TITLE PAGE

ROLE OF CORE SELF-EVALUATIONS, SELF-MONITORING AND SUPERVISORY SUPPORT ON TAKING CHARGE AT WORK

BY MICHAEL, AUGUSTINE OKPAGU

PG/M.Sc/13/65230

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF SCIENCE (M.Sc) DEGREE IN INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

FACULTY OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES,

UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA,

NSUKKA.

DECEMBER, 2015

APPROVAL

I, MICHAEL, AUGUSTINE OKPAGU a postgraduate student of the department of psychology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka with the registration number **PG/M.Sc/13/65230** has satisfactorily completed the requirements for course and research work for the award of Master of Science (M.Sc) degree honours in Industrial/Organizational Psychology. The work embodied in this dissertation has not been submitted in part or full for any other diploma or degree of this or any other university.

……………………

Dr. Ike, Onyishi.
Supervisor

…………………………

Dr. Chris, N. Uzondu
Head of Department

……………………

Prof. I.E., Madu
Dean, Faculty of the Social Sciences

…………………………

External Examiner

DEDICATION

To the Almighty God for His amazing grace and protection.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Ike Onyishi, you are simply an amazing supervisor. Your relentless effort towards getting the best out of me is beyond expression. Thank you immensely for always showing the way in the course of this study.

I wish to thank Assoc. Prof C.N Uzondu, Head, Department of Psychology, for his input and thorough review and correction of my project proposal. I also respectfully appreciate Dr. P.C. Mefoh for his constant feedbacks and assistance all through the process of this work. Dr. L.O. Amazue and other academic staff for their impact-based lectures and knowledge transfer.

For the all staff of the organizations that participated in this study, you contributed to my success story. Thank you!

To all my course/class mates; Rachel, Rev Sister Mary, Rev Sister Sabina, Levi, Jane, Insidibe, Onyishi amongst others, you guys rock! Thank you for choosing/believing in me as your class servant despite being among the youngest. I'm super humbled.

And finally, my Parents, Mr. & Mrs. Janet, Michael Okpagu, Prof Yakubu Aboki Ochefu, my mentor and business couch, for paying some bills and constant encouragement towards this goal. This is beyond just a page appreciation. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

List of Appendices

ABSTRACT

In this study the relationship between core self-evaluations, self-monitoring, supervisory support and taking charge was examined cross-sectionally among sales employees drawn from three (3) mobile money organizations. Supervisory ratings of subordinates' taking charge behaviour were collected and matched with 200 subordinates' self-ratings of core self-evaluations, self-monitoring and supervisory support characteristics .The researcher performed hierarchical regression analyses to examine the relationships. Results showed that core self-evaluations failed to make any statistically significant contribution. Support was found for the hypothesis that self-monitoring will significantly play a positive role on taking charge at work. Employees perceiving more career support from their supervisors were more likely to take charge at work, and the result was statistically significant in view of the hypothesis that supervisory support will significantly play a positive role on taking charge at work. Implications for management and future research are discussed.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The benefits of securing a committed workforce and retaining organizational competitive advantage over other organizations are crucial for the success and sustainability of organization and this is increasingly becoming indispensable. One of the essential sources of such competitive advantage according to researchers is the human capital (Bowen and Ostroff, 2004; Cunningham and Sagas, 2004). Being proactive is about taking control to make things happen rather than watching things happen. It involves aspiring and striving to bring about change in the environment and/or oneself to achieve a different future (Bindl and Parker, 2011; Grant and Ashford, 2008).

Extra-role performance, which includes taking charge behaviours**,** refers to discretionary behaviours (i.e. sportsmanship, civic virtue, and helping behaviour) on the part of the salesperson that are not objectively related to his/her sales productivity Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine and Bachrach (2000). Even though taking charge is not part of individual‘s assigned duties, they are still beneficial to the organization, its members and the employees themselves. In the sales context, it has been demonstrated that OCB have a strong, positive, and consistent effect on the evaluation of the employees‘ performance, in several contexts, Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994).

One of the arguments used to explain the influence of organizational citizenship behaviour on performance evaluation lies in the mediating effect of affective variables (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994). According to this idea, employees that engage in these behaviours will be rewarded with the positive liking of their supervisors (Lefkowitz, 2000). Despite these arguments, there is still the need to empirically confirm them in the sales context.

Recently Parker and Collins (2010) showed through empirical investigations that taking charge can be classified as important extra-role behaviour. Existing studies also provide extensive proof of the diverse ways in which workers express proactive behaviour, including seeking feedback (Ashford, Blatt & VandeWalle, 2003), breaking rules (Morrison, 2006), implementing ideas and solving problems (Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006), taking initiative in pursuing personal and organizational goals (Frese and Fay, 2001) , taking charge to bringing about change (Morrison and Phelps, 1999) and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB), (Allen, 2006; Li, Liang, & Crant, 2010; Organ, 1988; Onyishi, 2006). As suggested by these studies, attention to discretionary work behaviour has most often grown out of interest in a particular field. These phenomenon-driven approaches have led to rich array of proactive behaviours that have been important in diverse areas. Recently, focus has shifted to, taking charge, a less researched form of extra role behaviour that is capable of facilitating the initiation of innovative behaviours that are critical to modern organizational competitiveness and sustainability (Morrison & Phleps, 1999). Using both individual-level and contextual predictors, Morrison and Phelps (1999) demonstrated that taking charge behaviours are a function of an employee‘s felt responsibility to change the workplace, their belief in their capacity to perform and the perception of the top management‘s openness to change.

Despite the significance of taking charge at the workplace, its antecedents are relatively understood. Most attention has been given to reactive concepts of performance in which it is assumed that there is a set job to which an individual must be matched (Frese & Fay, 2001). For instance, much research has been devoted to investigating the predictors of standard task performance (Viswesvaran, 2001) as well as citizenship behaviours (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000). These concepts, however, have been criticized for their emphasis on rather passive behaviours (Morrison & Phleps, 1999). Researchers have proposed that both individual differences and contextual factors are antecedents to proactive work behaviours (Parker, Bindl & Strauss, 2010). To date, scholars have largely emphasized individual differences as antecedents to proactive work behaviour. Proactive personality, (Parker & Collins, 2010), general self-efficacy and felt responsibility (Morrison & Phleps, 1999) have well been linked with proactive work behaviour and some specifically to taking charge at work.

Conventionally, reseachers who have studied extrarole bahaviours have generaly focused on organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). However, Morrison and Phleps (1999) expanded the taking charge concept in response to the shortcomings of overly narrow conceptualization of extrarole behaviours, defining it as ― voluntary and constructive efforts, by individual employees, to effect organizationally functional change with respect to how work is executed within the contexts of their jobs, work units, or organizations‖ . According to Moon (2008), much studies on OCB has focused on helping contemporaries, being punctual, and attending nonrequired work functions, as opposed to more extensive behaviours embedded in a desire to help one‘s organization develop, advance, and improve. Clarifying the concept further, Van Dyne, Cummings and Parks, (1995), likened taking charge to be ― challenging-promotive‖ in that it fits into the general class of extrarole behaviours.

Moreover, taking charge, has been largely examined as discrete form of behaviour. It occurs when workers go one step further, informing their superiors of how they actually attempted to resolve problems (Morrison & Phleps, 1999).

Tucker (2007) in the same light sees taking charge as ―leverages of workers‖ firsthand knowledge of the details- and often the root causes- of problems, which enables them to offer particularly well-informed ideas about how to resolve them. Moon et al. (2008) succintly puts taking charge as innovative citizenship behaviour and posited that it is change oriented. Related concepts are role innovation (Schein, 1971), voice (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), role innovation, breaking rules (Morrison, 2006) and task revision (Staw & Boettger, 1990). Compared to voicing concerns, Morrison and Phleps (1999) further asserted that taking charge is more constructive form of speaking up because it can mitigate consequences and prevent recurrence. It is also motivated by desire for organizational improvement and is not necessarily rooted in principle or in a belief that current practices are wrong or bad.

Collectively, Frese and Fay (2001) refer to these concepts as ― active performance concepts‖ for the reason that, in contrast to traditional performance concepts that assume a given task or goal, these concepts imply that people can go beyond assigned tasks, develop their own goals, and adopt a long-term perspective to prevent problems.

Finally, taking charge occurs when employees seek to improve the way work is executed (i.e., work structures, practice, and routines) (Morrison & Phleps, 1999; Parker & Collins, 2010). Chiaburu and Tekleab (2004) further extended this model‘s ability to classify predictors not only according to their level (individual vs. contextual) but also according to their orientation (proactive vs. passive; VanDyne and LePine, 1998). This increases the model‘s power to examine antecedents that favour taking charge (e.g. propensity to trust and positive employee exchange ideology) as well as conditions that hinder such behaviour (e.g. monitoring styles that focus on process rather than output control). Both studies found that those employees on a higher job level were also more likely to engage in taking charge behaviour.

Even as the above research presents a foundation for a theoretical framework for the assessment of _challenging-promotive‘ (Van Dyne, Cummings & Parks, 1995) type of extra-role behaviours such as taking charge, it is not without its limitations. A wider range of predictors need to be assessed in order to better understand taking charge behaviours, such as examining the individual work control beliefs in taking charge behaviour (Onyishi, Ugwu & Ogbonne, 2012). This brings to term the question Ashford and Black (1996) asked ―whether employees are more likely to take charge if they perceive that the organization would be supportive if they were to engage in such behaviour.

Scholars have suggested that individuals‘personalities, and more specifically their dispositional states, play a key role in the determination of job attitudes and work-related behaviours (Judge, Locke & Durham, 1997). Core self-evaluations (CSE), a broad personality construct, has recently generated a great deal of research attention. However, while CSE has been found to be related to numerous relevant work outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction and job performance) and appears to be growing in its theoretical importance to the understanding of behavior at work, its relationship to taking charge at work has not been investigated. The concept was introduced by Judge, Locke and Durham (1997) who suggested that CSE represents the fundamental bottom-line assessment that people make about their worthiness, competence, and capabilities. In short, CSE are viewed as representing a cluster of four conceptually related traits: self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism or emotional stability. They further argued that a key characteristic that differentiates people from one another is the fundamental evaluations we make about ourselves and how we relate to our environment. These fundamental beliefs are called ―core self-evaluations‖. People who have positive core self-evaluations see themselves positively across a variety of situations, and approach the world in a confident, self-assured manner. They believe that they are capable of solving problems (high self-efficacy), worthy of respect and regard (high self-esteem), in control of and responsible for what happens to them (internal locus of control), and prone to be optimistic and free from doubts and worries (high emotional stability) (Judge, Erez, Bono & Thoresen, 2002).

