

Me or We? The Role of Personality and Justice as Other-Centered Antecedents to Innovative Citizenship Behaviors Within Organizations

Henry Moon
London Business School

Dishan Kamdar
Indian School of Business

David M. Mayer
University of Central Florida

Riki Takeuchi
Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

The present research takes an “other-centered” approach to examining personal and contextual antecedents of *taking charge* behavior in organizations. Largely consistent with the authors’ hypotheses, regression analyses involving data collected from 2 diverse samples containing both coworkers and supervisors demonstrated that the other-centered trait, duty, was positively related to taking charge, whereas the self-centered trait, achievement striving, was negatively related to taking charge. In addition, the authors found that procedural justice at the organizational level was positively related to taking charge when evaluated by a coworker, while both procedural and distributive justice were positively related to taking charge when considered by a supervisor. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

Keywords: taking charge, personality, organizational justice

An organization’s long-term viability is critically dependent on the proactive behaviors of its members (Kanter, 1983; Katz & Kahn, 1978). Katz (1964) alluded to the entire population of an organization when he stated that because of the inability of any organization to foresee all potential contingencies and environmental changes, “the resources of people in innovation, in spontaneous cooperation, in protective and creative behavior are thus vital to organizational survival and effectiveness” (p. 133). Although the importance of innovative behaviors is unquestioned, findings that reveal the antecedents that spur individual innovative behaviors in organizational settings have been relatively scant (e.g., Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Van der Veegt & Janssen, 2003; Zhen & Aryee, 2007).

The suggestion box represents one way in which an organization attempts to gather potentially fruitful ideas from its employees. We consider a scenario in which an individual stands in front of a suggestion box with a carefully constructed idea in hand. We ask what compels this individual, by contrast with other individuals, to engage in the actual process of trying to change and improve how things are done around them. We ask not only which employee will be more likely to provide innovative suggestions, but also which organization will encourage the average employee to pro-

vide more innovative suggestions. In sum, we address the often-overlooked aspects of innovative behaviors that are volitional in nature (Moon, Van Dyne, & Wrobel, 2005).

Morrison and Phelps (1999) described this behavior by detailing a taking charge construct to address the importance of providing suggestions for change when organizational functioning is deemed less than ideal. *Taking charge* is positioned as an extrarole behavior construct that differs from traditional innovative behaviors by requiring that the behavior include both (a) a discretionary attempt to initiate and enact positive change and (b) an intention to benefit the organization, as opposed to being rooted in personal gain. In this regard, taking charge combines aspects of both organizational innovation (Barron & Harrington, 1981) and good citizenship (Organ, 1988), creating a form of *innovative citizenship behavior*.

As suggested by our introductory quote, we provide an explanation for taking charge behavior based on other-centered values (McNeely & Meglino, 1994), rather than hedonistic (Korsgaard, Meglino, & Lester, 1996, 1997) models of human behavior. We address whether taking charge is more about “we” than it is about “me” by looking at both individual personality and organizational justice antecedents to this behavior across two samples.

Taking Charge

Traditionally, scholars who have examined extrarole behaviors have generally focused on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). However, Morrison and Phelps (1999) noted that “this research has been limited by an overly narrow conceptualization of extra-role behavior” (p. 406). In response to this shortcoming, they detailed the taking charge construct, defining it as “voluntary and constructive efforts, by individual employees, to effect organizationally functional change with respect to how work is executed within the contexts of their jobs, work units, or organizations” (p. 403). Indeed, much of the research on OCB has focused on helping

Henry Moon, Organizational Behavior Department, London Business School, London, United Kingdom; Dishan Kamdar, Organizational Behavior Department, Indian School of Business, Gachibowli, India; David M. Mayer, Department of Management, College of Business Administration, University of Central Florida; Riki Takeuchi, Department of Management of Organizations, School of Business and Management, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Kowloon, Hong Kong.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Henry Moon, London Business School, Regent’s Park, Sussex Place, London NW1 4SA, United Kingdom. E-mail: hmoon@london.edu

colleagues, being punctual, and attending nonrequired work functions, as opposed to more substantial behaviors rooted in a desire to help one's organization develop, evolve, and improve (Moon et al., 2005). Thus, although taking charge is a type of extrarole behavior, it differs meaningfully from OCB and related constructs such as principled organizational dissent, whistle blowing, voice, issue selling, task revision, role innovation, and personal initiative. (See Morrison & Phelps, 1999, for a detailed review of the distinctiveness of taking charge.)

Morrison and Phelps (1999) found support for an expectancy-based theoretical foundation predicting this behavior (e.g., self-efficacy and top management openness). They explained their findings as determined both by an individual's judgment about the likely outcomes and by judgments about the likelihood of success. Thus, Morrison and Phelps posited that employees are motivated to take initiative to challenge the status quo when they believe that change can and will be enacted. Although the usefulness of the expectancy paradigm has received support, we question whether this perspective provides the only explanation for what motivates taking charge behavior.

We draw on the self- versus other-centeredness literature to posit that when individuals are other-centered (either as a result of their own underlying disposition or as a result of the organizational context), they are more likely to take charge, because they want to help the organization function effectively (e.g., Epley, Caruso, & Bazerman, 2006; Korsgaard et al., 1996, 1997; Meglino & Korsgaard, 2004; Moon, 2001). We take a similar perspective to Morrison and Phelps (1999) by exploring both personal and contextual antecedents. We concur with Korsgaard and others (Korsgaard et al., 1996, 1997; Meglino & Korsgaard, 2004) who argue for the value of *concern for others* in the organizational sciences and who note that theories of other-centeredness have been muted by an overemphasis on hedonistic models of human behavior.

Contextual Antecedents of Taking Charge: Organizational Justice

Organizational justice refers to perceptions of fairness in the workplace (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2006). Research has demonstrated that justice perceptions are positively related to important outcomes such as job satisfaction, commitment, performance, and OCB (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). While research has examined the relationship between justice and OCB, there are no studies that have explored justice and taking charge.

