, Pourat, Jacobs, & Brindis, 2014).

During this study, I kept a research journal to help organizing thoughts and reflections emerging during the data collection and analysis phases. Reflective journals constitute a mean for qualitative researchers to record impressions and findings while gathering data (Young & MacPhail, 2015). Successful researchers engage in journaling and constant critical evaluation of themselves, the participants, and the data (Cowan, 2014). The reflective and analytical nature of the journal writing deepens researchers' comprehension of the study topic (Wyatt & Márquez, 2016). I store the collected data on

several external hard drives as backups. All external hard drives will be stored in a fireproof safe for 5 years, after which I will destroy them.

Data Analysis

Qualitative researchers analyze data gathered during interviews to identify emerging themes (St. Pierre & Jackson, 2014). To achieve methodological triangulation, I (a) interviewed PMP certified project managers, (b) interviewed ACP certified project managers, and (c) reviewed PMI documentation. Using multiple data collection sources provides researchers with a comprehensive understanding of the same phenomenon while applying methodological triangulation (Carter, Bryant-Lukosius, DiCenso, Blythe, & Neville, 2014; Joslin & Müller, 2016). Qualitative researchers employing methodological triangulation can compare emerging themes from different sources strengthening study accuracy (Braaf, Riley, & Manias, 2015).

Qualitative researchers analyze data to discover themes that can answer their research question (Yin, 2014). In this study, the objective of data analysis was to discover what strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. PMP and ACP certifications represented different approaches to achieve project success. The documentation review included published PMI material such as the Book of Knowledge (PMBOK) and practice guides. Themes discovered during data analysis provide a framework for addressing the research question (Houghton, Murphy, Shaw, & Casey, 2015).

Data analysis followed the 5 stages described by Yin's methodology for qualitative analysis: compiling, disassembling, reassembling, interpreting, and

concluding data (Vale, Branco, & Ribeiro, 2016). I used Microsoft Word and Excel to compile, disassemble, and reassemble the interview data into meaningful themes. Per Ose (2016), standard office programs come equipped with functionality ideal for organizing and coding qualitative research data. Moylan et al. (2015) list Microsoft Office programs as a viable, cheaper alternative to expensive data analysis programs. Qualitative researchers many times disregard Microsoft Excel® as mean for organizing and code data despite its vast capacity for arranging information (De Felice & Janesick, 2015).

Per Yin's data analysis methodology, the next step was to interpret the themes and their meaning (Vale et al., 2016). I made sense of the data themes within the context defined by the business problem. In this study, the business problem was that project managers lack strategies to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. Finally, I drew conclusions addressing the research question, by examining the relationship between the themes established during the interpretation step (Houghton et al., 2015). The conclusions were fundamental for answering the research question. Results from the data analysis steps form the basis for understanding the findings of the research study (Cooper et al., 2015). I analyzed the data using the methodology of SLT as the conceptual framework. By examining strategies used by project managers to prevent CWB in projects through the lens of SLT, I compared and analyzed the gathered data using a relevant model to answer the research question.

Reliability and Validity

In qualitative studies, the terms reliability and validity refer to the characteristics of the findings (Fan, 2013). The qualitative researcher explores individual experiences to

explain a particular phenomenon. Hence, the collected data has to be a true depiction of the individuals' view and experiences for the study results to be credible (Cronin, 2014). The academic rigor of a qualitative study depends on its level of trustworthiness (Houghton et al., 2013). The most common model used by qualitative researches for ensuring trustworthiness is the criteria applied by Lincoln and Guba (Houghton et al., 2013). The model has four aspects: (a) credibility, (b) dependability, (c) confirmability, and (d) transferability (Cope, 2014; Morse, 2015).

Reliability

The term reliability refers to the extent research findings can be easily replicated (Morse, 2015). As reliability is a quantitative measurement, qualitative researchers use dependability to demonstrate trustworthiness in a study (Elo et al., 2014; Houghton et al., 2013). Dependability pertains to the reliability of the data over time and in different contexts (Cope, 2014; Elo et al., 2014). Qualitative researchers can use various strategies to ensure dependability such as applying member checking and using case study protocols (Cope, 2014; Cronin, 2014). Member checking is a common tool to solidify research findings (Abma & Stake, 2014). Interview protocols can increase the level of reliable data obtained from participants (Benia et al., 2015).

Qualitative researchers can link dependability and confirmability together because the means to establish them is similar (Houghton et al., 2013). Confirmability refers to the objectivity of the researcher and the absence of personal bias in a study (Cope, 2014; Morse, 2015). The study findings need to be firmly rooted in the participant data without any part invented by the researcher (Elo et al., 2014). In addition to member checking,

researchers can use a reflective journal to create an audit trail ensuring confirmability by avoiding bias (Cope, 2014; Morse, 2015). Reflective journals constitute a tool for qualitative researchers to record observations, analytical findings, and emerging themes throughout the study process (Young & MacPhail, 2015).

In this study, I utilized interview protocol, member checking, and reflective journaling to establish dependability and confirmability. For each interview, I followed the same interview protocol (Appendix A) to use the same data collection method, used the same introduction, and asked the same questions. In qualitative case studies, a rigorous interview protocol will increase the reliability of the findings (Cronin, 2014; Enguidanos, Coulourides Kogan, Schreibeis-Baum, Lendon, & Lorenz, 2015). After the interview, I sent a synthesis of the transcription to the participant to validate that my interpretation was correct and contained all information the participant wanted to share. With member checking, the interviewees have the opportunity to confirm the accuracy of the researcher's depiction of their experiences (Harvey, 2015). Throughout the research process, I used a reflective journal to gather insights about collected data, emerging themes, and analytical decisions.

Validity

Quantitative researchers strive to ascertain academic rigor via validity whereas qualitative researchers focus on credibility and trustworthiness (Cope, 2014). The level of trustworthiness in a qualitative study is imperative for ensuring academic rigor (Houghton et al., 2013). Qualitative researchers use the model by Lincoln and Guba to assess trustworthiness: (a) credibility, (b) dependability, (c) confirmability, and

(d) transferability (Cope, 2014; Houghton et al., 2013; Morse, 2015). Credibility refers to the level of believability of the study findings (Houghton et al., 2013), and the appropriateness of the selected methodology, processing, and sampling design (Leung, 2015). Methods to ensure credibility include triangulation and member checking (Berger, 2015; Houghton et al., 2013; Morse, 2015). Credibility refers to internal validity whereas transferability pertains to external validity (Morse, 2015). How well study findings apply to other contexts or groups is the key factor determining transferability or generalizability (Elo et al., 2014; Houghton et al., 2013; Leung, 2015). Transferability refers to with what details the researcher describes the participant selection and data gathering process so other scholars can replicate the study in a different context getting the same results (Elo et al., 2014). Confirmability pertains to the degree of objectivity in the researcher and the absence of personal bias in a study (Cope, 2014; Morse, 2015).

Data saturation is an import aspect of data rigor and validity. When the interviewees were giving the same answers as I had already collected, and no new information was emerging from the responses, I had achieved data saturation. In studies, the researcher has reached the data saturation point when no new data and no new themes are emerging (Abma & Stake, 2014; Fusch & Ness, 2015). I applied member checking to ensure data saturation. Each interviewee received a summarized version of the interview to certify I had captured the data correctly and gave the interviewee the opportunity to provide more information. Abma and Stake (2014) list member checking as a mean to reach the data saturation point. Researchers accomplish data saturation when no new themes are emerging (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Houghton et al., 2013). I continued to

interview participants until there was a redundancy in the collected data and no new discoveries were apparent.

In addition to member checking, I applied methodological triangulation to achieve credibility in this study. I (a) interviewed PMP certified project managers, (b) interviewed ACP certified project managers, and (c) reviewed organizational documentation. Qualitative researchers strengthen study accuracy by employing methodological triangulation comparing emerging themes from different sources (Braaf et al., 2015). I ensured transferability with thick and rich descriptions of the study participants and the research context. Readers are able to determine for themselves the level of generalizability in my study. The trustworthiness of study findings depends on the availability of rich, appropriate, and well-saturated data (Elo et al., 2014).

Transition and Summary

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore what strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. Selected via purposeful sampling, the participants were PMP or ACP certified project managers who had completed at least one software project within the last 5 years. The data collection methods consisted of conducting semistructured interviews and reviewing published PMI material. I used Microsoft Excel and Microsoft Word to organize, code, and analyze the data. Methods to ensure study reliability and validity included following an interview protocol, member checking, reflective journaling, and applying methodological triangulation.

Section 2 included a discussion of the role of the researcher, the selection of participants, the choice of research method and design, the data collection and analysis, and the reliability and validity of the study. In Section 3, I will address (a) the presentation of findings, (b) the application to professional practice, (c) the implications for social change, (d) the recommendations for action and future research. To conclude, I will summarize the study and present my conclusions.

Section 3: Application to Professional Practice and Implications for Change

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative, multiple case study was to explore strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. CWB activities are difficult to detect before the harm is done (Bowling & Lyons, 2015; Klotz & Buckley, 2013). The consequences for not preventing and addressing CWB include lost revenue, missed opportunities, and reduced productivity (Ahmad & Omar, 2014; Al-A'wasa, 2018; Bowling & Lyons, 2015; Tuna et al., 2016)

The ten participants were PMP or ACP certified project managers who had completed at least one software project within the last 5 years. The data collection methods consisted of conducting semistructured interviews and reviewing published PMI material. I used Microsoft Word and Excel to analyze and compile the data. Five themes emerged from the findings: (a) participant communication, (b) proactive planning, (c) personal impact, (d) participant engagement, and (e) issue management. The themes constitute the strategies the project managers use to prevent CWB in projects.

Presentation of the Findings

The research question for this study was as follows: What strategies do project managers use to prevent counterproductive work behavior in projects that put project success at risk? I collected data for this study via interviews of PMI-certified project managers and review of published PMI documentation. The PMI documentation consisted of the *Agile Practice Guide* (PMI, 2017a) and *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK guide;* PMI, 2017b). Using Microsoft Word

and Excel, I analyzed and compiled the data into meaningful themes and sub-themes. I categorized the strategies into 5 themes: (a) participant communication, (b) proactive planning, (c) personal impact, (d) participant engagement, and (e) issue management. I will discuss the findings derived from the interviews along with the results from the documentation review. The discussion will also cover findings related to CWB activities and the efficiency of the strategies. To avoid confusion with the term project participant, I refer to the individual interviewees as P1-P10.

Theme 1: Participant Communication

The concept of participant communication covers (a) expectations, (b) status reporting, (c) explanations, and (d) communication tools (see Table 1). Communication is crucial for successful IT project managers (Bhoola & Giangreco, 2018). In the agile project methodology, the idea of servant leadership includes the team members needing an understanding of the purpose of the project (PMI, 2017a). Agile project managers gather the team around the purpose of the project (PMI, 2017a). When participants are aware of project objectives and everyone's area of responsibility, it leads to increased project success (Aga et al., 2016). Without a common goal, project participants are more inclined to engage in CWB (Brimecombe et al., 2014). If employees do not understand organizational decisions impacting their work responsibilities, it can trigger CWB (Al-A'wasa, 2018). Explaining the purpose of the project is key in agile project management (PMI, 2017a).

Table 1

Theme 1: Participant Communication

Subtheme	Response frequency (n = 10)	Response percentage
Clear expectations	9	90%
Reporting	7	70%
Explain why	7	70%
Communication tools	6	60%

Nine out of ten interviewees (90%) stressed the importance of having clear expectations as a mean for preventing CWB. In the interviews, the participants discussed various aspects of clear expectations: (a) be on the same page, (b) manage expectation, and (c) be transparent. Without guidance from management on what to expect, employees are left without proper direction (Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015). With all project participants knowing the purpose of the project, they can assess on an individual level how each person can contribute to the project success (PMI, 2017a).

In an application development context, P1 stressed the importance of the developer needing a clear understanding of the purpose of the application to avoid wasted efforts. P5 explained the importance of bringing everyone involved with a project, including direct reports to the project participants, together on the same page via an online communication depository. P3 talked about awareness and responsibility:

> Make sure everybody is aware up front as to what you are going to deliver, how you are going to deliver it, who the proper roles are in a project, and if there are any issues, who really is in charge of making the decisions.

IT project managers need to be effective communicators to ensure successful projects (Bhoola & Giangreco, 2018). P5 agreed with the general perception that project managers spend most of their time communicating. Transparency is vital for successful change management in an organization because it reduces disruptiveness caused by the change (PMI, 2017a). Project managers can discourage strategic misrepresentation by being transparent with project estimates and timelines (Naess et al., 2015). Organizational transparency could moderate the effects of CWB (Cohen, 2016). P8 talked both about setting expectations and being transparent stating that "if you are transparent and straightforward with folks, it is really appreciated." P8 blamed the lack of established expectations for project participants falling short because they would not know what they should be striving towards to do a good job. P5 explained how managing expectations ties into a successful end result:

> What is this individual's expectation? In the part of project success and how can I help manage that? If it is off line, if it is not aligned with project success, how can I manage? How can I help bring him back into alignment so they are now in flow with the rest of the team for the success of the project?