Bono & Judge (2003) submit that there likely exist many other criteria which CSE may significantly predict. Surprisingly, scholars have almost totally ignored/or are not even exploring the relationship between CSE and taking charge, an important extrarole behaviour. A study by Judge, Thoresen, Pucik & Welbourne, (1999) examined the relationship between CSE and organizational commitment. Yet, in this study only three of the four traits comprising CSE, in combination with positive affectivity, were assessed. The study, despite not utilizing the complete CSE construct, found a relationship between a proxy of similar core traits.

Given that Judge and Bono (2001) have successfully linked positive core self evaluations with job and life satisfaction as well as job performance, it seems reasonable to extend the CSE concept to other settings and populations. Specifically, if people who consider themselves worthy and able to cope with life's exigencies bring a positive frame to the events and situations they encounter at work and in life then follows that employees who have positive core self evaluations should also bring a positive frame to both the financial service and educational context and life. Therefore, this study attempted to examine the extent to which both the concept and the measure of core self evaluations could be extended to mobile money organizational setting.

The idea that stable differences in human personality can systematically influence individuals‘reactions to the workplace has a long history in organizational studies. Although the relevance of personality variables for predicting work related outcomes was once suspect, there is now ―abundant evidence for the robustness of many personality characteristics in understanding work-related attitude‖ (Day & Schleicher, 2006). It is argued that the recent study of personality in industrial and organizational (I-O) psychology is characterized by two limitations: (a) almost complete reliance on the Big Five to the exclusion of other personality variables (most notably, self-monitoring) and (b) insufficient theoretical attention paid to the criteria in work-related personality research. Personality plays an important role at work. To best appreciate the many influences that personality—and particularly self-monitoring personality (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). We turn to self-monitoring, another individual variable of interest.

Self-monitoring refers to the extent to which people monitor, control and modify their expressive behaviour to meet standards of social appropriateness (Synder, 1974). According to Snyder, (1974); Ickes & Barnes, (1977) and Lennox & Wolfe, (1984), self-monitoring is defined as degree to which one is attuned to the way one presents oneself in social situations and the degree to which one adjusts one‘s performance to create a desired impression. Individuals scoring high in self-monitoring better perceive socially-relevant stimuli than their low self-monitoring counterparts (Baumeister & Twenge, 2003). These studies indicate that high self-monitors use information present in their social environment to adjust their self presentation. A variety of behaviours and speech techniques can be used to adjust one‘s self-presentation in different social situations, but one simple means of adjusting self-presentation is to copy the behaviours of others

At the heart of self-monitoring theory is the proposition that individuals differ meaningfully in the extent to which they can and do engage in the expressive control required for the creation of appropriate self-presentations (Snyder, 1974). One class of individuals, high self-monitors, tend to be highly attuned to cues of situational appropriateness; chameleon-like (Snyder, 1974) they adapt their behaviors and attitudes to suit different situational requirements. Faced with a social situation, high self-monitors ask: ―Who does this situation want me to be and how can I be that person?‖

(Snyder, 1979). By contrast, the other class of individuals, low self-monitors, tend to be less attuned to the requirements of different situations than to their own inner beliefs and values. The very nature of organizations as the typical context for work is especially relevant for the study of self-monitoring. Organizational work is characterized by exercises of power and authority, enacted and perceived leadership, job performance and performance assessment, attitude formation and expression, and, most importantly, relationships. Indeed, there is a relationship imperative at the heart of most, if not all, organizational work (Gabarro, 1987). All of these phenomena—and especially work relationships—influence and are influenced by the expressive control of individuals engaged in social interaction. Establishing and maintaining effective work relationships allows for task coordination, information flow, and other work processes that are necessary for accomplishing the goals and objectives of an organization. In addition, relationships are central to many leadership functions, such as setting direction, building commitment, and creating alignment (McCauley & Van Velsor, 2004). Put simply, work would not be accomplished (at least not effectively) without a foundation of networked relationships in an organization. Self-monitoring personality is an important construct in understanding how such relationships are formed and maintained.

Supervisory career support is a key factor affecting an employee‗s career progression. Employees‗ careers are likely to be enhanced by supportive relationships with their supervisors (Wickramasinghe and Jayaweera, 2010). Supervisory support entails career enhancing functions such as providing challenging assignments, sponsorship, visibility, as well as psychosocial functions such as counselling, friendship and acceptance (Wickramasinghe and Jayaweera, 2010). Good supervisory feedback and constructive communication between an employee and his or her supervisor enhance the opportunity for advancement in the employee‗s capabilities (Van der Heijden, Kümmerling, Van Dam, Van Der Schoot, Estryn-Béhar and Hasselhorn, 2010). This support received and reduction in pressure may increase employee satisfaction and organizational commitment. Supervisors have the power to act as gatekeepers, as they have control over whether or not employees have access to and feel comfortable using work intiatives (Straub, 2012).

Powell (2011) opines that supervisory support is the extent to which leaders value their employee‗s contribution and care about their well being. In an organization where the supervisor is a team supervisor, the subordinates are heard, valued and cared for. A leader with high supervisory support will definitely bring about higher employee performance and a higher yield in organization.

Kossek, Pichler, Bodner and Hammer, (2011) agree that it is important to research informal workplace supports due to the rising trend of workplace stress today because informal supervisory support important in determining employee outcomes compared to formal supports (policies). Kossek et al (2011) argue that we need to form a better understanding of informal workplace support and how it affects work (Kossek et al., 2011), although it seems plausible that informal networks are equally as valuable in predicting other related work outocmes (i.e., the experience of commitment and proactive work behaviours such as taking charge).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Recently, researchers who have begun investigating the possible reasons to this question have advocated that more contextual and individual variables be examined, specifically within the Nigerian work environment (Onyishi & Ogbodo, 2012).

In this study therefore, attempt will be made to provide answers and expand the taking charge concept which according to Morrison and Phleps (1999), is a response to the shortcomings of overly narrow conceptualization of extra role behaviours that has mainly focused on helping contemporaries, being punctual, and attending to non-required work functions, as opposed to more extensive behaviours embedded in a desire to help one‘s organization develop, advance, and improve (Moon, et al., 2005).

1. What is the role of core self-evaluations on salespeople taking charge at work?
2. Will self-monitoring play a significant role on salespeople taking charge at work?
3. Will supervisory support play any meaningful role on salespeople taking charge at work?

PURPOSE OF STUDY

This study tries to investigate the role of core self-evaluations, self-monitoring and supervisory support on taking charge at work.

Specifically, the purpose of the study is:

1. To identify the role of core self-evaluations in the promotion of taking charge amongst salespeople in mobile money service organizations

2. To ascertain if self-monitoring contributes to the exhibition of taking charge amongst salespeople in mobile money service organizations

3. To identify the role of supervisor support in taking charge amongst salespeople in mobile money service organizations.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Taking Charge: This refers to an employee‘s voluntary and constructive efforts to effect organizationally functional change with respect to how work is executed within the contexts of their job, work unit, and organization, as measured by Morrison and Phleps (1999) measure of taking charge at work.

Core Self-Evaluations: Refers to the fundamental bottom-line assessment that an employee make about his/her worthiness, competence and capability, as measured using Judge, Locke and Durham (1997) core self-evaluations scale (CSES).

Self-Monitoring: Self-monitoring is defined as the degree to which an employee is attuned to the way one presents oneself in social situations and the degree to which one adjusts one‘s performance to create a desired impression as measured using self-monitoring scale by Synder (1984).

Supervisory Support: Refers to the degree of perceived career support received by an employee from his/her immediate supervisor in doing their job as measured using supervisory support scale (Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Wormly, 1990).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature is divided into theoretical and empirical review.

Theoretical Review

The following theories were reviewed:

Expectancy theory (Victor Vroom, 1964)

Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969/1982)

Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964)

Leader-Member Exchange Theory (Graen, Haga & Dansereau, 1975) Self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2002)

Goal-setting theory (Locke & Latham, 1990)

The Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964)

Expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) suggests that motivation is a multiplicative function of three constructs: expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. A variety of work uses expectancy theory as a general framework for assessing, interpreting, or evaluating employee behaviour. The Expectancy theory assume that employees expend effort in response to the fairness of outcomes offered by managers and organizations. In his theory of expectancy, Vroom (1964) proposed that a person‘s behaviour is motivated by the expectation that his/her behaviour will lead to certain outcomes, together with the values he/she places on those outcomes. He situated his theory on the notion that behaviour is a function of interaction of personality and the environment. Vroom‘s theory built on the concepts of valence, instrumentality and expected that the level at which an employee will engage in proactive behavior at the work place is dependent on how well they desire growth (Valence), their perceived probability that their efforts will lead to achievement of their work goal and that their efforts will have positive effect on their work performance.

Vroom further argued that people act on the basis of consequences or, more specifically, the expected consequences of their behaviour, according to behavioral theories such as the expectancy theory of motivation. Employee performance is frequently described as a joint function of ability and motivation, and one of the primary tasks facing a manager is motivating employees to perform to the best of their ability (Moorhead and Griffin, 1998). Drawing on the expectancy theory of Vroom (1964), Morrison and Phleps (1999) argued that taking charge involves a calculated decision process in which individuals assess the likelihood that they will be successful as well as the likely consequences of their action, such as whether the risks of taking charge outweigh the benefits. They found support for two variables related to these judgments: generalized self-efficacy and felt responsibility. Frese and Fay (2001) opined that individuals are motivated to use their initiative if they believe they will be in control of the situation (control appraisals) and of their own actions (Parker, 2000) and if they believe they can deal with potential negative consequences of using their initiatives (change orientation).

From the foregoing, it is evident that the managers can use this theory in developing programmes that tend to elicit and sustain proactive work behaviour particularly, that of taking charge at work. Individuals normally prefer different outcomes and so motivation programs should be flexible enough to address such differences in individual preference. In addition, managers should link desired outcomes to the performance goals of the organization so that workers will believe that hard work and proactive work behaviour of taking charge results in outcomes they prefer. Monge, Cozzens and Contractor (1992) examined the effect of two communication variables (information and group communication) and three motivational variables (perceptions of equity, expectations of benefits, and perceived social pressure) on innovations in organizations that utilized Scanlon plans. Although the rationale for expectations of benefits is explicitly linked to expectancy theory, the operationalization of this variable does not reflect the theory.

Attachment Theory (1969/1982)

Attachment theory was propounded by Bowlby (1969/1982). The original focus of the theory was on how children's attachment to, support from their parents enhanced or inhibited their exploration of novel and challenging environments. A central theme in attachment theory is the role of support from others in promoting an individual's exploration. The theory has been applied to understanding adult relationships (Wu, Parker and de Jong, 2014; Richards and Schat, 2011; Feeney and Vleet, 2010). The theory suggests that sensitive and responsive caregivers offer secure base to enable an individual to explore, learn about, and become competent in interacting with novel environments. More specifically, Feeney and Thush (2010) identified three forms of support that promote exploration: availability, encouragement of growth, and noninterference.

The attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969/1982) is used as a theoretical framework for identifying what type of support is important because of the theory‘s emphasis on exploration, which has strong parallels with work proactivity. Exploration stems from the motivation to master one‘s environment (Elliot and Reis, 2003) and by reducing knowledge gap (Loewenstein, 1994). Taking charge is similar to exploration in terms of its underlying motivation and behavioural function (Wu and Parker, 2014). When behaving proactively, individuals take charge of their work environments to bring about change (Morrison & Phleps, 1999), and come up with new ideas to improve work procedures (Scott & Bruce, 1994), and actively scan the environment for important cues to find a novel way forward (Frese & Fay, 2001). Thus, like exploration, taking charge behaviour involves efforts to actively control one‘s environment to be effective in the face of uncertainty and novelty (bateman & Crant, 1993; Griffin et al., 2007).

There can be little argument that although attachment theory has been quite influential among basic researchers, the theory of attachment has been largely ignored by researchers investigating the role of individual differences in applied workplace settings. Despite the obstacles faced in having attachment theory accepted by organizational researchers, a number of studies linking attachment styles to workplace outcomes have been published on a variety of topics Wu & Parker (2000). Moreover, these studies are being conducted with ever increasing frequency which seems to reflect the increased interest in attachment theory among personality researchers in general. Most of these studies have been conducted on topics such as leader–follower dynamics, where the parallels to parent– child relationships is fairly obvious, or on other issues closely linked with the experiences of attachment and loss such as job satisfaction and trust In line with the theory that secures attachment relationships foster exploration and support, Johnston (2000) demonstrated that securely attached leaders were more likely to delegate while avoidant leaders reported the least amount of delegation. It has been argued that self-confidence and empathic ability both of which as features of secure attachment orientation, are essential to visionary leadership (Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2002). Sosik and Megarian (1999) also argued that individuals who have greater capacity for emotion regulation will be more likely to promote positive emotions in their work group, be more encouraging of the creative efforts of their followers, and be more likely to put the needs of others before their own. Interestingly, the parallels between trust and attachment extend even to their expected outcomes. Individuals with secure attachment relationships are thought to be more willing to engage in exploratory and risk-taking behavior because they perceive their partner as being a secure base (Fraley and Shaver, 2008). Similarly, individuals in high trust relationships have been shown to be more likely to take risks due to their positive expectations and willingness to be vulnerable (Colquitt, 2007).

It is anticipated that while secure individuals will generally form secure, supportive, and happy relationships with supervisors, coworkers, anxiously attached individuals will be more prone to worrying about their relationships in the workplace and will generally report less taking charge behaviour.

Of particular interest to most researchers are the aspects of job performance that are more interpersonal in nature, namely discretionary work behaviors such as organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) and counter-productive work behaviors (CWBs), Dalal (2005). This is not only because of the interpersonal nature of attachment orientation itself, but also because discretionary work behaviours are more likely when individuals have formed (or failed to form) a close bond with their leaders, coworkers, and organizations. In terms of discretionary helping behaviors, Geller and Bamberger (2009) found that both avoidant and anxious attachment were associated with less instrumental helping behaviours in the workplace. Erez and Judge (2001) found that individuals higher on avoidant attachment are particularly unlikely to report engaging in volunteer activities (Erez, Mikulincer, van Ijzendoorn, & Kroonenberg, 2008).

Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964)

Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) can also explain the relationship between supervisors support (SS) and taking charge. When employees perceive more supervisor support than they expected, they contribute more, including taking charge, to the organization; otherwise, they reduce their contribution to the organization.

The social exchange theory, proposed by Blau (1964), posits that social behaviour (such as job performance) is the result of an exchange process. This exchange is regulated by the norm of reciprocity and it aims at maximizing benefits and minimizing costs or risks. Social exchange theory focused on the steps an organization should take to improve employee commitment (Blau, 1964). According to this theory, employees weigh the benefits and risks of this exchange process or social relationships. Positive relationship in this case refer to those in which the benefits outweigh the risks. When the risks outweigh the benefits, the employee will terminate that relationship. The exchange is based on the norm of reciprocity such as improving job performance in return for organizational support.

Social exchange theory is the basis for leader-member exchange (LMX) Sparrowe and Liden (1997). This occurs when an individual engages in a behaviour for someone; they expect to receive something in return. Both persons involved need to offer the other something that is valuable and reasonable, or fair. When there is a higher value of exchange, there is a quality of the LMX relationship (Wayne, Shore & Liden, 1997). Subordinates that have high quality LMX relationship with their supervisors are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs and engage in OCBs (Ning, Jian & Crant, 2010). Campbell (2000) suggests that supervisors who see employees performing proactively are more likely to give those employees independence and support as it is needed.

Social exchange theory can be explained by the concept of reciprocity. According to (Korsgaard, Meglino, Lester & Jeong, 2010), there are two forms of reciprocity. The first form is obligation to reciprocate, which is the belief that someone will return a favour or engage in a behaviour because they feel obligated to someone back. The second form of reciprocity is expected reciprocity. Expected reciprocity is the belief that if a person does something for another oerson, he or she should get some sort of benefit in return, in the near future. (Beham, 2011) and Korsgaard et al. (2010) agree that employees will act in accordance with social exchange theory.

Social exchange theory is relevant to employee perceptions of supervisory support because when employees believe that an organization is being supportive of them, they will, in turn, feel the need to be supportive of, work hard, for the organization (Korsgaard et al., 2010). As supervisors are considered the face of an organization, it is important to understand how their support can have an impact on an employee‘s behaviour of taking charge. This can have a positive impact on the organization. Tajfel and Turner (1979) social identity viewpoint also lend a hand to explain the relationship between organizational support and commitment. Social identity theory proposes that employees remain loyal when they feel their organization values and appreciates them. This feeling of high status increases employees‘ social identity which, in turn, strenghtens their commitment to the organization Tyler (1999).

Leader-Member Exchange Theory (Graen, Haga and Dansereau, 1975)

Another theoretical approach to be investigated in this study is leader-member exchange theory (LMX), which is an instance of a transactional leadership approach, proposing that leaders (in this case, supervisors) develop different kinds of exchange relationships with their subordinates (coworkers) (Dansereau & Haga, 1975) wherein exchanges concerning contribution, loyalty, professional respect, and affect are made (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). Leaders treat subordinates differently at varying degrees and levels contingent on whether the latter are part of the ingroup (high-quality relationship) or outgroup (low-quality relationship) (Graen and Scandura, 1987). Supervisors exchange personal and positional resources (inside information, influence in decision making, task assignment, job latitude, support, and attention) in return for subordinates‘ performance on unstructured tasks (Graen & Cashman, 1975). As a result, research shows mutual trust, positive support, informal interdependencies, greater job latitude, common bonds, open communication, high degree of autonomy, satisfaction, and shared loyalty exist Dansereau, Graen, and Haga, 1975).

In contrast, subordinates who perform only in accordance with the prescribed employment contract are characterized as ―out-group‖ with limited reciprocal trust and support, and few rewards from their supervisors (Deluga, 1998). The exchange between the superior-subordinate (dyad), a two-way relationship, is the unique basic premise and the unit of analysis of LMX. The dyadic relationships proposed by LMX differ in terms of their quality and are defined as either high quality or low quality relationships. Subordinate-members of these relationships are referred to as either in-group or out-group members in high- or low quality relationships, respectively (Dansereau et al., 1975). High quality dyads are characterized by frequent exchange of valued resources and engagement in activities beyond formal requirement, whereas low quality dyads rely more on the formal employment relationship (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). The specific kind of exchange relationship influences the amount of work-related resources available to the subordinate (Graen & Scandura, 1987) and determines leaders‘ behavior towards subordinates insofar as subordinates defined as in-group members are granted higher autonomy and influence in decision-making processes than out out-group members (Dansereau et al., 1975). In return, in-group members reciprocate with higher levels of performance, less inclination to leave, and taking on additional responsibilities (Keller &

Dansereau, 2001). Furthermore, leaders enjoy in-group members'loyalty and gain potentially more influence and higher status (Basu & Green, 1997). Over time, these high-quality exchange relationships turn into social relations (Basu & Green, 1997). A meta-analysis conducted by Gerstner and Day (1997) indicated a positive relationship between LMX and job performance, satisfaction with supervision, overall satisfaction, and commitment.

The basic principle of leader–member exchange (LMX) is that leaders develop different types of exchange relationships with their followers and that the quality of these relationships affects important leader and member attitudes and behaviors (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Liden et al., 1997; Sparrowe & Liden, 1997). In support of the theory, empirical research indeed has demonstrated that LMX has significant influences on outcomes such as task performance, satisfaction, turnover, and organizational commitment (Gerstner & Day, 1997).

It is interesting that although researchers have a considerable understanding of how LMX relates to a host of outcomes, including in-role (task) performance as well as attitudinal variables such as satisfaction with leader and organizational commitment, they have less understanding of how LMX is related to taking charge behaviour. For example, the most comprehensive meta-analysis of the LMX literature examined a number of outcomes, including performance ratings, objective performance, overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisor, organizational commitment, role conflict, role clarity, turnover, and member competence (Gerstner & Day, 1997) but did not include organizational taking charge behaviour criteria. In a small-scale meta-analysis based on

18 primary studies, Hackett, Farh, Song, and Lapierre (2003) reported a meta-analytic correlation between LMX and citizenship behaviours of .32. These authors also suggested that there were no moderating influences affecting the relationship between the two constructs.

Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2002)

Although a great deal is known about the implications of employee commitment for organizations, less attention has been paid to its ramifications for employees themselves. Another hypothetical framework based on an incorporation of the three-component model of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997) is Deci and Ryan's (1985) self-determination theory of motivation. Self-determination theory provides a particularly fruitful theoretical lens for explaining how taking charge behaviour is motivated. Thus, its arena is the investigation of people's inherent growth tendencies and innate psychological needs that are the basis for their self-motivation and personality integration, as well as for the conditions that foster those positive processes.

At the heart of SDT is the identification of three psychological needs: autonomy (deCharms, 1968), competence (White, 1959) and relatedness (Beaumeister & Leary, 1995). According to SDT, these needs are the basic nutriments required for psychological health. Consequently, it is the satisfaction of these needs rather than their strength that determines well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The need for autonomy is satisfied when, at the deepest levels of reflection, employees believe that what they are doing is freely chosen and consistent with their core values. The need for competence is satisfied when people believe they have the capability and resources needed to accomplish their tasks and achieve their objectives. Finally, the need for relatedness is satisfied when they feel valued and appreciated by others. Satisfaction of these needs is a prerequisite for the experience of autonomous regulation.