Justice theories suggest that when an organization is deemed as fair, employees will be more likely to make efforts to improve their organization. The relational and group-value models of justice posit that being treated in a just manner is important to individuals working in organizations because it suggests that they are valued (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler & Lind, 1992). To date, research regarding justice has implicitly viewed the benefits as predominantly preventive in nature (Brockner, 2002; Greenberg, 1993, 1994). Justice research has generally not examined whether fair treatment motivates individuals to take charge to promote positive change. Below we provide a rationale for why the two primary types of justice—distributive and procedural—might relate positively to taking charge behaviors.

The Role of Distributive Justice

Distributive justice is one of the oldest forms of justice and refers to the perceived fairness of decision outcomes (Adams, 1965). When an individual's outcomes are fair, it is a signal that an individual's abilities and production are valued by the organization. When one is perceived as a valued member of an organization, he or she is more likely to demonstrate behaviors to help the organization thrive, as a form of social exchange (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). In this regard, taking charge behaviors based on a distributive justice model would reflect a condition in which just reward and recognition for their contributions inspire individuals to engage in behavior aimed at initiating positive change in the organization. Mumford and Gustafson (1988) support this interpretation. They conclude their review of a number of studies on organizational climate by noting that successful, innovative research-and-design systems are characterized by recognition and reward for superior performance, particularly with respect to early stages of creativity.

Hypothesis 1a: Distributive justice will be positively related to taking charge.

The Role of Procedural Justice

Whereas distributive justice is concerned with the perceived fairness of decision outcomes, *procedural justice* focuses on the perceived fairness of procedures used to make decisions, a perception that can be based on factors such as whether the individual is given a voice in the procedure and the decision outcome (Thibaut & Walker, 1975), and whether the procedure is deemed to be consistent, ethical, free of bias, accurate, and correctable (Leventhal, 1980). When an organization offers members a voice in procedures, it implies that their ideas and thoughts are of concern to the organization. Similarly, a perception that procedures are consistent across the employee population, and that they are ethical and appropriate, suggests to employees that the organization cares about their welfare (Lind, Kulik, Ambrose, & de Vera Park, 1993).

Indeed, Tyler and Lind (1992) suggest an interpersonal model in which the social/psychological needs of individuals are likely to be met when their interactions with others are thought to be procedurally fair. Lind (1995) extends the outcomes of procedural justice to heightened levels of trust. Furthermore, Janssen (2004) found not only that procedural and distributive justice were negatively related to stress reactions, such as anxiety and burnout, but also that they moderated the relationship between innovative behaviors and stress reactions by reducing the negative effects of innovative behaviors on heightened stress reactions. Sweeney and McFarlin (1993) found that distributive justice was more likely to relate to personally referenced outcomes such as pay satisfaction, whereas procedural justice was more likely to be related to organizationally referenced outcomes such as commitment. Thus, an organizational environment in which individuals perceive procedural justice will enable them to feel safe enough to challenge the status quo by engaging in taking charge behavior.

Hypothesis 1b: Procedural justice will be positively related to taking charge.

Personal Antecedents of Taking Charge: Personality

Over the past decade, personality conceptualized as five broad factors (i.e., the five factor model [FFM], comprising Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness) has dominated the literature regarding how an individual's personality might be related to organizational outcomes. Meta-analyses (Hough, Eaton, Dunnette, Kamp, & McCloy, 1990) have demonstrated consistent relationships between broad factors of personality and a wide range of organizational outcomes. While the five broad dimensions have been found to relate to many organizational outcomes, research examining the relationship between the FFM (mainly Conscientiousness and Agreeableness) and citizenship behavior aimed at innovation has received weak support (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

In response to modest relationships between the FFM and organizational outcomes (Hurtz & Donovan, 2000), scholars have urged an examination of personality at a more fine-grained level (Ashton, 1998; Paunonen & Jackson, 2000). For example, personality researchers generally agree that the broad factor of Conscientiousness is comprised of at least two major facets, one related to a sense of *duty* or reliability and the other to *achievement striving* (Hough, 1992). Moon (2001) introduced the theory that, although duty and achievement striving are related to the broad factor Conscientiousness, these two facets are different to the degree that one (duty) is other-centered, whereas the other (achievement striving) is self-centered. He proposed future research that might replicate the findings that dutiful individuals behaved in a manner consistent with a concern about others and achievement-striving individuals behaved in a manner consistent with self-interest.

The Positive Influence of Duty

Moon (2001) found that dutiful individuals demonstrated feelings of responsibility toward the organization by deciding to de-escalate a commitment to a losing course of action despite the fact that doing so might be harmful to self-perception (Brockner, 1992) and socially undesirable (Staw & Ross, 1980). In this regard, duty was associated with husbanding organizational resources and revealed behavior that demonstrated a genuine concern for one's organization. It would follow that these individuals might demonstrate a similar proclivity to offer suggestions for challenging the status quo and attempt to see them through, with the purpose of increasing the welfare of the organization. That is, the same facet of personality that compels an individual to protect the organization might also compel an individual to promote positive change where deficiency is noted.

Hypothesis 2a: Duty will be positively related to taking charge.

The Negative Influence of Achievement Striving

McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1953) established that a high level of achievement striving is not always associated with high performance levels. There were many instances wherein achievement striving was negatively related to performance, for reasons related to the perceived attractiveness of the task. For example, they found that achievement strivers shunned activities in

which they did not foresee the chance for personal reward. Moon (2001) found that achievement strivers demonstrated concern for self in that they tended to escalate their commitment to losing propositions. That is, the underlying mechanism that caused individuals to engage in an escalation of commitment in failing projects that they were responsible for was a need to save face or avoid being personally associated with a failed project.

The interest of achievement strivers in their personal accomplishment might be exacerbated in actual work environments, wherein these individuals might focus more on personal performance and recognition and less on behaviors that are directed toward the benefit of others. For instance, Hough (1992) found that achievement striving was positively related to the advancement of managers but was detrimental to the performance of health care workers. Although there are specific circumstances in which performance is synonymous with taking charge (Feist, 1998), such as in research and development positions where innovation is a major function of the job, many jobs do not entail this specific requirement. Given that taking charge is operationalized as a construct rooted in the desire to improve the organization, as opposed to gaining personal outcomes, and given that it can be considered politically risky (Janssen, 2005), a self-interested individual may pause before advocating change. This would certainly be true to the extent that calling for change is not always viewed positively in organizations (Near & Miceli, 1987).

