THE ROLE OF EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION IN THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN PERSONALITY TRAITS AND EMPLOYEE JOB PERFORMANCE

SYEDA SHABANA KIRMANI

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Management)

Faculty of Management
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

AUGUST 2015

Dedicated to my beloved mother Taj Kirmani for her devotion to empower women through education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

With the wide acceptance and credence to the significant role of non-task performance within the employee job performance (EJP) criterion, the within individual factors that contribute to the development of both non-task as well as task performance have become the focus of the research. These within individual factors that contribute to the development of performance behaviors among university teachers especially in developing countries is an ignored aspect in the employee job performance (EJP) research. This study examined those factors by taking a within individual approach by focusing on personality traits of core self-evaluations (CSE), acquired motivational needs (MN) and task and non-task performance behaviors of employees. The study tested the direct as well as indirect effects of CSE on EJP. Convenient sampling was used by administering standardized questionnaires personally to 650 university teachers in five major cities of Pakistan. Quantitative data were analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM) and AMOS 22 software. This study extended the existing body of knowledge by introducing a new relationship between CSE personality traits and acquired motivational needs. Besides that, the study verified for the first time in personality and performance literature that acquired motivational needs acted as a mediating mechanism for explaining the CSE influence on EJP. The findings can be used as guidelines for university teachers to make appropriate career choices as well as the university management to make suitable decisions regarding selection and placement of teachers.

ABSTRAK

Dengan penerimaan yang luas dan kepercayaan kepada peranan penting prestasi bukan tugas dalam kriteria prestasi kerja pekerja (EJP), faktor individu yang menyumbang kepada pembangunan kedua-dua prestasi bukan tugas dan prestasi tugas telah menjadi tumpuan penyelidikan. Faktor-faktor individu yang menyumbang kepada pembangunan prestasi,tingkah laku dalam kalangan pensyarah universiti, terutamanya di negara-negara membangun, menjadi satu aspek yang diabaikan dalam penyelidikan prestasi kerja pekerja (EJP). Kajian ini mengkaji faktor-faktor tersebut dengan mengambil pendekatan individu yang memberikan tumpuan kepada trait personaliti untuk penilaian teras kendiri (CSE), keperluan motivasi yang diperoleh (MN) dan prestasi tingkah laku tugas dan bukan tugas pekerja. Kajian ini menguji kesan langsung dan tidak langsung CSE ke atas EJP. Persampelan mudah telah digunakan untuk mentadbir soal selidik yang seragam secara peribadi kepada 650 orang pensyarah universiti di lima buah bandar utama di Pakistan. Data kuantitatif dianalisis menggunakan structural equation modeling (SEM) dan perisian AMOS 22. Kajian ini dapat menambahkan ilmu sedia ada dengan memperkenalkan hubungan baharu antara trait personaliti CSE dengan keperluan motivasi yang diperoleh. Selain itu, kajian ini buat kali pertama dalam literatur personaliti dan prestasi mengesahkan bahawa keperluan motivasi yang diperoleh bertindak sebagai mekanisme perantara untuk menjelaskan pengaruh CSE ke atas EJP. Dapatan kajian ini boleh digunakan sebagai garis panduan oleh pensyarah universiti untuk membuat pilihan kerjaya yang sesuai dan boleh digunakan oleh pengurusan universiti untuk membuat keputusan yang sesuai dalam pemilihan dan penempatan pensyarah.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CSE   -   Core Self-Evaluations

CWB   -   Counterproductive Work Behavior

EJP   -   Employee Job Performance

LOC   -   Locus of Control

NACH   -   Need for Achievement

NAFF   -   Need for Affiliation

NPOW   -   Need for Power

NEO   -   Neuroticism

OCB   -   Organizational Citizenship Behavior

SEFF   -   Self-Efficacy

SES   -   Self-Esteem

TPB   -   Task Performance Behavior

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1   Introduction to the Study

The changing nature of jobs and organizational structures, along with unpredictable market conditions are instrumental in wide acceptance and equal credence to the employee non-task performance within employee job performance criterion (Howard, 1995; Barrick et al., 2001; Landy and Conte, 2010). This has redirected the focus of industrial-organization (I/O) research towards the within individual factors in employee personality (Judge et al., 1997; Seligman, 2002). A catalytical influence supporting and enhancing this trend came from Positive Psychology Movement (Seligman, 2002) which emphasizes understanding, harnessing and strengthening of the positive personality predictors of behavior (Seligman, 1998a) for beneficial behavioral outcomes.

Another important factor contributing to the increased interest in within individual predictors of employee non-task performance is linked with booming service industry where employees are required to go above and beyond the call of assigned job roles. The personal characteristics of employees due to their direct interaction with the customers greatly influence their job performance.

Another important factor contributing to the increased interest in within individual predictors of employee non-task performance is linked with booming service industry where employees are required to go above and beyond the call of assigned job roles. The personal characteristics of employees due to their direct interaction with the customers greatly influence their job performance. Additionally due to the unpredictable market conditions, the organizations are facing external and internal threats including economic and political factors, mergers, acquisitions, downsizing, rapidly changing customer needs and technological advancements. But the most crucial factor relates to the mounting occurrence and costs of counterproductive work behaviors such as fraud, theft, aggression, property and information misuse, disloyalty, absenteeism and turnover, challenging the organizational success but survival also (Levinson, 2010; Taylor, 2012).

In the face of such threats and challenges, organizations need human resources that are dependable and effective in normal as well as in difficult organizational phases to survive, keep pace with, and to compete effectively and efficiently in today's rapidly changing and turbulent business world (Morrison, 1994; Niehoff, 2004). To deal with these issues organizations are required to adopt somewhat flexible, autonomous, and team-based functioning. Such functioning depends upon the inputs of increased individual initiative and acts of cooperation (Ilgen and Pulakos, 1999) to enhance organizational effectiveness and efficiency. Katz and Kahn (1978) suggest that "organizational effectiveness cannot be achieved with mere disbursement of task performance. It requires willingness and initiatives of employees to go above and beyond the call of duty and to consciously refrain from acts harmful to the organizational well-being" which in terms of Organ (1993) is commonly known as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB).

The enormous magnitude of benefits and costs attached to positive and negative deviant behaviors calls for attention towards the factors that are instrumental in shaping them (Appelbuam et al., 2005; Kidwell et al., 2005). Consequently increased interest and attention is witnessed in past few decades towards examining factors influencing employee non-task performance i.e.

organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behaviors besides task performance (Peterson, 2002a).

In their prominent book "The Social Psychology of Organizations" Katz and Kahn (1978) identifies two important roles of employees: in-role or task-performance and extra-role or non-task performance. The in-role performance relates to the assigned tasks while extra-role relates to that part of employee performance that is not assigned or explicitly rewarded by the organization but that contributes greatly to support organizational performance. Each set of performance is based on different factors: in-role on knowledge, competencies, skills and qualification specific for performing the assigned job, while extra-role performance is based on personal characteristics and voluntary choices of employees such as traits and motivation (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Niehoff, 2004). According to Katz and Kahn (1978) organizational efficiency and effectiveness cannot be achieved with mere disbursement of in-role performance. It requires employees' willingness and initiatives to go above and beyond the call of duty (OCB) and to consciously refrain from acts that are harmful (CWB) to the organizational well-being".

Therefore past few decades have witnessed a transition from organization-centered approaches towards more employee-centered approaches. This transition has further paved the way for greater attention to the understanding of employees' personal characteristics that were considered basic contributors of the non-task performance (Barrick et al., 2001; Bono and Judge, 2003; Kacmar, 2009). According to the management theorists and gurus the non-task performance is as crucial and essential job performance component for achieving individual and rganizational effectiveness and efficiency as is task performance (Katz and Kahn 1978; Morrison, 1994; Rotundo and Sackett, 2003; Niehoff, 2004; Dalal, 2005).

1.2   Background of the Study

The employee job-performance (EJP) is generally the extensively studied phenomena within the domain of I/O psychology (Boomer et al., 1995). Employee job performance is referred to the degree of effectiveness of employee behaviors in meeting organizational objectives (Campbell, 1990; Motowidlo, 2003). The literature indicates that various models exhibit multi-dimensionality of job performance, yet the task-jobs have always been central and generally been evaluated and considered as overall job performance; thus more or less ignoring the non-task dimensions of performance. However, with the changing nature of jobs and organizational structures along with boom of service industry, the non-task dimensions of employee performance (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002) are increasingly seen critical for effective organizational performance (Fox and Spector, 2007). The research in this domain indicates that non-task behaviors have profound effects on efficient and effective organizational performance (Podsakoff et al, 2000).

Therefore, a paradigm shift in the traditional model of employee job performance is witnessed that was only concerned with the mere disbursement of core task-jobs (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997). The new performance model developed by Rotundo and Sackett (2002) offers an integrated view of three dimensions of employee performance behaviors, giving equal importance to each. The I/O scholars and practitioners observe that the role of OCB in organizational performance is as crucial as task-behaviors (Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994; Robinson and Bennett, 1995; Rotundo and Sackett, 2002; Organ et al, 2006). Concurrently, CWB also has significant implications on organizational performance and success (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002).

Literature review has revealed that employee job performance: both task and non-task performance is investigated and debated comprehensively in the past decades; consequently the foci of employee job performance research is developed

from the interaction of various individual (Porter et al., 1973; Judge, Martocchio, and Thoresen, 1997; Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Barrick, Stewart and Piotrowski, 2002; Mount, Harter, and Barrick, 2004; Egan, 2005), sociological (Lerner, Brush, and Hisrich, 1997), organizational, situational (Ferguson and Cheek, 2011) and environmental factors (Sadler and Barry, 1970; Child, 1972; Leblebici, 2012). Therefore, EJP behavior is typically viewed within the social/organizational framework or within the personality framework, while the integrated models view performance triggered by both factors. So the factors that influence EJP can be categorized into two general groups: external factors such as social, environmental, situational and organizational factors and the internal factors that relate to the within individual factors i.e. personality traits, attitudes and motivations etc.

With the changing nature of jobs and organizational structures and boom of service industry, the non-task performance is widely accepted as an integral part of employee job performance among organizational scholars and practitioners (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002). These new developments have created greater dependency upon employees requiring them to contribute beyond their prescribed job roles or to engage more in extra-role/non-task behaviors. The extra-role behaviors are voluntary in nature and involve numerous acts of employee's cooperation, spontaneous inputs, loyalty, instant decision making and readiness to contribute to the organizational effectiveness in normal and in turbulent times as well (Katz and Kahn, 1978).

Katz and Kahn (1978) further asserted that the extra-role/non-task performance is based on different set of factors than those required for in-role/task performance and essentially involve employee personal traits and motivations. Other researchers like Borman and Motowidlo (1993) further supporting Katz and Kahn assertion noted that task performance requires knowledge, skills and competencies specifically needed to perform a particular job whereas non-task performance is based on the personal characteristics such as traits and motivations of an employee. They further add that external organizational factors or

interventions can only be effective when the employee's personality traits, motivational needs and behavioral patterns are well examined and understood.

The literature suggests that personality traits influence job performance (Barrick et al., 2001). Extensive literature review also revealed that Big-Five personality traits model has been most commonly used by researchers to explain employee job performance (Blake and Pfeffer, 1989; Judge, Martocchio and Thoresen, 1997; Hurtz and Donovan, 2000; Barrick, Mount, and Judge, 2001; Barrick, Stewart and Piotrowski, 2002; Mount, Harter, and Barrick, 2004; Hogan, 2004; Niehoff, 2004; Egan, 2005; Barrick, Parks and Mount, 2005). A new construct of core self-evaluation (CSE) personality traits is prompted to be linked with performance mainly through motivation (Judge et al., 1998). Judge and colleagues assert that CSE traits predict job performance more dynamically than Big-Five model (Judge et al., 1997; Bono and Judge, 2003). However, despite recognizing the multi-dimensionality of employee job performance (EJP) the focus of personality-performance relationship remained on evaluating the task behaviors than any other dimension of job performance.

Another important issue in personality and performance research is highlighted by Barrick and colleagues (2001). They note that despite significant correlation between particular personality constructs and performance very few studies are dedicated to examine the comprehensive mechanism that links personality to performance. They further observe that most personality and performance research is focused on probing direct relationship while the process that explains how personality influences performance is largely not taken into consideration. Therefore they urged that process models for personality-performance association should be developed. A plausible link relates to an individual's motivation that has long been identified by various scholars as the proximal mechanism through which personality influences performance (Murray, 1938; Kanfer, 1991; Barrick et al., 1993; Mount and Barrick, 1995).

The above background of the study highlighted three areas of concern including relationship between: a) personality traits and motivations, b) motivations and employee job performance, and c) personality traits and employee job performance. The following paragraphs discuss those concerns in the light of literature for developing the problem statement of the study.

1.3 Problem statement

The relationship of personality traits with job performance is the most intensively studied and probably the most controversial topic in organizational research (Barrick et al., 2001). The personality influences on job performance are referred as illusive and misleading by Blake and Pfeffer (1989) declaring in their prominent article that "dispositions are likely to have only limited effects on attitudes and behaviors inside organizations and therefore should not be included in selection decisions". The other scholars contradicting this view assert that people have steady dispositional traits to engage in specific behaviors (Shoda and Mischel, 1993) and Hogan and colleagues conclude that the root of controversy over the utility of personality traits in selection decisions lies in the ambiguity in choosing specific traits from the pool of thousands of traits (Hogan, Barrett, and Hogan, 2007).

Much of the controversy was resolved with the introduction of Big-Five personality traits model (Costa and McCrae, 1992). Thus the Big-five model became the most influential personality traits model used for examining employee job performance (Barrick and Mount, 1991). However, the quality of Big-Five traits for predicting job performance remained questionable across a number of studies (Locke and Hulin, 1962; Ghiselli, 1973; Schmitt et al, 1984; Barrick and Mount, 1991). Conscientiousness showed consistent relationship with task performance across studies, while other traits in big-five model showed

inconsistent relationship with employee job performance (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997; Hough et al., 1998; Barrick et al., 2001; Judge and Ilies, 2002; Judge et al., 2003; Klang, 2012; Ferris et al., 2012; Pirooz et al., 2013).