Seven out of ten interviewees (70%) stressed the importance of explaining to the project participants why things are done a certain way. P2 stated, "the most important thing to me is always explain the goal or the intent of why we are doing something." P1 explained that changes are sometimes outside the project manager's control. In those situations, P1 explained the circumstances for the change to ease tension amongst the participants. P7 talked about how not explaining the value of a project can trigger CWB:

> Another technique is to describe the value of why you are doing all this and the outcomes and a lot of times people do not. Then there is resistance to trying new things and change. Then of course recognizing and announcing to people about the success of the change.

P7 talked about setting expectations with the participants on what they will be doing on the project to ensure the right persons are in the right positions. P7 emphasized that it could mean giving a participant a new role. Setting expectations about one's role and responsibility ties into the theme of proactive planning and having the right resources on the project.

Seven out of ten interviewees (70%) used reporting as a means to prevent CWB in their projects. Strategic misrepresentation of project documentation and reporting is detrimental to a project manager's ability to successfully govern a project, and can take place anytime during a project (Pinto, 2014). Having meetings with engaged participants is a way for agile project managers to strengthen the level of teamwork (PMI, 2017a). Through project reporting, stakeholders and participants share information relevant to the project (PMI, 2017b). P6 talked about the importance of kick-off meetings to establish project roles and responsibilities, so everybody knows from the start what is going on. P6 stressed that a project manager needs to follow up with scheduled periodic meetings to continue to enforce the message. To increase accuracy, P2 made participants provide status updates with specific percentage milestones (10%, 25%, 50%, 75%, or 90%) because "everything else in between that really does not matter."

Six out of ten interviewees (60%) talked about different ways they ensure efficient communication with a project. A communication management plan establishes planning, implementation, and monitoring of project communication to ensure effectiveness (PMI, 2017b). P3 explained that in large projects a communication plan is established from the very beginning. The communication plan tailors to the various audiences and types of communication involved in the project. Also, P5 talked about agreeing on communication lines and who communicates what to whom. P5 linked efficient communication with increased trust amongst project participants. P5 distinguished between over- and under-communicating in a project and considered both areas a concern for project managers. P5 described over-communication as participants derailing conversations or going off topic in status meetings, and under-communication as participants reluctant to provide any updates at all. To address these communication issues, P5 stressed that project managers have to identify these behaviors early on and address them by managing participants' level of participation in status meetings. Early detection of issues ties into the theme of issue management and project managers needing to be aware of potential issues.

Theme 2: Proactive Planning

With proactive planning, project managers can prevent CWB from putting project success at risk. Insufficient project management practices can cause failure in projects (Jørgensen, 2016). To ensure that the team does not overcommit, agile project managers plan for the coming cycle, deliver, and evaluate the results before planning for the next cycle (PMI, 2017a). Under the theme proactive planning, seven subthemes emerged from

the findings: (a) contractors, (b) training, (c) right resources, (d) lessons learned, (e) pay for performance, (f) change format, and (g) change contingency (see Table 2).

Table 2

Theme 2: Proactive Planning

Subtheme	Response frequency (n = 10)	Response percentage
Contractors	5	50%
Training	5	50%
Right resources	3	30%
Lesson learned	3	30%
Pay for performance	2	20%
Change format	1	10%
Change contingency	1	10%

Half of the interviewees (50%) talked about using contractors as well as providing training as ways to prevent CWB in projects. According to P2, the advantage of using external resources is that if the vendor signed a contract that this work should be done by a specific time, the vendor could add more resources to meet the deadline. P2 continued that if a project only includes internal resources, a project manager cannot always easily add resources to a project due to budget and resource constraints. P3 talked about the challenges of changing vendors if they were not to work out, as that becomes a contractual issue. P3 pointed out faulty third-party technology as a threat to project success:

> You are halfway down a project then you realize that the technology is not going to do it. We have at that time changed how we are approaching the project which is certainly impacting the dollars and the time. We have actually dragged this

> thing out, not doing the implementation according to what the original estimation was. Because we could not. The vendor was not able to deliver. We encountered things no one knew of at the time.

P5 and P9 stressed the importance of effective communication between contractors and the employees on the project team. P5 recommended early in a project determining responsibility and establishing the communication channels to avoid confusion about what is reported to whom by whom at what time. In project teams with contractors in different time zones, P9 suggested rotating the timing of the status meetings so not just one team gets the uncomfortable start time. P9 recommended altering the schedule, so the meetings are held both in the morning and in the evening.

Training as a technique to prevent CWB refers not just to expanding participants' skill set. Training can prevent future CWB activities. Training for project managers can raise the awareness of CWB and the impact of personal bias (Zuber, 2015). P6 talked about providing training to participants as a response to CWB if the participants did something they should not have because they did not know better. P7 stated that training sessions are a way to refresh everybody on what is coming. P1 pointed out that project managers need training as well to handle different situations and personalities. P2 stressed that a project team moving to the agile methodology needs training to understand the new concept of application development and rapid releases. P5 explained that every quarterly review meeting with all project teams includes a training session covering a topic relevant to issues the teams are faced with at the moment such as risk management, time management, and contract management. P5 use this strategy to improve participant

behavior as well as provide training: “I look for the trends that are off-setting our goals, and then try to use that on a quarterly basis.”

Three out of ten interviewees (30%) talked about having the right resources on a team as well as using lessons learned sessions to avoid repeating mistakes in future projects. P3 and P6 talked about the necessity of having experienced resources. P3 stated that project managers depend on “the experience of the resource” to achieve project success. By looking at failed projects, project managers can learn valuable lessons for ensuring project success (Dunkley & Franklin, 2017; Hartmann & Dorée, 2015). Instead of focusing on individual projects, projects managers should look for cross-project factors within an organization to see common issues and obstacles (Hartmann & Dorée, 2015). P1 described the purpose of an after-action review to evaluate “What was supposed to happen? What happened? What was right or wrong? How can we do it better next time?”. P10 stressed the importance of lesson learned meetings as they provide insight on why mistakes happened. P10 continued “everyone that comes to those types of meetings might be able to better explain exactly what was the risk, and why did we have this issue, and why was not the risk identified earlier on in the project.”

Out of the ten interviewees, 20% mentioned pay for performance as a way to prevent CWB. P3 and P5 talked about tying project performance to employee bonus payout as a motivational factor for not engaging in CWB. Amongst the ten interviewees, only one person (10%) talked about changing up the format as well as having a contingency in the budget to account for changes. P7 declared that the strategy is to change the routine as it keeps participants alert. P7 explained that when teams work

together a long time, participants start to anticipate questions and answers resulting in that “people are not actively thinking anymore.” Contingency reserves can be set aside for rework or unknown factors impacting the project (PMI, 2017b). Per P7 having budget money to account for changes gives the project manager freedom to add or change resources based on small scope changes without having to cut through red tape each time.

Theme 3: Personal Impact

In a project context, the social interaction between participants is the basis for learning new behaviors (Brunstein et al., 2015; Hanna et al., 2013). Participants can learn both positive and negative behaviors through observation of social interaction between team members (Hu et al., 2015). A manager’s personal attention to team participants and their needs can empower the individuals to take ownership of their work which is beneficial to project success (Aga et al., 2016; Masa'deh et al., 2016). Through conversations, project managers can detect interpersonal issues within the team (PMI, 2017b). The theme personal impact includes (a) one-on-one’s, (b) personal socialization, (c) team support, (d) acknowledgement, and (e) work with everyone (see Table 3).

Table 3

Theme 3: Personal Impact

Subtheme	Response frequency (n = 10)	Response percentage
One-on-One's	7	70%
Personal socialization	7	70%
Team support	7	70%
Acknowledgement	4	40%
Work with everyone	4	40%

Seven out of ten interviewees (70%) described how they prevent CWB by handling issues with participants on a personal level in one-on-one meetings. Shoss et al. (2016) suggested addressing the issues causing stress for individuals as a coping strategy for managers with disengaged employees. P6 stated "I always believe in praise of public, punish in private." P5 learned from experience that addressing issues in public will make people defensive and not resolve the issue at hand. Instead, P5 approached the individuals in private about helping them achieve their goals.

Seven out of ten interviewees (70%) talked about how personal relationships can alleviate CWB in projects. Project managers' emphatical capabilities are critical for building relationships and emotional rapport with project participants (Bhoola & Giangreco, 2018). Project participants evaluate the expected personal reward and the benefits of collaborating with other team members (Aubé & Rousseau, 2014). When participants perceive collaboration as a threat to individual success and advancement, they engage in CWB activities (Aubé & Rousseau, 2014). Fitting into the project culture and getting along with other team members can be deterrents for CWB tendencies (Harold et al., 2016). Effective team interaction is vital for a successful project result (Savelsbergh et al., 2015). Informal conversations are one mean for an agile project manager to encourage collaboration within a project team (PMI, 2017a).

P8 suggested taking the project team out to lunch as a way to build relationships and strengthen team collaboration. P8 explained that with a strong sense of team belonginess, participants go out of their way to support each other. If project managers cultivate the relationships within the team, P8 believed they can "get all that goodness

that comes out of a team", which leads to successful projects. P6 talked about participant communication and how they need to see each other" as people first and co-workers second." P6 explained that "we learned everything we need to know in kindergarten", and that participants should "be nice to each other and then we can all make it work." P8 stressed the importance of harmonious project teams and stated "the troops, keep them happy, I say it jokingly, but it really is the core of it, the relationships."

Seven out of ten interviewees (70%) mentioned how they as project managers need to show participants how they support the team. In the position as a role model, managers impact employees' tendencies for engaging in CWB (Ben Sasson & Somech, 2015; Brown et al., 2005; Kalshoven et al., 2016; Wu, 2017). Employees with a perception that the manager mistreats them un have a higher tendency to engage in CWB activities (Al-A'wasa, 2018; Lim & Loosemore, 2017). Being empathic and engaging with the project team is essential for a successful IT project manager (Bhoola & Giangreco, 2018). Agile project managers focus on facilitating collaboration instead of managing the coordination of the project (PMI, 2017a).

P7 talked about being a role model and helping project participants: "If you want people to talk more, then do more questioning. If you want people to listen, then listen more." When asked to perform tasks they do not agree with, employees use CWB to cope with the stress (Schulte-Braucks et al., 2018). P1 stated "do not ask your team to do stupid things" and explained that participants need to have trust in the management's support of the team. P2 focused on keeping participants motivated, engaged and well-informed as a way to support the team.

Four out of ten interviewees (40%) stressed the importance of acknowledgement. P2 and P5 both talked about participants worrying they would not get credit for the work they put into a project. P2 and P5 recommended acknowledging achieved milestones and recognizing a job well done as ways a project manager can motivate the team as well as prevent disgruntled participants. P9 talked about communicating achievements to the whole project team and making the supervisor of the participants aware of their accomplishments. In a project setting, participants do a cost versus reward evaluation before engaging in the social exchange (Aubé & Rousseau, 2014). If the participant perceives the personal rewards to outweigh the costs, the individual will be engaged (Aubé & Rousseau, 2014). P5 analyzes the behavior and needs of the participants to match up with the individual's contribution to a project. P5 looks at what drives a participant and aims to put the participant in a position where the contribution matches the individual's aspirations.

Four out of ten interviewees (40%) discussed that project managers need to be able to work with everyone. All project participants can impact the project performance with their personal characteristics, including the project manager (Gallagher et al., 2015; Soomro et al., 2016). The project participants' emotional intelligence is essential for handling changes and issues impacting the project thus increasing the chance of success (PMI, 2017a). P1 stressed the importance of versatility in a project manager and continued "you need to understand how to approach someone, and what they are good at, and what they are not good at." P9 emphasized the importance of getting to know the good and bad habits of each participant and use that as a way to build trust and show

support of the team "making them feel that you have their back." P10 talked about successful project manager being able to connect with both with the project participants as with the stakeholders on an executive level to get the project objectives across. P10 recommended learning different leadership styles to better handle different personalities and connect with them on their level.

Theme 4: Participant Engagement

The people factor is often behind project failure (Nelson, 2007). Individual contributions are essential to project success (Standing et al., 2016). Problems with project participants are one of the people factors putting projects at risk (Dwivedi et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2017). By engaging all project participants, project managers can create a culture in which everyone contributes and cares about the results. The team climate is critical for project success (Tyssen et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2015). The theme participant engagement covers (a) engage stakeholders and (b) participant input (see Table 4).

Table 4

Theme 4: Participant Engagement

Subtheme	Response frequency (n = 10)	Response percentage
Engage stakeholders	5	50%
Participant input	4	40%

Half of the interviewees (50%) talked about the importance of engaging stakeholders in the project. Managing stakeholder engagement is to work with stakeholders to meet their needs and requirements (PMI, 2017b). With engaged

stakeholders, project managers can ensure their support for the project and address potential change resistance (PMI, 2017b). P3 and P6 expressed how business representatives need to agree to the scope, so there are not any misunderstandings of what the project team is delivering. P8 recommended getting all project participants, including business users, on the same page early in the project to ensure everyone is driving towards the same goal. The organizational culture can act as a moderator for CWB activities (Cohen, 2016). P8 emphasized that project managers should avoid a situation where IT is pitched against the business by creating an us-versus-them culture. P8 explained that project managers should work for a mutual appreciation and understanding of each other's work between IT and the business area. This concept ties into the theme of participant communication.