Hypothesis 2b: Achievement striving will be negatively related to taking charge.

Moon, Hollenbeck, Humphrey, and Maue (2003) recently outlined how facets of a higher order factor might suppress the relationship between the factor and a criterion of interest to the degree that the facets have *opposite* relationships with the criterion. Cohen and Cohen (1975) define *suppression* as a rare occurrence where the amount of variance that is explained by the sum of the squared bivariate correlations ($r_{x_1y_2} + r_{x_2y_2}$) is less than the amount of variance explained by the squared multiple correlation between the two predictors and the criterion (i.e., $R_{x_1x_2y_2}$). In this study, the fact that duty and achievement striving relate in opposite ways to taking charge would result in the aggregation of these items demonstrating little or no significant relationship with the dependent variable of interest. Therefore, we do not formally detail a hypothesis regarding the broad factor Conscientiousness and taking charge behaviors.

Study 1

Method

Research Design

This study included 432 individuals working in various organizations. The focal respondents were 115 full-time employees attending a part-time evening MBA program. (There were 160 potential participants, with a response rate of 73%.) Focal employees who volunteered to participate in the study were asked to complete items related to their personalities, and they were each instructed to distribute surveys to 3 other employees at their respective firms. Two independent coworkers were asked to evaluate the level of perceived justice in the organization, while a 3rd

independent coworker was asked to evaluate the focal employee's level of taking charge. All participants were informed that participation was voluntary, confidential, and noncompensated. Additionally, all coworkers were provided self-addressed stamped envelopes in which to return their responses in a confidential manner. The focal employees received feedback on their personality measures and an overall assessment by their peers. By using a different source for each of the three general constructs of interest (personality, organizational justice, and taking charge), we minimized the concerns about percept-percept biases that are often associated with studies on justice, personality, and organizational outcomes.

The average age of focal employees was 27.98 ($SD = 3.30$), with roughly a 2:1 ratio of male to female participants (66.23% male and 33.77% female). The focal employees, on average, had 1.78 years of job experience with the present employer ($SD = 1.57$) and 3.08 years of organizational tenure ($SD = 2.43$). The majority of the respondents were Caucasian/White (73.0%); others categorized themselves as Asian/Pacific Islander (10.4%), Middle Eastern/Indian (4.3%), African American (3.5%), Hispanic/Latino (3.5%), and other (5.3%). All items of interest were computed using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Independent Variables

Control variables. Although Organ and Ryan's (1995) meta-analysis did not find any significant relationships between gender and tenure, it was based on a very small number of studies (four to five), and there have been some studies that found gender to be associated with extrarole behaviors (e.g., Allen, 2006; Morrison, 1994). We therefore controlled for both gender (0 = male, 1 = female) and occupational tenure (measured in months) in this study.

Organizational justice. We focused on justice at the organizational level for three reasons. First, we were interested in contextual factors that impacted taking charge behavior. Second, by examining justice at the organizational level, we were able to assess justice from the perspectives of multiple employees working with the focal individual, and we thereby reduced concerns of response bias. Third, by studying justice at the organizational level, it was easier to identify practical implications regarding how organizations can structure their decision-making policies and procedures to help create an environment that is conducive to taking charge behavior (cf. Naumann & Bennett, 2000).

In line with prior research on justice at the aggregate level, we explicitly directed the respondents to think in terms of the overall organization. Specifically, the justice item directions read as follows: "When answering this section, please think about all of the employees in your organization on average." Distributive justice climate was appraised by four items taken from Colquitt (2001) and included the items "Does employee output reflect the effort employees' have put into their work?" and "Does employee output reflect what they have contributed to the organization?" Procedural justice climate was assessed by Colquitt's seven-item scale for procedural justice and included the items "Have employees been able to express their views and feelings during those procedures?" and "Have those procedures been applied consistently?"

Two coworkers rated the level of distributive and procedural justice within their organization. We selected an index of within-

group interrater agreement, R_{wg} (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1993), to examine the suitability of aggregation. Justification for aggregation is demonstrated by examining agreement within settings rather than differences across groups. More specifically, Schneider and Bowen (1985) noted, "the appropriate test for within-setting agreement would be a measure of homogeneity rather than an analysis of variance (ANOVA) index, or the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC), that depend upon *between* setting differences for significance" (p. 426).

We conducted confirmatory factor analysis to examine the discriminant validity of our justice constructs. We first examined the fit of a two-factor model, which specified Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice as separate factors. The two-factor model indicated a good fit with the observed covariance matrix, $\chi^2(26) = 122.05$, $p < .001$; root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .11, comparative fit index (CFI) = .96, Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) = .91. We compared the fit of this two-factor model with that of a one-factor model (which included all justice items loading on a single factor). The one-factor model produced an average fit ($\chi^2 = 314.99$, $df = 27$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .19, CFI = .88, TLI = .75). A change in chi-square test indicated that the two-factor model represented a significantly better fit than the one-factor model ($\chi^2_{\text{difference}} = 192.94$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$). Thus procedural justice and distributive justice were analyzed separately in testing the study hypotheses.

For the 87 (of 115) pairs where both coworkers from a firm returned the surveys, within-group interrater agreement was calculated for Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice. The median indexes of within-group interrater agreement for Distributive Justice (.85) and Procedural Justice (.84) were both acceptably high (James et al., 1993). For the remaining 28 respondents, where only one response was obtained per organization, we examined any differences between single respondents and paired respondents on the demographic variables (e.g., age, gender, race) and the organizationally relevant variables (e.g., job tenure, organizational tenure). There were no significant differences between the single and multiple response participants, and the single response participants did not influence the results in any way. The reliability of the distributive justice scale was .85, and that of the procedural justice scale .90.

Personality. For the broad factor of personality (Conscientiousness), we used the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992) that contained 12 items. All items in Study 1 were measured with a 7-point Likert scale anchored from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). We note that several items that were used for the broad factor were also used for the facets (thus the high correlation). Duty was assessed with a 7-item measure including items related to responsibility and reliability. We deleted the particular item related to cheating because this item reduced the reliability of the scale. Achievement striving was assessed with an 8-item measure including items related to personal achievement and production.