The theory further suggests that the social environment influences intrinsic motivation through its impact on need satisfaction or perceptions of competence, autonomy and (Grouzet et al., 2004). These needs are seen as universal necessities and studies suggest that they are among the most significant needs and those most closely associated with event-based affect (Sheldon et al., 2001). Moreover, the focus of SDT is not individual differences in the strength of these needs, but the degree to which they are satisfied. Gagne´ and Deci (2005) cite several studies which have found that managers' autonomy support leads to greater satisfaction of the needs for competence, relatedness and autonomy and, in turn, to favourable work behaviours or attitudes.

The autonomy of employees in organizations has long been identified as vital for intrinsic motivation at work (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), and autonomy support is the most significant social-contextual variable that predicts autonomous forms of motivation (e.g., taking charge), (Williams, Gagné, Ryan, & Deci, 2002). In the works of Deci, Connell and Ryan (1989), the scholars argue that autonomy support in organizations is primarily provided by the supervisor. As Baard, Deci and Ryan (2004) would say, ―Autonomy support is the ―interpersonal climate created by the manager in relating to subordinates.‖ Supervisory behaviour can be seen as either informational, i.e., promoting competence and supporting autonomy, or controlling, i.e., pressuring employees to think, feel, or behave in specified ways (Deci & Ryan, 1985). A controlling supervisory style has been found to have a detrimental effect on subordinates' intrinsic motivation (Richer & Vallerand, 1995). Supervisors who try to confine and micromanage employees' behaviour rather than supporting their independence are thus likely to undermine autonomous motivation of taking charge. Autonomy supportive supervision on the other hand will encourage autonomous forms of motivation such as taking charge at work. Autonomy support not only encourages the internalization of proactive goals, it also ensures that this internalization is integrated, i.e., that it becomes an integral part of a person's work-related identity, rather than being introjected, i.e., engaged in out of a sense of obligation, thus contributing to its sustainability. Thus, one can assume that the act of taking charge at work by employees is solely not dependent on contextual variables alone but to a great extent as a result of them being self determined to change the status quo by going above and beyond against all odds in asserting themselves.

Goal -Setting Theory (Locke & Latham, 1990)

Edwin Locke and Gary Latham (1990), influential figures in goal-setting theory and research, have incorporated several studies about goals into a theory of goal setting and task performance. According to this theory, there appear to be two cognitive determinants of behaviour: values and intentions (goals). A goal is defined simply as what the individual is consciously trying to do. Locke and Latham (1990) posit that the form in which one experiences one's value judgments is emotional. That is, one's values create a desire to do things consistent with them and also affect behaviour (job performance) through other mechanisms. For Locke and Latham, goals, therefore, direct attention and action. Furthermore, challenging goals mobilize energy, lead to higher effort, and increase persistent effort. Goals motivate people to develop strategies that will enable them to perform at the required goal levels. Finally, accomplishing the goal can lead to satisfaction and further motivation, or frustration and lower motivation if the goal is not accomplished. Borrowing from Parker and Collins (2010) assertions, taking charge attempts to influence the way work is executed.

Based on hundreds of studies, the major finding of goal setting is that individuals who are provided with specific, difficult but attainable goals perform better than those given easy, nonspecific, or no goals at all. At the same time, however, the individuals must have sufficient ability, accept the goals, and receive feedback related to performance (Latham, 2003). A major factor in attainability of a goal is self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). This is an internal belief regarding one‘s job-related capabilities and competencies. If employees have high self-efficacies, they will tend to set higher personal goals under the belief that they are attainable. The first key to successful goal setting is to build and reinforce employees‘ self-efficacy. According to Morrison and Phleps (1999), self-efficacy is important because it raises one‘s feelings of control and the perceived likelihood of success. It also leads people to persist more (Lent, Brown & Larkin, 1987). Thus, goal-setting is very critical in the evaluation of perceived success by employees.

A person with a learning goal orientation wants to develop competence by mastering challenging situations. In contrast, the person with a performance goal orientation wants to demonstrate and validate competence by seeking favorable judgments. Considerable research has indicated that a learning goal orientation has a positive impact on work-related behaviors and performance (VandeWalle, 2001; Van Yperson & Janssen, 2002). The learning goal orientation is particularly relevant in today‘s work environment, which requires employees to be proactive (i.e. take charge), solve problems, be creative and open to new ideas, and adapt to new and changing situations (Luthans, 2011). In order for assigned goals to affect individual performance, individuals must initially accept the goal and remain committed to it (Locke & Latham, 1990). That is, individuals must be truly trying to attain the assigned goal. Therefore, individual performance results from an interaction between goal difficulty and goal commitment, with the highest level of individual performance occurring when individuals are highly committed to difficult goals (Tubbs, 1993).

Despite the benefits of goal setting, there are a few limitations of the goal-setting process (Locke & Latham, 2002). First, combining goals with monetary rewards motivates many organization members to establish easy rather than difficult goals. In some cases, organization members have negotiated goals with their supervisors that they have already completed. Second, goal setting focuses organization members on a narrow subset of measurable performance indicators while ignoring aspects of job performance that are difficult to measure. The adage ―What gets measured is what gets done‖ applies here. Third, setting performance goals is effective in established jobs, but it may not be effective when organization members are learning a new, complex job.

Locke and Latham (2002) provided a well-developed goal-setting theory of motivation as the theory emphasizes the important relationship between goals and performance. Research supports predictions that the most effective performance seems to result when goals are specific and challenging, when they are used to evaluate performance and linked to feedback on results, and create commitment and acceptance. The motivational impact of goals may be affected by moderators such as employees' ability and self-efficacy. A learning goal orientation leads to higher performance than a performance goal orientation, and group goal-setting is as important as individual goal-setting. From the foregoing, it can therefore be deduced that employees who engage in goal setting are more likely to go above and beyond and have higher propensity of exhibiting the behaviour of taking charge. Parker and Collins (2010) reported that proactive personality was found to be an antecedent to the proactive work behaviours of taking charge (β= .26) and problem prevention (β= .24). They also reported that learning goal orientation was an antecedent to the proactive work behaviour of taking charge (β= .16). Morrison and Phleps argued that those with high felt responsibility for change will perceive behaviours such as taking charge because they provide a sense of personal satisfaction. Finally, felt responsibility was an antecedent to the work behaviour of taking charge (β= .42), Parker & Collins, (2010). Felt responsibility for change predicts taking charge (Morrison & Phleps, 1998), as well as continuous improvement (Fuller, Marler & Hester, 2000).

One of the most frequently studied factors influencing goal commitment was monetary incentives. Locke and Latham (1990) suggested that monetary incentives strengthen goal commitment if the amount of money is sufficiently large and the incentives are not tied to goals perceived as impossible. Though, engaging in taking charge behaviour has been defined to be voluntary, it is however important that managers understand how to promote this essentially beneficial attribute of their employees by providing the fuel that power their set work goals such as special incentives.

A number of studies examined situations in which the accepted relationship between goals and performance was not observed. First, research suggests that goals can narrow an individual‘s focus to perform only behaviors directly associated with goal attainment, at the cost of other desirable behaviors Staw and Boettger (1990).

Second, research suggests that multiple goals can sometimes cause individuals to experience conflict, and sacrifice performance on one goal to meet a second goal (Tubbs, 1993).

Third, research suggests that difficult goals do not always result in higher performance on complex tasks; inspiring researchers to examine factors that might make goal-setting effective for these tasks (Mone & Shalley, 1995).

Empirical Review

Core self-evaluations and taking charge at work

A study involving 456 salespeople conducted by Erez and Judge (2001) showed that those with higher levels of core self-evaluations were both more persistent in their tasks and also put forth greater efforts toward achieving success. Similar results were obtained in more controlled laboratory setting as well. Since this intial investigation, subsequent research has largely confirmed the importance of the core components and the aggregated core self-evaluations construct in the prediction of job attitudes. The average meta-analytic correlation of the four aggregated traits with job satisfaction was shown to be r= 0.41 (Judge & Bono, 2001).

Bono and Colbert (2005) found that individuals high in core self-evaluations were more satisfied compared to those with low core self-evaluations, when they received multi-level source feedback. Those with high core self-evaluations were more committed to goals when their own self-ratings did not match the ratings provided by others, whereas those with low core self-evaluations were more committed to goals when their ratings did match the ratings provided by others. To put this in a different way, those with high core self-evaluations seemed to prefer hearing opinions that were consistent with their own. Core self-evaluations has also been found to relate to proactive work behaviours. Specifically, core self-evaluations has been linked to proactive coping in response to stress (Kammer-Mueller, Judge and Scott, 2009), to entrepreneurial activity and risk taking (Simsek, Heavy & Veiga, 2010) and constructive responses to performance feedback (Bono & Colbert, 2005).

Judge et al. (2000) found that employees with positive core self-evaluations not only perceived their job as higher in intrinsic characteristics, they actually attained jobs that were more complex. Specifically, in a laboratory study in which participants solved anagrams, core self-evaluations were positively related to self-reported task motivation ($r=0.39$, $p<0.01$), persistence (time spent) in solving anagrams ($r= 0.24$, $p<0.05$), and task performance (number of anagrams solved) r= 0.35, $p < 0.01$). Judge et al. *(*1999) found associations between core self-evaluations and organizational commitment (r=0.52, $p < 0.001$).

Also, Srivastava, Locke, Judge and Adams (2010) found that positive core self-evaluations caused individuals to seek complex and challenging work (because they believe themselves capable of performing such work), they obtain more complex jobs (because of greater beliefs in their ability to perform these jobs, and also perhaps because employers are more likely to select them for such jobs (Judge, Erez et al.,1998), and perceive these jobs as more challenging in turn.

Other studies have found similar levels of relationship using core self-evaluations measured directly ((Best, et al., 2005; Heller, Judge, & Watson, 2002; Judge & Bono, 2001; Judge, & Watson, 2002; Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, 2005, Judge et al., 2002; Abikoye and Sholarin, 2012).

Indeed, Judge, Thoreson, Pucik and Welbourne (1999) found that managers who scored high on the core self-evaluations traits were able to cope better with organizational change. As suggested by a reviewer, it is also possible that core self-evaluations are linked to performance ratings such as taking charge because supervisors may like employees with high core self-evaluations (they may find positive employees more pleasant to be around regardless of their objective level of performance).

Whereas the focus of core self-evaluations research has been on its relationship with job satisfaction and job performance, there have been occasional studies that have examined other work and life correlates. For example, Judge et al. (2002) examined the relationships between the core self-evaluation traits and life satisfaction, happiness, stress (self-reported stress on the job), and strain (somatic symptoms). Weighted average correlations across all four traits and four samples were 0.25 for life satisfaction, 0.56 for happiness, 0.23 for stress (a high score indicates low stress), and 0.24 for strain (high score indicates fewer symptoms). Judge et al. (1999) also found associations between core self-evaluations and salary (r ¼ 0.10, p < 0.05), career plateauing (r ¼_0.32, p < 0.01), and organizational commitment (r ¼0.52, p < 0.01).