Scope creep is a factor that cause project failure (Jørgensen, 2016). Project managers can manage scope creep by having stakeholders agree to the project scope in the beginning of a project (PMI, 2017b). P9 stressed the importance of project managers explaining to the business users why IT needs clear requirements as well as a continuous engagement with the end users, and that stakeholders cannot "just give us a napkin with writings on and then walk away until we deliver." P5 explained that he/she invites project stakeholders to the status meeting to motivate the project team by reinforcing the commitment from the business as well as celebrating achieved milestones. Acknowledging accomplishments ties into the theme of personal impact.

Four out of ten interviewees (40%) stressed participant input as a key to successful results. P1 explained how brainstorming sessions allow participants to share

creative ideas. Estimates made by other participants may differ from the project manager's forecasts (Flyvbjerg, 2014). P2 stressed the importance of letting participants provide their own estimates and that "as a project leader, I am not putting words in someone's mouth or giving them timelines that they did not agree to and sign up for." P8 and P10 contributed "the lack of buy-in from the team" as a vital factor for CWB activities. P8 explained that buy-in has to come from everyone involved with the project because "if the tech lead or any team member are not on board, they do not think it is a good use of their time, you may have trouble getting quality work out of them."

Theme 5: Issue Management

Conflicts in project contexts are unavoidable and successful project managers depend on their conflict resolution skills to achieve a positive conclusion to the conflict (PMI, 2017b). Conflicts with a positive ending result in creative solutions and stronger personal relationships, whereas a negative ending destroys work relationship and threatens project productivity (PMI, 2017b). Project managers can ease the financial impact of CWB by managing the risks associated with the project (Dittes et al., 2015). If the project manager allows CWB to become an organizational accepted norm, successful project results will be at risk (Tuna et al., 2016). Project managers that anticipate and assess risks are better equipped to handle issues, thus minimizing the threat to project success (Fabricius & Büttgen, 2015). Three subthemes emerged from the findings regarding how a project manager can manage issues: (a) escalation, (b) early action, and (c) change resources (see Table 5).

Table 5

Theme 5: Issue Management

Subtheme	Response frequency (n = 10)	Response percentage
Escalation	7	70%
Early action	6	60%
Change resources	6	60%

Seven out of ten interviewees (70%) talked about the need to escalate to resolve CWB. The communication management plan should include a strategy for the escalation process (PMI, 2017b). As a conflict resolution technique, project managers can withdraw from the situation and have others, who are better positioned, address the issue (PMI, 2017b). For P10, escalation is the last resort as P10 tries to work with the participant on an individual basis first. P6 described how a project manager sometimes needs to work with the supervisor of the participant to resolve issues:

> Some things you can deal with yourself. But some things are a little bit out of your scope as a project manager because they are actually managed by someone else, only on loan to you for the purpose of that project. Sometimes dealing with it is having somebody else deal with it.

Six out of ten interviewees (60%) mentioned that project managers need to identify and address issues at an early stage to contain the damage. If project managers do not address CWB on an early stage, the behavior will become accepted and spread to other individuals (Hu et al., 2015). There has to be trust between project participants so project managers can handle issues without jeopardizing project success (Swärd, 2016).

P1 and P9 talked about the fear to tell the manager the truth causing an individual to wait with sharing bad news which could end with negative consequences for the individual. Instead, employees tend to tell their managers what they think they want to hear. CWB can constitute withholding information. P9 set the expectations with the project team by enforcing the message "telling the bad news right away so we can get on it and get it fixed."

Accurate project estimates should suffice for a successful result, but risk factors affecting the timeline, cost, or scope will add risk to project success (Allen, 2015). By managing risks, project managers can remove threats to project success (Allen, 2015). P3 provides training to project managers to identify and address issues early, particularly on detecting inaccurate estimates. P3 pushes project participants to clarify how they arrived at the estimates, but recognizes that "other are better at estimating than others." P5 and P7 stressed the importance of detecting trends early and moving quickly to get details from complainants to identify and address the underlying reason. P7 explained project managers have to take a pro-active stand and look for hidden issues to prevent problems from even occurring.

Six out of ten interviewees (60%) mentioned changing resources as a mean to address CWB in projects. Changing resources can include removing and replacing participants from a project team. Successful collaboration is dependent on effective interaction between participants (Savelsbergh et al., 2015). P3 and P7 would remove the project members if they were operating in a destructive manner trying to sabotage the project or not putting in their full effort. How easy it can be to get a participant off a

project can depend on the visibility of the person's CWB activities. P5 described how a decrease in stock value could get the management's attention that someone is not doing what they are supposed to be doing. P6 stated that "a team is a living breathing thing", and both P3 and P6 considered disruptive project members as a threat to a well-functioning team. P3 talked about even removing vendors from a project although that is more complicated due to contractual issues. Still, the message from the participants was that if a resource is not working out, the project manager should remove the person from the project.

Changing resources could also entail adding new resources to the project team to meet deadlines and manage resource constraints. P2 described the challenge of working with participants not fully dedicated to the project, and how their work responsibilities outside of the project interfere with the progression of the project. P2 resolved the situation by working with the manager of the participant to arrange for an additional resource to assist with the workload. A successful project team consists of individuals with the expertise required to solve the issue (Savelsbergh et al., 2015). P3 talked about new resources with more experience bringing new ideas and perspectives to a project. P6 explained how participants are sometimes given to a project manager based on their experience but lacking the specific knowledge required for the new project. P6 gave the example of a project involving cloud computing, in which participants with experience working in a data center would not have the required skill set. To resolve the situation, P6 would either train the participants or bring in new resources with the proper experience.

Counterproductive Work Behavior Activities

The interviewees described behaviors and activities putting project success at risk (see Table 6). The most frequent CWB activities by participants were (a) non-functioning participants and (b) unclear expectations. The CWB includes activity from all involved parties such as project participants, project manager, stakeholders, and supervisors.

Table 6

CWB Activities by Participants

Activity	Response frequency (n = 10)	Response percentage
Non-functioning participants	9	90%
Unclear expectations	8	80%
Distractions	5	50%
Participants not wanting to be on the project	5	50%
Bad estimates	4	40%
Different personalities or cultures	4	40%
Participants not reporting to project manager	4	40%
Stakeholder lack of participation	3	30%
Copy bad behavior	2	20%

The break-out for the activity non-functioning participants is shown in Table 7. The interviewees disclosed a wide range of behaviors and activities regarding participants not doing what they were supposed to be doing. Shortcomings in project participants are one factor that risk project success in software projects (Jørgensen, 2016; Nelson, 2007). The people factor is a relevant aspect of a project as success is dependent on individual efforts (Standing et al., 2016).

Table 7

Break-out of Activity Non-Functioning Participants

Activity	Response frequency (n = 9)	Response percentage
Negative attitude	5	56%
Different objective	4	44%
Intentional bad behavior	3	33%
Looking good	3	33%
Faulty project management	2	22%
Manager not managing	2	22%
Participant not seeing an issue	2	22%
Participant pulled off project by supervisor	2	22%
Limited outside experience	1	11%
Off-duty activities	1	11%
Too comfortable	1	11%

Five out of nine interviewees (56%) mentioned negative attitude as a risk to project success. P7 gave several examples of participants' negative attitude and resistance to contribute:

> I would look at it on a case by case basis to determine what it is that they are resisting. If it is simply "I do not want your meeting" and "I do not like the way you handle the meeting" then do not attend. But if it is as far as "I do not agree with how you are managing what you are doing" and "I do not want to give you a status update" and "I don't want to report my time". Then, there has to be a different kind of discussion about whether they should be on the project or not.

P9 talked about "team members not doing their work and holding up other team members" by refraining from interacting with other team members whose work they are dependent on to do theirs with the excuse "Oh, I cannot do my part because Joe over here

did not do his part." P3 mentioned how disgruntled employees not satisfied with the organization are not applying their full effort into the project.

Four out of nine interviewees (44%) talked about participants having different objectives. A project manager can motivate team members by aligning the participants' goals with the project objectives (Aga et al., 2016; Tyssen et al., 2014). P1 defined it as "alignment of personal objectives over project objectives or a mentor's objectives over the project's objectives." However, there may be individuals unaware of their behavior causing counterproductive effects (Hu et al., 2015). P2 gave an example of a developer who did not do what he was supposed to because he had a different objective. P2 explained that after a successful demo to the customers, the developer admitted that that work was a front because it would not work in practice; the developer thought the important thing was to deliver a successful demo. P2 had to explain to the developer that "the most important thing is the product actually works."

Out of the eight interviewees who talked about unclear expectations as a risk to project success, seven respondents (88%) mentioned unclear project objectives and plans, whereas four respondents (50%) pointed to unclear roles and responsibilities (see Table 8). Inadequate project management practices constitute a threat to IT project success (Jørgensen, 2016). Failed processes are a common reason for project failure (Nelson, 2007).

Table 8

Break-out of Activity Unclear Expectations

Activity	Response frequency (n = 8)	Response percentage
Unclear project objective & plan	7	88%
Unclear roles & responsibilities	4	50%
Unclear scope	3	38%
Rework	1	13%
Unclear directives	1	13%

P5 talked about how unclear project objectives can lead to unsuccessful projects when participants "lack of clarity on the end goal of the deliverables." P5 explained that participants become disengaged and lose commitment when they do not understand the project objective. P5 concluded "that behavior transcends onto other individuals on the project which again causes more delays and more lack of quality on the results they do provide. All wraps into the project being unsuccessful." P6 explained the impact to a project by participants' not knowing their role and communicating with stakeholders when they should not. P6 said that it interferes with "the project managers' ability to govern" forcing the project manager "to do a bunch of damage control." P6 also pointed out the participants who "do not recognize they are in the lead and are not taking charge even though they have been empowered to do so" as causes for faulty projects.

Table 9

CWB Activities and Situations by Non-Participants

Activity/Situation	Response frequency (n = 10)	Response percentage
Changes after project start	4	40%
Change of management direction	3	30%
Different time zones	3	30%
Regulations	1	10%
Weather	1	10%

The interviewees also referred to activities and situations causing risk to project success, that are not triggered by project participants. The themes are shown in Table 9. Four out of ten interviewees (40%) talked about changes after project start as reasons for unsuccessful projects. Unfamiliar technology is a key factor causing risk in an IT project (Jørgensen, 2016). P3 talked about outside vendors and new technology not working as expected forcing the project team to reassess the approach of the project because "the vendor was not able to deliver, we encountered things no one knew of at the time." P6 described how changes in resources impact a project when a project manager plans for senior resources but are assigned junior resources. P6 concluded, "there was just no way we were going to make the schedule" because if the project manager cannot staff the team appropriately, the project will not be successful.

Three out of ten interviewees (30%) considered change in management direction and different time zones as causes for unsuccessful projects. If organizational practices do not make sense, employees are more likely to disregard them (Dittes et al., 2015). Lack of management support can negatively impact the chances for success in a project

(Jørgensen, 2016). P8 talked about organizational CWB and described it as "that is really less the PM managing down and more of a PM managing across or up." Scope creep is a threat to project success (Jørgensen, 2016). P6 described how changing customer demands could change the direction of a project:

> You know the external situations a lot of times will have a greater impact than the internal situations for at least if your project is cancelled that is a big impact. If your scope changes because you are trying to respond to market conditions or customer demands, that is certainly another thing to consider.

P9 stated "the time zone is a killer" and explained the issues with having project participants in different time zones:

> They send out a request for information, that takes a day, you get the information you send it back to them. You know that could take another day, and then they find out I did not word it correctly, or they did not word it correctly, and there is that disconnect. Time zone problems have been an issue.

Strategy Efficiency

Strategy efficiency refers to how the participants know their strategies are working to prevent CWB in projects putting success at risk. As shown in Table 10, not all participants explicitly talked about the effectiveness of their strategies. Half of the interviewees (50%) considered their strategies a success if there were no issues reported. P9 stated, "you can tell whether your strategy is working by the interactions between the group and also the amount of work is getting out." P2 explained, "to me the definition of having it work is the person getting their work completed on time."

Table 10

Strategy Efficiency

Response	Response frequency (n = 10)	Response percentage
Success if no issues	5	50%
Participant Feedback	4	40%
Strategies develop from experience	3	30%
Not tracked	2	20%

Four out of ten interviewees (40%) used feedback from other project participants as an indicator for seeing how well the strategies worked. P9 shared how participants from a previous project reached out and asked P9 to get assigned to their new project because it was not going well. The previous participants knew P9 would get the project back on track with successful results. P9 was shocked because at the end of the previous project P9 thought "God these guys are never going to want to work with me again", because the project had been rough for everyone involved. P9 had pushed the participants hard to deliver, but had "explained everything why and what we were doing and we were successful." P9 took the fact that the participants asked P9 to join their current project as a confirmation that the strategies were successful.

Three out of ten interviewees (30%) pointed out that strategies develop as your experience grows. P6 talked about how junior managers only want to hear that something can be done because they are uncertain how to address issues that may come up and may have "a more brash bold way of dealing with things that the situation may warrant." P3 said this about CWB:

> There is a lot of counterproductive behavior that over time you get used to dealing with, and that experience helps you deal with that as it comes along or you can foresee it coming. Because you have seen it somewhere else.