To examine whether duty and achievement striving are distinct constructs, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis. We first examined the fit of a two-factor model, which specified Duty and Achievement Striving as separate factors. The two-factor model indicated a good fit with the data ($\chi^2 = 111.84$, $df = 74$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .04, CFI = .98, TLI = .96). We compared the fit of this two-factor model with that of a one-factor model (which

Table 1
Study 1 Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations for All Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Gender (0 = male, 1 = female)	-.31	.47	—							
2. Tenure (months)	48.44	32.42	-.14	—						
3. Procedural justice	4.20	1.08	-.15	-.10	(.85)					
4. Distributive justice	4.42	1.25	-.10	.02	.59**	(.90)				
5. Duty	5.46	0.80	.02	-.01	-.02	-.02	(.71)			
6. Achievement striving	5.95	0.68	-.02	-.06	-.01	-.12	.50**	(.86)		
7. Conscientiousness	5.48	0.71	.04	.00	-.02	-.10	.84**	.63**	(.80)	
8. Taking charge	5.41	0.96	.07	.04	.23*	.12	.06	-.19*	-.11	(.94)

Note. $N = 115$. Variables 3 to 8 were assessed with a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Data in parentheses are reliability scores (alpha) for the corresponding scales.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$.

included all the duty and achievement striving items loading on a single factor). The one-factor model also fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 125.22$, $df = 75$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .05, CFI = .97, TLI = .95). A change in chi-square test indicated that the two-factor model represented a significantly better fit than the one-factor model ($\chi^2_{\text{difference}} = 13.38$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$). Thus duty and achievement striving were analyzed separately in testing the study hypotheses. The Cronbach's alpha for Duty was .71, and the Cronbach's alpha for Achievement Striving was .86.

Dependent Variable: Taking Charge

We used the 10-item Taking Charge scale developed by Morrison and Phelps (1999). Items included "This person often tries to introduce new structures, technologies, or approaches to improve efficiency," and "This person tries to implement solutions to pressing organizational problems." The reliability of this scale was .94.

Results

Table 1 displays the means, standard deviations, intercorrelations, and reliabilities of the variables of interest. We tested our hypotheses using parallel hierarchical regression. In particular, we were interested in contrasting the influences of distributive and procedural justice on taking charge, and contrasting the influence of facets of conscientiousness on taking charge with that of their broad factor. The correlations between the facets and the factors related to personality were consistent with existing scales in which facet items were also included in the measurement of the factor.

Table 2 displays the regression results pertaining, first, to the justice measures and, second, to the personality measures as they relate to taking charge. Step 1 includes the two control variables. Neither variable was significantly related to taking charge. Step 2 provides a comparative test of distributive and procedural justice, and the influence of each on an individual's proclivity toward taking charge. It was posited in Hypothesis 1a that distributive justice would be positively related to taking charge. The results did not support this hypothesis, $t(2, 112) = -.21$, *ns*, $\Delta R^2 = .09$ for step. Hypothesis 1b proposed that procedural justice would be positively related to taking charge. The results supported this hypothesis, $t(2, 112) = 2.60$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .09$ for step.

Step 3 of Table 2 displays the regression results relating the facets of conscientiousness to taking charge. As a side note, we report that we conducted a supplementary analysis in which we changed the order of inclusion (i.e., personality variables appeared in Step 1), but this did not influence the results pertaining to justice or personality in any significant way. Hypothesis 2a predicted that individual levels of duty would lead to higher levels of taking charge. The results supported this relationship, $t(2, 110) = 2.20$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .07$ for step. Hypothesis 2b predicted that individual levels of achievement striving would lead to lower levels of taking charge. Results supported this relationship, $t(2, 110) = -3.01$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .07$ for step. In addition, we ran another supplementary analysis in which we replaced Duty and Achievement Striving with the broad factor, Conscientiousness, in Step 3 of the regression. As we suspected, the broad factor Conscientiousness did not exhibit any relationship with taking charge behavior, $t(2, 110) = -1.36$, *ns*, $\Delta R^2 = .02$ for step.¹

Discussion

Consistent with our theoretical grounding, Study 1 provided evidence that dutiful individuals are most likely to take charge in organizations, while those individuals high in achievement striving (a self-centered characteristic) are less likely to take charge. We also demonstrated that it is the procedurally just organization that can expect its employees to initiate and enact change—whereas distributively just organizations did not reap the same benefits.

However, there were several aspects of the sample used in Study 1 that would require us to pause before uniformly embracing the findings. First, even though all of the constructs were garnered from different sources, the limitations regarding the overall context of the study were what would be expected from a convenience sample of evening MBA students. Second, the findings were based exclusively on the perceptions of coworkers. Previous studies, especially those regarding distributive justice, have utilized the perceptions of supervisors. It may have been the case that we did not find a significant relationship between distributive justice and taking charge because of the looser coupling between distributive

¹ Results pertaining to this analysis are available upon request from the primary author.

Table 2
 Study 1 Hierarchical Regression of Taking Charge on Narrow Facets of Conscientiousness (Duty and Achievement Striving), and Organizational Justice (Procedural and Distributive)

Model	Variable	β	ΔR^2
Step 1: Controls			.00
	Gender	.00	
	Tenure	-.03	
Step 2: Organizational Justice			.09*
	Procedural	.32*	
	Distributive	-.03	
Step 3: Individual Conscientiousness facets			.07*
	Duty	.22*	
	Achievement Striving	-.31*	

Note. $N = 115$. Standardized beta weights are reported after each step.
 * $p < .05$.

justice and coworker evaluations of this scale, a reflection of the fact that supervisors have more influence on rewards. Therefore, Study 2 was intended to replicate the findings of Study 1, with two contextual differences. First, we collected data from a single organization. Second, we collected data from both coworkers and supervisors.

Study 2

Method

Research Design

A sample of 253 engineers (local Indians) at an oil refinery located in India and owned by a *Fortune* 500 company, along with their immediate coworkers and their supervisors, participated in this study (63% response rate). All subjects spoke fluent English, the working language in the division. Most participants (90.08%) were male with at least an undergraduate university degree (78%). The mean age was 30.40 years ($SD = 5.52$).