Other empirical studies have also linked core self-evaluations to motivational variables, including self-determination, task motivation, and goal setting behaviour (Bono & Colbert, 2005). Individuals high in CSE are likely to hold positive expectations about their ability to perform. High CSE is one of the personality traits that researchers gave named proactive personality. High CSE is theorized to positively influence employee behaviour and job attitudes, one of such attitudes should be taking charge at work. Then, from the empirical study, there are relations between self-evaluation and motivational variables, including self-determination, task motivation, and goal-setting behavior (Erez & Judge, 2001).

Self-monitoring and taking charge at work

The relevance of self-monitoring personality to performance in organizational settings was examined recently using meta-analytic procedures by Day, Schleicher, Unckless and Hiller (2002). A total of 136 data samples (N523, 191) were used by these scholars to estimate the relationships between self-monitoring and various work-related constructs: job attitudes (including organizational commitment, job satisfaction, job involvement, and role stressors), individual ability, job performance and advancement and leadership. Conceptualizing the criterion domain in broad terms as compared with a narrow focus solely on performance outcomes is more descriptive of how individual employees contribute to the broader organizational mission (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

Indeed, a meta-analytic research by Day & Schleicher (2006) using 3,089 participants with 28 samples shows that high self monitors are generally more concerned with – and successful in – getting along and getting ahead at work .

Day, Schleicher, Unckless and Hiller (2002) using 2,777 participants with 23 samples in the meta-analysis also found out that high self-monitors also tend to engage in proactive behaviors such as pursuing leadership roles, feedback-seeking (Moss et al., 2003). Thus, under conditions of accountability, high self-monitors are likely to be particularly motivated to engage in proactive behaviour in order to create favorable impressions, whereas low self-monitors are likely to be comparatively indifferent to how their actions appear to others and thereby less likely to engage in proactive behaviour.

Blakely, Andrews and Fuller (2003) sampled two hundred and three (203) professionals and 71 supervisors who were asked to complete a measure of OCB for their subordinates of a Federal research laboratory. The research sought to establish the relationship between self-monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviour. Self-monitoring was found to be significantly correlated with the interpersonal helping OCB dimension at Time 1 ($r = .24$, $p = .01$) and at Time 2 ($r =.18$, $p = .05$) and also with the individual initiative OCB dimension at Time 1 ($r = .20$, $p = .01$) and at Time 2 ($r = .20$, p

= .05). An examination of the initial Time 1 model, in which interpersonal helping in regressed on self-monitoring and the four control variables, reveals that the model is statistically significant and that the relationship between interpersonal helping and self-monitoring remains statistically significant, after controlling for organizational commitment, job satisfaction, perceived organizational support, and the motivating potential score. Self-monitoring was also found to significantly predict individual initiative even after taking into account the four control variables.

The role of self-monitoring orientation on network position and workplace performance was the focus of one such recent study by Mehra, Kilduff and Brass (2001). Mehra et al. found in a sample of 116 employees of a high-technology company that high self-monitors were more likely than low self-monitors to occupy central positions in their social networks, which was shown to predict independently individuals' workplace performance (in addition to self-monitoring scores). As noted by the authors, the results ‗paint a picture of people shaping the networks that constrain and enable performance'' (p. 121). High self-monitors appear to have access to the kinds of diverse information needed to make sense of various opportunities that contribute to better individual and group performance (Sparrowe et al., 2001) as well as long-term career success (Seibert, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001).

In a field study that examines how self-monitoring, leader-member exchange, and objective performance interactively influence performance appraisals, Duarte and Goodson (2012) collected data from 367 employees of a telephone company in the Southeastern United States. Twenty five supervisors, with spans of control ranging between 8 and 18, rated their employees on various performance dimensions. The results obtained posits that self-monitoring and objective performance interactively influence ratings such that high objective performers receive higher ratings than low objective performers regardless of their monitoring status; low performing high self-monitors receive higher ratings than low performing low self-monitors with the overall model being significant ($F=54.24$; df: 3, 237, $p<.001$) and the Objective Performance x Self-monitoring interaction term being significant as well ($t=-2.243$, $p<.05$). The results further indicated that the relationship between self-monitoring and performance ratings is dependent on the level of objective performance. High performers receive high ratings regardless of their self-monitoring. For low performers, ratings improve as self-monitoring increases.

While studies such as these show that self-monitoring is selectively related to performance ratings, it is not clear whether high self-monitors are actually better performers or whether they are adept at receiving better ratings through manipulation of the social situation. A meta-analysis by Day, Unckless, Schleicher, and Hiller (2002) showed a weak but significantly higher relationship between self-monitoring and subjective measures of performance ($r=.15$) than objective measures of performance and advancement ($r=.03$).

Based on the results of the Day et al. (2002) meta-analysis, an empirically based picture emerges of the self-monitoring personality at work. In general, high self-monitors (in comparison to low self-monitors) tend to be more involved in their jobs, have higher levels of cognitive ability, perform at a higher level, are rated as better managers, and are more likely to emerge as leaders. Based on this positive picture of the high self-monitor, a question might be asked as to why any organization would ever want to hire a low self-monitor (given a choice). In terms of positive outcomes, low self-monitors were only found to have lower levels of reported role stress and stronger commitment to the organization.

Supervisory support and taking charge at work

Using a sample of 115 employees from a utility company, Fuller, Marler and Hester (2006) study posits that linkage to resources was a critical factor in employees‘ felt responsibility for constructive change in the organization. Autonomy to use resources signals the organization‘s support for proactivity (Scott & Bruce, 1994) and trust that the resources will be used responsibly. Access to resources to pursue proactive goals also communicates to employees the organization‘s endorsement of proactivity.

Chen and Chiu (2008) examined the mediating processes underlying the relationship between supervisor support and and employee organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). They collected data from 323 employees and their immediate supervisors in seven Taiwanese companies. Results showed that supervisor support influenced the employees‘ OCB indirectly through two cognitive processes (job satisfaction and person-organization fit) and one affective process (job tension).

Wang (2014) examined the role of organizational commitment on perceived supervisor support (PSS) and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). Also, the moderating effect of organizational tenure on the relationship between PSS and OCB was tested. Using two hundred and thirty eight (238) employees from Chinese employees, the author performed hierachical regression analyses to examine the mediation and moderation models. Results showed that employees perceiving more support from the supervisor were more likely to conduct OCB, and this greater likelihood, to a large extent, was realized through employees‘commitment to the organization. The relationship between PSS and organizational commitment was however reported to be stronger among employees with long tenure.

Rousseau and Aube (2010) in their quest to deepen the understanding of the relationships between perceived organizational support (POS) and the dimensions of organizational commitment (i.e. affective, normative and continuance commitment), and to test the moderating effect of locus of control and work autonomy used a sample of 249 prison employees. The results showed that POS is positively and significantly correlated with affective and normative commitment. In addition, the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses support the moderating effect of *locus* of control and work autonomy with regard to the relationship between POS and affective commitment. This study highlights the importance of providing support to employees in order to foster their affective and normative commitment to the organization. Moreover, the results provide evidence in favour of managerial interventions aimed at enhancing perceived control and, consequently, minimizing the negative effects of a lack of organizational support on employees' affective commitment.

Ohly, Sonnentag and Plunk (2006) using 301 leaders and subordinates in the United states reported that leader support positively predicts various forms of proactive behaviours, including personal intiative , and idea implementation (Axtel et al., 2000).

Some empirical studies have also proved the relationship of supervisor support and employee job performance including extra role behaviours. For example, supportive leader behaviors were found to be positively related to every form of OCB in the study conducted by Wayne (1997) using 250 employees to study the effects of leadership style on self-regulatory mindset of employees also found to have an impact on organizational commitment, which is a strong predictor of taking charge

Other empirical studies have focused on examining the relationship between work-family support practices and organizational performance such as profitability, product quality, ability to grow, ability to attract essential employees, market value, and management-employee relations (Konrad & Mangel, 2000; (Perry-Smith & Blum, 2000; (Meyer, Mukerjee & Sestero, 2001). In some cases, support includes outcome-focused elements, such as praise and rewards for good performance (Ohly et al.; Oldham & Cummings) which might undermine intrinsic motivation for proactivity. With regards to career satisfaction, Wickramasinghe and Jayaweera (2010) examined the effect of supervisory support on career satisfaction using 232 employees. The results revealed that supervisory career support significantly predicted career satisfaction (Wickramasinghe and Jayaweera, 2010).

A research done by Bartlett (2001) using 230 employees in three blue chip companies demonstrated that employees were more affectively committed to the organization when they received supervisor and coworker support. From Bartlett‘s study, it can be inferred that the display of this commitment could be as a result of the employees taking charge at work by going beyond statutory responsibilities enshrined in their job descriptions.

Summary of Literature Review

From the foregoing, six (6) theories were reviewed. Expectancy theory centered on the notion that an employee‘s behaviour is motivated by the expectation that his/her behaviour will lead to certain outcomes, together with the value he/she places on those outcomes. According to the theory, employees act on the basis of consequences, or, more specifically, the expected consequences of their behaviours (Vroom, 1964). The focus of attachment theory on the other hand is the role of support from others (in this case, supervisory support) in promoting employees‘ exploration. The theory suggested that sensitive and responsive caregivers offer secure base to them explore, learn about, and become competent in interacting with novel environments. Three forms of informal supports that promote exploration according to Feeney and Thush (2010) were availability, encouragement of growth, and noninterference.

Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) may provide a solid background to explain the SS–TC relationship. According Blau (1964), employees are likely to reciprocate the favorable conducts of people with whom they interact. In general, the literature indicates the employee–organization exchange tends to foster employees' attitudes and behaviours toward the organization, and the employee–supervisor exchange is more related to those attitudes and behaviours toward the supervisor (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002; DeConinck, 2010). From the standpoint of employees, there is a possibility that they have mixed perceptions for the organization and the supervisor (DeConinck, 2010), and thus they may also respond to supervisors' actions by releasing attitudes or behaviours toward organizations. According to the norm of reciprocity, employees are obligated to return favours that have been delivered by the employers in the course of interactions (Suazo, 2011).