Moreover most studies examined the relationship between big-five traits and task performance while studies examining it with non-task performance were very few (Dalal, 2005). Additionally Big-five model is also criticized among scholars for lacking theoretical groundings (Hough et al., 1998; Barrick et al., 2001; Judge and Ilies, 2002). Drawing on the inconsistent results of Big-five traits with job performance and lack of theoretical groundings, it is suggested by management theorists that employee job performance (i.e. task and non-task behaviors) should be examined with emerging new constructs of dispositional traits in a comprehensive manner beyond Big-Five traits model (Barrick et al., 2001; Judge and Ilies, 2002; Ferris et al., 2012).

Relatively a new dispositional construct: core self-evaluation (CSE) coined by Judge, Locke and Durham (1997) is gaining attention of the organizational scholars.   Research shows CSE significantly relates with job-performance including task performance (Judge et al., 1997; Judge and Bono, 2001b; Bono and Judge, 2003; Kacmar, 2009; Rich, LePine and Crawford, 2010; Grant and Wrzesniewski, 2010), organizational citizenship behavior (Bowling and Wang, 2012) and counterproductive work behavior (Ferris et al, 2012). CSE is propagated to be more dynamically and comprehensively representing job performance than the Big Five model (Judge and Bono; 2001b). Indicated by four sub-traits of self-efficacy, locus of control, self-esteem, and emotional stability, CSE refers to employee's subjective bottom-line judgment about their competencies, capabilities and overall organizational self-worth (Judge and Hurst, 2008). Each of the four traits constitutes a deeper level evaluative expression a person holds about oneself (Judge at al., 1997). These fundamental self-assessments that people hold about themselves and their role in the world profoundly influence their attitudes and behaviors at workplace (Judge and Larsen, 2001).

Though some overlapping of CSE traits with Big-Five traits led to the view that CSE is drawn from the Big-Five trait of neuroticism, however CSE theorists (Judge and Bono; 2001b) clarified that the Big-Five model neither incorporates self-esteem as a constituent of the model nor it relates self-esteem as a part of the various explanations of neuroticism construct. Parallel to the narrow conceptualization of neuroticism in Big-Five model, CSE offers a much broader and elaborate description of this trait. Apart from failing to measure self-esteem, the scales of neuroticism lack evaluative questions incorporating only descriptive questions (Judge et al., 1997; Bono and Judge., 2003). This lack of evaluative quality in Big-Five model does not correspond with the inclusion criterion set for CSE traits (Judge et al, 1997). As compared to CSE, Big-Five model lacks theoretical support. CSE also offers a greater scope than Big-Five model which just categorizes personality into five types whereby CSE represents an evaluative broader personality trait that describes the basic assessments of a person about his capabilities, strengths, and worth in the world that can be generalized to all personality types (Watson and Clark, 1984).

Despite advocating significant influences of CSE on EJP by CSE theorists (Judge et al., 1997; 1998; Judge and Bono, 2001), there is dearth of studies that examined this relationship, while CSE and non-task performance relationship is almost ignored. The emphasis till date remains on the task-behavior dimension of employee performance. The CSE-OCB (non-task performance) relationship has not been examined in past except one recently published study (Bowling et al., 2011), yet a number of studies suggest strong association between different sub-traits of CSE separately; self-esteem and OCB (Pierce and Gardner, 2004; Sekiguchi and Sablynski, 2008; Ferris et al., 2009; Ariani, 2012), self-esteem and CWB (Wells and Rankin, 1983; Salmivalli, 2001; Whelpley and Daniel, 2011) neuroticism and CWB (Slaughter and Kausel; 2009; Bowling et al., 2011), locus of control and CWB (Sprung and Jex, 2012), self-efficacy and OCB (Cooper, 2010; Mansor, Darus and Dali, 2013).

The studies examining CSE-EJP relationship are very few; therefore CSE theorists (Judge and Bono, 2001; Ferris et al., 2011) urge to examine it further in order to verify the findings of previous studies and also to explore new avenues regarding new cultural and sectoral contexts.

Organizations today are greatly relying on employee personal characteristics for effective Job performance (Judge and Ilies, 2003). These characteristics also include employee personality traits and motivations which have been central to examine job performance phenomena (Judge and Bono, 2001; Ferris, 2008). The significance of these two factors has increased many folds with the emergence of non-task performance as an equally important component of job performance criterion. The non-task performance is linked with traits and motivations of individuals (Judge et al., 1997; Bono and Judge., 2003).

Basically employee performance is the function of traits and motivation (Judge et al., 2001). Employee motivation with regard to its influence on job performance is an important issue in I/O research (Judge and Bono; 2001; Minor, 2003; Redmond, 2010). Judge and Ilies (2002) assert that difference in performance levels may be found related to the difference in individual motivation that can be traced back to the dispositional traits. They further added that due to the countless number of traits associated with motivation, the accurate answer to the question that what trait will be related to some specific form of motivation and behavioral outcome still requires a great amount of empirical research (Austin and Klein, 1996).

The relationship between CSE personality traits and motivation is already established in previous literature indicating relationship between CSE traits and goal-setting motivation (Bono and Judge, 2001) and approach and avoidance motivation (Ferris, 2008). However, both motivational frameworks lack to explain CSE influence across all performance behaviors in a comprehensive manner (Ferris et al., 2012). For example goal-setting motivation can conceptually and

practically be related to task-performance while non-task performance falls out of its domain. Additionally challenging goals do motivate employees but only those who feel committed to them. Regarding CSE and approach and avoidance motivation relationship the results show that CSE is explained more significantly from the avoidance motivation whereas it is conceptually more close to approach motivation. The debate among CSE theorist is still on, whether to conceptualize CSE from approach orientation or avoidance orientation (Ferris et al., 2012). Subsequently exploring other motivational frameworks in examining CSE relationship with job performance is suggested by CSE scholars (Judge and Bono, 2001; Ferris, 2008). So far it has not been examined with acquired motivational needs framework (McClelland, 1961) and examining this relationship may fill the gap in CSE and motivation relationship.

Regarding relationship between CSE and acquired motivational needs, the literature indicates that though CSE as a single construct has not been examined with acquired motivational needs but four sub traits representing CSE have been individually examined with acquired motivational needs. For example self-esteem is examined with need for achievement as a single component of MNs construct (e.g. Covington and Omelich, 1984; Ajayi, 2002; Ferris et al., 2010), self-esteem with need for affiliation (Astra and Singg, 2000; Riketta, 2004) and self-esteem with need for power (Gecas, 1989). The second CSE sub-trait of self-efficacy is examined with need for achievement (Rotter, 1966; Bono and Judge, 2001; Bandura, 1997; 2006), need for power (Gecas, 1989) and need for affiliation (Lawrence, 1999). The locus of control is examined with need for achievement (Rotter, 1966; Bono and Judge, 2003), need for affiliation (Ang and Chang, 1999; Semykina and Linz, 2007), while relationship between locus of control and need for power is almost ignored. The literature indicates relationship between neuroticism and need for achievement (Ivan, 1984; McCrae and John, 1992), need for power (Barrick and Mount, 1991) while its relationship with need for affiliation is ignored. Although some of the CSE sub-traits are examined with individual motivational needs, but So far CSE as a single construct with acquired motivational needs is not examined together. Therefore examination of both

constructs in a comprehensive manner is expected to open new perspectives in the personality and motivation literature.

Though motivation has been extensively studied with employee job performance criterion (Barrick and Mount, 1991; Schmidt and Hunter, 1992; Kanfer et al, 1994; Austin and Klein, 1996; Fuhrmann and Kuhl, 1998) the focus however, remained on the relationship between motivation and task-performance (Judge and Bono, 2001) while the non-task performance behaviors (i.e. OCB and CWB) have been generally ignored.

Numerous dispositional and attitudinal antecedents and predictors of non-task behavior representing citizenship (Podsakoff et al., 2000), and counterproductive work behaviors (Robinson and Bennett, 2000) have been studied, however very few studies examined the relationship between motivation and non-task behaviors (O'Brien, 2004; Ferris, 2008). So far the relationship between acquired motivational needs and employee job performance is partially examined either with task behaviors (Redmond, 2010) or organizational citizenship behaviors (Niehoff, 1994), while its relationship with counterproductive work behavior is almost ignored. Therefore comprehensive application of motivational needs framework with integrated job continuum model is still not taken into consideration and may add new perspectives to the already partially examined relationship between the two variables.

Although the direct effects of personality traits on job performance (Task-behaviors) are extensively researched, very few studies looked into the mediating mechanism that can explain how personality traits influence performance (Ferris et al., 2012).

The literature indicates that there are theoretical groundings or conditions for a variable to be used as a mediator. Firstly that mediating variables must have

previously established relationship with independent variable; secondly it must have previously established relationship with dependent variable. The acquired motivational needs fulfill the above mentioned criteria to function as a mediator between CSE and EJP. In previous paragraphs it is already discussed that acquired motivational needs have been examined with different personality traits as single constructs as well as with employee job performance. However acquired motivational needs have not been examined with CSE as a personality trait and with job continuum model representing three job performance behaviors: task performance, organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. Especially relationship between acquired motivational needs and counterproductive behavior has been almost ignored.

The core self-evaluation theory posits that motivation acts as mediator between personality and performance relationship. The previous studies also verify the role of motivation as mediator between the two variables. For example the goal-setting motivation mediated the relationship between CSE personality traits and task performance (Judge and Bono, 2001). Similarly approach and avoidance motivations mediated between CSE personality traits and employee job performance (Ferris, 2008).

Summarizing the above discussion it is observed that literature shows that CSE personality traits are linked with goal-setting motivations (Erez and Judge, 2001), and approach and avoidance motivations (Ferris, 2008) but both motivational frameworks lacked to explain CSE influence across all performance behaviors in a comprehensive manner (Ferris et al., 2012). Subsequently exploring other motivational frameworks in examining CSE relationship with job performance is suggested by CSE scholars (Judge and Bono, 2001; Ferris, 2008). So far acquired motivational needs framework (McClelland, 1961) has never been used as a mediator between personality and performance relationship. Therefore, this gap needs to be addressed and the relationship between acquired motivational needs, CSE personality traits and job continuum model representing three job performance behaviors: task performance, organizational citizenship behavior and

counterproductive work behavior still needs to be simultaneously and comprehensively examined.

The discussion to this stage boils down to one central point; since the core self-evaluation theory suggests that CSE personality traits influence employee job performance through the channel of motivation (Judge et al., 1998), it is also expected that CSE as a personality trait influences employee task and non-task performance behaviors through the motivational mechanisms of acquired needs. This assumption is further supported by Organ et al., (2004) who claimed that OCB: a component of EJP may have its links with dispositional traits and motivational needs of the individuals. Similar support came from CSE theorist Judge et al., (1998) claiming that 'personality influences behaviors through motivational factors. In addition, Ferris et al., (2012) highlighted the need to further examine CSE-performance link applying new motivational frameworks and new cultural contexts. So far CSE has not been examined with acquired motivational needs framework, hence this study is examining the correlation between the two variables but also intends to use it as an alternate motivational framework between personality traits and performance.

The above discussed gaps require further investigation and need to be examined together to clearly understand the relationship between CSE personality traits, acquired motivational needs and employee job performance. Secondly, whether the acquired motivational needs act as mediating mechanism in explaining the influence of CSE traits on the three job performance behaviors also needs further examination. Therefore, drawing support from the core self-evaluation theory and relying on the above discussion the study comes up with the following problem statement;

"To what extent do the core self-evaluations personality traits influence employee job performance either directly or indirectly through the process of acquired motivational needs in the context of university teachers in Pakistan"

1.4   Research Questions

On the basis of the above problem statement, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

i.   Is there any relationship between CSE personality traits and acquired motivational needs in the context of university teachers in Pakistan?

ii.   Is there any relationship between acquired motivational needs and job performance behaviors (i.e. task performance behavior, organizational citizenship behavior and counter-productive work behavior) in the context of university teachers in Pakistan?

iii. Do the acquired motivational needs act as a mediating mechanism between CSE personality traits and job performance behaviors (i.e. task performance behavior, organizational citizenship behavior and counter-productive work behavior) in the context of university teachers in Pakistan?

1.5   Aim of the Study

The aim of the study is to determine the role of personality traits and motivational needs in the development of different employee performance behaviors: for understanding, predicting and managing employee behavior especially in the context of university teachers in Pakistan.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The scope of the study includes a non-western, Asian, collectivist developing country: Pakistan. It focuses on the service industry of higher education in Pakistan. Population included male and female university level teachers in five major cities of Pakistan. These cities were the hub of universities and include Lahore, Peshawar, Karachi and Quetta, while the fifth city was the federal capital city of Islamabad. The current study besides examining the correlation between CSE traits and motivational needs also examines motivational needs theory (McClelland, 1961) as an alternate framework and mediating mechanism to examine CSE influence on employee job performance. The study took a within individual approach and examined the relationship between CSE personality traits, acquired motivational needs and task as well as non-task performance behaviors of university teachers in Pakistan.

1.7 Research Objectives

Subsequent to the research questions this study develops the following three core objectives:

i. To determine the relationship between CSE personality traits and acquired motivational needs in the context of university teachers in Pakistan.
ii. To determine the relationship between acquired motivational needs and job performance behaviors (i.e. task performance behavior, organizational citizenship behavior and counter-productive work behavior) in the context of university teachers in Pakistan.
iii. To determine whether acquired motivational needs act as a mediator between CSE personality traits and job performance behaviors (i.e. task

performance behavior, organizational citizenship behavior and counter-productive work behavior) in the context of university teachers in Pakistan.

1.8 Significance of the Study

The study has noteworthy contributions to offer to the organizational behavior literature. Literature indicates that there are three indicators of significance of a research. First it introduces a new variable, second it introduces new relationship and thirdly it develops new model or theory in a new context. The current study is the groundwork to introduce and establish need-based perspective in personality and performance literature. Although sub-traits of CSE as single constructs have been examined individually with motivational needs previously but to the knowledge of researcher CSE traits relationship with acquired motivational needs is comprehensively examined for the first time in the personality and performance literature in this study.

Whereas for the first time in the current study comprehensive application of McClelland's theory of acquired motivational needs as a mediating process is applied to explain the influence of core self evaluations (CSE) personality traits simultaneously on three employee job performance (EJP) behaviors (task performance behavior, organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior).