We used three survey instruments in our study: one for employees, one for their coworkers, and a final survey for the supervisors. The employee survey measured personality and perceptions of the company's organizational justice. Employees completed the survey in groups during their working hours, in a room on company premises. They were assured that their responses would be confidential and that their individual responses would not be seen by anyone in the company. We randomly selected 1 coworker (with at least 6 months' tenure) from each group to rate other group members on their level of taking charge. On average, coworkers provided assessments of 6.33 employees. These randomly selected coworkers did not complete the self-report questionnaire and are not included in the 253 engineers who are the focal study participants. Finally, the supervisors were also asked to rate the level of taking charge of the employees. On average, supervisors provided assessments of 6.33 employees. Overall, we collected data from 40 groups (3–14 members, average size = 6.33 employees).

Independent Variables

Control variables. To be consistent with Study 1, we also controlled for both gender (0 = female, 1 = male) and organization tenure (measured in years) in this study.

Organizational justice. All items in Study 2 were measured with a 7-point Likert scale anchored from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). We used the same four-item distributive and seven-item procedural justice scales from Colquitt (2001) used in Study 1. The items included "Does employee output reflect the effort employees' have put into their work?" and "Does employee output reflect what they have contributed to the organization?" (for distributive justice); and "Have employees been able to express their views and feelings during those procedures?" and "Have those procedures been applied consistently?" (for procedural justice).

As in Study 1, we conducted confirmatory factor analysis to examine the discriminant validity of our justice constructs. Examination of a two-factor model ($\chi^2 = 52.35$, $df = 32$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .05, CFI = .99, TLI = .98) revealed a much better fit than that shown by a one-factor model ($\chi^2 = 208.57$, $df = 33$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .15, CFI = .92, TLI = .86). A change in chi-square test ($\chi^2_{\text{difference}} = 156.22$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$) gave strong support for treating the two justice dimensions as separate constructs. Cronbach's alpha was .89 for Distributive Justice and .93 for Procedural Justice.

Personality. As in Study 1, we used the 12-item measure to capture the broad factor Conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992); the 8-item measure for duty; and another 8-item scale for achievement striving. We conducted a confirmatory factor analysis to examine whether duty and achievement striving are distinct constructs, as we did in Study 1. We first examined the fit of a two-factor model, which specified Duty and Achievement Striving as separate factors. The two-factor model indicated a good fit with the data ($\chi^2 = 181.27$, $df = 69$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .08, CFI = .97, TLI = .95). We compared the fit of this two-factor model with that of a one-factor model (which included all the duty and achievement-striving items loading on a single factor). The one-factor model did not fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 456.89$, $df = 70$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .15, CFI = .88, TLI = .80). A change in chi-square test indicated that the two-factor model represented a significantly better fit than the one-factor model ($\chi^2_{\text{difference}} = 275.62$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$). Thus duty and achievement striving were analyzed separately in testing the study hypotheses. The reliability of the scale for duty was .92, and that of the achievement striving scale was .90.

Dependent Variable: Taking Charge

As in Study 1, we used the 10-item Taking Charge scale developed by Morrison and Phelps (1999). In this study, we obtained independent ratings from the coworker and the supervisor. The reliabilities for taking charge were .94 (coworker ratings) and .89 (supervisor ratings).

Since supervisors and coworkers rated multiple employees on taking charge, we conducted 30° within and between analysis tests (supervisor-rated expectation [E] value for taking charge = .39; coworker-rated E value for taking charge = .38) to assess sources of variance. Results indicated that lack of independence was not a

practical problem (neither E value exceeded the cutoff of 1.73) and that analysis at the individual level was appropriate (Dansereau, Alutto, & Yammarino, 1984).

Results

Table 3 displays the means, standard deviations, intercorrelations, and reliabilities of the variables of interest for Study 2. We regressed the variables of interest using methods similar to those employed in Study 1. Table 4 displays the regression results pertaining, first, to the justice measures and, second, to the personality measures as they relate to taking charge. Table 4 also includes two separate sets of regressions that display both the coworker (Model 1) and supervisor (Model 2) assessments of taking charge behavior. Again, the two control variables included in Step 1 did not have significant relationships with taking charge. Step 2 of each model provides a comparative test of Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice and their influence on an individual's proclivity toward taking charge.

It was posited in Hypothesis 1a that distributive justice would be positively related to taking charge. The results did not support this hypothesis for coworker assessment, $t(2, 246) = 1.44, ns, \Delta R^2 = .09$ for Step 2, but they supported the hypothesis for supervisor assessment, $t(2, 248) = 2.44, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .11$ for Step 2. Hypothesis 1b proposed that procedural justice would be positively related to taking charge. The results supported this hypothesis for both the coworker evaluation, $t(2, 246) = 3.65, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .09$ for Step 2, and the supervisor evaluation, $t(2, 248) = 3.35, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .11$ for Step 2.

Step 3 of Table 4 displays the regression results relating the facets of Conscientiousness to taking charge. Hypothesis 2a predicted that individual levels of duty would lead to higher levels of taking charge. The results supported this relationship for both the coworker, $t(2, 244) = 1.91, p = .05, \Delta R^2 = .07$ for step, and the supervisor, $t(2, 248) = 2.71, p < .01, \Delta R^2 = .06$ for step. Hypothesis 2b predicted that individual levels of achievement striving would lead to lower levels of taking charge. Results supported this relationship for both coworker, $t(2, 244) = -4.42, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .07$ for step, and supervisor, $t(2, 248) = -4.03, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .06$ for step. Again, as in Study 1, we ran a supplementary analysis, replacing the last step with the broad

factor, Conscientiousness. As we suspected, it did not exhibit any relationship with taking charge when considering the evaluation of the supervisor, $t(1, 249) = -1.11, ns, \Delta R^2 = .00$ for step; however, interestingly, the large negative influence that Achievement Striving had on the coworker assessment led to the broad factor exhibiting a negative relationship with taking charge behavior, $t(1, 245) = -2.88, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .03$ for step.