Two out of ten interviewees (20%) said they did not intentionally apply specific strategies. P2 explained, "one reason I thought the topic was interesting is I never really thought about it that way so I cannot say that I intentionally did anything to prevent intentional bad behavior."

Findings Linked to the Social Learning Theory

In this study exploring strategies used by project managers to prevent CWB from putting project success at risk, I applied the social learning theory (SLT) created by Bandura (1972) as the conceptual framework. Per SLT, individuals learn new behavior via observation and imitation of others, referred to as modeling (Bandura, 1972). Individuals observe other individuals they perceive as role models and mimic their behavior (Horsburgh & Ippolito, 2018; Miller & Morris, 2016). I analyzed the findings of this study through the lens of the SLT, but I found that only the theme personal impact includes strategies in which the project manager operates as a positive role model by supporting the team and engaging in personal socialization. The interviewees did not indicate project participants engage in CWB because they copy the bad behavior of other individuals. The findings suggest it is inadequate to use only the SLT to explain and prevent CWB in project participants.

One of the issues with the SLT and CWB is that it is unclear if individuals copy deviant behavior from an individual because the person is a role model, or the person

becomes a role model because the individuals like the behavior they are observing (Sharma, 2018). It is insufficient to rely on personal perceptions as an indicator of behavioral tendencies (Sharma, 2018). Other theories provide alternate explanations to why individuals engage in a particular behavior (Aubé & Rousseau, 2014; Davis & Holland-Davis, 2015; Donner et al., 2016). It is not sufficient to use the SLT as the only theory to identify strategies project managers use to prevent counterproductive behavior in project participants causing risk to project success.

Applications to Professional Practice

The purpose of this study was to identify strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. Responses from interviewed PMI certified project managers and review of PMI documentation formed the basis for the results. The findings are indicative of 5 themes on how project managers can prevent CWB: (a) participant communication, (b) proactive planning, (c) personal impact, (d) participant engagement, and (e) issue management. The findings are relevant for project managers because when participants have clear expectations of project goals and responsibilities, it leads to a higher chance of process success (Aga et al., 2016). When project participant behavior, such as CWB, is not aligned with project objectives, project success can be at risk (Pinto, 2014; Sharma, 2018; Zhang et al., 2015). A project team in which participants get along can discourage individual CWB activities (Harold et al., 2016). Project participants' contributions and commitments are vital to achieving project success (Bhoola & Giangreco, 2018; Müller & Martinsuo, 2015). Failed IT projects constitute a threat to an organization's financial situation due to wasted resources and lost

growth opportunities (Bhoola & Giangreco, 2018; Jørgensen, 2014; Zhang et al., 2015). By applying these strategies, project managers and other organizational leaders can prevent CWB activities in projects minimizing risks to project success, which can lead to improved organizational financial performance and increased revenue.

Implications for Social Change

The results of the study show that project managers can prevent CWB by ensuring project participants have a clear understanding of what is expected of them and why. The findings also suggest that project managers can discourage CWB tendencies by engaging with project participants on a personal level and showing support for the project team. By creating a positive, supportive project culture, project managers can help project participants become motivated and satisfied leading to productive and engaged members of the community. Healthy work environments are free from the stress brought on by CWB, which could otherwise cause problems in employees' personal lives. Happy individuals can create positive social change via volunteering and other activities supporting their local community.

Recommendations for Action

I make the following recommendations to project managers who want to prevent CWB in their projects: (a) be honest and upfront to participants about the status of the project and the work they are performing; (b) explain why there are changes and how they impact participants; (c) get to know your participants on a personal level; (d) learn from mistakes made on past project; (e) engage the whole project team to provide input and feedback; and (f) address issues as soon as they come to your attention. Project

managers and other professionals with project management responsibilities can take advantage of the results in their efforts to prevent CWB impacting the success of a project. By keeping the project team informed about what is going on with the project, project managers will reduce uncertainty and confusion amongst participants. A project climate without issues and conflicts allows participants to focus on completing their tasks successfully which is essential for project success. When project managers know their participants well, they can better anticipate how individuals will behave in certain situations. I will share the findings of this study with the interviewees as well as the local PMI chapter.

Recommendations for Further Research

The findings of this study add to the body of knowledge on how project managers prevent CWB in projects. In this qualitative case study, I interviewed certified members in a PMI chapter located in the southeastern United States, as well as reviewed published PMI material. The limitations are the geographical area, case setting, and choice of research design.

Recommendations for further research include varying the geographical area and the sample population, as well as applying a different research design. Future researchers should consider investigating if strategies from project managers who are not PMI certified differ from the results of this study. Also, future researchers could focus on if project managers applying the agile methodology differ in their approach to prevent CWB. Suggestions for future research topics include focusing on each specific theme emerging from this study: (a) participant communication, (b) proactive planning, (c)

personal impact, (d) participant engagement, and (e) issue management. Future research on how project managers can prevent CWB in projects will provide support for increasing the rate of successful projects.

Reflections

My DBA journey has been long and challenging, yet rewarding. While expanding my understanding of the research topic, the manner in which I evaluate information and source material became more critical and selective. I am applying this change in thinking in my private life as well. I have learned how to plan and execute an extensive research project, which added to my academic and professional skill sets alike. I can apply the findings of the study in my professional position as a manager for a software engineering team because project management is part of my responsibilities.

Because I am managing projects in my professional life, I was concerned about any bias I might project on the interviewees based on my own experiences and opinions. By following the interview protocol, I ensured that my personal bias would not impact the interviewees because interview protocols is a way for researchers to apply best practices (Benia et al., 2015). During the interviews, I paid close attention to the manner in which I asked the questions to ensure I did not lead the participants on via my tone of voice or emphasis on certain words.

Summary and Study Conclusions

The objective of this qualitative multiple case study was to explore strategies project managers use to prevent CWB in projects that put project success at risk. The study population consisted of ten PMP or ACP certified project managers who were

members of a PMI chapter in the southeastern United States, and had been involved in at least one software project completed within the last 5 years. Section 3 constituted of (a) presentation of the findings, (b) applications to professional practice, (c) implications for social change, (d) recommendations for action and further research, and (e) reflections.

The findings derived from interview data and document review of published PMI material. After I used Microsoft Word and Excel to analyze and compile the data, 5 themes emerged: (a) participant communication, (b) proactive planning, (c) personal impact, (d) participant engagement, and (e) issue management. The themes represent the strategies the PMI-certified project managers use to prevent CWB in projects. The SLT was the conceptual framework of the study. Only the theme of personal impact related to the SLT concept that individuals learn new behavior via observation and modeling. It is inadequate to use only the SLT as the conceptual framework to explain and prevent CWB in project participants.

To prevent CWB from putting project success at risk, project managers should be transparent and honest with participants about the project and the work. Project managers should get to know the participants and keep them engaged during all phases of the project. Also, project managers should provide a clear understanding of the expectations and learn from past mistakes. Remediating efforts should commence as soon as the project managers are aware of issues and conflicts. These actions will help project managers to prevent CWB causing risk to project success.

References

Abbott, A. A., Fuji, K. T., & Galt, K. A. (2015). A qualitative case study exploring nurse engagement with electronic health records and e-prescribing. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 37*, 935-951. doi:10.1177/0193945914567359

Abma, T. A., & Stake, R. E. (2014). Science of the particular: An advocacy of naturalistic case study in health research. *Qualitative Health Research, 24*, 1150-1161. doi:10.1177/1049732314543196

Afshari, L., & Gibson, P. (2016). How to increase organizational commitment through transactional leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 37*, 507-519. doi:10.1108/LODJ-08-2014-0148

Aga, D. A. (2016). Transactional leadership and project success: The moderating role of goal clarity. *Procedia Computer Science, 100*, 517-525. doi:10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.190

Aga, D. A., Noorderhaven, N., & Vallejo, B. (2016). Transformational leadership and project success: The mediating role of team-building. *International Journal of Project Management, 34*, 806-818. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.02.012

Ahmad, A., & Omar, Z. (2014). Reducing deviant behavior through workplace spirituality and job satisfaction. *Asian Social Science, 10*(19), 107-112. doi:10.5539/ass.v10n19p107

Al-A'wasa, S. I. S. (2018). The impact of organizational justice on the counterproductive work behavior (CWB): A field study conducted in the Jordan customs department (JCD). *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 9*(1), 27-38.

Retrieved from www.ijbssnet.com

Allen, S. (2015). Risk research trends in the project environment. *Journal of Management & Engineering Integration, 7*(2), 28-36. Retrieved from http://www.journalmei.com/submit

Anthopoulos, L., Reddick, C. G., Giannakidou, I., & Mavridis, N. (2016). Why e-government projects fail? An analysis of the Healthcare. gov website. *Government Information Quarterly, 33*, 161-173. doi:10.1016/j.giq.2015.07.003

Anyan, F. (2013). The influence of power shifts in data collection and analysis stages: A focus on qualitative research interview. *The Qualitative Report, 18*, 1-9. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr

Arashpour, M., Wakefield, R., Lee, E. W. M., Chan, R., & Hosseini, M. R. (2016). Analysis of interacting uncertainties in on-site and off-site activities: Implications for hybrid construction. *International Journal of Project Management, 34*, 1393-1402. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.02.004

Aronson, Z. H., Shenhar, A. J., & Patanakul, P. (2013). Managing the intangible aspects of a project: The affect of vision, artifacts, and leader values on project spirit and success in technology-driven projects. *Project Management Journal, 44*(1), 35-58. doi:10.1002/pmj.21322

Aubé, C., & Rousseau, V. (2014). Counterproductive behaviors: Group phenomena with team-level consequences. *Team Performance Management, 20*, 202-220. doi:10.1108/TPM-05-2013-0014

Bandura, A. (1972). *Social learning theory*. New York, NY: General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1978). Social learning theory of aggression. *Journal of Communication, 28*(3)*,* 12-29. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1978.tb01621.x

Baškarada, S. (2014). Qualitative case studies guidelines. *The Qualitative Report, 19*, 1-25. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr

Beauregard, T. A. (2014). Fairness perceptions of work− life balance initiatives: Effects on counterproductive work behaviour. *British Journal of Management, 25*, 772-789. doi:10.1111/1467-8551.12052

Belschak, F. D., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. (2018). Angels and demons: The effect of ethical leadership on Machiavellian employees' work behaviors. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 1-12. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01082

Belschak, F. D., Den Hartog, D. N., & Kalshoven, K. (2015). Leading Machiavellians: How to translate Machiavellians' selfishness into pro-organizational behavior. *Journal of Management, 41*, 1934-1956. doi:10.1177/0149206313484513

Ben Sasson, D., & Somech, A. (2015). Do teachers misbehave? Aggression in school teams. *Journal of Educational Administration, 53*, 755-772. doi:10.1108/JEA 01-2014-0011

Bendoly, E., Perry-Smith, J. E., & Bachrach, D. G. (2010). The perception of difficulty in project-work planning and its impact on resource sharing. *Journal of Operations Management, 28*, 385-397. doi:10.1016/j.jom.2009.11.011

Benia, L. R., Hauck-Filho, N., Dillenburg, M., & Stein, L. M. (2015). The NICHD investigative interview protocol: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 24*, 259-279. doi:10.1080/10538712.2015.100674

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 349-360. doi:10.I037//0021-9010.85.3.349

Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 15*, 219-234. doi:10.1177/1468794112468475

Bethards, M. L. (2014). Applying social learning theory to the observer role in simulation. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing, 10*, 65-69. doi:10.1016/j.ecns.2013.08.002

Bhati, K. S., Hoyt, W. T., & Huffman, K. L. (2014). Integration or assimilation? Locating qualitative research in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 11*, 98-114. doi:10.1080/14780887.2013.772684

Bhoola, V., & Giangreco, A. (2018). HR activities and practices for project success: A multi-method approach from Indian IT firms. *Australasian Journal of Information Systems, 22.* 1-29. Retrieved from http://journal.acs.org.au/index.php/ajis

Blickle, G., & Schütte, N. (2017). Trait psychopathy, task performance, and counterproductive work behavior directed toward the organization. *Personality and Individual Differences, 109*, 225-231. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.01.006

Boblin, S. L., Ireland, S., Kirkpatrick, H., & Robertson, K. (2013). Using Stake's qualitative case study approach to explore implementation of evidence-based practice. *Qualitative Health Research, 23*, 1267–1275. doi:10.1177/1049732313502128

Boddy, C. R. (2014). Corporate psychopaths, conflict, employee affective well-being and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Business Ethics, 121*, 107-121. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1688-0

Bolino, M. C., & Klotz, A. C. (2015). The paradox of the unethical organizational citizen: The link between organizational citizenship behavior and unethical behavior at work. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 6*, 45-49. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.03.026

Bossan, B., Jann, O., & Hammerstein, P. (2015). The evolution of social learning and its economic consequences. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 112*, 266-288. doi:10.1016/j.jebo.2015.01.010

Bowling, N. A., & Lyons, B. D. (2015). Not on my watch: Facilitating peer reporting through employee job attitudes and personality traits. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 23*, 80-91. doi:10.1111/ijsa.12097