Self determination theory premise on the belief that human beings show persistent positive features that shows effort and commitment in their lives, which are inherent growth tendencies. At the heart of this theory is the identification of three psychological needs: autonomy (deCharms, 1968), competence (White, 1959) and relatedness (Beaumeister & Leary, 1995). These needs are the basic nutrients required for taking charge at work. According to both theory and research, high self-monitors have an edge in terms of getting along at work because their interpersonal style is adaptive and flexible. High self-monitors are motivated to meet the expectations of others, which is also likely to enhance their likeability. It has been argued that likeability is a key variable that is associated with progression into middle management (Hogan, Curphy & Hogan, 1994); thus, there is an inherent link between getting along and getting ahead in organizations which shares the same attribute of taking charge at work. Day et al. (2002) earlier findings revealed that high self-monitors have greater ability to become leaders rather that low self-monitors. Studies by DeMarree, Wheeler, & Petty (2005) showed that low self-monitors are less likely to engage in taking charge behaviours under conditions of accountability, as they tend to ignore and resist social expectations. Indeed, they also posited that high self-monitors are generally more concerned with – and successful in- getting along and getting ahead at work (Day & Schleicher, 2006). They tend to engage in proactive behaviours such as pursuing leadership roles (Day, Schleicher, Unckless & Hiler, 2002) and feedback-seeking (Moss et al., 2003). Thus under conditions of accountability, high self-monitors are more likely to engage in taking charge behaviour in order to create favourable impressions. Again, a search of the literatures shows scanty scholarly works on self-monitoring and taking. This calls for more targeted studies.

Goal-setting theory by Locke and Latham (1990) demonstrated that there appear to be two cognitive determinants of behaviour: values and intentions (goals). For Locke and Latham, goals, therefore direct attention and action. Based on a number of studies of goal setting, employees provided with specific, difficult but attainable goals performs better than those with non easy, nonspecific, or no goal at all. The scholars opined that in order for assigned goals to affect employee performance, they must initially accept the goal and remain committed to it. Findings by Erez, &

Bono (2001) in their study of sales people found that those with higher levels of core self-evaluations were both more persistent in their tasks and also put forth greater effort towards achieving success. Core self-evaluations have also been found to relate to proactive work behaviour. Specifically, it has been linked to proactive coping in response to work stress (Kammer-Mueller, et al., 2009), to entrepreneurial activity and risk taking (Simsek, Heavy, & Veiga, 2010) and constructive responses to performance feedback (Bono & Colbert, 2005). Judge et al. (2000) also found that positive core self-evaluators not only perceived their job as higher in intrinsic characteristics, they actually attained jobs that were more complex. The limitation of empirical studies on the contribution core self-evaluations to taking charge creates the premise for further studies such as this.

Finally, previous studies found that social support from the organization can increase employee‘s good impression of the organization and acceptance of the organization‘s goals and values, and thus lead employees commit more to their organizations (Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). Employee commitment has also been shown to contribute to OCB (Chiaburu & Byrne, 2009; Lehmann-Willenbrock, Grohmann, & Kauffeld, 2012). More directly, Liu (2009) found that organizational commitment can mediate the relationship between perceived organizational support (POS) and OCB. Due to the close connectedness of PSS and POS, this study can logically extend these previous findings to the SS–TC linkage. Several studies reported that supervisory support positively predicts various forms of proactive behaviour, including personal intiative (Ohly, Sonnentage & Plunk, 2006), and idea implementation Axtel et al., 2000). From these findings, it will be in place to suggest that they could be a positive relationship between taking charge behaviours of employees and supportive supervision.

It is interesting that although researchers have a considerable understanding of how LMX relates to a host of outcomes, including in-role (task) performance as well as attitudinal variables such as satisfaction with leader and organizational commitment, they have less understanding of how LMX is related totaking charge behaviour. For example, the most comprehensive meta-analysis of the LMX literature examined a number of outcomes, including performance ratings, objective performance, and overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisor, organizational commitment, role conflict, role clarity, turnover, and member competence (Gerstner & Day, 1997) but did not include organizational taking charge behaviour criteria. In a small-scale meta-analysis based on 18 primary studies, Hackett, Farh, Song, and Lapierre (2003) reported a meta-analytic correlation between LMX and citizenship behaviours of .32. These authors also suggested that there were no moderating influences affecting the relationship between the two constructs.

Hypotheses

1. Core self-evaluations will significantly play a positive role on employee behaviour of taking charge at work
2. Self-monitoring will significantly play a positive role on employee behaviour of taking charge at work
3. Supervisory support will significantly play a positive role on employee behaviour of taking charge at work.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

Participants for this study were 200 direct reports (followers), and 26 supervisors, from one department within three licensed Mobile Money Organizations (MMOs) located in Abuja. Two hundred and fifty seven (257) questionnaires were sent to the organizations, 219 questionnaires were retrieved, and however, 200 well completed questionnaires were analyzed for a valid response rate of 78%. Participants in this study were mainly salespeople/business developers and their immediate supervisors/managers. The majority were female (58%) and (42%) were male.

The direct reports also had varying levels of education. The largest percentage had a bachelor‘s degree (41.5%), followed by postgraduate‘s degree (26.5%), National Certificate of Education/National Diploma (26%) and O‘Level (6%). The mean age was 34.05 years (*SD* _ 8.20). The focal employees, on average, had 4.08 years of job experience with the present employer (*SD* _ 4.18) and 3.72 years of organizational tenure (*SD* _ 3.14).

INSTRUMENTS

Four standardized instruments were used to assess the study variables: taking charge scale, core self-evaluations scale, self-monitoring scale and supervisory support scale. In addition, the data came from two sources (i.e., supervisors and direct reports-employees), this helped in reducing the common method bias that is most prevalent in most organizational studies (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003). The independent variables (i.e., core self-evaluations, self-monitoring and supervisory support) were gathered by assessing the direct reports. The dependent variable was obtained by asking the supervisors to answer items measuring their perception of their direct reports‗ taking charge behaviour.

Taking Charge at Work Scale

Morrison and Phelps (1999) measure of taking charge at work was used in the study. The scale has 10-items co-worker or supervisor ratings that ranges from strong disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Morrison and Phleps (1999) reported a Cronbach‗s alpha reliability of .95 using ratings from supervisor/co-workers. Onyishi, Ugwu and Ogbonne (2012) adopted a self-report measure using Nigerian samples and they reported item total correlation ranging from .30 to .66 and a Cronbach alpha of .81. However, in the current study, Cronbach alpha of .78 independent ratings from direct reports‗supervisors were obtained in a pilot study involving 104 sales representatives drawn from three (3) mobile money organizations in Abuja.

A sample item is 'this employee often tries to institute new work methods that are more effective for the company'.

Core Self-Evaluations Scale (CSES)

The 12-item Core Self-evaluations Scale (CSES) developed by Judge and Bono (2003) was used to assess core self-evaluations. The instrument is scored along a five-point Likert scale with options ranging from ―Strongly Disagree‖ (1) to ―Strongly Agree‖

(5), and with higher scores denoting high core self-evaluations and vice versa. Six item on the scale (items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12) are reverse scored while items 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11 are direct scored. Robust psychometric properties have been reported for the scale ((Abikoye and Sholarin, 2012) including an average reliability of .84, test re-test reliability of .81; item-total correlations ranging from .48 to .55 as well as high and positively correlated inter-item matrices (when the negatively worded items had been reverse scored) when used with Nigerian sample.

The instrument contains items, including, — I am confident I get the success I deserve in life,‖ —sometimes when I fail I feel worthless,‖ — I am filled with doubts about my competence,‖ and — I determine what will happen in my life‖. This measure was chosen as it is an emerging dispositional assessment that has demonstrated relationships with several organizationally-based constructs such as job satisfaction and job performance (Judge et al., 2005; Judge & Bono, 2001; Judge et al., 2000). In the current study, a Coefficient alpha of .74 was obtained in a pilot study involving 104 salespeople drawn from three (3) mobile money organizations in Abuja

Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS)

This 18-item scale measures the level of self-monitoring in an individual. There are two response choices, true or false. High self-monitoring individuals should have high scores in the keyed direction, while low self-monitoring individuals answer in the alternative direction. Snyder and Gangestad (1986) report an acceptable level of internal consistency reliability for this scale (= 0.70), where an alpha of 0.70 is the minimum considered acceptable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Previous work has found this measure to have moderate internal reliability, with Cronbach‘s alpha ranging from 0.67 to

.75 (Ahmed, Garg, & Braimoh, 1986). The scale also exhibits good construct validity (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000), although there is evidence that the measure might be multi-faceted (Ahmed et al, 1986).

For the purpose of this study, the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (RSMS) provided by Lennox and Wolfe (1984) is used. The scale is composed of 13 items and divided into two subscales: Ability to Modify Self-presentation and Sensitivity to the Expressive Behavior of Others. Items are scored on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*certainly, always false*) to 5 (*certainly, always true*). The self-presentation subscale consists of 7 items (e.g., ―I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.‖) and the sensitivity subscale consists of 6 items (e.g., ―I am often able to read people‘s true emotions correctly through their eyes‖). Cronbach‘s alpha in previous studies range from 0.75 to 0.83 (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Shuptrine, Bearden, & Teel 1990). This scale was adopted mainly due to its likert scaling format which made the scale consistent in response format with the three other variables of interest in this current study and for its fewer items when compared to the 25-item scale true/false response format originally developed. In the current study, a Coefficient alpha of .80 was obtained in a pilot study involving 104 salespeople drawn from three (3) mobile money organizations in Abuja.

Supervisory Support Scale (SSS)

This nine-item scale measures individual perceptions of the extent of supervisory support in their job. Supervisory support was assessed with a five-point Likert-type scale where one corresponds strongly disagree to and five corresponds to strongly agree.

Therefore, high scores on this scale suggest high levels of supervisory support. Greenhaus et al. (1990) report a high coefficient alpha of 0.93 for this scale. In terms of validity, supervisory support correlated positively with perceptions of acceptance, job discretion, employee promotability, and job performance in terms of both tasks and relationships (Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Wormley, 1990).

Items from this scale includes: ― My supervisor takes the time to learn about my career goals and aspiration‖ ―My supervisor gives me helpful feedback about my performance‖ and ―My supervisor cares about whether or not I achieve my goals‖

Procedures

The following procedure was used in gathering the data set. First, the approval of the Department of Psychology at the University of Nigeria, Nsukka was sought and obtained. After this approval was obtained, organizations were contacted directly by the researcher and permission was obtained from the supervisors of all participants through the Human Resources department at the organizations. Generally, this required meeting multiple times with an organization to assess their level of commitment and willingness to partner on the current study.

Approval from one large mobile money service organization was first obtained. Initial interest was obtained from one key leader in their personnel/human resource department, who saw the potential relevance of the study, and the potential benefit for the organization. This key leader then facilitated setting up with other key leaders within the organization who has the potential power to approve the organization's participation in the study, one-one meetings were also arranged to continue the approval process. After these multiple meetings and one-one sessions, approval was obtained from the organization.

With the assistance of the Human Resource department, the first names, last name, and phone numbers for each direct report participant and supervisor were obtained. This included sufficient information to be able to link supervisors with their respective direct reports. An identification number was assigned to each direct report. The first number identifies the group they belonged to, and the second number identifies them as direct report within the group. The identification number allowed for proper identification, linking of the direct report data with the appropriate supervisor, and facilitation of the multilevel sampling procedure that was used. This identification number also ensured the confidentiality of the individual responses.