Because individuals are nested within groups in Study 2, we deemed it important to analyze our data using random coefficient modeling (commonly referred to as hierarchical linear modeling [HLM]). The results of the HLM analyses were consistent with the hierarchical regression analyses. Specifically, when taking charge as rated by coworkers was the dependent variable, gender ($B = .36, p > .05$) and tenure ($B = .00, p > .05$) were nonsignificant controls in Step 1. In Step 2, consistent with the results of Study 1, Distributive Justice did not predict taking charge as rated by coworkers ($B = .08, p > .05$), while Procedural Justice ($B = .25, p < .001$) related positively to taking charge as rated by coworkers. For Step 3 evaluations, Duty ($B = .15, p < .05$) was positively related to taking charge as rated by coworkers, whereas Achievement Striving ($B = -.35, p < .001$) was negatively related to taking charge as rated by coworkers. Similarly, when taking charge as rated by supervisors was the dependent variable, gender ($B = .13, p > .05$) and tenure ($B = .01, p > .05$) were nonsignificant controls in Step 1. Consistent with the study hypotheses, Procedural Justice ($B = .28, p < .001$) and Distributive Justice ($B = .18, p < .05$) positively predicted taking charge as rated by supervisors in Step 2. For Step 3 evaluations, Duty ($B = .25, p < .01$) related positively to taking charge as rated by supervisors, whereas Achievement Striving ($B = -.38, p < .001$) was negatively related to taking charge as rated by supervisors.

Discussion

The results of Study 2 were largely consistent with those of Study 1. In general, the importance of procedure over distribution was evident when considering the assessment of coworkers; however, Study 2 broadened the findings of Study 1 by establishing that the links between the two forms of justice were significant when considering the evaluation of the supervisor. With regard to the facets of personality, we again found that duty (positive) and

Table 3
Study 2 Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations for All Variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Gender (0 = female, 1 = male)	.91	0.29	—								
2. Tenure (years)	4.64	3.58	.07	—							
3. Procedural justice	4.14	1.24	-.09	.02	(.92)						
4. Distributive justice	4.01	1.46	-.07	.14*	.43**	(.90)					
5. Duty	4.57	1.19	-.00	.04	.26**	.03	(.84)				
6. Achievement striving	4.59	1.14	-.10	.00	.03	.12	.50**	(.93)			
7. Conscientiousness	4.67	0.86	-.07	.02	.30**	.07	.74**	.61**	(.89)		
8. Taking charge (cow)	3.62	1.26	.08	.03	.28**	.20**	.03	-.23**	-.09	(.94)	
9. Taking charge (sup)	4.48	1.57	.02	.07	.29**	.26**	.10	-.16*	.01	.36**	(.89)

Note. N = 253. Variables 3 to 9 were assessed with a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Data in parentheses are reliability scores (alpha) for the corresponding scales. (cow) = coworker evaluations; (sup) = supervisor evaluations.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 4

Study 2 Hierarchical Regression of Taking Charge From Both Coworker and Supervisor Evaluations on Narrow Facets of Conscientiousness (Duty and Achievement Striving), and Organizational Justice (Procedural and Distributive)

Coworker evaluations			Supervisor evaluations		
Variable	β	ΔR^2	Variable	β	ΔR^2
Step 1: Controls			Step 1: Controls		
Gender	.07		Gender	.01	
Tenure	.02	.01	Tenure	.07	.01
Step 2: Organizational justice			Step 2: Organizational justice		
Procedural justice	.25***	.09***	Procedural justice	.22***	.11***
Distributive justice	.10		Distributive justice	.16*	
Step 3: Individual			Step 3: Individual		
Conscientiousness facets			Conscientiousness facets		
Duty	.14*	.07***	Duty	.19**	.06***
Achievement striving	-.31***		Achievement striving	-.28***	

Note. $N = 253$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

achievement striving (negative) led to stark differences in how both the coworker and the supervisor assessed the willingness of the individual to bring forth ideas for change. Dutiful individuals were again evaluated to be more likely to take charge, while achievement strivers were again evaluated to be less likely to take charge.

General Discussion

The purpose of our research was to take a self- versus other-centered approach to examining personal and contextual antecedents to taking charge behavior. Across two studies, we found support for the theory that a facet of personality related to concern for others (duty) is positively related to taking charge behavior, whereas a facet of personality related to self-interest and personal achievement (achievement striving) is negatively related to taking charge. We also found that across both samples, and regardless of whether a coworker or supervisor evaluated the behavior, procedural justice was an important contextual predictor of taking charge behavior, while distributive justice was important when considering the evaluation of the supervisor.

Theoretical Implications

We add to the growing body of literature that advocates a narrower conceptualization of individual personality (Hogan & Roberts, 1996; Hough, 1992; Moon, 2001; Stewart, 1999). In this study, the variance explained by facets of Conscientiousness far exceeded those of the broad factor Conscientiousness. We provide support for Moon's (2001) theory that the facets of Conscientiousness contain self-centered information (personal achievement) and other-centered information (duty). The complex pattern of our findings regarding personality variables supports the care with which one must interpret the *correlations* of personality variables versus the *regressions* of personality variables. Specifically, we found that while the correlation between Duty and taking charge was not significant, the regression between Duty and taking charge was significant, when controlling for Achievement Striving.

Brass (1985) detailed what he termed to be a *mutual suppression effect*. He noted that there was a classic problem posed by the fact

that, according to job characteristics theory, job complexity should have a positive influence on job satisfaction; but job complexity was highly correlated with job uncertainty, which had a negative relationship with job satisfaction. Brass's argument was that the high correlation between uncertainty and complexity masked the real strength of the relationship between each of the two variables and job satisfaction. This was due to the fact that the two variables were related to job satisfaction in opposite ways. He proffered that once the shared variance was partialled from each variable, the true strength of the relationship between each of these variables and job satisfaction would be exhibited. He found evidence that the documented relationships increased substantially once the influence of the other variable was partialled from each variable.