Braaf, S., Riley, R., & Manias, E. (2015). Failures in communication through documents and documentation across the perioperative pathway. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 24*, 1874-1884. doi:10.1111/jocn.12809

Bradshaw, E. A. (2015). “Obviously, we’re all oil industry”: The criminogenic structure of the offshore oil industry. *Theoretical Criminology, 19*, 376-395. doi:10.1177/1362480614553521

Bredillet, C., Tywoniak, S., & Dwivedula, R. (2015). What is a good project manager? An Aristotelian perspective. *International Journal of Project Management, 33,* 254-266. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.04.001

Brimecombe, M., Magnusen, M. J., & Bunds, K. (2014). Navigating the storm: A counterproductive work behavior and leadership case study in a division I FBS school. *Sport Management Review, 17*, 219-237. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2013.03.001

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*, 117-134. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002

Brunstein, J., Jaime, P., Curi, D. P., d'Angelo, M. J., & Mainardes, E. W. (2015). Assessment and evaluation of higher education in business management: An analysis of the Brazilian case in the light of social learning theory for sustainability. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 40*, 833-854. doi:10.1080/02602938.2015.1041096

Bungay, V., Oliffe, J., & Atchison, C. (2016). Addressing underrepresentation in sex work research: Reflections on designing a purposeful sampling strategy. *Qualitative Health Research*, *26*, 966-978. doi:10.1177/1049732315613042

Byrne, K., Keys, R., Schaffer, C., & Solic, A. N. (2014). How to prepare a program roadmap. *Journal of Economic Development, Management, IT, Finance, and Marketing, 6*, 1-22. Retrieved from http://www.gsmi-ijgb.com/Pages/JEDMITFMV6N1.aspx

Cameron, R., Sankaran, S., & Scales, J. (2015). Mixed methods use in project management research. *Project Management Journal*, *46*(2), 90-104. doi:10.1002/pmj.21484

Campbell, J. L., & Göritz, A. S. (2014). Culture corrupts! A qualitative study of organizational culture in corrupt organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *120*, 291-311. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1665-7

Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum, 41*, 545-547. doi:10.1188/14.ONF.545-547

Castille, C. M., Buckner, J. E., & Thoroughgood, C. N. (2018). Prosocial citizens without a moral compass? Examining the relationship between Machiavellianism and unethical pro-organizational behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 149*, 919-930. doi:10.1007/s10551-016-3079-9

Chen, K., Lei, H., Li, G., Huang, W., & Mu, L. (2015). Cash incentives improve participation rate in a face-to-face survey: An intervention study. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 68,* 228-233. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.08.002

Chen, S. P., & Mykletun, R. J. (2015). Beyond post-downsizing organisational injustice and counterproductive work behaviours: Antecedents and consequences of learnt helplessness. *International Journal of Business and Management, 10*(6), 1-14. doi:10.5539/ijbm.v10n6p1

Chernyak-Hai, L., & Tziner, A. (2014). Relationships between counterproductive work behavior, perceived justice and climate, occupational status, and leader-member exchange. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 30*, 1-12. doi:10.5093/tr2014a1

Chipchase, L., Hill, A., Dunwoodie, R., Allen, S., Kane, Y., Piper, K., & Russell, T.

(2014). Evaluating telesupervision as a support for clinical learning: An action research project. *International Journal of Practice-based Learning in Health and Social Care, 2*(2), 40-53. doi:10.11120/pblh.2014.00033

Chowthi-Williams, A., Curzio, J., & Lerman, S. (2016). Evaluation of how a curriculum change in nurse education was managed through the application of a business change management model: A qualitative case study. *Nurse Education Today, 36*, 133-138. doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2015.08.023

Cohen, A. (2016). Are they among us? A conceptual framework of the relationship between the dark triad personality and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). *Human Resource Management Review, 26*, 69-85. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2015.07.003

Cooper, J., Courtney-Pratt, H., & Fitzgerald, M. (2015). Key influences identified by first year undergraduate nursing students as impacting on the quality of clinical placement: A qualitative study. *Nurse Education Today, 35*, 1004-1008. doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2015.03.009

Cope, D. G. (2014). Methods and meanings: Credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum, 41*, 89–91. doi:10.1188/14.ONF.89-91

Cowan, J. (2014). Noteworthy matters for attention in reflective journal writing. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 15*, 53-64. doi:10.1177/1469787413514647

Crocker, J. C., Beecham, E., Kelly, P., Dinsdale, A. P., Hemsley, J., Jones, L., & Bluebond-Langner, M. (2015). Inviting parents to take part in paediatric palliative care research: A mixed-methods examination of selection bias. *Palliative*

Medicine, 29, 231-240. doi:10.1177/0269216314560803

Cronin, C. (2014). Using case study research as a rigorous form of inquiry. *Nurse Researcher, 21*(5), 19-27. doi:10.7748/nr.21.5.19.e1240

Daniel, P. A., & Daniel, C. (2018). Complexity, uncertainty and mental models: From a paradigm of regulation to a paradigm of emergence in project management. *International Journal of Project Management, 36*, 184-197. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.07.004

Davis, D. F., Golicic, S. L., Boerstler, C. N., Choi, S., & Oh, H. (2013). Does marketing research suffer from methods myopia? *Journal of Business Research, 66*, 1245-1250. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.020

Davis, J., & Holland-Davis, L. (2015). Beyond neighborhoods and crime: Expanding the scope of social disorganization to explain occupational deviance. *Sociological Inquiry, 85*, 262-284. doi:10.1111/soin.12071

De Felice, D., & Janesick, V. J. (2015). Understanding the marriage of technology and phenomenological research: From design to analysis. *The Qualitative Report, 20*, 1576-1593. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr

De Massis, A., & Kotlar, J. (2014). The case study method in family business research: Guidelines for qualitative scholarship. *Journal of Family Business Strategy, 5*, 15-29. doi:10.1016/j.jfbs.2014.01.007

De Poel, F. M., Stoker, J. I., & Van der Zee, K. I. (2014). Leadership and organizational tenure diversity as determinants of project team effectiveness. *Group & Organization Management, 39*, 532-560. doi:10.1177/1059601114550711

Dittes, S., Urbach, N., Ahlemann, F., Smolnik, S., & Müller, T. (2015). Why don't you stick to them? Understanding factors influencing and counter-measures to combat deviant behavior towards organizational IT standards. *Wirtschaftsinformatik*, 615-629. Retrieved from http://www.fim-rc.de/Seiten/en/Research/Research_Articles.aspx

Donner, C., Maskaly, J., & Fridell, L. (2016). Social bonds and police misconduct: An examination of social control theory and its relationship to workplace deviance among police supervisors. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 39*, 416-431. doi:10.1108/PIJPSM-10-2015-0109

Drabble, L., Trocki, K. F., Salcedo, B., Walker, P. C., & Korcha, R. A. (2015). Conducting qualitative interviews by telephone: Lessons learned from a study of alcohol use among sexual minority and heterosexual women. *Qualitative Social Work, 15*, 118-133. doi:10.1177/1473325015585613

Drake, G. (2013). The ethical and methodological challenges of social work research with participants who fear retribution: to 'do no harm'. *Qualitative Social Work, 13*, 304-319. doi:10.1177/1473325012473499

Dunkley, R. A., & Franklin, A. (2017). Failing better: The stochastic art of evaluating community-led environmental action programs. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 60*, 112-122. doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2016.11.005

Dush, L. (2012). The ethical complexities of sponsored digital storytelling. *International Journal of Cultural Studies, 16*, 627-640. doi:10.1177/1367877912459142

Dutta, D., & Bose, I. (2015). Managing a big data project: The case of ramco cements

limited. *International Journal of Production Economics, 165*, 293-306. doi:10.1016/j.ijpe.2014.12.032

Dwivedi, Y. K., Wastell, D., Laumer, S., Henriksen, H. Z., Myers, M. D., Bunker, D… (2015). Research on information systems failures and successes: Status update and future directions. *Information Systems Frontiers, 17*, 143-157. doi:10.1007/s10796-014-9500-y

Dworkin, S. L. (2012). Sample size policy for qualitative studies using in-depth interviews. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 41*, 1319–1320. doi:10.1007/s10508-012-0016-6

Edwards, M. T. (2017). An organizational learning framework for patient safety. *American Journal of Medical Quality, 32*, 148-155. doi:10.1177/1062860616632295

Eik-Andresen, P., Landmark, A. D., & Johansen, A. (2015). Managing cost and time in a large portfolio of projects. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 21*, 502-509. doi:10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00205-1

Elo, S., Kääriäinen, M., Kanste, O., Polkki, T., Utriainen, K., & Kyngas, H. (2014). Qualitative content analysis: A focus on trustworthiness. *SAGE Open, 4*, 1–10. doi:10.1177/2158244014522633

Emerick, N. A., Curry, T. R., Collins, T. W., & Fernando Rodriguez, S. (2014). Homicide and social disorganization on the border: Implications for Latino and immigrant populations. *Social Science Quarterly, 95*, 360-379. doi:10.1111/ssqu.12051

Enguidanos, S., Coulourides Kogan, A. M., Schreibeis-Baum, H., Lendon, J., & Lorenz, K. (2015). 'Because I was sick': Seriously ill veterans' perspectives on reason for 30-day readmissions. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 63*, 537-542. doi:10.1111/jgs.13238

Eriksson, D. (2016). The role of moral disengagement in supply chain management research. *European Business Review, 28*, 274-284. doi:10.1108/EBR-05-2015-0047

Escoffery, C., Kenzig, M., & Hyden, C. (2015). Getting the most out of professional associations. *Health Promotion Practice*, *16*(3), 309-312. doi:10.1177/1524839914566654

Fabricius, G., & Büttgen, M. (2015). Project managers' overconfidence: How is risk reflected in anticipated project success? *Business Research, 8*, 239-263. doi:10.1007/s40685-015-0022-3

Fan, X. (2013). " The test is reliable";" The test is valid": Language use, unconscious assumptions, and education research practice. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 22*, 217-218. doi:10.1007/s40299-012-0036-y

Fassinger, R., & Morrow, S. L. (2013). Toward best practices in quantitative, qualitative, and mixed- method research: A social justice perspective. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling & Psychology, 5*(2), 69-83. Retrieved from http://jsacp.tumblr.com/

Féris, M. A. A., Zwikael, O., & Gregor, S. (2017). QPLAN: Decision support for evaluating planning quality in software development projects. *Decision Support*

Systems, 96, 92-102. doi:10.1016/j.dss.2017.02.008

Ferreira, A. I. (2017). Leader and peer ethical behavior influences on job embeddedness. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studie.* Advanced online publication. doi:10.1177/1548051817702095

Ferreira, M. F., & Nascimento, E. D. (2016). Relationship between personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors. *Psico-USF, 21*(3), 677-685. doi:10.1590/1413-82712016210319

Fida, R., Paciello, M., Tramontano, C., Barbaranelli, C., & Farnese, M. L. (2015). "Yes, I Can": the protective role of personal self-efficacy in hindering counterproductive work behavior under stressful conditions. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping, 28,* 479-499. doi:10.1080/10615806.2014.969718

Fida, R., Paciello, M., Tramontano, C., Fontaine, R. G., Barbaranelli, C., & Farnese, M. L. (2015). An integrative approach to understanding counterproductive work behavior: The roles of stressors, negative emotions, and moral disengagement. *Journal of Business Ethics, 130*, 131-144. doi:10.1007/s10551-014-2209-5

Finfgeld-Connett, D. (2014). Use of content analysis to conduct knowledge-building and theory-generating qualitative systematic reviews. *Qualitative Research, 14*, 341-352. doi:10.1177/1468794113481790

Flyvbjerg, B. (2014). What you should know about megaprojects and why: An overview. *Project Management Journal, 45*(2), 6-19. doi:10.1002/pmj

Ford, C. A., Cheek, C., Culhane, J., Fishman, J., Mathew, L., Salek, E. C., Webb, D., & Jaccard, J. (2016). Parent and adolescent interest in receiving adolescent health

communication information from primary care clinicians. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *59*, 154-161. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2016.03.001

Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 20*, 1408-1416. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr

Galić, Z., & Ružojčić, M. (2017). Interaction between implicit aggression and dispositional self-control in explaining counterproductive work behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 104*, 111-117. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.07.046

Gallagher, E. C., Mazur, A. K., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2015). Rallying the troops or beating the horses? How project-related demands can lead to either high-performance or abusive supervision. *Project Management Journal, 46*(3), 10-24. doi:10.1002/pmj.21500

Gastmyer, C. L., & Pruitt, B.E. (2014). The impact of the affordable care act on health education: Perceptions of leading health educators. *Health Promotion Practice, 15*, 349-355. doi:10.1177/1524839913499348

Gentles, S. J., Charles, C., Ploeg, J., & McKibbon, K. A. (2015). Sampling in qualitative research: Insights from an overview of the methods literature. *The Qualitative Report, 20*, 1772-1789. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr

Gill, A., Lapalme, M. È., & Séguin, M. (2014). When politics meets ethics: How political skill helps ethical leaders foster organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 26*, 204-218. Retrieved from

http://www.pittstate.edu/business/journal-of-managerial-issues/index.dot

Gillespie, N., Dietz, G., & Lockey, S. (2014). Organizational reintegration and trust repair after an integrity violation: A case study. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 24*, 371-410. doi:10.5840/beq2014437

Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods, 16*, 15-31. doi:10.1177/1094428112452151

Goldstein, T., Gray, J., Salisbury, J., & Snell, P. (2014). When qualitative research meets theater the complexities of performed ethnography and research-informed theater project design. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*, 674-685. doi:10/18/201510.1177/1077800413513738

Golparvar, M. (2016). Unconventional functions of deviant behaviors in the relationship between job stress and emotional exhaustion: Three study findings. *Current Psychology, 35*, 269-284. doi:10.1007/s12144-014-9292-8

Gray, E. (2005). Utilizing the ethics of project management in the healthcare field. *Project Management Institute, 36*(4), 61-65. Retrieved from https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/utilizing-ethics-pm-healthcare-field-5531

Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 11*, 30-42. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00224

Guay, R. P., Choi, D., Oh, I. S., Mitchell, M. S., Mount, M. K., & Shin, K. H. (2016). Why people harm the organization and its members: Relationships among

personality, organizational commitment, and workplace deviance. *Human Performance, 29*, 1-15. doi:10.1080/08959285.2015.1120305

Guest, G., Namey, E., & McKenna, K. (2017). How many focus groups are enough? Building an evidence base for nonprobability sample sizes. *Field Methods, 29*, 3-22. doi:10.1177/1525822X16639015

Gunia, B. C., & Kim, S. Y. (2016). The behavioral benefits of other people's deviance. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 19*, 653-675. doi:10.1177/1368430216638532

Haahr, A., Norlyk, A., & Hall, E. O. (2014). Ethical challenges embedded in qualitative research interviews with close relatives. *Nursing Ethics, 21*, 6-15. doi:10.1177/0969733013486370

Haji-Kazemi, S., Andersen, B., & Klakegg, O. J. (2015). Barriers against effective responses to early warning signs in projects. *International Journal of Project Management, 33*, 1068-1083. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2015.01.002

Hall, J. L. (2016). Columbia and Challenger: Organizational failure at NASA. *Space Policy, 37*, 127-133. doi:10.1016/j.spacepol.2016.11.001

Hanna, R. C., Crittenden, V. L., & Crittenden, W. F. (2013). Social learning theory: A multicultural study of influences on ethical behavior. *Journal of Marketing Education, 35,* 18-25. doi:10.1177/0273475312474279

Harold, C. M., Oh, I. S., Holtz, B. C., Han, S., & Giacalone, R. A. (2016). Fit and frustration as drivers of targeted counterproductive work behaviors: A multifoci perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*, 1513-1535.

doi:10.1037/apl0000150

Harris, L. M., Boggiano, V., Nguyen, D. T., & Pham, L. H. L. (2013). Working in partnership with interpreters studies on individuals affected by HIV/AIDS in Vietnam. *Qualitative Health Research, 23*, 1408-1418. doi:10.1177/1049732313506964

Hart, S. M., & Warren, A. M. (2015). Understanding nurses' work: Exploring the links between changing work, labour relations, workload, stress, retention and recruitment. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 36*, 305-329. doi:10.1177/0143831X13505119

Hartmann, A., & Dorée, A. (2015). Learning between projects: More than sending messages in bottles. *International Journal of Project Management, 33*, 341-351. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.07.006

Harvey, L. (2015). Beyond member-checking: A dialogic approach to the research interview. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 38*, 23-38. doi:10.1080/1743727X.2014.914487

Hedlund, E., Börjesson, M., & Österberg, J. (2015). Team learning in a multinational military staff exercise. *Small Group Research, 46*, 179-203. doi:10.1177/1046496414568462

Henderson, A. K. (2016). Jesus didn't teach us to juggle: Religious involvement, work–family conflict, and life satisfaction among African Americans. *Journal of Family Issues, 37*, 1558-1584. doi:10.1177/0192513X14561520

Hodgson, D. E., & Paton, S. (2016). Understanding the professional project manager:

cosmopolitans, locals and identity work. *International Journal of Project Management, 34*, 352-364. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2015.03.003

Hollinger, R. C., & Clark, J. P. (1983). *Theft by employees*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Holmberg, C., Farahani, Z., & Witt, C. M. (2016). How do patients with chronic neck pain experience the effects of qigong and exercise therapy? A qualitative interview study. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*. 1-8. doi:10.1155/2016/8010891

Horsburgh, J., & Ippolito, K. (2018). A skill to be worked at: Using social learning theory to explore the process of learning from role models in clinical settings. *BMC Medical Education*, 18, 1-8. doi:10.1186/s12909-018-1251-x

Houghton, C., Casey, D., Shaw, D., & Murphy, K. (2013). Rigour in qualitative case-study research. *Nurse Researcher, 20*(4), 12-17. doi:10.7748/nr2013.03.20.4.12.e326

Houghton, C., Murphy, K., Shaw, D., & Casey, D. (2015). Qualitative case study data analysis: An example from practice. *Nurse Researcher, 22*(5), 8-12. doi:10.7748/nr.22.5.8.e1307

Hu, Y. L., Hung, C. H., & Ching, G. S. (2015). Examining the counterproductive work behaviors within Taiwan academic setting: A pilot study. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development, 9*(1), 63-82. doi:10.6197/HEED.2015.0901.04

Hungerford, C. (2014). Recovery as a model of care? Insights from an Australian case study. *Issues In Mental Health Nursing, 35*, 156-164.

doi:10.3109/01612840.2013.855281

Hunter, E. M., & Penney, L. M. (2014). The waiter spit in my soup! Antecedents of customer-directed counterproductive work behavior. *Human Performance, 27*, 262-281. doi:10.1080/08959285.2014.913595

Hyett, N., Kenny, A., & Dickson-Swift, V. (2014). Methodology or method? A critical review of qualitative case study reports. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being*, *9,* 1-12. doi:10.3402/qhw.v9.23606

Janssen, M., van der Voort, H., & van Veenstra, A. F. (2015). Failure of large transformation projects from the viewpoint of complex adaptive systems: Management principles for dealing with project dynamics. *Information Systems Frontiers, 17,* 15-29. doi:10.1007/s10796-014-9511-8

Jerolmack, C., & Khan, S. (2014). Talk is cheap: Ethnography and the attitudinal fallacy. *Sociological Methods & Research, 43*, 178-209. doi:10.1177/0049124114523396

Jhang, J. H., & Lynch, J. G. (2015). Pardon the interruption: Goal proximity, perceived spare time, and impatience. *Journal of Consumer Research, 41*, 1267-1283. doi:10.1086/679308

Johnson, B. (2014). Ethical issues in shadowing research. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 9*, 21-40. doi:10.1108/QROM-09-2012-1099

Johnson, E. I., & Easterling, B. A. (2015). Coping with confinement adolescents' experiences with parental incarceration. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 30*, 244-267. doi:10.1177/0743558414558593

Jørgensen, M. (2014). Failure factors of small software projects at a global outsourcing marketplace. *Journal of Systems and Software*, *92*, 157-169. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2014.01.034

Jørgensen, M. (2016). A survey on the characteristics of projects with success in delivering client benefits. *Information and Software Technology, 78,* 83-94. doi:10.1016/j.infsof.2016.05.008

Joslin, R., & Müller, R. (2016). Identifying interesting project phenomena using philosophical and methodological triangulation. *International Journal of Project Management, 34*. 1043-1056. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.05.005

Kaczynski, D., Salmona, M., & Smith, T. (2014). Qualitative research in finance. *Australian Journal of Management, 39*, 127-135. doi:10.1177/0312896212469611

Kalshoven, K., van Dijk, H., & Boon, C. (2016). Why and when does ethical leadership evoke unethical follower behavior? *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*, 500-515. doi:10.1108/JMP-10-2014-0314

Karim, J., Bibi, Z., Rehman, S. U., & Khan, M. S. (2015). Emotional intelligence and perceived work-related outcomes: Mediating role of workplace incivility victimization. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 30*, 21-37. Retrieved from http://www.pjprnip.edu.pk/pjpr

Klein, B. R., Allison, K., & Harris, C. T. (2017). Immigration and violence in rural versus urban counties, 1990–2010. *The Sociological Quarterly, 58*, 229-253. doi:10.1080/00380253.2017.1296339

Klotz, A. C., & Buckley, M. R. (2013). A historical perspective of counterproductive

work behavior targeting the organization. *Journal of Management History, 19*(1), 114-132. doi:10.1108/17511341311286222

Knight, K., Worrall, L., & Rose, T. (2015). The provision of health information to stroke patients within an acute hospital setting: what actually happens and how do patients feel about it? *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation, 22*, 78-97. doi:10.1310/FC6M-P7L0-W3XD-4WAE

Kuah, C. T., Wong, K. Y., & Tiwari, M. K. (2013). Knowledge sharing assessment: An ant colony system based data envelopment analysis approach. *Expert Systems with Applications, 40*, 3137-3144. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2012.12.027

Kutsch, E., & Hall, M. (2009). The rational choice of not applying project risk management in information technology projects. *Project Management Journal, 40*(3), 72-81. doi:10.1002/pmj.20112

Lappe, M., & Spang, K. (2014). Investments in project management are profitable: A case study-based analysis of the relationship between the costs and benefits of project management. *International Journal of Project Management*, *32*, 603-612. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.10.005

Le, K., Donnellan, M. B., Spilman, S. K., Garcia, O. P., & Conger, R. (2014). Workers behaving badly: Associations between adolescent reports of the Big Five and counterproductive work behaviors in adulthood. *Personality and Individual Differences, 61*, 7-12. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2013.12.016

Lepage, C., Yuan, T., Leon, S., Marshall, S., Labelle, P., & Ferland, M. (2016). Systematic review of depression in mild traumatic brain injury: study protocol.

Systematic Reviews, 5(23), 1-5. doi:10.1186/s13643-016-0196-6

Leung, L. (2015). Validity, reliability, and generalizability in qualitative research. *Journal of Family Medicine & Primary Care, 4*, 324-327. doi:10.4103/2249-4863.161306

Ligthart, R., Oerlemans, L., & Noorderhaven, N. (2016). In the shadows of time: A case study of flexibility behaviors in an interorganizational project. *Organization Studies, 37*, 1721-1743. doi:10.1177/0170840616655487

Lim, B. T., & Loosemore, M. (2017). The effect of inter-organizational justice perceptions on organizational citizenship behaviors in construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management, 35*, 95-106. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.10.016

Lips-Wiersma, M., & Mills, A. J. (2014). Understanding the basic assumptions about human nature in workplace spirituality beyond the critical versus positive divide. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 23*, 148-161. doi:10.1177/1056492613501227

Liu, J. F., & Tsai, T. C. (2016). Developing decision-making support system using risk efficiency on building projects in Taiwan. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation, 9*(1), 23-34. Retrieved from http://www.ijoi-online.org

Liu, M., & Wang, Y. (2015). Data collection mode effect on feeling thermometer questions: A comparison of face-to-face and web surveys. *Computers in Human Behavior, 48*, 212-218. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.01.057

Lloyd, E. A., & Schweizer, V. J. (2014). Objectivity and a comparison of methodological

scenario approaches for climate change research. *Synthese, 191*, 2049-2088. doi:10.1007/s11229-013-0353-6

Locatelli, G., Mancini, M., & Romano, E. (2014). Systems engineering to improve the governance in complex project environments. *International Journal of Project Management, 32*, 1395-1410. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.10.007

López-Martín, C., & Abran, A. (2015). Neural networks for predicting the duration of new software projects. *Journal of Systems and Software*, *101*, 127-135. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2014.12.002

Lovatt, M., Nanton, V., Roberts, J., Ingleton, C., Noble, B., Pitt, E., Seers, K, & Munday, D. (2015). The provision of emotional labour by health care assistants caring for dying cancer patients in the community: A qualitative study into the experiences of health care assistants and bereaved family carers. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 52*, 271-279. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2014.10.013

Lyons, H. Z., Johnson, A., Bike, D. H., Flores, L. Y., Ojeda, L., & Rosales, R. (2013). Qualitative research as social justice practice with culturally diverse populations. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology, 5*(2), 10-25. Retrieved from http://jsacp.tumblr.com/

MacKenzie, S., Baadjies, L., & Seedat, M. (2015). A phenomenological study of volunteers' experiences in a South African waste management campaign. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *26*, 756-776. doi:10.1007/s11266-014-9450-5

Mahaney, R. C., & Lederer, A. L. (2006). The effect of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for

developers in information systems project success. *Project Management Journal, 37*(4), 42-54. Retrieved from https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/intrinsic-extrinsic-rewards-project-success-5558

Mansfield, K. C. (2014). How listening to student voices informs and strengthens social justice research and practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 50*, 392-430. doi:10.1177/0013161X13505288

Marcus, B., Taylor, O. A., Hastings, S. E., Sturm, A., & Weigelt, O. (2016). The structure of counterproductive work behavior: A review, a structural meta-analysis, and a primary study. *Journal of Management, 42*, 203-233. doi:10.1177/0149206313503019

Marion, J. W., Richardson, T., & Earnhardt, M. (2016). Project execution: A research agenda to explore the phenomenon. *The Journal of Modern Project Management, 4*(1), 70-79. Retrieved from http://www.journalmodernpm.com

Marrone, S. R. (2016). Informed consent examined within the context of culturally congruent care: An interprofessional perspective. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 27,* 342-348. doi:10.1177/1043659615569537

Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A., & Fontenot, R. (2013). Does sample size matter in qualitative research? A review of qualitative interviews in IS research. *Journal of Computer Information Systems, 54*(1), 11-22. doi:10.1080/08874417.2013.11645667

Martínez-Córcoles, M., & Stephanou, K. (2017). Linking active transactional leadership and safety performance in military operations. *Safety Science, 96*, 93-101.

doi:10.1016/j.ssci.2017.03.013

Masa'deh, R. E., Obeidat, B. Y., & Tarhini, A. (2016). A Jordanian empirical study of the associations among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, knowledge sharing, job performance, and firm performance: A structural equation modelling approach. *Journal of Management Development, 35*, 681-705. doi:10.1108/JMD-09-2015-0134

Matta, F. K., Erol-Korkmaz, H. T., Johnson, R. E., & Biçaksiz, P. (2014). Significant work events and counterproductive work behavior: The role of fairness, emotions, and emotion regulation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*, 920-944. doi:10.1002/job.1934

McBeath, B. (2015). Making sense of HUSK: Practice implications for social change initiatives. *Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work, 12*, 139-154. doi:10.1080/15433714.2014.960251

McConnell, S. (1996). *Rapid development: taming wild software schedules*. Redmond, WA: Pearson Education.