Two hundred and fifty seven (257) surveys were distributed to direct reports in the organizations. These direct reports were from a potential 46 supervisors (i.e., groups).This survey consists of items measuring their perception of their supervisor's support characteristics, items measuring their perception of their own core self-evaluations, and self-monitoring. The surveys made available to the organizations, were completed and returned by the participants anonymously to a box provided that would be retrieved at a predetermined time by a volunteer staff of each of the organization. They were assured that their responses would be confidential and that their individual responses would not be seen by anyone in the company.

These responses from the direct reports were organized so as to examine how many different supervisors where rated. Or in other words, how many different supervisors (i.e., groups) these direct reports originated from. To prevent survey fatigue of supervisors, a ceiling of 10 direct reports per supervisor was used. If a supervisor had more than 10 direct reports, random digit numbers were generated to determine which employees would be excluded from this study.

A second survey was then distributed to supervisors asking for their perception of their direct reports‘ taking charge at work behaviour. This was distributed to 26 supervisors- a response rate of 57%. Data from the direct reports and supervisors were combined to form a complete data set. This resulted in valid responses from 200 direct reports, and 26 supervisors.

Design/Statistics

The research employed a cross-sectional survey design because one or more samples were drawn from the population at one time. Multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the data. Statistical package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was employed in the data analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

First, a preliminary analysis was conducted on the data obtained from respondents to ascertain the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables (see Table 1). Next, hierarchical multiple regression was conducted to test the hypotheses of the study with taking charge at work as the dependent variable. The variables were entered into the equation in four steps. The first step consists of the demographic variables (gender, marital status, level of education, organizational tenure, job tenure, and age) that were entered into the equation as control variables. The second, third, and fourth step consists of core self-evaluations, self-monitoring, and supervisory support, respectively that were entered into the equation to test their predictability of taking charge at work (see Table 2). All data were analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0.

Table 1

Means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables

	Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Gender	1.58	.49	—						
2	Marital status	1.42	.49	-.04	—					
3	Level of education	2.89	.87	-.09	-.07	—				
4	Organizational tenure	3.72	3.14	-.08	-.24***	.11	—			
5	Job tenure	4.08	4.18	.05	-.14	-.06	.02	—		
6	Age	34.05	8.20	-.10	-.33***	.20**	.32***	.58***	—	
7	Core self-evaluations	41.99	5.57	-.05	.07	-.10	-.07	.12	.03	—
8	Self-monitoring	46.60	7.29	-.09	.06	.10	-.08	-.00	-.03	.17*
9	Supervisory support	34.00	7.29	-.03	-.01	.01	.00	-.00	.08	.09
10	Taking charge at work	37.90	5.84	.08	-.15*	.08	.03	-.04	.09	-.06

Note. N = 200 * = p < .05(two-tailed), ** = p < .01 (two-tailed), *** = p < .001 (two-tailed). Gender was coded 1 = male, 2 = female; marital status: 1 = married, 2 = single; level of education: 1 = O'Level, 2 = NCE/ND, 3 = HND/Bachelor Degree, 4 = Postgraduate Degree. Organizational tenure, job tenure, and age were coded in years, such that higher scores represent higher number of years spent in the organization, or higher number of years spent on the job, or older age.

The results in Table 1 indicated that among the demographic variables, marital status was significantly and negatively correlated with taking charge at work (r = -.15, p = .030) whereas gender, level of education, organizational tenure, job tenure, and age were not significantly correlated with taking charge at work. It was posited in Hypothesis 1 that core self-evaluations would be positively related to taking charge. The results did not support this hypothesis for employee assessment. Self-monitoring (r = .16, p = .027) and supervisory support (r = .27, p < .001) were however positively correlated with taking charge at work.

Table 2
Hierarchical multiple regression of predictors of taking charge at work

Variable	**Step 1** β	**Step 2** β	**Step 3** β	**Step 4** β
Controls				
Gender	.10	.09	.11	.11
Marital status	-.13	-.13	-.13	-.13
Level of education	.05	.05	.02	.03
Organizational tenure	-.04	-.04	-.03	-.02
Job tenure	-.14	-.13	-.14	-.11
Age	.14	.14	.15	.11
Core self-evaluations		-.03	-.07	-.08
Self-monitoring			.19**	.15*
Supervisory support				.25***
Adjusted R^2	.018	.014	.042	.100
ΔR^2	.048	.001	.032	.060
ΔF	1.61	.21	6.70**	13.26***

Note. * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$

The results of the hierarchical multiple regression in Table 2 indicated that the demographic variables: (gender, marital status, level of education, organizational tenure, job tenure, and age), collectively accounted for only 1.8% variance in taking charge at work and were not significant individual predictors of taking charge at work. Further, the results also revealed that core self-evaluations was not a significant predictor of taking charge at work as it accounted for only 0.1% of the variance in taking charge at work. Meanwhile self-monitoring ($\beta = .19$, $p = .010$) and supervisory support ($\beta = .25$, $p < .001$)were significant positive predictors of taking charge at work and accounted for additional 3.2% and 6% of the variance in taking charge at work, respectively.

Thus, Hypothesis 1 which stated that core self-evaluations would significantly predict taking charge at work was rejected. However, Hypotheses 2 and 3 that stated respectively, that self-monitoring and supervisory support would significantly predict taking charge at work, were confirmed.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

This study investigated the roles of core self-evaluations, self-monitoring and supervisory support were examined as possible antecedents to taking charge at work. The finding of this study gave support for two out of the three proposed hypotheses. This chapter discusses the implication, limitation of the study, as well as recommendations for future research.

The first hypothesis tested in this study stated that core self-evaluations will significantly play a positive role on employee behaviour of taking charge at work. Result of the data analysis showed that core self-evaluations had a significantly negative role in taking charge at work among salespeople. Though, previous work had not considered core self-evaluations as a direct antecedent of taking charge. There are other criteria that the individual core traits have been found to predict, such as coping with organizational change (Judge et al., 1999), organizational justice (Vermunt, van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, & Blaauw, 2001), self-efficacy (Onyishi & Ogbodo, 2012), voice behaviour (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998), among others. Why would individuals undertake a task at all if they saw themselves as incapable or unworthy of success? Similarly, why set challenging goals if one believes oneself to be incompetent and why persist in the face of obstacles if one believes that success is beyond one‘s grasp? All these questions begs for further research on the role of core self-evaluations on taking charge

In this study, support was found for the second hypothesis which stated that self-monitoring will significantly play a positive role on employee behaviour of taking charge at work. Hence, these results provide support for the notion that individuals may bring with them a predisposition to perform taking charge directed at others and the organization has the ability to either enhance or limit these behaviours. Moreover, this study provided evidence of the temporal stability of these relationships and illustrates the importance of self monitoring in predicting the behaviour of taking charge at work.

Additionally, these results provide partial confirmation of past research indicating positive relationships between context-relevant attitudes and OCB. Specifically, the organization directed dimension of loyal boosterism was related to organizational commitment, job satisfaction, motivating potential, and perceived organizational support, all of these relationships held except for motivating potential. This pattern of findings, that context-relevant attitudes are related to OCBO and not OCBI, is consistent with theories of social exchange (Blau, 1964) and reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) that suggest reciprocation efforts by employees are directed at the source of benefits (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996).

While this aspect was not measured, the results suggest that HSMs may have attempted to compensate for low objective performance and low leader-member exchange by engaging in appropriate self-presentation behaviors to influence their supervisor‘s impressions of them. High self-monitors are likely to know how to rationalize their actions and manage information that others receive about them (Caldwell & O‘Reilly, 1982). They carefully evaluate their situations for cues regarding supervisor expectations and responses, and are likely to know that, despite the presence of objective information, their supervisors use some degree of subjectivity in their ratings of employees. In contrast, LSMs with low taking charge behaviour received commensurately low taking charge ratings. This result is consistent with the theoretical position that low self-monitors display a greater degree of consistency between their situational cues and behaviour. Simply put, LSMs are less concerned and comfortable about representing themselves as something they are not, and as a result, are not adept at engaging in behaviour that might create a more favorable impression than reality supports. Given that the supervisor has no information to the contrary, he or she is inclined to rate these employees in a manner consistent with their actual performance and leader member exchange status. Self-monitoring seems like a plausible result and proposed relationships were supported in this study.

This study follows a social exchange perspective to investigate the role of supervisory support and taking charge behaviour at work relationship. The third hypothesis examined in this study was that supervisory support will significantly play a positive role on taking charge at work. Result of data analysis showed that supportive supervision was a significant predictor of taking charge. Consistent with previous research (Aryee, Budhwar & Chen, 2002; DeConinck, 2010), the present results imply that the employee-organization social exchange appears impossible to be totally separated from the employee-supervisor social exchange. The findings of this study indicate that support from the supervisor can also result in employees‘ attitudes (e.g., organizational commitment) and behaviors (e.g., taking charge) that are regarded to be directed toward the organization. Although this study did not include POS and other supervisor-directed attitudes and behaviours, the present findings, together with those reported previously (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman & Taylor, 2000), suggest that in addition to distinguishing the employee-organization and employee-supervisor exchanges, perhaps it is more important to identify how they interact to influence employee outcomes. This might be particularly useful in triggering employees‘ taking charge.

The findings also reveal that organizational commitment needs to be considered for a more thorough understanding of the supervisory–taking charge association. Stepping beyond previous studies focusing on a set of organization-based variables (e.g., Liu, 2009); this study mixed the supervisor- (i.e., SS) and organization-focused variables (i.e., supervisory support and taking charge) to offer a more complex perspective. The findings support the viewpoint that the supervisor is likely to be viewed as the representative of the organization, and his or her discretion can also influence their recognition of the organization, which further influences their behaviours. Besides, employees‘ acceptance and recognition of the organization‘s values, or the tendency to commit to the organization, tend to be more sensitive to supervisor‘s actions. This phenomenon might be due to that the long-term social exchange relationship is stronger than the short-term one, but it might be more difficult to recover when it is damaged

Implications of this Study

Although there are limitations with this study, however, the results of the present study are particularly strong for several reasons. First, the taking charge ratings were obtained from the supervisor and were not subordinate self-ratings, which is characteristic of many studies of extra role behaviour such as OCB. Thus, the common source problem of inflated relationships between taking charge and other variables of interest was avoided. This approach reduced the problem of common method bias stated by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee and Podsakoff (2003). Organ and Ryan‘s (1995) meta-analysis of OCB studies found that relationships were greater when the subordinates rated their own OCBs than when the OCBs were rated by their supervisors. Also, this sample consisted of professionals, for whom taking charge are more difficult to differentiate from normal, in-role job performance. For blue collar workers, who comprise the samples for much of OCB research, extra-role job behaviours are more easily identified (Organ & Ryan, 1995). Further, one might argue that a financial institution regulated by Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), would be a strong, with rules, regulations, and numerous other constraints on behaviour that would diminish the importance of individual dispositions in influencing behaviour, thereby making the results of the current study particularly interesting.