Similarly, we found that the relationship between Duty and taking charge was masked by the correlation between Duty and Achievement Striving ($r = .50$ in both studies), because of the fact that Duty was positively related to taking charge while Achievement Striving was negatively related to taking charge. However, we do not intend to argue against the validity of the FFM. We do not argue against the fact that, at a broad level, the extent to which individuals indicate that they are responsible and achievement driven will cluster separately from evaluations regarding depression and anxiety. Our position is simply that a higher order factor structure does not preclude meaningful differences among the underlying facets. The important contribution of this article goes beyond a demonstration of a case where there is a difference in predictive relationships among facets of a higher order factor, to a demonstration of one in which facets of a higher order factor have opposite relationships with a criterion of interest.

The results of this study also have implications for the justice literature. While we found support for the theory that employees in a procedurally just organization are more likely to take charge, distributively fair organizations may not garner the same positive consequences. These results are important because they help dispel the "*distributive dominance*" myth that employees are predominantly motivated by their pay and other personal outcomes (Korsgaard et al., 1996, 1997). Regarding distributive justice, it is interesting that the only instance in which distributive justice demonstrated a link with taking charge was in the Indian context.

The fact that we found differences in the ability of distributive justice to predict taking charge, based on the cultural context (Chao & Moon, 2005), is interesting from a theoretical standpoint. An explanation for this difference might lie in the fact that employees in a high power distance culture typically do not expect the organization to be fair, and that they may expect the supervisor to have more direct control of the rewards in an organization. This would imply that the behaviors that might elicit distributive reward are directed more toward a supervisor than to coworkers, particularly in a high power distance culture, such as that of India.

Practical Implications

As competition in today's marketplace becomes fiercer, organizations are evaluating their human capital to gain a competitive advantage. One strategy is to harness the creative potential of organizational incumbents. The results of this research suggest that this can be done in one of two ways. First, in analyzing some of the personality traits organizations seek in potential employees, we found direct evidence that an individual high in a sense of duty possesses the most potential to promote positive change. Perhaps more practically important is the consistent finding that those individuals whom one might initially expect to be prone to taking charge, the achievement strivers, are actually less likely to exhibit taking charge behaviors.

Second, in addition to the findings regarding personality traits, our results suggest that organizations that are perceived to be procedurally just, independent from distributively just organizations, are more likely to realize the benefits of employee taking charge behavior. This particular finding suggests that organizations that embed procedural justice into their human resource practices are better positioned to garner the benefits of employee taking charge behavior than organizations that fail to explicitly consider fair procedures. While research on procedural fairness has primarily focused on its influence as a *preventive* instrument to mitigate negative events, our findings advance the importance of procedural fairness as a *promotive* instrument to increase the likelihood that organizational members will take charge. Justice has been linked to general citizenship behaviors (Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993); however, a major strength of this study is that it provides the first empirical support, to our knowledge, of a link between procedural justice and taking charge.

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

The present research has several strengths. First, we gathered data related to justice, personality, and taking charge using different sources for each one. This design allowed for analyses that were free of percept–percept bias. Second, we examined both personal and organizational factors as antecedents to taking charge. Whereas past studies focused largely on either personal or environmental effects, we found relationships for both in the present study. Third, our data set in Study 1 included a large number of different organizations, which added to the generalizability of our findings. Fourth, we replicated the findings from Study 1 with a second sample that was from a single context rather than from multiple organizations in different industries.

Despite these strengths, there are also a number of limitations. First, we understand that there were limitations based upon our context. In Study 1 we were not able to control for the various jobs that the respondents had. There may have been some jobs wherein taking charge was more central to the overall job description. The sample in our second study was conducted in a large company; however, the sample consisted of Indian nationals. It is important to replicate our findings in any number of different contexts and, going forward, it would also be useful to begin to think of both boundary conditions and moderators of our central findings. A second limitation of the research is that all of the data were collected at roughly the same time. Thus, we are unable to make definitive causal conclusions based on our findings. A third limitation is that our findings were established in the absence of efficacy-based measures like those employed by Morrison and Phelps (1999). Future studies can replicate our findings with a more robust model.

With respect to the findings regarding the difference in predictive ability between duty and achievement striving, we promote research that looks at the differential influence of the two facets in regard to team decision processes (Moon, Conlon, et al., 2003) and the way in which individuals give and receive help in teams (Porter et al., 2003; Beersma et al., 2003). We position this article as a beginning set of studies in what we hope will be a stream of research exploring the antecedents of this important behavior. Finally, although our focus was on the antecedents of taking charge, future research should also examine the consequences of taking charge, such as productivity and objective performance.

Conclusion

Firms that do not challenge the status quo and do not innovate will be unlikely to “take charge” of today's dynamic market. The critical contribution of this study is that it provides evidence that the antecedents to taking charge are based more on concerns about others than on self interest. Organizations need to be aware that to get their employees' to take charge within the firm, it may be more about “we” than it is about “me.”

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). New York: Academic Press.
- Allen, T. D. (2006). Rewarding good citizens: The relationship between citizenship behavior, gender, and organizational rewards. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*, 120–143.
- Ashton, M. C. (1998). Personality and job performance: The importance of narrow traits. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*, 289–304.
- Barron, F., & Harrington, D. M. (1981). Creativity, intelligence, and personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 32*, 439–476.
- Beersma, B., Hollenbeck, J. R., Humphrey, S. E., Moon, H., Conlon, D. E., & Ilgen, D. R. (2003). Cooperation, competition, and team performance: Towards a contingency approach. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 572–590.
- Brass, D. J. (1985). Technology and the structuring of jobs: Employee satisfaction, performance, and influence. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 35*, 216–240.
- Brockner, J. (1992). The escalation of commitment to a failing course of action: Toward theoretical progress. *Academy of Management Review, 17*, 39–61.