McCusker, K., & Gunaydin, S. (2015). Research using qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods and choice based on the research. *Perfusion, 30*, 537-542. doi:10.1177/0267659114559116

McEvenue, G., Hofer, S. O., Lista, F., & Ahmad, J. (2016). Performing ethical research as a plastic surgeon in private practice: The institutional review board. *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, *36*, 508-514. doi:10.1093/asj/sjv263

McIntosh, M. J., & Morse, J. M. (2015). Situating and constructing diversity in semi-

structured interviews. *Global Qualitative Nursing Research, 2*, 1-12. doi:10.1177/2333393615597674

McManamny, T., Sheen, J., Boyd, L., & Jennings, P. A. (2015). Mixed methods and its application in prehospital research: A systematic review. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 9*, 214-231. doi:10.1177/1558689813520408

Meer, T. V. D., & Tolsma, J. (2014). Ethnic diversity and its effects on social cohesion. *Annual Review of Sociology, 40*, 459-478. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043309

Meier, L. L., & Spector, P. E. (2013). Reciprocal effects of work stressors and counterproductive work behavior: A five-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*, 529-539. doi:10.1037/a0031732

Mekpor, B., & Dartey-Baah, K. (2017). Leadership styles and employees' voluntary work behaviors in the Ghanaian banking sector. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 38*, 74-88. doi:10.1108/LODJ-09-2015-0207

Mellor, J., Ingram, N., Abrahams, J., & Beedell, P. (2014). Class matters in the interview setting? Positionality, situatedness and class. *British Educational Research Journal, 40*, 135-149. doi:10.1002/berj.3035

Messikomer, C. M., & Cirka, C. C. (2010). Constructing a code of ethics: An experiential case of a national professional organization. *Journal of Business Ethics, 95*, 55-71. doi:10.1007/s10551-009-0347-y

Meyer, W. G. (2014). The effect of optimism bias on the decision to terminate failing projects. *Project Management Journal, 45*(4), 7-20. doi:10.1002/pmj

Miller, B., & Morris, R. G. (2016). Virtual peer effects in social learning theory. *Crime & Delinquency, 62*, 1543-1569. doi:10.1177/0011128714526499

Molena, A., & Rovai, R. L. (2016). Reference model for improved communicability in projects: survey among members of the PMI, São Paulo Chapter. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, 9*, 682-706. doi:10.1108/IJMPB-01-2016-0006

Molloy, C. (2015). Getting by or getting in? Grappling with access and affect in qualitative research projects involving vulnerable human subjects. *Qualitative Inquiry, 21*, 467-476. doi:10.1177/1077800415569783

Monzani, L., Braun, S., & van Dick, R. (2016). It takes two to tango: The interactive effect of authentic leadership and organizational identification on employee silence intentions. *German Journal of Human Resource Management, 30*, 246-266. doi:10.1177/2397002216649896

Moore, C., & Gino, F. (2015). Approach, ability, aftermath: A psychological process framework of unethical behavior at work. *The Academy of Management Annals, 9*, 235-289. doi:10.1080/19416520.2015.1011522

Morris, W. K., Vesk, P. A., McCarthy, M. A., Bunyavejchewin, S., & Baker, P. J. (2015). The neglected tool in the Bayesian ecologist's shed: A case study testing informative priors' effect on model accuracy. *Ecology and Evolution, 5*, 102-108. doi:10.1002/ece3.1346

Morse, J. M. (2015). Critical analysis of strategies for determining rigor in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Health Research, 25*, 1212-1222.

doi:10.1177/1049732315588501

Morse, J. M., & Coulehan, J. (2015). Maintaining confidentiality in qualitative publications. *Qualitative Health Research, 25*, 151-152. doi:10.1177/1049732314563489

Moylan, C. A., Derr, A. S., & Lindhorst, T. (2015). Increasingly mobile: How new technologies can enhance qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Work, 14*, 36-47. doi:10.1177/1473325013516988

Müller, R., & Martinsuo, M. (2015). The impact of relational norms on information technology project success and its moderation through project governance. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, 8*, 154-176. doi:10.1108/IJMPB-04-2014-0036

Naess, P., Andersen, J. A., Nicolaisen, M. S., & Strand, A. (2015). Forecasting inaccuracies: a result of unexpected events, optimism bias, technical problems, or strategic misrepresentation? *Journal of Transport and Land Use, 8*(3), 39-55. doi:10.5198/jtlu.2015.719

Nelson, R. R. (2007). IT project management: Infamous failures, classic mistakes, and best practices. *MIS Quarterly Executive, 6,* 67-78. Retrieved from http://misqe.org

Ng, T. W., Lam, S. S., & Feldman, D. C. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior: Do males and females differ? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 93*, 11-32. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2015.12.005

Ogden, L. P. (2014). “My life as it is has value”: Narrating schizophrenia in later years. *Qualitative Health Research, 24*, 1342–1355. doi:10.1177/1049732314546752

Ose, S. O. (2016). Using excel and word to structure qualitative data. *Journal of Applied Social Science, 10.* 147-162. doi:10.1177/1936724416664948

Padalkar, M., & Gopinath, S. (2016). Six decades of project management research: Thematic trends and future opportunities. *International Journal of Project Management, 34,* 1305-1321. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.06.006

Pallas, S. W., Khuat, T. H. O., Le, Q. D., & Ruger, J. P. (2015). The changing donor landscape of health sector aid to Vietnam: A qualitative case study. *Social Science & Medicine, 132*, 165-172. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.03.027

Palmer, J. C., Komarraju, M., Carter, M. Z., & Karau, S. J. (2017). Angel on one shoulder: Can perceived organizational support moderate the relationship between the dark triad traits and counterproductive work behavior? *Personality and Individual Differences, 110*, 31-37. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.01.018

Paschen, J. A., & Ison, R. (2014). Narrative research in climate change adaptation - Exploring a complementary paradigm for research and governance. *Research Policy, 43*, 1083-1092. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2013.12.006

Pfadenhauer, M., & Grenz, T. (2015). Uncovering the essence: The why and how of supplementing observation with participation in phenomenology-based ethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 44*, 598-616. doi:10.1177/0891241615587382

Pinsky, D. (2015). The sustained snapshot: Incidental ethnographic encounters in qualitative interview studies. *Qualitative Research, 15*, 281-295. doi:10.1177/1468794112473493

Pinto, J. K. (2014). Project management, governance, and the normalization of deviance. *International Journal of Project Management*, *32*, 376-387. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.06.004

Pinto, J. K., Dawood, S., & Pinto, M. B. (2014). Project management and burnout: Implications of the Demand–Control–Support model on project-based work. *International Journal of Project Management*, *32*, 578-589. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.09.003

Pinto, J. K., & Patanakul, P. (2015). When narcissism drives project champions: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of Project Management, 33*, 1180-1190. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2015.01.013

Pinto, J. K., & Winch, G. (2016). The unsettling of "settled science:" The past and future of the management of projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, *34*, 237-245. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2015.07.011

Pluye, P., & Hong, Q. N. (2014). Combining the power of stories and the power of numbers: Mixed methods research and mixed studies reviews. *Annual Review of Public Health, 35,* 29-45. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-032013-182440

Porananond, D., & Thawesaengskulthai, N. (2014). Risk management for new product development projects in food industry. *Journal of Engineering, Project, and Production Management, 4*, 99-113. Retrieved from http://www.ppml.url.tw/EPPM_Journal

Poston, R. S., & Richardson, S. M. (2011). Designing an academic project management program: A collaboration between a university and a PMI chapter. *Journal of*

Information Systems Education, 22, 55-72. Retrieved from http://jise.org

Price, M. R., & Williams, T. C. (2015). When doing wrong feels so right: Normalization of deviance. *Journal of Patient Safety*. doi:10.1097/PTS.0000000000000157

Priesemuth, M., Arnaud, A., & Schminke, M. (2013). Bad behavior in groups: The impact of overall justice climate and functional dependence on counterproductive work behavior in work units. *Group & Organization Management, 38*, 230-257. doi:10.1177/1059601113479399

Project Management Institute (PMI). (2017a). *Agile practice guide*. Newtown Square, PA: Author.

Project Management Institute (PMI). (2017b). *A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK guide)* (6th ed.). Newtown Square, PA: Author.

Raman, P., Sambasivan, M., & Kumar, N. (2016). Counterproductive work behavior among frontline government employees: Role of personality, emotional intelligence, affectivity, emotional labor, and emotional exhaustion. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 32*, 25-37. doi:10.1016/j.rpto.2015.11.002

Ramazani, J., & Jergeas, G. (2015). Project managers and the journey from good to great: The benefits of investment in project management training and education. *International Journal of Project Management*, *33*, 41-52. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.03.012

Rasinger, S. M. (2013). *Quantitative research in linguistics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Rauch, A., Doorn, R., & Hulsink, W. (2014). A qualitative approach to evidence-based entrepreneurship: Theoretical considerations and an example involving business clusters. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 38*, 333-368. doi:10.1111/etap.12093

Raymond-Flesch, M., Siemons, R., Pourat, N., Jacobs, K., & Brindis, C. D. (2014). There is no help out there and if there is, it's really hard to find": A qualitative study of the health concerns and health care access of Latino "DREAMers. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 55,* 323-328. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.05.012

Reiman, T., Rollenhagen, C., Pietikäinen, E., & Heikkilä, J. (2015). Principles of adaptive management in complex safety–critical organizations. *Safety Science, 71,* 80-92. doi:10.1016/j.ssci.2014.07.021

Resick, C. J., Hargis, M. B., Shao, P., & Dust, S. B. (2013). Ethical leadership, moral equity judgments, and discretionary workplace behavior. *Human Relations, 66*, 951-972. doi:10.1177/0018726713481633

Reuter, C., Ludwig, T., Kaufhold, M. A., & Spielhofer, T. (2016). Emergency services′ attitudes towards social media: A quantitative and qualitative survey across Europe. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 95*, 96-111. doi:10.1016/j.ijhcs.2016.03.005

Riera, A., Ocasio, A., Tiyyagura, G., Krumeich, L., Ragins, K., Thomas, A., Trevino, S, & Vaca, F. E. (2014). Latino caregiver experiences with asthma health communication. *Qualitative Health Research, 25*, 16-26. doi:10.1177/1049732314549474

Robards, B. (2013). Friending participants: Managing the researcher–participant relationship on social network sites. *Young, 21*, 217-235. doi:10.1177/1103308813488815

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 555-572. doi:10.2307/256693

Rolstadås, A., Pinto, J. K., Falster, P., & Venkataraman, R. (2015). Project decision chain. *Project Management Journal, 46*(4), 6-19. doi:10.1002/pmj.21517

Roy, K., Zvonkovic, A., Goldberg, A., Sharp, E., & LaRossa, R. (2015). Sampling richness and qualitative integrity: Challenges for research with families. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 77*, 243-260. doi:10.1111/jomf.12147

Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Jones, K. S., & Liao, H. (2014). The utility of a multifoci approach to the study of organizational justice: A meta-analytic investigation into the consideration of normative rules, moral accountability, bandwidth-fidelity, and social exchange. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 123*, 159-185. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.10.011

Sharma, N. (2018). Contribution of social learning in counterproductive work behaviors. In A. Sandu & A. Frunza (Eds.), *Ethical Issues in Social Work Practice* (pp. 260-281). doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-3090-9.ch014

Savelsbergh, C. M., Poell, R. F., & van der Heijden, B. I. (2015). Does team stability mediate the relationship between leadership and team learning? An empirical study among Dutch project teams. *International Journal of Project Management,*