The study also responds to the call of CSE theorists (Judge, and Bono, 2001b; Bono and Judge, 2003) urging researchers to develop process based model. They further emphasized to apply new framework and new context in the study of CSE-performance relationship above and beyond the goal setting motivation and

approach and avoidance motivation frameworks, generally referred for explaining CSE influence on job performance behaviors.

Referring to the first motivational framework in examining CSE and EJP relationship, the use of goal setting motivation framework is viewed theoretically more suitable in the context of task performance (Ferris et al, 2012). The findings show that not all specific and challenging goals motivate individuals except the ones they like to be committed to (Erez and Zidon, 1984; Locke and Latham, 1990). Similarly, use of Approach/Avoidance motivation framework in explaining CSE influence on job performance is being criticized pertaining to the ongoing debate to proximally conceptualize CSE through approach or through avoidance motive (Ferris et al, 2012).

Subsequently exploring other motivational frameworks in examining CSE relationship with job performance is suggested by CSE scholars (Judge et al., 2008). Thus for the first time this study offers an alternate framework of McClelland's theory to explain CSE influence on employee job performance on the basis of previous groundings as mediator.

CSE is prompted to robustly predict employee job performance (Judge and Bono, 2001; Bono and Judge, 2003), however, number of studies examining CSE-EJP relationship is quite limited. Most studies focused only on the task-performance dimension of EJP while CSE relationship with non-task behavior is almost ignored. CSE and OCB relationship in personality and performance literature has been ignored in the previous research except one recent published study by Bowling et al., (2011). The review of CSE literature by Ferris et al., (2012) shows inconclusive findings on CSE-CWB relationship. Most of the CSE-CWB studies examined only one sub-trait of CSE such as self-esteem and CWB relationship (Whelpley and McDaniel, 2011). Further research is called for by CSE scholars (Bono and Judge, 2003; Judge et al., 2008). The current study examines this relationship by applying the direct as well as indirect measures of CSE, hence

providing a broader and comparable view of CSE-CWB relationship. Thus this study contributes in extending research in this area and also verifying previous findings.

Additionally an important contribution relates to the selection of a new context of this study. Based on research from various disciplines Judge et al (1997) observed that persons' appraisals of their external world are influenced by their desires and the characteristics of the objects as well as by the basic beliefs they hold concerning themselves, other persons and the world in general. Drawing on this observation, it is understood that one's evaluation of external world comprising of one's cultural, socio-economic and political environment significantly influence one's self-evaluations. Hence, it is essential to take into consideration the specific context with regard to difference in cultural and geographical background, nature of jobs and type of industry (Piccolo et al, 2005) while examining CSE-job performance relationship. A difference in the context of those factors may influence the way individuals evaluate themselves, others and the world.

Most CSE-performance studies are conducted in western individualistic cultures mostly in USA or other developed western countries (Judge et al., 1998; Erez and Judge, 2001). The few studies conducted in Asian collectivist cultures were also chosen countries that were developed and stable economies such as Japan, China and Korea (Dickson, Hanges and Lord, 2001; Piccolo et al, 2005). Little attention is being paid in this domain to conduct research in developing or underdeveloped Asian countries that are relatively unstable economically and politically such as Pakistan. Most CSE and job performance studies have focused on the performance of services perspectives of employee such as sales persons, managers and university students (Erez and Judge, 2001; Piccolo et al, 2005; Kacmar, 2009; Rich, LePine and Crawford, 2010; Ferris et al, 2012) whereas job performance especially in the contexts of university teachers and higher education industry was generally ignored. CSE theorists (Judge et al., 2005) thus urge to conduct CSE research in diverse cultures in order to assess cultural impacts on

self-evaluations of individuals. To answer the call of CSE theorists, the study incorporates a non-western, collectivist, developing country Pakistan and its higher education service industry for examining the role of CSE traits and acquired motivational needs on the task and non-task performance behaviors of university teachers in Pakistan.

The task and non-task performances are essential components of EJP but in service industry the non-task performance becomes more important because an employee interaction with end user is direct and noticeably obvious (Karatepe and Demir, 2014). Therefore the personal characteristics such as traits and motivations of employees also directly influence the end user. The university teachers are directly responsible to equip and prepare the youth with knowledge, skills and competencies essential for advancement and progress of a country (HEC Report, 2010) especially in a developing country like Pakistan. They require knowledge, skills and competencies specific to their assigned jobs as well as initiative and motivation to exert beyond the call of their assigned duty. Thus non-task performance is essentially embedded in the teachers' job.

Due to close interaction; the traits and motivations of teachers also directly influence their student. For example a teacher with high self-efficacy trait and achievement motivation is more likely to motivate his/her students by means of his/her performance than a teacher with low self-efficacy trait and achievement motivation. Therefore, examining predictors of non-task performance such as traits and motivations will be useful in various management decisions regarding selection, placement and promotion issues.

1.8.1 Theoretical Significance

The major contributions of this study to the existing literature are to:

i.   Firmly establish and configure the need-based motivational perspective of task and non-task performance.

ii. Identify the importance of relationship between core self-evaluations personality traits and need-based motivational perspective.

iii. Authentication of significant relationship between CSE personality traits and employee job performance regarding task and non-task performance.

iv. Identify the measures of CSE traits as a whole construct and with reference of its four dimensions separately predicting the Job performance behaviors through motivational process.

1.8.2 Practical Significance

The findings of the study will contribute to the managers' knowledge in understanding the process and associations between specific employee's personality traits, motivational needs and performance behavior patterns. It will enable them to apply effective interventions to utilize employees' specific traits and motivation for enhancing individual and organizational performance, encouraging organizational citizenship behaviors, and predicting and preventing counterproductive work behaviors.

1.9   Limitations

Due to the constraints of time and resources, this study is limited to the university level teachers. Only universities located in five major cities of Islamabad, Lahore, Karachi, Peshawar and Quetta in Pakistan are considered. The cross sectional and convenient sampling approach is applied to meet time and costs limitations. The use of self-report measures is another limitation. The relationship of CSE personality traits, acquired motivational needs and task and non-task performance of university teachers in Pakistan were the focus of the study.

1.10   Conceptual and Operational Definitions of the Selected Variables

1.10.1 Core Self-Evaluations (CSE)

Core self-evaluations are defined as "the fundamental bottom-line evaluations that people make about their self worth" (Judge et al., 1997). CSE is indicated by four self-evaluative sub-traits of self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control and neuroticism. According to Judge et al., (1997) these fundamental evaluations represent how people evaluate themselves, others and the world. These evaluations though subconsciously, affect an individual's self-assessments and the assessment of others and world as a whole.   CSE has important and essential implications on an individual's job-satisfaction and overall performance (Judge et al., 1998). Research posits that study of CSE traits and its underlying psychological processes enable us to effectively appreciate and predict employee's attitudes and behaviors at workplace (Bono and Judge; 2003). Thus an employee's

evaluation of his work may be directly or indirectly influenced by his own self-evaluation, or his colleagues.

For the purpose of this study CSE is viewed as the basic assessments that employees make about their competence, skills, abilities and overall worth in a workplace. These basic assessments of employees profoundly effect their job performance behaviors. CSE is measured directly by using the 12-item scale developed by Judge et al., (2003) and indirectly by using the independent scales of its four sub-traits.

The sub-trait of self-esteem refers to the "approval of one's self and the degree to which one sees oneself capable, significant, successful, and worthy" (Kirkpatrick and Ellis, 2001). For the purpose of this study it is viewed as an employee confidence and faith about his/her self-worthiness in his workplace. To measure it independently Rosenberg (1965) well established 10-items scale is used.

Generalized self-efficacy refers to one's beliefs regarding one's ability to carry out particular tasks (Bandura, 1997). For the purpose of this study it is viewed as an employee belief that he/she holds the essential skills and competence to perform the assigned tasks. To measure it independently Chen, Gully and Eden (2001) 8-item scale is used.

The locus of control (LOC) is defined as "one's belief in one's ability to control one's environment" (Bono and Judge; 2003). For the purpose of this study it is viewed as an employee ability to be in control of his job related tasks and responsibilities. To measure it independently Rotter (1966) 8-item scale is used.

Neuroticism is defined as "the tendency to exhibit poor emotional adjustment and experience negative affects such as fear, hostility and depression

(Goldberg, 1990). It is also described as "an individual's emotional sensitivity or over-responsiveness (Eysenck, 1994). For the purpose of this study it is viewed as an employee inability to emotionally adjust with his/her job, co-workers and organizational environment. To measure it independently Eysenck, Eysenck and Barrett (1985) 12-item scale is used.

1.10.2 Task Performance (TPB)

Task performance is defined as the "capability with which job incumbents perform activities that are formally recognized as part of their jobs; activities that contribute to the organization's technical core" (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993). Task performance involves all those activities that an employee is hired to perform to transform raw materials into finished goods and services. Task performance behaviors have their bases upon factors such as job knowledge, formal training, past experience, and cognitive, perceptual and psycho-motor abilities of an employee (Hunter and Hunter, 1984).

For the purpose of this study task performance behaviors include all those activities that are prescribed in the job description of an employee or the assigned task for which an employee is hired for and being paid. Williams and Anderson (1991) 7-items scale was used for measuring task performance. This selection was based upon the nature of items that clearly explained and measured the given definition of task performance and does not overlap with contextual or citizenship performance behaviors. Moreover the scale was based on self-reporting that suits the within individual approach of the current study as compared to other scales that were other-reported (Welbourne, 1997; Eisenberger et al., 2001).

1.10.3 Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

The role theory (Katz, and Kahn, 1978) classifies employee roles into two types: the behaviors that are formally required to perform one's job and are based upon one's knowledge, ability, and skills to perform a specific assigned job, while the second type, the supra-role behaviors signify behaviors that are not formally required or mentioned in job-description and are based upon the discretionary choice of a person to indulge in or withhold; especially when there is no reward or retribution attached in either case by the organization. Developing on the concept of "Extra/Supra Role Behaviors", Smith, Bateman and Dennis Organ (1983) presented the notion of "Organizational Citizenship Behavior" (OCB) and defined OCB as "Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ et al, 2006).

OCB is a much broader aspect of job performance that is linked with the personal choice of an employee highlighting the role of individual characteristics such as personality traits and motivations (Smith et al, 1983). For the purpose of this study it is viewed as an employee discretionary choice to engage in activities that are above and beyond the call of duty and which ultimately results in organizational effectiveness. The current study is applying Smith et al., (1983) 9-items scale to measure OCB due to its precision and validity in measuring OCB.

1.10.4 Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB)

Counterproductive work behaviors are defined as "those voluntary employee behaviors that violates significant organizational norms and in doing so

threatens the well-being of organization and its members or both" (Robinson and Bennett, 1995).

For the purpose of the current study counter productive work behaviors are viewed as those employee behaviors that are harmful to the organization and its members. These behaviors can cause harm to other employees, to the products, property and management system of an organization. CWB is measured using the 10-items scale developed by Robinson and Bennett (1995).

1.10.5 Acquired Motivational Needs (MN)

Acquired needs theory is a pertinent theory representing three acquired motivational needs of achievement, affiliation and power. Theory promotes that difference in the level of three needs results in difference in performance (McClelland; 1965).

The need for achievement (NACH) is described by McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1958) as a desire to achieve success in competition with some standards of excellence". To accomplish tasks, high achievers acquire necessary skills, deal with challenges, and conceive innovative strategies and procedures to perform their work (Chusmir and Azevedo, 1992). They also have an acute sense of timings and working well against the given time targets (Murray, 1938). The need for affiliation (NAFF) is characterized by a desire for social interaction and social approval. The people with need for affiliation are sensitive towards being socially accepted or rejected (Hill, 1991). They are more motivated to develop and maintain their social and interpersonal relationships (Heyns, Veroff, and Atkinson, 1958). In an organizational setting the people with high need for affiliation are more suitable for jobs that involve more social interaction. While need for power

(NPOW) is characterized by a desire to take control of people, situations and resources. This need drives people to challenge and confront others and to engage in competition where they anticipate winning (McClelland, 1961; 1985). Such individuals look for positions of authority and control over others (Murray, 1938).

McClelland and colleagues (1961, 1985) also developed "Thematic Apperception Test" to measure motivation generally known as TAT. The use of TAT in measuring motivation has been greatly criticized in research circles as it lacks predictive power in certain situations and requires lengthy processing (Barbuto and Scholl, 1998). For the purpose of this study Turner (1996) 15-item scale is used for two reasons: a) it is simple and quick to complete and administer which can be expected to enhance the response rate of the participants; and b) it has the highest reliability ratings .80-.83 using the Cronbach's alpha scale as compared to the other instruments.