- Brockner, J. (2002). Making sense of procedural fairness: How high procedural fairness can reduce or heighten the influence of outcome favorability. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 58–76.
- Chao, G., & Moon, H. (2005). A cultural mosaic: Defining the complexity of culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1128–1140.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1975). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York: Wiley.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386–400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425–445.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Dansereau, F., Alutto, J. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1984). *Theory testing in organizational behavior: The variant approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51–59.
- Epley, N., Caruso, E., & Bazerman, M. H. (2006). When perspective taking increases taking: Reactive egoism in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 872–889.
- Feist, G. J. (1998). A meta-analysis of personality in scientific and artistic creativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 290–309.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 81–103.
- Greenberg, J. (1994). Using socially fair treatment to promote acceptance of a work site smoking ban. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 288–297.
- Greenberg, J., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). *The handbook of organizational justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Issues and non-issues in the fidelity-bandwidth trade-off. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 627–637.
- Hough, L. M. (1992). The “Big Five” personality variables—construct confusion: Description versus prediction. *Human Performance*, 5, 139–155.
- Hough, L. M., Eaton, N. K., Dunnette, M. D., Kamp, J. D., & McCloy, R. A. (1990). Criterion-related validities of personality constructs and the effect of response distortion on those validities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 581–595.
- Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869–879.
- James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1993). r-sub(wg): An assessment of within-group interrater agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 306–309.
- Janssen, O. (2004). How fairness perceptions make innovative behavior more or less stressful. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 201–215.
- Janssen, O. (2005). The joint impact of perceived influence and supervisor supportiveness on employee innovative behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 573–579.
- Kanter, R. (1983). *The change masters*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131–146.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Lester, S. W. (1996). The effect of other-oriented values on decision making: A test of propositions of a theory of concern for others in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 68, 234–245.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Lester, S. W. (1997). Beyond helping: Do other-oriented values have broader implications in organizations? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 160–177.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. S. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27–55). New York: Plenum.
- Lind, E. A. (1995). Justice and authority relations in organizations. In R. S. Cropanzano & K. M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational politics, justice, and support: Managing the social climate of the workplace* (pp. 83–96). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Lind, E. A., Kulik, C., Ambrose, M., & de Vera Park, M. (1993). Individual and corporate dispute resolution: Using procedural fairness as a decision heuristic. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38, 224–251.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum.
- McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. (1953). *The achievement motive*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 836–844.
- Meglino, B. M., & Korsgaard, A. (2004). Considering rational self-interest as a disposition: Organizational implications of other orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 946–959.
- Moon, H. (2001). The two faces of conscientiousness: Duty and achievement striving in escalation of commitment dilemmas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 533–540.
- Moon, H., Hollenbeck, J. R., Humphrey, S. E., & Maue, B. (2003). The tripartite model of neuroticism and the suppression of depression and anxiety within an escalation of commitment dilemma. *Journal of Personality*, 71, 347–368.
- Moon, H., Van Dyne, L., & Wrobel, K. (2005). The circumplex model and the future of organizational citizenship research. In D. Turpinseed (Ed.), *A handbook on organizational citizenship behavior: A review of “good soldier” activity in organizations* (pp. 1–31). New York: Nova Science.
- Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P., & Organ, D. W. (1993). Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: Sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 209–225.
- Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee’s perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1543–1567.
- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extra role efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 403–419.
- Mumford, M., & Gustafson, S. (1988). Creativity syndrome: Integration, application, and innovation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 27–43.
- Naumann, S. E., & Bennett, N. (2000). A case for procedural justice climate: Development and test of a multilevel model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 881–889.
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1987). Whistle-blowers in organizations: Dissidents or reformers? In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 9, pp. 321–368). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527–556.
- Oldham, G. R., & Cummings, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 607–634.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal

and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775–802.

Paunonen, S. V., & Jackson, D. N. (2000). What is beyond the Big Five? Plenty! *Journal of Personality*, 68, 821–835.

Porter, C. O. L. H., Hollenbeck, J. R., Ilgen, D. R., Ellis, A. P. J., West, B. J., & Moon, H. (2003). Backing-up behaviors in teams: The role of personality and legitimacy of need. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 391–403.

Schneider, B., & Bowen, D. E. (1985). Employee and customer perceptions of service in banks: Replication and extension. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 423–433.

Staw, B. M., & Ross, J. (1980). Commitment in an experimenting society: A study of the attribution of leadership from administrative scenarios. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 249–260.

Stewart, G. L. (1999). Trait bandwidth and stages of job performance: Assessing differential effects for conscientiousness and its subtraits. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 959–968.

Sweeney, P. D., & McFarlin, D. B. (1993). Workers' evaluations of the

“ends” and the “means”: An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 23–40.

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 115–191). New York: Academic Press.

Van der Veegt, G. S., & Janssen, O. (2003). Joint impact of interdependence and group diversity on innovation. *Journal of Management*, 29, 729–751.

Zhen, X. C., & Aryee, S. (2007). Delegation and employee work outcomes: An examination of the cultural context of mediating processes in China. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 226–238.

Received November 11, 2005
 Revision received April 25, 2007
 Accepted May 3, 2007 ■



**AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
 SUBSCRIPTION CLAIMS INFORMATION**

Today's Date: _____

We provide this form to assist members, institutions, and nonmember individuals with any subscription problems. With the appropriate information we can begin a resolution. If you use the services of an agent, please do **NOT** duplicate claims through them and directly to us. **PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY AND IN INK IF POSSIBLE.**

PRINT FULL NAME OR KEY NAME OF INSTITUTION	MEMBER OR CUSTOMER NUMBER (MAY BE FOUND ON ANY PAST ISSUE LABEL)	
ADDRESS	DATE YOUR ORDER WAS MAILED (OR PHONED)	
CITY STATE/COUNTRY ZIP	<input type="checkbox"/> PREPAID <input type="checkbox"/> CHECK <input type="checkbox"/> CHARGE CHECK/CARD CLEARED DATE: _____	
YOUR NAME AND PHONE NUMBER	(If possible, send a copy, front and back, of your cancelled check to help us in our research of your claim.) ISSUES: <input type="checkbox"/> MISSING <input type="checkbox"/> DAMAGED	
TITLE	VOLUME OR YEAR	NUMBER OR MONTH

Thank you. Once a claim is received and resolved, delivery of replacement issues routinely takes 4–6 weeks.

(TO BE FILLED OUT BY APA STAFF)

DATE RECEIVED: _____	DATE OF ACTION: _____
ACTION TAKEN: _____	INV. NO. & DATE: _____
STAFF NAME: _____	LABEL NO. & DATE: _____

Send this form to APA Subscription Claims, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE. A PHOTOCOPY MAY BE USED.