33, 406-418. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.08.008

Schrems, B. M. (2014). Informed consent, vulnerability and the risks of group-specific attribution. *Nursing Ethics, 21*, 829-843. doi:10.1177/0969733013518448

Schulte-Braucks, J., Baethge, A., Dormann, C., & Vahle-Hinz, T. (2018). Get even and feel good? Moderating effects of justice sensitivity and counterproductive work behavior on the relationship between illegitimate tasks and self-esteem. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/ocp0000112

Schütte, N., Blickle, G., Frieder, R. E., Wihler, A., Schnitzler, F., Heupel, J., & Zettler, I. (2016). The role of interpersonal influence in counterbalancing psychopathic personality trait facets at work. *Journal of Management*. doi:10.1177/0149206315607967

Sechudi, O., & Olivier, B. (2016). The influence of transformational leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour in a South African combat military unit. *Journal of Psychology in Africa, 26*, 363-367. doi:10.1080/14330237.2016.1208948

Shaffer, J. A., & Darnold, T. C. (2018). Human resource practices and coercive control interact to predict CWB: A meta-ethnographic study. *Academy of Management Proceedings*. Advanced online publication. doi:10.5465/AMBPP.2018.166

Shao, Z., Feng, Y., & Hu, Q. (2016). Effectiveness of top management support in enterprise systems success: a contingency perspective of fit between leadership style and system life-cycle. *European Journal of Information Systems, 25*, 131-

153. doi:10.1057/ejis.2015.6

Sheffield, J., & Lemétayer, J. (2013). Factors associated with the software development agility of successful projects. *International Journal of Project Management, 31*, 459-472. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2012.09.011

Shmueli, O., Pliskin, N., & Fink, L. (2016). Can the outside-view approach improve planning decisions in software development projects? *Information Systems Journal, 26,* 395-418. doi:10.1111/isj.12091

Shoss, M. K., Hunter, E. M., & Penney, L. M. (2016). Avoiding the issue: Disengagement coping style and the personality - CWB link. *Human Performance, 29,* 106-122. doi:10.1080/08959285.2016.1148036

Simmons, A. D., & Bobo, L. D. (2015). Can non-full-probability internet surveys yield useful data? A comparison with full-probability face-to-face surveys in the domain of race and social inequality attitudes. *Sociological Methodology, 45*, 357-387. doi:10.1177/0081175015570096

Smith, T. A. (2014). Testing theory and related factors for influencing proficiency in quantitative research. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 18*(4), 117-128. Retrieved from http://www.alliedacademies.org

Soomro, A. B., Salleh, N., Mendes, E., Grundy, J., Burch, G., & Nordin, A. (2016). The effect of software engineers' personality traits on team climate and performance: A systematic literature review. *Information and Software Technology, 73*, 52-65. doi:10.1016/j.infsof.2016.01.006

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*, 446-460. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.10.005

Spencer, D. C. (2014). Sensing violence: An ethnography of mixed martial arts. *Ethnography, 15*, 232-254. doi:10.1177/1466138112471108

Standing, O., Standing, S., & Kordt, E. (2016). Explaining attribution in information technology projects. *Journal of Systems and Information Technology, 18*, 216-227. doi:10.1108/JSIT-01-2016-0002

St. Pierre, E. A., & Jackson, A. Y. (2014). Qualitative data analysis after coding. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*, 715-719. doi:10.1177/1077800414532435

Stephens, C., & Breheny, M. (2013). Narrative analysis in psychological research: An integrated approach to interpreting stories. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 10*, 14-27. doi:10.1080/14780887.2011.586103

Stingl, V., & Geraldi, J. (2017). Errors, lies and misunderstandings: Systematic review on behavioural decision making in projects. *International Journal of Project Management, 35,* 121-135. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.10.009

Stoica, R., & Brouse, P. (2014). An adaptive and preemptive theory for improving systemic IT project failure trends ("AdaPIT" theory). *Procedia Computer Science*, *28*, 247-256. doi:10.1016/j.procs.2014.03.031

Stratton, S. J. (2016). Research in prehospital and disaster health and medicine: The manuscript methods section. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine, 31*, 1-3. doi:10.1017/S1049023X15005592

Swärd, A. (2016). Trust, reciprocity, and actions: The development of trust in temporary inter-organizational relations. *Organization Studies, 37*, 1841-1860. doi:10.1177/0170840616655488

Talet, A. N., Mat-Zin, R., & Houari, M. (2014). Risk management and information technology projects. *International Journal of Digital Information and Wireless Communications (IJDIWC)*, *4*(1), 1-9. doi:10.17781/P001078

Taylor, R. G., Brice, J., & Robinson, S. L. (2016). Perception deception: Security risks created by optimistic perceptions. *Journal of Systems and Information Technology, 18,* 2-17. doi:10.1108/JSIT-07-2015-0062

Tharenou, P. (2015). Researching expatriate types: The quest for rigorous methodological approaches. *Human Resource Management Journal, 25*, 149-165. doi:10.1111/1748-8583.12070

Tickle-Degnen, L. (2013). Nuts and bolts of conducting feasibility studies. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 67*, 171-176. doi:10.5014/ajot.2013.006270

Tomkins, L., & Eatough, V. (2013). The feel of experience: Phenomenological ideas for organizational research. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 8*, 258-275. doi:10.1108/QROM-04-2012-1060

Toprak, E., & Genc-Kumtepe, E. (2014). Cross-cultural communication and collaboration: Case of an international e-learning project. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning, 17*(1), 134-146. doi:10.2478/eurodl-2014-0009

Tuna, M., Ghazzawi, I., Yesiltas, M., Tuna, A. A., & Arslan, S. (2016). The effects of the perceived external prestige of the organization on employee deviant workplace

behavior: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 28*, 366-396. doi:10.1108/IJCHM-04-2014-0182

Tyssen, A. K., Wald, A., & Heidenreich, S. (2014). Leadership in the context of temporary organizations: A study on the effects of transactional and transformational leadership on followers' commitment in projects. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21*, 376-393. doi:10.1177/1548051813502086

Vale, J., Branco, M. C., & Ribeiro, J. (2016). Individual intellectual capital versus collective intellectual capital in a meta-organization. *Journal of Intellectual Capital, 17*, 279-297. doi:10.1108/JIC-06-2015-0058

van Zyl, C. J. J., & de Bruin, G. P. (2018). Predicting counterproductive work behavior with narrow personality traits: A nuanced examination using quantile regression. *Personality and Individual Differences, 131*, 45-50. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2018.04.014

Verburg, R. M., Bosch-Sijtsema, P., & Vartiainen, M. (2013). Getting it done: Critical success factors for project managers in virtual work settings. *International Journal of Project Management, 31*, 68-79. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2012.04.005

Verner, J. M., Babar, M. A., Cerpa, N., Hall, T., & Beecham, S. (2014). Factors that motivate software engineering teams: A four country empirical study. *Journal of Systems and Software*, *92*, 115-127. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2014.01.008

Vieru, D., & Rivard, S. (2014). Organizational identity challenges in a post-merger

context: A case study of an information system implementation project. *International Journal of Information Management, 34*, 381-386. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2014.02.001

Wang, L., Kunc, M., & Bai, S. J. (2017). Realizing value from project implementation under uncertainty: An exploratory study using system dynamics. *International Journal of Project Management.* Advanced online publication. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.01.009

Wang, Q., Koh, J. B. K., & Song, Q. (2015). Meaning making through personal storytelling: Narrative research in the Asian American context. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 6*, 88-96. doi:10.1037/a0037317

Wang, X. (2013). The construction of researcher–researched relationships in school ethnography: Doing research, participating in the field and reflecting on ethical dilemmas. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*, 763-779. doi:10.1080/09518398.2012.666287

Wated, G., & Sanchez, J. I. (2015). Managerial tolerance of nepotism: The effects of individualism–collectivism in a Latin American context. *Journal of Business Ethics, 130*, 45-57. doi:10.1007/s10551-014-2195-7

Welsh, J. A., Nelson, J. M., Walsh, A., Palmer, W., & Vos, M. B. (2014). Brief training in patient-centered counseling for healthy weight management increases counseling self-efficacy and goal setting among pediatric primary care providers: Results of a pilot program. *Clinical Pediatrics, 54*, 425-429. doi:10.1177/0009922814553432

Wiewiora, A., Trigunarsyah, B., Murphy, G., & Coffey, V. (2013). Organizational culture and willingness to share knowledge: A competing values perspective in Australian context. *International Journal of Project Management, 31*, 1163-1174. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2012.12.014

Winch, G., & Leiringer, R. (2016). Owner project capabilities for infrastructure development: A review and development of the "strong owner" concept. *International Journal of Project Management, 34*, 271-281. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2015.02.002

Wu, Y. C. (2017). Mechanisms linking ethical leadership to ethical sales behavior. *Psychological Reports, 120*, 537-560. doi:10.1177/0033294117693594

Wyatt, M., & Márquez, C. P. (2016). Helping first-year undergraduates engage in language research. *Language Teaching Research, 20*, 146-164. doi:10.1177/1362168814562013

Xia, N., Zhong, R., Wang, X., & Tiong, R. (2018). Cross-domain negative effect of work-family conflict on project citizenship behavior: Study on Chinese project managers. *International Journal of Project Management, 36*, 512-524. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.11.005

Yam, K. C., Klotz, A. C., He, W., & Reynolds, S. J. (2017). From good soldiers to psychologically entitled: Examining when and why citizenship behavior leads to deviance. *Academy of Management Journal, 60*, 373-396. doi:10.5465/amj.2014.0234

Yıldız, B., Alpkan, L., Sezen, B., & Yıldız, H. (2015). A proposed conceptual model of

destructive deviance: The mediator role of moral disengagement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 207*, 414-423. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.111

Yin, R. K. (2013). Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. *Evaluation, 19*, 321-332. doi:10.1177/1356389013497081

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Young, A. M., & MacPhail, A. (2015). 'Standing on the periphery': Cooperating teachers' perceptions and responses to the role of supervision. *European Physical Education Review, 21*, 222–237. doi:10.1177/1356336X14557582

Yu, H., Abdullah, A., & Saat, R. M. (2014). Overcoming time and ethical constraints in the qualitative data collection process: A case of information literacy research. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 46*, 243-257. doi:10.1177/0961000614526610

Zhang, X., De Pablos, P. O., & Xu, Q. (2014). Culture effects on the knowledge sharing in multi-national virtual classes: A mixed method. *Computers in Human Behavior, 31*, 491-498. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2013.04.021

Zhang, H., Luo, X. R., Liao, Q., & Peng, L. (2015). Does IT team climate matter? An empirical study of the impact of co-workers and the Confucian work ethic on deviance behavior. *Information & Management, 52*, 658-667. doi:10.1016/j.im.2015.05.006

Zhou, L., & Baptista Nunes, M. (2013). Doing qualitative research in Chinese contexts: Lessons learned from conducting interviews in a Chinese healthcare environment.

Library Hi Tech, 31, 419-434. doi:10.1108/LHT-11-2012-0104

Zhu, Y. Q., & Kindarto, A. (2016). A garbage can model of government IT project failures in developing countries: The effects of leadership, decision structure and team competence. *Government Information Quarterly, 33*, 629-637. doi:10.1016/j.giq.2016.08.002

Ziakas, V., & Boukas, N. (2014). Contextualizing phenomenology in event management research: Deciphering the meaning of event experiences. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management, 5*, 56-73. doi:10.1108/IJEFM-08-2012-0023

Zuber, F. (2015). Spread of unethical behavior in organizations: A dynamic social network perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 131*, 151-172. doi:10.1007/s10551-014-2270-0

Appendix A: Interview Protocol and Interview Questions

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

A. The interview session will start with greetings and introductions, after which I will give a short description of the research topic.

B. I will thank the participant for the willingness to participate in the study

C. I will ask the participant to read and sign the consent form. I will tell the participant to ask questions if anything is unclear.

D. The participant will be given a copy of the consent form for their records.

E. I will turn on the audio recorder and I will note the date, time and location.

F. The code name for the participant will be indicated on the audio recorder, documented on my copy of the consent form and the interview will begin.

G. The interview will span between 30 and 60 minutes for responses to the eight interview questions, including any additional follow-up questions.

H. I will remind participants of the purpose of the study before asking questions. The purpose of the case study is to explore strategies project managers use to prevent counterproductive behavior in projects.

I. I will inform the participant that after I have transcribed the interview, I will provide the report to the participant via email. At that point, if the participant wants to add something to the interview, he or she can reply to the email with the additional information.

J. At the end of the interview, I will thank the research participant for taking the time to participate in the study.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The interview questions are as follows:

1. In projects, what participant behavior and activity have you experienced that put project success at risk?

2. What strategies have you used to prevent participant behavior and activity that put project goals and success at risk?
3. Which of these strategies worked best and why was it successful?
4. How did you make sure the strategies to prevent counterproductive work behavior worked in the project?
5. When applying the strategies to prevent counterproductive work behavior, what obstacles did you encounter and how did you overcome them?
6. How did project participants react to the implementation of the strategies?
7. Do you have anything else to add about preventing counterproductive work behavior among project participants?