Table 1.1: Definitions of Variables and the Key Terms of Study

Key Terms	Abbreviations	Definitions	Authors / year
Core Self- Evaluation	CSE	"The fundamental bottom-line evaluations that people make about their competence, strengths, and abilities".	Judge et al., (1997)
Locus of control	LOC	"One's belief in one's ability to control one's environment".	Bono and Judge; (2003)
Self-esteem	SES	"The approval of one's self and the degree to which one sees oneself as capable, significant, successful, and worthy" .	Kirkpatrick and Ellis (2001)
Self-efficacy	SEF	"A person's beliefs in his/her ability to succeed in a particular situation".	Bandura (1977)
Neuroticism	NUE	"Tendency to exhibit poor emotional adjustment and to experience negative affects such as fear, hostility and depression"	Goldberg (1990)
Key Terms	**Abbreviations**	**Definitions**	**Authors/year**
McClelland's need theory	MN	A pertinent need theory representing three acquired motivational needs of achievement, affiliation and power. Theory promotes that difference in the level of three needs results in difference in performance.	McClelland (1965)
Need for Affiliation	NAFF	The affiliation need indicates a need to be associated with other people and desire for social approval.	Coon, (1998)
Need for power	NPOW	The need for power is characterized by a desire to take control of people, situations, and resources. This need drives people to challenge and confront others and to engage in competition where they anticipate winning	McClelland, (1961; 1985)

Key Terms	Abbreviations	Definitions	Authors/year
Need for Achievement	NACH	The need for achievement refers to a desire to succeed against some standards of excellence	McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1958)
Employee Job performance	EJP	The degree to which employee behaviors fulfill requirements of the jobs they are hired for in effectively meeting organizational objectives.	Campbell (1990)
Key Terms	**Abbreviations**	**Definitions**	**Authors/year**
Task Performance Behavior	TPB	The capability with which job incumbents perform activities that are formally recognized as part of their jobs; activities that contribute to the organization's technical core either directly by implementing a part of technological process, or indirectly by providing it with needed materials or services.	Borman and Motowidlo (1993)
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	OCB	Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization	Organ et al., (2006)
Counterproductive work behaviors	CWB	Voluntary behavior that violate significant organizational norms and in doing so threatens the well being of an organization, its members, or both.	Robinson and Bennett (1995)

1.11 Organization and Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is organized into five chapters.

    i.   Chapter one includes the introduction, background and context of the study, problem statement, research questions, aim and scope of the study, research objectives, theoretical and practical significance of the study, limitations and conceptual and operational definitions of selected variables. It also includes the scope of the study and justification for selecting the research sector and definition of key constructs used in the study.

   ii.   Chapter Two is dedicated to the literature review. It also presents theoretical framework and the hypotheses of the study.

  iii.   Chapter Three presents the research design and methodology. The research approach, sampling design and questionnaire design, methods of administering questionnaires and the statistical tools used to evaluate the research hypotheses of the research.

  iv.   Chapter Four deals with analyses of data and presents results of the study. The sample characteristics, reliability measures with findings of hypotheses testing applying diverse statistical tools are also displayed.

   v.   Chapter 5 presents rationally derived explanations of the findings and analysis of some notable and interesting results of the current study. In addition to the plausible justifications for the key findings of relationship between the influences of personality traits of core self evaluations on employee job performance (task and non-task), an elaborate discussion on the limitations and implications of the study as well as the future recommendations and directions is also included. Accordingly, this chapter is structured into three sections presenting discussion on the findings, explanation of the results, limitations, implications and future recommendations.

REFERENCES

Ackerman, P. L. (1988). Determinants of individual differences during skill acquisition: Cognitive abilities and information processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General,* 117(3)**,** 288-318.

Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* 67 (5)**,** 422-436.

Ajayi, B. T. (2002). Relationship between self-esteem and achievement motivation of women in colleges of education, Kwara State. *Nigerian Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 8(1), 221-230.

Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* , 4(2) , 142-175.

American Association of Management (2005). *Electronic monitoring and surveillance survey*. AMA/E Policy Institute Research. New York.

Anand, V. Ashforth, B. E. and Joshi, M. (2005). Business as usual: The acceptance and perpetuation of corruption in organizations. *The Academy of Management Executive,* 19(4)**,** 9-23.

Anderson, J. C. and Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. Psychological Bulletin, 103(3), 411-423

Appelbuam, S. H., Deguire, K. J. and Lay, M. (2005). The relationship of ethical climate to deviant workplace behavior. *Corporate Governance,* 5(4)**,** 43-55.

Appelbuam, S.H. Appelbuam, S. H., and Shapiro, B.T. (2006), "Diagnosis and Remedies for Deviant workplace behaviors. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 9 (2), 14-20.

Appelbuam, S. H., Iaconi, G.D and Matousek, A. (2007). Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impacts and solutions. *Corporate Governance,* 7(5), 586-598.

Ariani, D. W. (2012). Linking Self-Esteem to Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Business and Management Research,* 1(2)**,** 26-38

Arnold, M. J, and Reynolds, K. E. (2003). Hedonic shopping motivations. *Journal of Retailing,* 79 (2), 77-95.

Arvey, R. D. and Murphy, K. R. (1998). Performance evaluation in work settings. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 49**,** 141-168.

Avey, J. B., Palanski, M. E. and Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). When leadership goes unnoticed: The moderating role of follower self-esteem on the relationship between ethical leadership and follower behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics.* 98**,** 573-582.

Austin, J. and Klein, H. (1996). *Work motivation: Goal Striving*. In K. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual differences and behaviors in organizations.* 209-257, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Axtell, M. C. and Parker, K. S. (2003). Promoting role breadth self-efficacy through involvement, work redesign and training. *Human Relations.* 56 (1),113-131.

Baker, T. L. (1994). *Doing Social Research.* (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Inc.

Banerjee, M. (1986). *Organizational Behavior.* (2ndEd). Allied Publishers: Bombay.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs.

Bandura, A. and Cervone, D. (1986). Differential engagement of self-reactive influences in cognitive motivation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes.* 38**,** 92-113.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Worth Publishers.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 52(1)**,** 1-26.

Bandura, A. and Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 88(1)**,** 87-99.

Bandura, A. (2004). Health promotion by social cognitive means. *Health Education and Behavior,* 31(2)**,** 143-164.

Barbuto, J. E., and Scholl, R. W. (1998). Motivation sources inventory: Development and validation of new scales to measure an integrative taxonomy of motivation. *Psychological Reports,* 82(3)**,** 1011-1022.

Barnard, C. (1938). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barrick, M. R., and Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology.* 44(1)**,** 1-26.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K. and Strauss, J. P. (1993). Conscientiousness and performance of sales representatives: Test of the mediating effects of goal setting. *Journal of Management.* 36(2)**,** 230-252.

Barrick, M. R., and Mount, M. K. (1996). Effects of impression management and self-deception on the predictive validity of personality constructs. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 81(3)**,** 261-272.

Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., Neubert, M. J. and Mount, M. K. (1998). Relating member ability and personality to work-team processes and team effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 83(3)**,** 377-391.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K. and Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: what do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,* 9(1/2)**,** 9-30.

Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L. and Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 87(1)**,** 43-51.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K. and Gupta, R. (2003). Meta-analysis of the relationship between the five-factor model of personality and Holland's occupational types. *Personnel Psychology,* 56(1)**,** 45-74.

Barrick, M. R., Parks, L. and Mount, M. K. (2005). Self-monitoring as a moderator of the relationships between personality traits and performance. *Personnel Psychology.* 58(3)**,** 745-767.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K. and Li, N. (2013). The theory of purposeful work behavior. The role of personality, higher order goals and job characteristics. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(1), 132-153.

Baron, R. M. and Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, Strategic and statistical considerations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(6), 1173-1182.

Bartlett, M. Y. and Desteno, D. (2006). Gratitude and Prosocial Behavior: Helping When It Costs You. *Psychological Science.* 17(4)**,** 319-325.

Bateman, T. S. and Organ, D. W. (1983). Job Satisfaction and the Good Soldier: The Relationship Between Affect and Employee Citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal,* 26(4)**,** 587-595.

Baumeister, R. F. (Ed.). (1993). *Self-esteem.* New York: Plenum Press.

Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., and Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles? Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 4(1), 1-44.

Beauregard, R. A. (1980). Interpretations of Capitalism: An Essay Review**.** *Contemporary Crisis*, 4, 103-114.

Bell, S. T. (2007). Deep-level composition variables as predictors of team performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 92(3)**,** 595-615.

Bennett, R. J. (1998). Perceived powerlessness as a cause of employee deviance: Dysoperational behavior in organizations: Violent and deviant behavior. *Monographs in organizational behavior and industrial relations*, 23, 221-239.

Bennett, R. J. and Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 85(3)**,** 349-360.

Bennett, R. J. and Stamper, C. L. (2001). Corporate citizenship and deviancy: A study of discretionary work behavior. *International Research in the Business Disciplines,* 3**,** 265-284.

Bennett, R. J. and Robinson, S. L. (2003). *The past, present, and future of workplace deviance research.* In Greenberg, J. (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior:* In *"The State of the Science*, (2nd Ed.), 247-81. NJ: Mahwah.

Bergeron, D. M. (2007). The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: good citizens at what cost? *Academy of Management Review,* 32(4)**,** 1078-1095.

Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S. and Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: a review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 92(1)**,** 410-424.

Best, R. G., Stapleton, L. M. and Downey, R. G. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job burnout: the test of alternative models. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,* 10(4)**,** 441-451.

Bloch, P. H., Nancy, M. R. and Scott, A. D. (1994). The shopping mall as consumer habitat. *Journal of Retailing,* 70 (1), 23-42.

Bobko, P., Roth, P. L. and Potosky, D. (1999). Derivation and implications of a meta-analytic matrix incorporating cognitive ability, alternative predictors, and job performance. *Personnel Psychology,* 52**,** 561-589.

Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review***,** 24(1), 82-98.

Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H. and Niehoff, B. P. (2004). The other side of the story: Re-examining prevailing assumptions about organizational citizenship behaviour. *Human Resource Management Review, 14*(2), 229-246.

Bolte, A., Goschke, T. and Kuhl, J. (2003). Emotion and Intuition Effects of Positive and Negative Mood on Implicit Judgments of Semantic Coherence. *Psychological Science.* 14(5)**,** 416-421.

Bommer, W. H., Johnson, J. L., Rich, G. A., Podsakoff, P. M. and Mackenzie, S. B. (1995). On the interchangeability of objective and subjective measures of employee performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology,* 48(3)**,** 587-605.

Bono, J. E. and Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-Concordance at Work: Toward Understanding the Motivational Effects of Transformational Leaders. *Academy of Management Journal.* 46(3)**,** 554-571.

Borman, W. C. and Brush, D. H. (1993). More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. *Human Performance,* 6(1)**,** 1-21.

Borman, W. C. and Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. *Personnel Selection in Organizations,* 71**,** 98.

Borman, W. C. and Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance,* 10(2)**,** 99-109.

Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D. and Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,* 9(1/2)**,** 52-69.

Borman, W. C. (2004). The concept of organizational citizenship. *Current Directions in Psychological Science,* 13(6)**,** 238-241

Boruch, R. F. and Wolin, L. (1970). A procedure for estimation of trait, method and error variance attributable to a measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 547- 574.

Bowling, N. A., Burns, G. N., Stewart, S. M. and Gruys, M. L. (2011). Conscientiousness and agreeableness as moderators of the relationship between neuroticism and counterproductive work behaviors: A constructive replication. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 19*(3), 320-330

Bowling, N. A., Wang, Q. and Li, H. Y. (2012). The Moderating Effect of Core Self-Evaluations on the Relationships between Job Attitudes and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Applied Psychology, 61*(1), 97-113.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). *The competent manager: A model for effective performance*. John Wiley and Sons.

Brockner, J. (1979). The effects of self-esteem, success–failure, and self-consciousness on task performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 37(10)**,** 1732-1741.

Byrne, B. M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS; Basic concepts applications and programming.* (2nd Ed.). New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

Campbell, J. and Pritchard, R. (1976). *Motivation theory in industrial and organizational psychology.* In MD Dunnette, ed. (1976). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology.* Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.

Campbell, J. D. (1990). Self-esteem and clarity of the self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 59(3)**,** 538-549.

Campbell, J. P., Gasser, M. and Oswald, F. (1996). *The substantive nature of job performance variability.* In *Individual Differences and Behavior in Organizations***.** (9th Ed.), 258-299. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H. and Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. *Personnel Selection in Organizations,* 35-70.

Campion, M. A., Lord, R. G. and Pursell, E. D. (1981). Individual and organizational correlates of promotion refusal. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 19(1)**,** 42-49.

Carmines, E. G. and Mciver, J. P. (1981). *Analyzing models with unobserved variables: Analysis of covariance structures*. California: Sage.

Case, J. (2000). *Employee theft: The profit killer*. Del Mar, CA: John

Caspi, A., Roberts, B. W. and Shiner, R. L. (2005). Personality development: Stability and change. *Annual. Rev. Psychol,* 56**,** 453-484.

Cast, A. D., and Burke, P. J. (2002). A theory of self-esteem. *Social Forces*, 8(3), 1041-1068.

Chalabaev, A., Sarrazin, P., Stone, J., and Cury, F. (2008). Do achievement goals mediate stereotype threat? An investigation on females' soccer performance. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *30*, 143-158.

Chang, M. L. (2009). An appraisal perspective of teacher burnout: Examining the emotional work of teachers. *Educational Psychology Review*, 21(3), 193-218

Chang, K. and Smithikrai, C. (2010). Counterproductive behavior at work: An investigation into reduction strategies. *International Journal of Human Resource* Management, 21 (8), 1272-1288.

Chen, P. Y. and Spector, P. E. (1992). Relationships of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft and substance use: An exploratory study. Journal *of Occupational and organizational Psychology*, 65(3), 177-184.

Chen, G., Gully, S. M., and Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-83.

Chen, S. X., and Carey, T. P. (2009). Assessing citizenship behavior in educational contexts. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 27(2), 125-137.

Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I.-S., Berry, C. M., Li, N. and Gardner, R. G. (2011). The five-factor model of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 96(6)**,** 1140-1166.

Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment and performance: the role of strategic choice. *Sociology,* 6(1)**,** 1-22.

Chusmir, L. H. (1985). Motivation of managers: Is gender a factor? *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 9(1)**,** 153-159.

Chusmir, L. H. and Azevedo, A. (1992). Motivation needs of sampled Fortune-500 CEOs. Relations to organization outcomes. *Perceptual and Motor Skills,* 75(2)**,** 95-612.

Clarke, S and Robertson, I. (2008). An examination of the Role of Personality in Work Accidents Using Meta-analysis. *Applied Psychology,* 57(1), 94-108.

Clarke, D. (2003). *Prosocial and anti social behavior.* USA: Routledge

Coffin, B. (2003). Breaking the silence on white collar crime. *Risk Management,* 50 (9), 8-10

Cohen, S. and Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin,* 98(2)**,** 310-357.

Cohen, J. (1988*). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Routledge Academic.

Cohen-Charash, Y., and Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 86(2)**,** 278-321.

Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L. and Barrick, M. R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 89(4)**,** 599-609.

Collins, J. M., and Schmidt, F. L. (1993). Personality, integrity, and white collar crime: A construct validity study. *Personnel Psychology,* 46(2)**,** 295-311.

Colquitt, J. A., and Simmering, M. J. (1998). Conscientiousness, goal orientation, and motivation to learn during the learning process: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* m83(4)**,** 654-665.

Colquitt, J. A, LePine, J. A. and Noe, R. A. (2000) 'Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: A meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research', Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(5), 678-707.

Conard, M. A., and Matthews, R. A. (2008). Modeling the stress process: Personality eclipses dys-operational cognitions and workload in predicting stress. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 44**,** 171-181.

Cook, T. D. and Campbell. D. T (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings.* Boston: Houghton Mufflin.

Coon, D. (1998). *Introduction to Psychology: Exploration and Application.* Pacific

Costa, P. T. and Mccrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO Personality Inventory: In S. R. Briggs and J. Cheek (Eds): Personality Measures*. Greenwich CT: JAI Press.

Cote, J. A. and Buckley, M. R. (1987). Estimating trait, method and error variance: Generalizing across 70 construct validation studies. *Journal of Marketing Research,* 24(3), 315-318.

Covington. M. V. and Omelich C. L. (1984). Task-oriented versus competitive learning structures: Motivational and performance consequences. *Journal of Educational psychology,* 76(6), 1038

Craig, A. J. and Schuldt, W. J. (1984). Effects of choice, goal difficulty, and need for achievement on performance. *Journal of Clinical Psychology,* 40 (6), *354-61.*

Cullen, M. J. and Sackett, P. R. (2003). *Personality and counterproductive workplace behavior.* In *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations*. 150-182. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Daft, R. L. (2008). *The leadership Experience*, South-Western Pub.

Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 90(6)**,** 1241-1255.

David, J. P. and Suls, J. (1999). Coping efforts in daily life: Role of Big   Five traits   and   problem appraisals. *Journal of Personality,*   77(5)**,** 265-294.

Davis-Blake, A. and Pfeffer, J. (1989). Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 385-400.

Davis, A.L. and Rothstein, H.R. (2006), "The Effects of the Perceived Behavioral Integrity of Managers on Employee Attitudes: A Meta-analysis", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67(4), 407-419.

De Chermont, K. (2003). *The relation between group diversity and group functioning: Disentangling the effects of objective and subjective diversity.* Doctoral Thesis. RICE UNIVERSITY, Huston: USA.

Deckers, L. (2004). *Motivation: Biological, psychological, and environmental* (2nd Ed.). Boston, USA: Pearson Education

De Vaus, D. A. (1993). Survey in Social Research (3rd Ed.), London: UCL Press

Dickson, T. L. (1991). *Structure of the Air Force's job performance measurement system and predictability of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB)*. DTIC Document.

Dickson, M. W. and Hanges, P. J. (2001). Trends, developments and gaps in cross-cultural research on leadership. *Advances in Global Leadership,* 2, 75-100.

Digman, J. M. (1989). Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. *Journal of Personality,* 57(2)**,** 195-214.

Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 41**,** 417-440.

Digman, J. M. (1997). Higher-order factors of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 73(6)**,** 1246-1256.

Douglas, S. C. and Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86(4)**,** 547-559.

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M. and Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly***,** 39(2), 239-263.

Egan, K. (2005). *An Imaginative Approach to Teaching*. Jossey-Bass Publishers. San Francisco.

Eisenberg, A. P. (2000). *The search for integrity: A leadership impact study.* Doctoral Thesis. ProQuest.

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D. and Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 42-51.

Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* 4(2), 142-175

Elliot, A. J. and Sheldon, K. M. (1997a). Avoidance achievement motivation: a personal goals analysis. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 73*, 171-185.

Elliot, A. J., Sheldon, K. M. and Church, M. A. (1997b). Avoidance personal goals and subjective well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 23(9)**,** 915-927.

Erdheim, J., Wang, M. and Zickar, M. J. (2006). Linking the Big Five personality constructs to organizational commitment. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 41(5)**,** 959-970.

Erez, A. and Judge, T. A. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations to goal setting, motivation, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86(6)**,** 1270-1279.

Erez, M. and Zidon, I. (1984). Effect of goal acceptance on the relationship of goal difficulty to performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 69(1)**,** 69-78.

Erickson, K. A. and Lehmann, A. C. (1996). Expert and exceptional performance: Evidence of maximal adaptation to task constraints. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 47(1)**,** 273-305.

Erickson, K. A. and Smith, J. (1991). *Toward a general theory of expertise: Prospects and limits*. UK. Cambridge University Press.

Everton, W.J., Jolton, J.A. and Mastrangelo, P.M. (2007), "Be nice and fair or else: understanding reasons for employees' deviant behaviors", Journal of Management Development, 26 (2), 117-131.

Eysenck, S. B., Eysenck, H. J. and Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6(1), 21–29.

Eysenck, H. J. (1988). Personality and criminality: A dispositional analysis. *Advances in Criminological Theory,* 1**,** 89-110.

Eysenck, H. J. (1994). Meta-analysis and its problems. *BMJ: British Medical Journal,* 309(6957)**,** 789-792.

Fan, X, Thompson, B. and Wang, L. 1999. The effect of sample size, estimation methods, and model specification on SEM fit indices. *Structural Equation Modeling,* 6, 56-83.

Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M. and Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management,* 16(4)**,** 705-721.

Ferguson, T. D. J., and Cheek, R. (2011). How important are situational constraints in understanding job satisfaction? *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(22), 221-232.

Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C. and Frink, D. D. (2005). Development and validation of the political skill inventory. *Journal of Management*, 31(1), 126-152

Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J. and Heller, D. (2009). Organizational supports and organizational deviance: The mediating role of organization-based self-

esteem. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 108(2), 279-286.

Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., Lian, H. and Keeping, L. M. (2009). When does self-esteem relate to deviant behavior? The role of contingencies of self-worth. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 94**(5),** 1345-1353.

Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., and Tan, J. A. (2012). Core self-evolutions: A review and evaluation of literature. *Journal of Management,* 38(1), 81-128.

Ford, C. V., King, B. H. and Hollender, M. H. (1988). Lies and liars: psychiatric aspects of prevarication. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 145(5), 554-562

Fornell, C. and Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39-50.

Fox, S. and Spector, P. E. (In press). *Counterproductive work behavior: Actors and targets.* Washington DC: APA Press.

Fox, S. and Spector, P. E. (1999). A model of work frustration-aggression. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20(6), 915-931.

Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., and Bruursema, K. (2007). Does your co-worker know what you're doing? Convergence of self-and peer-reports of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Stress Management, 14*(1), 41-60.

Frayne, C. A., and Latham, G. P. (1987). Application of social learning theory to employee self-management of attendance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 72(3)**,** 387-392.

Fredrickson, B. L., and Joiner, T. (2002). Positive emotions trigger upward spirals toward emotional well-being. *Psychological Science,* 13(2)**,** 172-175.

Fredrickson, B. L., and Branigan, C. (2005). Positive emotions broaden the scope of attention and thought-action repertoires. *Cognition & Emotion,* 19**,** 313-332.

Fredrickson, B. L., and Losada, M. F. (2005). Positive affect and the complex dynamics of human flourishing. *The American Psychologist,* 60(7)**,** 678-686.

Frese, M., and Zapf, D. (1994). *Action as the core of work psychology: A German approach*. In: H. C. Triandis,, M. D. Dunnette, and L. M. Hough (Eds.),

Handbook of Organizational Psychology, 271-340. Consulting Psychologists Press.

Frese, M. (2007) 'The Psychological Actions and Entrepreneurial Success: An Action Theory Approach', in J. R. Baum, M. Frese and R. A. Baron (eds), Siop Organizational Frontiers Series: The Psychology of Entrepreneurship. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 151-188.

Fried, Y., and Ferris, G. R. (1987). The validity of the job characteristics model: A review and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 40(2)*, 287-322.

Fried, Y. (1991). Meta-analytic comparison of the Job Diagnostic Survey and Job Characteristics Inventory as correlates of work satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(5)*, 690-697.

Fuller Jr, B., and Marler, L. E. (2009). Change driven by nature: A meta-analytic review of the proactive personality literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75(3)*, 329-345.

Funder, D. C. (2006). Towards a resolution of the personality triad: Persons, situations, and behaviors. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(1), 21-34.

Funderburg, S. A., and Levy, P. E. (1997). The influence of individual and contextual variables on 360-degree feedback system attitudes. *Group & Organization Management, 22(2)*, 210-235.

Gallagher, H. G. (1990). *By trust betrayed: Patients, physicians, and the license to kill.* Third Reich. H. Holt.

Ganster, D. C., Hennessey, H. W. and Luthans, F. (1983). Social desirability response effects: Three alternative models. *Academy of Management Journal, 26* (2), 321-331

Gardner, D, G. and Jon L. P. (2010). The core self-evaluation scale: Further construct validation evidence. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 70 (2), 291-304.

Gbadamosi, G. (2006). Predictors and correlates of Charlatan behavior in a non-western context. *Journal of Global Business & Technology, 2*(1), 23-32.

Gefen, D. and Boudreau, M. (2000). *Structural Equation Modeling Techniques and Regression: Guidelines for Research Practice*, 1-78. Communications of AIS.

Gellately, I. R. (1996). Conscientiousness and task performance: Test of a cognitive process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(5)*, 474-482.

George, J. M. and Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin,* 112(2)**,** 310-329.

George, J. M. and Jones, G. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance,* 10(2)**,** 153-170.

Gerbing, D. W. and Anderson, J. C. (1988). An updated paradigm for scale development   incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25(2), 186-192.

Giacalone, R. A., Riordan, C. A. and Rosenfield, P. (1997). *Employee sabotage. Antisocial behavior in organizations***.** Thousand Oaks CA: Sage

Gist, M. E. and Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review***,** 17(2), 183-211.

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). An alternative description of personality: the big fie factor structure. *Journal of Personality and social Psychology*, 59(6), 1216-1229.

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment,* 4(1)**,** 26-42.

Gram, W. C. and Rogers, R. W. (1990). Power and personality: Effects of Machiavellianism need for approval and motivation on use of influence tactics. *Journal of General Psychology*, 117(1), 71-83.

Grant, S. and Langan-fox, J. (2006). Occupational stress, coping and strain: The combined/interactive effect of the Big Five traits. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 41(4)**,** 719-732.

Grant, A. M. and Sonnentag, S. 2010. Doing good buffers against feeling bad: Prosocial impact compensates for negative task and self-evaluations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 111(1), 13-22.

Grant, A. M. and Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). I won't let you down...or will I? Core self-evaluations, other-orientation, anticipated guilt and gratitude, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 95(1), 108.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management,* 16(2)**,** 399-432.

Greenberg, L., and Barling, J. (1996). Employee Theft. *Trends in Organizational Behavior,* 3**,** 49-64.

Greiner, B. and Leitner, K. (1989). Assessment of job stress: The RHIA-Instrument.

Griffin, R. W. (1991). Research notes: Effects of work redesign on employee perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors: a long-term investigation. *Academy of Management Journal,* 34(2)**,** 425-435.

Gruys, M. L. and Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,* 11(1)**,** 30-42.

Guzzo, R. A., Jette, R. D. and Katzell, R. A. (1985). The effects of psychologically based intervention programs on worker productivity: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology,* 38(4)**,** 275-291.

Hacker, D. J. (1998). Meta-cognition: Definitions and empirical foundations, *Meta-cognition in Educational Theory and Practice***.** 1-24.

Hackman, J. R. and Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* 16(2)**,** 250-279.

Hair, F. J., Black, W. C., Babin, J. B., Anderson, E. R. (2009). *Multivariate Data Analysis.* (7th Ed); Pearson Education Inc.

Hall, M. and Smith, D. (2009). Mentoring and turnover intentions in public accounting firms: a research note. *Organizations and Society*, 34(6), 695-704.

Hancock, G. R. (2006). Power analysis in covariance structure models. In G. R. Hancock & R. O. Mueller (Eds.), *Structural Equation Modeling: A Second Course*. Greenwood, CT: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Hansemark, O. C. (2003). Need for achievement, locus of control and the prediction of business start-ups: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 24 (3), 301-319.

Harter, S. (1990). Causes, correlates and the operational role of global self-esteem: A life span perspective. In R. Sternberg and J. J. Kooligian (Eds), *Competence Considered*, 67-97. Yale University Press.

Hastings, S. E. and O'Neil, T. A. (2009). Predicting workplace deviance using broad versus narrow personality variables. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 47**,** 289-293.

Hegarty, W. H. and Sims, H. P. (1978). Some determinants of unethical decision behavior: An experiment. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 63(4), 451.

Hegarty, M. (2005). *Multimedia learning about physical systems*. In *The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning*. 447-465. NY: Cambridge Press.

Heggestad, E. D. and Kanfer, R. (2000). Individual differences in trait motivation: Development of the Motivational Trait Questionnaire. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *33*(7), 751-776.

Henle, C. A. (2005). Predicting workplace deviance from the interaction between organizational justice and personality. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 17(2), 247-263.

Henle, C. A., Giacalone, R. A. and Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2005). The role of ethical ideology in workplace deviance. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 56(3)**,** 219-230.

Herzberg, F. (1965). The motivation to work among Finnish supervisors. *Personnel Psychology* , *18(4), 393-402.*

Heyns, R. W., Veroff, J. and Atikinson, J. W. (1958). A scoring manual for the affiliation motive. *Motives in fantasy, action and society*. New York: Van Nostrand, 205-218.

Hill, C. A. (1991). Seeking emotional support: The influence of affiliative need and partner warmth. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*(1), 112-121.

Hill, S. E. and Buss, D. M. (2006). Envy and positional bias in the evolutionary psychology of management. *Managerial and Decision Economics, 27*(2-3), 131-143.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hockey, J. (1997). A complex craft: United Kingdom PhD supervision in the social sciences. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education,* 2(1)**,** 45-70.

Hoel, H., Einarsen, S. and Cooper, C. L. (2003). *Organizational effects of bullying. Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace:* In *International Perspectives in Research and Practice*, 145-161. London: Taylor & Francis.

Hofmann, D. A., Jacobs, R. and Gerras, S. J. (1992). Mapping individual performance over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 77(2)**,** 185-195.

Hogan, J. and Hogan, R. (1989). How to measure employee reliability. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 74(2)**,** 273-279.

Hogan, R., Hogan, J. and Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and answers. *American Psychologist,* 51(5)**,** 469-477.

Hogan, J. and Ones, D. S. (1997). Conscientiousness and integrity at work. *In R.Hogan, J. A. Johnson, and S. R. Briggs (Eds.), Handbook of personality psychology*, 849–870. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Hogan, R. and Shelton, D. (1998). A socio-analytic perspective on job performance. *Human Performance,* 11(2/3)**,** 129-144.

Hogan, R. (2004). Personality psychology for organizational researchers. *In B. Schneider & D.B. Smith (Eds,), Personality and organizations,* 3-21. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hogan, J., Barrett, P. and Hogan, R. (2007). Personality measurement,   faking, and employment selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 92(5)**,** 1270-1285.

Homes-Smith, P. (2011). Advanced structural equation modeling using AMOS. Workshop material provided at the ACSPRI 2011   Spring program. School Research Evaluation and Measurement Services. Melbourne.

Hough, L. M., Eaton, N. K., Dunnette, M. D., Kamp, J. D. and McCloy, R. A. (1990). Criterion-related validities of personality constructs and the effects of response distortion on the validities (Monographs). *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 75, 581-595.

Hough, L. M. (1992). The Big Five personality variables--construct confusion: Description versus prediction. *Human Performance,* 5**,** 139-155.

House, A., Dennis, M., Mogridge, L., Warlow, C., Hawton, K. and Jones, L. (1991). Mood disorders in the year after first stroke. *The British Journal of Psychiatry,* 158(1)**,** 83-92.

Howard, A. E. (1995). The changing nature of work. Jossey-Bass.

Hu, L. T. and Bentler, P. M. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), Structural equation modeling: *Concepts, issues, and applications*, 76-99. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hu, L. and Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cut off criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Structural Equation Modeling: *A Multidisciplinary Journal,* 6(1), 1-55.

Hunt S. T. (1996). Generic work behavior: An investigation into the dimensions of hourly job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 51-83.

Hunter, J. J. and Hunter, R. F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96(1), 72-98.

Hunter, J. J. (1986). Cognitive ability, cognitive aptitudes, job knowledge, and job performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 29(3), 340- 362.

Hurtz, G. M. and Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 85(6)**,** 869- 879.

Hysong, S. and Quinnes, M. (1997). The relationship between self- efficacy and performance: A meta-analysis. T*he Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 1997. St. Louis, MO.

Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D. and Taylor, M. S. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *64*(4), 349-358.

Ilgen, D. R. and Pulakos, E. D. (1999). *The Changing Nature of Performance: Implications for Staffing, Motivation and Development*. In *Frontiers of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Jossey-Bass Inc.

Ilies, R., Hauserman, N., Schwochau, S. and Stibal, J. (2003). Reported incidence rates of work-related sexual harassment in the United States: Using meta-analysis to explain reported rate disparities. *Personal Psychology,* 56(3), 607- 631.

Ilies, R., Fulmer, I. S., Spitzmuller, M. and Johnson, M. (2006). Personality and citizenship behavior: The role of affect and satisfaction. *66th Annual Meeting of Academy of Management.* 2006. Atlanta, Georgia.

Ilies, R., De Pater, I. and Judge, T. 2007. Differential affective reactions to negative and positive feedback, and the role of self-esteem. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 22(6), 590-609.

Ilies, R., Wilson, K. S. and Wagner, D. T. (2009). The spillover of daily job satisfaction onto employees' family lives: The facilitating role of work-family integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, *52*(1), 87-102.

James, L. P., Lyman, W.P. (1982). Factors affecting the context for motivation in public organizations. The Academy of Management Review, 7(1), 89-92.

Jerel, E. S., Edgar, E. K.(2009). The neurotic employee: Theoretical analysis of the influence of narrow facets of neuroticism on cognitive, social and

behavioral processes relevant to job performance. Research in Personal and Human Resources Management, 28; 265-341

Johnson, D. S. and Perlow, R. (1992). The impact of need for achievement components on goal commitment and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 22(21) 1711-1720.

Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C. and Levy, P. E. (2008). Getting to the core ofcore self-evaluation: a review and recommendations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 29(3)**,** 391-413.

Johnson, W., McGue, M. and Krueger, R. F. (2005). Personality stability in late adulthood: A behavioral genetic analysis. *Journal of Personality,* 73(2)**,** 523-552.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A. and Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core-evaluations approach. *Research in organizational behavior,* 19(1)**,** 151-188.

Judge, T. A., Martocchio, J. J. and Thoresen, C. J. (1997). Five-factor model of personality and employee absence. *Journal of Applied psychology,* 82(5)**,** 745-755.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C. and Kluger, A. N. (1998a). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 83(1)**,** 17-34.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A. and Bono, J. E. (1998b). The power of being positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance,* 11(2/3)**,** 167-187.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V. and Welbourne, T. M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 84(1)**,** 107-122.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E. and Locke, E. A. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of applied psychology,*85(2)**,** 237-249

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E. and Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin,* 127(3)**,** 376-407.

Judge, T. A. and Larsen, R. J. (2001). Dispositional affect and job satisfaction: A review and theoretical extension. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes,* 86**,** 67-98.

Judge, T. A. and Bono, J. E. (2001a). A rose by any other name: Are self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, neuroticism, and locus of control indicators of a common construct? In B. W. Roberts, & R. T. Hogan (Eds.), *Personality and Psychology in the workplace*, 93-118.

Judge, T. A. and Bono, J. E. (2001b). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86(1)**,** 80-92.

Judge, T. A. and Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 87(4)**,** 797-807.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E. and Thoresen, C. J. (2002). Are measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy indicators of a common core construct? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 83(3)**,** 693-710.

Judge, T. A., Heller, D. and Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(3), 530 541.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E. and Thoresen, C. J. (2003).The core self-evaluations scale: Development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology,* 56(2)**,** 303-331.

Judge, T. A., Van Vianen, A. E. and De Pater, I. E. (2004). Emotional stability, core self-evaluations, and job outcomes: A review of the evidence and an agenda for future research. *Human Performance,* 17(3)**,** 325-346.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A. and Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life satisfaction: The role of self-concordance and goal attainment. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 90(2)**,** 257-268.

Judge, T. A. and Hurst, C. (2008). How the rich (and happy) get richer (and happier): relationship of core self-evaluations to trajectories in attaining work success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(4), 849-867.

Kacmar, K. M., Collins, B. J., Harris, K. J. and Judge, T. A. (2009). Core self-evaluations and job performance: the role of the perceived work environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(6), 1572- 1580.

Kammeyer-Mueller J. D., Judge, T. A. and Scott, B. A. 2009. The role of core self-evaluations in the coping process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 177-195.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D. and Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. Wiley. New York.

Kahneman, D. (1973). *Attention and effort*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. and Judge, T. A. (2008). A quantitative review of mentoring research: Test of a model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 72(3)**,** 269-283.

Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Judge, T. A. and Scott, B. A. (2009). The role of core self-evaluations in the coping process. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 94(1)**,** 177-195.

Kanfer, R. and Hulin, C. L. (1985). Individual differenced in successful job searches following lay-off. *Personnel Psychology,* 38(4)**,** 835-847.

Kanfer, R. and Ackerman, P. L. (1989). Dynamics of skill acquisition: Building a bridge between abilities and motivation. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Advances in the psychology of human intelligence,* 5, 99-134.

Kanfer, R. (1990). Motivation theory and industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette and L. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Theory in industrial and organizational psychology*, 1, 75-170.

Kanfer, R. (1990). Motivation and Individual Differences in Learning: An Integration of Developmental, Differential, and Cognitive Perspectives. *Learning and Individual Differences, 2*, 221-239.

Kanfer, R. (1991). It's a goal, goal, goal setting world. Review of *A theory of goal setting and task performance* by E. A. Locke and G. P. Latham. *Contemporary Psychology,* 36, 847-848.

Kanfer, R., Ackerman, P. L., Murtha, T. C., Dugdale, B. and Nelson, L. (1994). Goal setting, conditions of practice, and task performance: A resource allocation perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 79(6), 826-835.

Kanfer, R. and Kantrowitz, T. M. (2002) *'Ability and Non-Ability Predictors of Performance*', in S. Sonnentag (Ed.), In *Psychological Management of Individual Performance*. 27-50. Chichester: Wiley.

Karatepe, O. M. (2010). The effect of positive and negative work-family interaction on exhaustion: does work social support make a difference? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 22*(6) 836-856.

Karatepe, O. M., Demir, E., (2014). Linking core self-evaluations and work engagement to work-family facilitation: A study in hotel industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 26*(2) 307-323.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R. L. (1964). Motivational Basis of Organizational Behavior. *Behavioral Science,* 9(2), 131-146.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations.* (2nd Ed.), New York. Wiley.

Katz, J. and Gartner, W. (1988). Properties of emerging organizations. *Academy of Management Review,* 13(3), 429-441.

Kaplan, H. B. (1975). Increase in self-rejection as an antecedent of deviant responses. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence,* 4(3)**,** 281-292.

Kaplan, D. and Muthen, B. (1985). A comparison of some methodologies for factor analysis of non-normal Likert variables. *British Journal of Mathematical and statistical Psychology,* 38, 171-189.

Keashly, L. and Jagatic, K. (2003). By any other name: American perspectives on workplace bullying. *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice***,** 31-61. London: Taylor & Francis.

Kelloway, E. K., Loughlin, C., Barling, J. and Nault, A. (2002). Self Reported Counter Productive Behavior And Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Separate But Related Constructs. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1/2), 143-151.

Kernis, M. H., Grennemann, B. D. and Barclay, L. C. (1989). Stability and level of self-esteem as predictors of anger arousal and hostility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 56**,** 1013-1023.

Kernis, M. H. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14(1), 1-26.

Kidwell, Roland E. and Susan M. Kochanowski (2005). The morality of employee theft: teaching about ethics and deviant behavior in the workplace. *Journal of Management Education,* 29(1), 135-152.

Kidwell, E. Roland. and Christopher L. Martin, (2004). *Managing organizational deviance*, 69-85, Thousand Oaks.

Kirkpatrick, L. A. and Ellis, B. J. (2001). *: Interpersonal Processes*, (Chapter 16). *Blackwell handbook of social   psychology.* 411-436.

Kline, R. B. (1998). Software review: Software programs for structural equation modeling: Amos, EQS, and LISREL. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *16*(4), 343-364.

Kline, R. B. (2005). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Korman, A. K. (1970). Towards a hypothesis of work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 54(1)**,** 31-41.

Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., Lester, S. W. and Jeong, S. S. (2010). Paying you back or paying me forward: Understanding   rewarded   and unrewarded   organizational citizenship   behavior. *Journal   of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 277–290.

Kuhl, J. (1985). Volitional mediators of cognition-behavior consistency: Self-regulatory processes and action versus state orientation. *Action Control. Springer*, 101-128.

Landy, F.J. and Conte, J. M. (2010). *Work in the 21st century: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. (3rd Ed.) John Wiley & Sons.

Langner, C. A. and Winter, D. G. (2001). The motivational basis of concessions and   compromise: Archival and laboratory studies.*Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied***,** 146(4),   1-19.

Latham, G. P. and Locke, E. A. (1991). Self-regulation through goal setting. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 50(2)**,** 212-247.

Latham, G. P., and Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, *56*, 485-516.

Latham, G.P., & Budworth, M. (2006). The study of employee motivation in the 20th Century. In L. Koppes (Ed.), The science and practice of industrial-

organizational psychology: The first hundred years, pp. 353-381. Lawrence Erlbaum. Mahwah, NJ.

Leblebici, D. (2012). Impact of Workplace Quality On Employee's Productivity: Case Study Of A Bank In Turkey. *Journal of Business, Economics and Finance,* 1(1)**,** 38-49.

Lee, C. and Farh, J. L. (1999). The effects of gender in organizational justice perception*. Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(1), 133–143.

LePine, J. A. and Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance; Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability: *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(2): 326-336

LePine, J. A., Erez, A. and Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 87(1)**,** 52-65.

LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P. and LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(5), 764-775.

Lerner, M., Brush, C. and Hisrich, R. (1997). Israeli women entrepreneurs: an examination of factors affecting performance. *Journal of Business Venturing,* 12(4)**,** 315-339.

Levinson, M. (2010). *The Box: How the Shipping Container Made the World Smaller and the World Economy Bigger (New in Paper)*, Princeton University Press.

Liu, Y., Ferris, G. R., Zinko, R., Perrewe, P. L., Weitz, B. and Xu, J. (2007). Dispositional antecedents and outcomes of political skill in organizations: A four-study investigation with convergence. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 71(1), 146-165.

Locke, E. A. and Latham, G. P. (1990). Work motivation and satisfaction: Light at the end of the tunnel. *Psychological Science,* 1(4), 240-246.

Locke, E. A., McClear, K. and Knight, D. (1996). Self-esteem and work. *International Review of Industrial/Organizational Psychology,* 11, 1-32.

Lord, R. G. and Hanges, P. J. (1987). A control system model of organizational motivation: Theoretical development and applied implications. *Behavioral Science,* 32(3)**,** 161-178.

Losada, M. and Heaphy, E. (2004). The role of positivity and connectivity in the performance of business teams. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 47(6)**,** 740-765.

Lussier, R. N. and Achua, C. F. (2007). *Effective Leadership: Cases and Exercises*, Thomson.

Luthans, F. and Krietner, R. (1985). *Organizational Behavior Modification and Beyond: An operant and Social Learning Approach*. (2nd Ed.), Glenview: London.

Mackenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M. and Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 50(1)**,** 123-150.

Mackenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M. and Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *The Journal of Marketing***,** 57(1), 70-80.

Mackenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M. and Paine, J. B. (1999). Do citizenship behaviors matter more for managers than for salespeople? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* 27(4)**,** 396-410.

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W. and Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 10(1), 130-149.

Maddux, J. E. (1995). *Self-efficacy Theory*. Springer.

Maddux, R. B. (2000). *Effective Performance Appraisals*. Crisp Publications.

Mansor, A., Darus, A. and Dali, M. H. (2013). Mediating Effect of Self-efficacy on Self-leadership and Teachers' Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Conceptual Framework. *International Journal of Economics Business and Management Studies, 2*(1), 1-11

Marsh, H. W. and Hocevar, D. (1985). Application of confirmatory factor analysis to the study of self-concept: First-and higher-order factor models and their invariance across groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, *97*(3), 562-582.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4*)*, 370-396.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.

Mathieu, J. E., Martineau, J. W. and Tannenbaum, S. I. (1993). Individual and situational influences on the development of self-efficacy: implications for training effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology,* 46(1)**,** 125-147.

McAdams, D. P. and Valliant, G. E. (1982). Intimacy motivation and psychosocial adjustment: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality Assessment,* 46**,** 586-593.

McAdams, D. P., Healys, S. and Krause, S. (1984). Social motives and patterns of friendship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 47(4)**,** 828-838.

McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A. and Lowell, E. L. (1958). A scoring manual for the achievement motive. *Motives in fantasy, action, and society***,** 179-204, Princeton.

McClelland D. 1961. *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

McClelland, D. C. (1965). *Achievement motivation can be developed*, American Institute of Motivation.

McClelland, D. and Wilsnack, S. C. (1972). The effects of drinking on thoughts about power and restraint. *The drinking man***,** 123-141.

McClelland, D. C. and Watson, R. I. (1973). Power motivation and risk taking behavior1. *Journal of Personality,* 41(1)**,** 121-139.

McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. Irvington Pub.

McClelland, D. C. and Burnham, D. H. (1976). *Power is the great motivator*. Harvard Business Press.

McClelland, D., Atkinson, J., Clark, R. and Lowell, E. (1976). *The achievement motive*. Irvington. New York.

McClelland, D. C. and Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). Leadership motive pattern and long-term success in management. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 67(6)**,** 737-743.

McClelland, D. C. (1985). How motives, skills, and values determine what people do. *American Psychologist,* 40(7)**,** 812-825.

McCrae, R. R. and John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality,* 60(2)**,** 175-215.

McCrae, R. R. and Costa Jr, P. T. (2003). *Personality in adulthood: A five-factor theory perspective*. The Guilford Press.

McGrath, R. E., Mitchell, M., Kim, B. H. and Hough, L. (2010). Evidence for response bias as a source of error variance in applied assessment. *Psychological Bulletin,* 136(3), 450.

Mcnall, L. A., Masuda, A. D., Shanock, L. R. and Nicklin, J. M. (2011). Interaction of core self-evaluations and perceived organizational support on work-to-family enrichment. *The Journal of Psychology,* 145(2)**,** 133-149.

Mehta, K. R. (2004). *Examining the relationships between motivational traits and counterproductive work behaviors*. Doctoral Thesis, Emory University.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L. and Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 61(1)**,** 20-52.

Miller, D. T., Turnbull, W. and Mcfarland, C. (1988). Particularistic and universalistic evaluation in the social comparison process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 55(6)**,** 908-917.

Minor, J. B. (2005). *Organizational Behavior 1: Essential Theories of Motivation and Leadership*. Armonk, NY:M.E. Sharpe.

Mitchell, T. M., Caruana, R., Freitag, D., Mcdermott, J. and Zabowski, D. (1994). Experience with a learning personal assistant. *Communications of the ACM,* 37(7)**,** 80-91.

Morgan, W. (2002). Origin and History of earliest "Thematic Apperception Test". *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 79 (3), 422-445.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 76(6), 845-855.

Moorman, R. H., Niehoff, B. P. and 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(3)**,** 209-225.

Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal,* 37(6)**,** 1543-1567.

Motowidlo, S. J. and Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 79**,** 475-480.

Motowidlo, S. Schmidt, M. and Ed, P. (1997). *New Models of Work Performance: The changing nature of job performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development,* 21-55, San Francisco. CA: Jossey Bass.

Motowidlo, S. J. Borman, W. C. and Schmitt, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance,* 10(2)**,** 71- 83.

Motowidlo, S. and Schmidt, M. (1999). *Performance assessment in unique jobs*. Pulakos (Eds.), 56-86.

Motowidlo, S. J. (2003*). Job performance. Handbook of Psychology*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Mount, M. K. and Barrick, M. R. (1995). The Big Five personality dimensions: Implications for research and practice in human resources   management. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management,* 13(3)**,** 153-200.

Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R. and Stewart, G. L. (1998). Five-factor model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance,* 11(2/3)**,** 145-165.

Mount, M., Johnson, E., Ilies, R. and Barrick, M. Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating role of workplace deviance. Annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Toronto, Canada, (2002).

Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R. and Ryan, A. M. (2003). Research themes for the future. *Personality and Work***,** 326-344.

Mount, M., Ilies, R. and Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating   effects   of   job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology,* 59(3)**,** 591-622.

Mowday, R. T. (1978). The exercise of upward influence in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly***,** 23, 137-156.

Mruk, C.J.   (1995). *Self-esteem Research, Theory, and Practice: Towards a Positive Psychology of Self-esteem*, (3rd Ed.) Springer: NY

Mualik, S. A., and Millsap, R. E. (2000). Doing the four-step right. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 7(1), 36-73.

Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D. and Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 38**,** 30-38.

Mumford, M. D., Mobley, M. I., Uhlam, C. E., Reitter-Palmon, R. and Doares, L. M. (1991). Process analytic models of creative thought. *Creat. Res. J,* 4(2)**,** 91–122.

Mumford, M. D., Gessner, T. L., Connelly, M. S., O'Connor, J. A., and Clifton, T. C. (1993). Leadership and destructive acts: Individual and situational influences. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *4*(2), 115-147.

Mumford, M. D., Baughman, W. A., Maher, M. A., Costanza, D. P. and Supinski, E. P. (1997). Process-based measures of creative problem-solving skills: Category combination. *Creativity Research Journal,* 10(1)**,** 59-71.

Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in personality: A clinical and experimental study of fifty men of college age.* Oxford University Press New York.

Murphy, K. R. (1989). Is the relationship between cognitive ability and job performance stable over time?. *Human Performance*, *2*(3), 183-200.

Murphy, K. R. (1993). *Honesty in the workplace*. Brooks/Cole Pacific Grove, CA.

Murphy, J. G. (1994). *Kant: The philosophy of right*, Mercer University Press.

Murphy, G., Athanasou, J. and King, N. (2002). Job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior: A study of Australian human-service professionals. *Journal Managerial Psychology*, 17(4), 287-297.

Nauta, A. and Sanders, K. (2000). Interdepartmental negotiation behavior in manufacturing organizations. *International Journal of Conflict Management,* 11(2)**,** 135-161.

Newness, K., and Viswesvaran, C. 2010. An analysis and reliability generalization for the Core Self-Evaluation Scale (CSES). Paper presented at the 25th Annual Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Niehoff, M. R. (2004). A motive-based view of organizational citizenship behavior: applying an old lens to a new class of organizational behaviors. *28th Annual National Agricultural Education Research Conference*. California.

O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality and Quantity*, 41(5), 673-690.

Ohly, S. and Fritz, C. (2007). Challenging the status quo: What motivates proactive behavior? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* 80(4)**,** 623-629.

Ones, D. S. (1993). *The construct validity of integrity tests.* Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Iowa City: University of Iowa.

Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C. and Schmidt, F. L. (1993). Comprehensive meta-analysis of integrity test validities: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 78(4)**,** 679-703.

Ones D. S., Viswesvaran C. and Reiss A. D. (1996). Role of social desirability in personality testing for personnel selection: The red herring*. Journal of Applied Psychology,* 81(6), 660–679.

Ones, D. S. and Viswesvaran, C. (2001). Integrity Tests and Other Criterion Focused Occupational Personality Scales (COPS) Used in Personnel Selection. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,* 9(1)**,** 31-39.

Onyishi, I. K. and Ogbodo, E. (2012). The contributions of self-efficacy and perceived organizational support when taking charge at work. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology,* 38(1)**,** 1-11.

O'Reilly III, C. A. and Chatman, J. A. (1994). Working smarter and harder: A longitudinal study of managerial success. *Administrative Science Quarterly***,** 39, 603-627.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. MA: Lexington books Lexington.

Organ, D. W. (1988). A restatement of the satisfaction-performance hypothesis. *Journal of Management.* 14(4)**,** 547-557.

Organ, D. W. (1990a). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 12(1)**,** 43-72.

Organ, D. W. (1990b). The subtle significance of job satisfaction. *Clinical Laboratory Management Review,* 4(1)**,** 94-98.

Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management,* 20(2)**,** 465-478.

Organ, D. W. and Ryam, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology,* 48(4)**,** 775-802.

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance,* 10(2)**,** 85-97.

Organ, D. W. and McFall, J. B. (2004). Personality and citizenship behavior in organizations. *Personality and Organizations***,** 291-314.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M. and Mackenzie, S. (2006). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It's Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences.* Thousand Oaks.

Packer, E. (1985). *Understanding the subconscious*, Jefferson School of Philosophy, Economics, and Psychology/TOF Pub.

Packer, E. (1985/1986). The art of introspection. *The Objectivist Forum*, 6(1), 1-10 and 7: 1-8.

Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival manual; A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows (version 12)*. (2ⁿᵈ Ed.). Allen Unwin.

Parker, S. K., Williams, H. M. and Turner, N. (2006). Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 91(3)**,** 636-652.

Paulhus, D. L. and John, O. P. (1998). Egoistic and Moralistic Biases in Self-Perception: The Interplay of Self-Deceptive Styles with Basic Traits and Motives. *Journal of Personality,* 66(6)**,** 1025-1060.

Pearce, J. L. and Gregersen, H. B. (1991). Task interdependence and extra role behavior: A test of the mediating effects of felt responsibility. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 76(2)**,** 838-844.

Pekrun, R., Elliot, A. J., and Maier, M. A. (2009). Achievement goals and achievement emotions: Testing a model of their joint relations with academic performance. *Journal of educational Psychology*, *101*(1), 115.

Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A. and Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. *Annual. Rev. Psychol,* 56**,** 365-392.

Perlow, R. and Latham, L. L. (1993). Relationship of client abuse with locus of control and gender: A longitudinal study in mental retardation facilities. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 78(5)**,** 831-834.

Peterson, C. and Seligman, M. E. (1984). Causal explanations as a risk factor for depression: Theory and evidence. *Psychological Review,* 91(3)**,** 347-374

Peterson., D. K. (2002a). Deviant workplace behavior and the organization's ethical climate. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(1), 47-61.

Peterson, D. K. (2002b), "The Relationship between Unethical Behavior and the Dimensions of the Ethical Climate Questionnaire", *Journal of Business Ethics,* 41(4), 313-326.

Phillips, J. S. and Lord, R. G. (1986). Notes on the practical and theoretical consequences of implicit leadership theories for the future of leadership measurement. *Journal of Management, 12*(1), 31-41.

Pickering, A. D. and Gray, J. A. (1999). *The neuroscience of personality.* Handbook of personality: Theory and Research. (2nd Ed.)**,** 277-299. NY: Guilford Press.

Piccolo, R. F., Judge, T. A., Takahashi, K., Watanabe, N. and Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations in Japan: relative effects on job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and happiness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(8), 965-984.

Pierce, J. L. and Gardner, D. G. (2004). Self-esteem within the work and organizational context: A review of the organization-based self-esteem literature. *Journal of Management, 30*(5), 591-622.

Pearce, J.L. (1993). Volunteers: The organizational behavior of unpaid workers. London: Routledge.

Pinder, C. C. and Walter, G. A.(1984). Personnel transfers and employee development. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management,* 2**,** 187-218.

Pinder, C. C. (1998). *Work motivation in organizational behavior.* Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

Pinder, C. C. (2008). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Psychology Press.

Piccolo, R. F., Judge, T. A., Takahashi, K., Watanabe, N. and Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations in Japan: relative effects on job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and happiness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(8), 965-984.

Ployhart, R. E. and Hakel, M. D. (1998). The substantive nature of performance variability: Predicting inter-individual differences in intra-individual performance. *Personnel Psychology,* 51(4)**,** 859-901.

Podsakoff, P. M. and Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management,* 12(4)**,** 531-544.

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H. and Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 1(2)**,** 107-142.

Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M. and Mackenzie, S. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 82(2)**,** 262-270.

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. and Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management,* 26(3)**,** 513-563.

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y. and Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.

Porter, W., Mitchell, J., Beckman, W. and Dewitt, C. (1973). Behavioral implications of mechanistic ecology. *Oecologia,* 13(1)**,** 1-54.

Puffer, S. M. (1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 72(4)**,** 615-621.

Quinones, M. A., Ford, J. K. and Teachout, M. S. (1995). The relationship between work experience and job performance: A conceptual and meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology,* 48(4)**,** 887-910.

Raykov, T. and Marcoulides, G. A. (2000). *A First Course in Structural equation modeling. Mahwah*, New Jersey: Lawrence Eribaum Associates.

Rector, N. A. and Roger, D. (1997). The stress buffering effects of self-esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 23(5)**,** 799-808.

Redmond, P. (2010). Investigating the use of online discussions in an undergraduate face-to-face course. *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference*, (2010), 783-790.

Rich, B. L., LePine, J. A. and Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal,* 53(3)**,** 617-635.

Richey, J. E., Nokes-Malach, T. J., and Wallace, A. (2014). Achievement Goals, Observed Behaviors, and Performance: Testing a Mediation Model in a College Classroom. Paper presented in the *COGSCI* 2014: The Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society.

Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 23(3)**,** 257-266.

Robinson, S. L. and Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal,* 38(2)**,** 555-572.

Robinson, S. L. and Bennett, R. J. (1997). *Workplace deviance: Its definition, its manifestations, and its causes.* Elsevier Science/JAI Press.

Robinson, S. L. and Greenberg, J. (1999*). Employees behaving badly: Dimensions, determinants and dilemmas in the study of workplace deviance.* In *Trends in Organizational Behavior,* (5th Ed.), 1-23. NY: Wiley.

Roe, R. A. and Ester, P. (1999). Values and work: Empirical findings and theoretical perspective. *Applied Psychology*, *48*(1), 1-21.

Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcements, *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 1-28.

Rotter, J. B. (1990). Internal versus external control of reinforcement. *American Psychologist,* 45**,** 489-493.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenberg, M., Schooler, C., Schoenbach, C. and Rosenberg, F. (1995). Global self-esteem and specific self-esteem: Different concepts, different outcomes. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 141-156.

Rosenberg, M. and Owens, T. J. (2001). *Low self-esteem people: Extending self-esteem theory and research.* In T. J. Owens, S. Stryker, & N. Goodman (Eds.), 400-436. New York: Cambridge.

Rotundo, M. and Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: a policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 87(1)**,** 66-80.

Rutter, D. R. (2000). Attendance and re-attendance for breast cancer screening: A prospective 3-Year Test of the Theory of Planned Behavior. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 5(1), 1-13.

Sackett, P. R. and Larson Jr, J. R. (1990). Research strategies and tactics in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette, & L.M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (2nd Ed.) 1, 419-489. CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Sackett, P. and Devore, C. (2001). Counterproductives at work. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, C. and Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work & Organizational Psychology,* 1, 145-164. London: Sage.

Sackett, P. R. (2003). Stereotype threat in applied selection settings: A commentary. *Human Performance,* 16(3)**,** 295-309.

Sadler, P. and Barry, B. (1970). *Organizational development: case studies in the printing industry*, Longmans London.

Sadri, G. and Robertson, I. T. (1993). Self-efficacy and work-related behavior: A Review and Meta-analysis. *Applied Psychology*, 42(2), 139-152.

Salancik, G. R. and Pfeffer, J. (1977). An examination of need-satisfaction models of job attitudes. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 22(3), 427-456.

Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European Community. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 82(1)**,** 30-43.

Salgado, J. F. (2002). The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,* 10(1/2)**,** 117-125.

Salmivalli, C. (2001). Feeling good about oneself, being bad to others? Remarks on self-esteem, hostility, and aggressive behavior. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 6* (4), 375-393.

Saucier, G. and Goldberg, L. R. (2003). The structure of personality attributes. In M. R. Ryan (Ed.), In *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations*, 1-29: San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Scarpi, D. (2006). Fashion stores between fun and usefulness. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, *10*(1), 7-24.Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E. and Outerbridge, A. N. (1986). Impact of job experience and ability on job knowledge, work sample performance, and supervisory ratings of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 71(3)**,** 432-439.

Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E., Outerbridge, A. N. and Goff, S. (1988). Joint relation of experience and ability with job performance: Test of three hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 73(1)**,** 46-57.

Schmidt, F. L. and Hunter, J. E. (1992). Development of a causal model of processes determining job performance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science,* 1(3)**,** 89-92.

Schmidt, F. L., Viswesvaran, V. and Ones, D. S. (1997). Validity of integrity tests for predicting drug and alcohol abuse: A meta-analysis. *Meta-analysis of drug abuse prevention programs,* 170**,** 69-95.

Schmidt T, F. and Hunter, J. (1998). Validity of personnel assessment methods: 85 years of research findings. The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin,* 124(3)**,** 262-274.

Schultheiss, O. C. and Brunstien, J. C. (2002). Inhibited power motivation and persuasive communication: *A lens model analysis. Journal of Personality*, 70(4), 553-582.

Schumacker, S. A. and Bronwell, A. (1984). Toward a theory of social support: Closing conceptual gaps. *Journal of Social Issues,* 40(4)**,** 11-36.

Schumacker, R.E. and Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sekiguchi, T., Burton, J. P. and Sablynski, C. J. (2008). The role of job embeddedness on employee performance: The interactive effects with leader-member exchange and organization-based self-esteem. *Personal Psychology*, 61(4), 761-792

Seligman, M. E. P. (1998a). *Building human strengths: psychology's forgotten mission.* (1st Ed.), APA Monitor.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic Happiness: Using the New positive Psychology to Realize Your Potential for Lasting Fulfillment;* NY: Free Press.

Sharma, V. and Mavi, J. (2001). Self-esteem and performance on word tasks. *The Journal of Social Psychology,* 141(6)**,** 723-729.

Sheldon, K. M. and Elliot, A. J. (1999). Goal striving, need satisfaction and longitudinal well-being: The self-concordance model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 76(3)**,** 482-497.

Shoda, Y. and Mischell, W. (1993). Cognitive social approach to dispositional inferences: What if the perceiver is a cognitive social theorist? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 19**,** 574-585.

Shore, L. M., Barksdale, K. and Shore, T. H. (1995). Managerial perceptions of employee commitment to the organization. *Academy of Management Journal,* 38(6)**,** 1593-1615.

Sims, R. R. (2002). *Managing organizational Behavior*, (1ˢᵗ Ed.). Greenwood Publishing Group USA.

Skarlicki, D. P., Folger, R. and Tesluk, P. (1999). Personality as a moderator in the relationship between fairness and retaliation. *Academy of Management Journal,* 42(1)**,** 100-108.

Slaughter, J. E. and Kausel, E. E. (2009). The neurotic employee: Theoretical analysis of the influence of narrow facets of neuroticism on cognitive, social and behavioural processes relevant to job performance. *Research in personnel and human resources management, 28*, 265-341.

Smith, C., Organ, D. W. and Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 68(4)**,** 653-665.

Smith, J. A. and Todd, P. E. (2001). Reconciling Conflicting Evidence on the Performance of Propensity-Score Matching Methods. *The American Economic Review*, 91(2), 111–118.

Smither, J. W., Collins, H. and Buda, R. (1989). When ratee satisfaction influences performance evaluations: A case of illusory correlation. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 74(4), 599.

Steenkamp, J. B. E. and Baumgartner, H. (2000). On the use of structural equation models for marketing modeling. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *17*(2), 195-202.

Steers, R. M. (1975). Effects of need for achievement on job performance-job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(6), *678-682.*

Sonnentag, S. (1998). Expertise in professional software design: A process study. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 83(4)**,** 703-716.

Sonnentag, S. (2000). *Expertise at work*: *Experience and excellent performance.* In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds*.). International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* 223-264. Wiley.

Sonnentag, S. and Frese, M. (2001). *Performance concepts and performance theory*: In *Psychological Management of Individual Performance***.** Wiley.

Sonnentag, S. and Frese, M. (2002) 'Performance concepts and performance theory', In S. Sonnentag (ed.), *Psychological Management of Individual Performance.* Chichester: Wiley, 3-25.

Spangler, W. D. and House, R. J. (1991). Presidential effectiveness and the leadership motive profile. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 60(3)**,** 439-455.

Spector, P. E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employee's locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin,* 91(3)**,** 482-497.

Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of the Work Locus of Control Scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61(4), 335-340.

Spector, P. E. and Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review,* 12(2)**,** 269-292.

Spector, P. E. and Fox, S. (2005). *The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior*. In Fox S, Spector PE (Eds), *Counterproductive work Behaviors: Investigations of Actors and Targets*. APA Press. Washington DC.

Speier, C. and Frese, M. (1997). Generalized self efficacy as a mediator and moderator between control and complexity at work and personal initiative: A longitudinal field study in East Germany. *Human Performance,* 10(2)**,** 171-192.

Sperandio, J. C. (1971). Variation of operator's strategies and regulating effects on workload. *Ergonomics*, 14(5), 571-577.

Sproles, G. B. (1981). Analyzing fashion life cycle: Principles and perspectives. *The Journal of Marketing,* 45(5), 116-124

Sprung, J. M. and Jex, S. M. (2012). Work locus of control as a moderator of the relationship between work stressors and counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *19*(4), 272-291.

Srivastava, A., Locke, E. and judge T. (2002). Dispositional causes of task Satisfaction: The mediating role of chosen level of task complexity. R. Ilies (chair), Core self-evaluations: New developments and research findings.

Symposium presentation at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Annual Meetings, Toronto.

Stajkovic, A. D. and Luthans, F. (1997). A meta-analysis of the effects of organizational behavior modification on task performance, 1975-95. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(5), 1122-1149.

Stajkovic, A. D. and Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin,* 124(2), 240-261.

Staw, B. M. and Cohen-Charash, Y. (2005). The dispositional approach to job satisfaction: More than a mirage, but not yet an oasis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 26, 59-78.

Steenkamp, J. B. E. and Baumgartner, H. (2000). On the use of structural equation models for marketing modeling. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 17(2), 195-202.

Steers, R. and Braunstein, D. (1976). A behaviorally based measure of Manifest needs in work settings questionnaire. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 9, 251-266.

Steptoe, A., Wardle, J. and Marmot, M. (2005). Positive affect and health-related neuroendocrine, cardiovascular and inflammatory processes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America,* 102, (18), 6508-6512.

Storms, P. L. and Spector, P. E. (1987). Relationships of organizational frustration with reported behavioral reactions: The moderating effect of locus of control. *Journal of Occupational Psychology,* 60(1), 227-234.

Sutcliffe, K. and Vogus, T. (2003). Organizing for resilience. *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline*, 94-110.

Sutherland, E. H. and Crime, W. C. (1983). *The Uncut Version* (with an Introduction by Gilbert Geis and Colin Goff). New Haven, London: Yale University Press.

Tabachnick, B. G. and Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Experimental designs using ANOVA.* Thomson/Brooks/Cole.

Tang, T. L.-P. and Ibrahim, A. H. S. (1998). Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior revisited: Public personnel in the United States and in the Middle East. *Public Personnel Management*, 27, 529-550.

Taylor, S. G. and Kluemper, D. H. (2012). Linking perceptions of role stress and incivility to workplace aggression: The moderating role of personality. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *17*(3), 316.

Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N. and Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: a meta analytic review. *Personnel Psychology,* 44**,** 703-742.

Tharenou, P. (1979). Employee self-esteem: A review of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 15**,** 316-346.

Tolchinsky, P. D., and King, D. C. (1980). Do goals mediate the effects of incentives on performance? *Academy of Management Review*, *5*(3), 455-467.

Trapnell, P. and Wiggins, J. (1996). A dynamic-interaction perspective on the Five-Factor Model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed). *The Five-Factor Model of Personality: Theoretical Perspectives***,** 89-162. NY: Guilford Press.

Trevino, L. K. and Brown, M. E. (2005). The role of leaders in influencing unethical behavior in workplace. *Managing Organizational Deviance***,** 69-87.

Trevino, L. K., Weaver, G. R. and Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of Management,* 32**,** 951-990.

Trist, E. and Bamforth, K. (1951). Some Social and Psychological Consequences of the Longwall Method. *Human Relations*, 4 (1), 3-33.

Tupes, E. and Christal, R. (1961). Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings*. USAF ASD Tech. Report,* 61-97. Lackland Air Force Base, TX: US Air Force.

Turner, J. (1996). *The acquired motivational needs of students enrolled in agriculture education programs in Georgia.* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Georgia, Athens.

Van Der Linden, D., Sonnentag, S., Frese, M. and Van Dyck, C. (2001). Exploration strategies, performance, and error consequences when learning a complex computer task. *Behavior & Information Technology,* 20(3)**,** 189-198.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L. and Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 17**,** 215-215.

Van Dyne, L., Vandewalle, D., Kostova, T., Latham, M. E. and Cummings, L. (2000). Collectivism, propensity to trust and self-esteem as predictors of

organizational citizenship in a non-work setting. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 21(1)**,** 3-23.

Van Fleet, D. D. and Griffin, R. W. (2006). Dysoperational organization culture: The role of leadership in motivating dysoperational work behaviors. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 21**,** 698-708.

Van Scooter, J. R. (1994). *Evidence for the usefulness of task performance, job dedication, and interpersonal facilitation as components of overall performance.* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Florida.

Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2006). Compulsory citizenship behavior: Theorizing some dark sides of the good soldier syndrome in organizations. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior,* 36(1)**,** 77-93.

Vinchur, A. J., Schippmann, J. S., Switzer, F. S. and Roth, P. L. (1998). A meta-analytic review of predictors of job performance for salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 83(4)**,** 586-597.

Viswesvaran, C. and Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment,* 8(4)**,** 216-226.

Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L. and Ones, D. S. (2005). Is there a general factor in ratings of job performance? A meta-analytic framework for disentangling substantive and error influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 108-131.

Vroom, V. H. 1964. *Work and motivation*. Wiley New York.

Wall, T. D. and Clegg, C. (1981). A longitudinal field study of group work redesign. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 2(1)**,** 31-49.

Wall, T. D., Corbett, J. M., Martin, R., Clegg, C. W. and Jackson, P. R. (1990). Advanced manufacturing technology, work design, and performance: A change study. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 75(6)**,** 691-697.

Wall, T. D., Jackson, P. R. and Davids, K. (1992). Operator work design and robotics system performance: A serendipitous field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 77(3)**,** 353-362.

Watson D. (200). *Mood and temperament.* New York: Guilford Press

Wells, L. E. and Marwell, G. (1976). *Self-esteem.* Beverly Hills.

Wells, L. E. and Rankin, J. H. (1983). Self-concept as a mediating factor in delinquency. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 46(1), 11-22.

Watson, D. and Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: the disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin,* 96(3)**,** 465-490.

Welbourne, T. M. (1997). Valuing employees: A success strategy for fast growth firms and fast paced individuals. *CAHRS Working Paper Series,* 97-106.

Whelpley, C. E. and McDaniel, M. A. (2011). Self-Esteem and Counterproductive Behavior: A Meta-analytic Review. In *26th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.* 12-13 April, 2011. Chicago, 1-22

Williams, L. J. and Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management,* 17(3)**,** 601-617.

Winter, D. G. (1973). *The Power Motive*. New York: Free Press

Winter, D. and Stewart, A. (1978). Power motivation. In H. London & J. Exner (Eds.) *Dimensions of Personality***,** 391-447. NY: Wiley.

Winter, D. G. and Barenbaum, N. B. (1985). Responsibility and the power motive in women and men. *Journal of Personality,* 53(2)**,** 335-355.

Winter, D. G. (1988). The Power motive in women and men. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 54(3), 510-519

Winter, D. G. (1993). Power, affiliation, and war: Three tests of a motivational model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 65(3), 532-545.

Winter, D. G. (2000). The satisfying principle in capability learning. *Strategic Management Journal,* 21(10/11)**,** 981-996.

Wojciszke, B. and Struzynska, K. A. (2007). Power influences self-esteem. *Social Cognition,* 25(4), 472-494.

Wylie, R. C. (1979). *The self-concept: Theory and research on selected topics.* (2nd Ed). University of Nebraska Press.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. and Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 74(3)**,** 235-244.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in Organizations*. (4th Ed.), Englewood Cliffs. NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Zickar, M. J. and Slaughter, J. E. (1999). Examining creative performance over time using hierarchical linear modeling: An illustration using film directors. *Human Performance,* 12**,** 211-230.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Investigating self-regulation and motivation: Historical background, methodological developments, and future prospects. *American Educational Research Journal,* 45(1)**,** 166-183.

Zurbriggen, E. L. (2000). Social motives and cognitive power-sex associations: Predictors of aggressive sexual behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 78(3)**,** 559-581.