Secondly, this study also extended our knowledge of the role of self-monitoring in the performance behaviour of employees by showing its influence on taking charge at work. The results of this study demonstrate the importance of including self-monitoring as a component in models of the performance appraisal process, particularly when the political nature of this process is considered. As recognized by Ferris and Judge (1991), HSMs are in a position to adjust their behaviour to present more favourable impressions of themselves, and, thus may use impression management techniques to enhance their outcomes in selection, performance evaluation, promotion, and/or compensation decisions.

Finally, in addition to the findings, the result suggests that organizations that are perceived to be supportive of the employees are more likely to realize the benefits of employee taking charge. This particular finding suggests that organizations that embed supportive supervision into their human resource practices are better positioned to garner the benefits of employee taking charge behaviour than organizations that fail to explicitly consider support procedures. While research on supervisory support has primarily focused on its influence as a preventive instrument to mitigate negative events, the findings advance the importance of informal support as a promotive instrument to increase the likelihood that organizational members will take charge

The complex pattern of the findings regarding personality variables supports the care with which one must interpret the correlations of personality variables versus the regressions of personality variables. Specifically, it was found that while the correlation between core self-evaluations and taking charge was not significant, the regression between self-monitoring and supervisory support and taking charge was significant respectively. These results are important because they help dispel the ―*distributive dominance*‖ myth that employees are predominantly motivated by their pay and other personal outcomes (Korsgaard et al., 1997).

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

While the results of this study showed that individuals who are high self-monitors exhibit more taking charge behaviour , it is assumed that the cues sensed by the high self-monitor and not sensed by the low self-monitor are for the individual to be helpful to co-workers. It is possible, perhaps even likely, that in some organizations such norms and cues would not only be lacking but counter to the assumptions. In some organizations high self-monitors may be responsive to cues to not help co-workers (e.g., it‘s every woman for herself). Thus, in organizations which foster a spirit of cooperativeness, high self-monitors may exhibit greater taking charge while in organizations which foster individual competitiveness high self-monitors may exhibit less taking charge behaviour. Conceivably such differences could exist within a single organization, depending on the particular organizational subunit or level of the hierarchy. Taking charge research at the group level, as has been suggested by Organ and Ryan (1995) on OCB, would be helpful in furthering the understanding of the self-monitoring and taking charge relationship. A second area of potential research pertains to other possible moderators of the taking charge-supervisor support relationship. Other than the potential moderating effect of organizational or sub-group norms, other potential moderators include leader behaviours and the extent, if any, to which the organization attempts to, incorporate taking charge behaviours into its formal appraisal system.

Limitations of the study

Despite the contributions of this study, as with any study, there are also some limitations which should be noted. First, the taking charge scale used in this study has been used in previous research (Onyishi & Ogbodo, 2012) using self-report approach and has demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties; however, the validity of this scale is not yet established in Nigeria being that the supervisor/coworker rating which the original measure was designed for is used for the first time in this study. Further, the results may simply be due to the nature of the sample rather than widely generalizable to other work settings.

The second limitation was the cross-sectional nature and use of only self-report measures do serve as there is concern that self-report methodology will lead to the overstatement of relationships between variables. To address this concern, future research should adopt a longitudinal design where the levels of taking charge and the outcome variables are assessed at various points in time so that inferences can be made about the causal nature of these relationships

Third, there were limitations based upon the study context. In this study it was difficult to control for the various jobs that the respondents had. There may have been some jobs wherein taking charge was more central to the overall job description. It is important to replicate the research findings in other different contexts and, going forward, it would also be useful to begin to think of both boundary conditions and moderators of the central findings.

Suggestions for further research

Future research is needed to continue to examine both the individual and contextual antecedents of taking charge. First, researchers could design longitudinal studies to see if core self-evaluations characteristics at individual level continue to be positively related to employees‘ outcomes over time. This would allow researchers to examine the central tenet of taking charge, that employees are developed over time because of their association with these characteristics. Longitudinal studies allow researchers to begin to track changes over time.

Second, future research needs to examine if the positive relationships in this study hold across cultures. Technology has allowed our economy to become global, rather than regional. Leaders, know more than ever, and lead different types of individuals across cultures and nations. Researchers must examine taking charge and its consequences across individuals of varying ethnicities and cultures. Some questions needed to be answered with future research. Are there some organizations where taking charge is less effective? Are there some organizations where taking charge is more effective? These and other questions are needed to examine the potential global impact of taking charge.

Third, researchers need to perform qualitative studies that examine the process by which individual and organizational characteristics facilitate taking charge within direct reports. This type of research could examine both direct reports, and taking charge through conducting interviews. Data from the interview could then be analyzed using qualitative techniques to look for overarching themes. A qualitative research agenda may allow researchers to gain the perspective of direct reports on how the supporting characteristics of their supervisors influenced their taking charge at work. Also, a qualitative study could examine the perspective of supervisors. This would allow research to understand the intentional behaviours supervisors used to facilitate an increase in direct reports‘ taking charge. An understanding of the process by which taking charge is increased could help researchers design a leader development curriculum that enhances employees‘ taking charge behaviours.

Fourth, researchers need to examine the development of a supportive supervisor style. How do supervisors acquire these characteristics? Can these characteristics be acquired by other supervisors desiring to increase their leadership abilities? What types of curriculum and experiential activities are best in facilitating the development of supportive supervision that will enhance workers‘ taking charge? These and other developmental questions need to be examined.

Finally, researchers need to examine the boundaries of taking charge. For example, are there certain types of organizations or contexts in which taking charge characteristics flourish? Are there organizations or contexts that employees may struggle in? Researchers also need to examine potential negatives of taking charge at work.

Summary/conclusion

Firms that do not challenge the status quo and do not innovate will be unlikely to

―take charge‖ of today‘s dynamic market. The critical contribution of this study is that it provides evidence that the antecedents to taking charge are based more on concerns about others than on self interest. Organizations need to be aware that to get their employees‘ to take charge within the firm, it may be more about —we‖ than it is about —me.‖ This study examined the individual and contextual differences as antecedents to taking charge at work: core self-evaluations, self-monitoring, and supervisory support. Results were reported that showed core self-evaluations were not positively related to taking charge. Self-monitoring characteristics and supervisory support were however found to play significant positive roles in employee behaviour of taking charge.

Conclusively, these results suggest several implications for managers. First, by identifying the dispositional characteristic of self monitoring as a predictor of taking charge, managers and organizations may wish to actively seek out individuals high in self monitoring. These individuals may effectively aid and support efforts to build effective work teams. Second, managers who are interested in actively promoting the performance of taking charge may need to concentrate their efforts on improving certain organizational characteristics. For example, the significant relationship between informal support and motivating potential with personal industry suggest efforts be made on improving job design that clearly highlights extra effort tracking. Identifying other stable dispositional characteristics linked with taking charge may also aid managers in promoting organizational effectiveness.

REFERENCES

Abikoye GE, Sholarin AM. (2012). core-self evaluations and psychological health among caregivers of psychiatric patients in Southwestern Nigeria. *Int J Appl Sc Tech., 2*(6), 67–72.

Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*, 422–436.

Ahmed, S. M. S., Garg, R., & Braimoh, G. (1986). Psychometric properties of Snyder's Self monitoring of Expressive Behavior Scale. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 63*, 495–500.

Allen, T. (2006). Rewarding good citizens: The relationship between citizenship behaviour, gender and organizational rewards. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,*, 36, 120-143.

Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(3), 267–285.

Ashford, S. J., & Black, J. S. (1996). Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81* (2), 199-214.

Ashford, S. J., Blatt, R., & VandeWalle, D. . (2003). Reflections on the looking glass: A review of research on feedback-seeking behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management,* , 29, 769–799.

Axtel, C. H. (2000). Shopfloor innovation: Facilitating the suggestion and implemntation of ideas. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*, 265-285.

Baard, P. P., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. (2004). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34* (10), 2045-2068.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-effcicacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37*, 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.

Bartlett, K. (2001). The relationship between training and organizational commitment: A study in the healthcare field. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12*, 1173-1182.

Basu, R. & Green, S.G. (1997). Leader-member exchange and transformational leadership: an empirical examination of innovative behaviors in leader-member dyads. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27* (6), 477-499.

Baumeister, R.F., & Twenge, J.M. (2003). *Handbook of psychology: Personality and social psychology.* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Beaumeister, R., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497−529.

Beham, B. (2011). Work-family conflict and organizational citizenship behaviour: Empirical evidence from Spanish employees. *Community, Work & Family, 14*(3), 63-80. doi:10.1080/13668803.2010.506034

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

Bishop, J. W., Dow, S.K, Goldsby, M.G., & Cropanzano, R. (2005). A construct validity study of commitment and perceived support variables: A multifoci approach across different team environments. *Group & Organization Management, 30*(2), 153-181.

Blakely, G.L., Andrews, M.C., & Fuller, J. (2003). Are chameleons good citizens? A longitudinal study of the relationship between self-monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 18*, 131-144.

Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Bono, J.E., & Colbert, A.E. (2005). Understanding responses to multi-source feedback: The role of core self-evaluations. *Personnel Psychology, 88*, 171-203.

Bono, J.E., & Judge, T.A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*, 554-571.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Explanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. S. Borman, *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, D.E., & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: The role of the "strength" of the HRM system. *Academy of Management Review,*, 29, 203-221.

Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss.* London: Pimlico.

Caldwell, D., & O'Reilly, C. (1982). Responses to failure: The effects of choice and responsibility on impression management. *Academy of Management Journal, l*(25), 121-136.

Campbell, D. (2000). The proactive employee: managing workplace initiative. *Academy of Management Executive, 14*, 52-66.

Chen, C., Chiu, S. (2008). An integrative model of linking supervisor support and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 23*(1), 1-10.

Chiaburu, D.S., & Tekleab, A.G. (2004). Extra-role behaviours challenging the status-quo: Validity and antecedents of taking behaviour. *Behaviour Conference Paper.* Academy of Management Proceedings.

Chia-Huei, W., & Parker S.K. (2014). The role of leader support in facilitating proactive work behaviour: A perspective from attachment theory. *Journal of Management*. doi:10.1177/019206314544745

Colquitt, J., B. Scott & J. LePine . (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: a meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk-taking and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 909-927.

Covey, S. (1989). *The 7 habits of highly effective people.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*.

Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2004). People make the difference: The influence of the coaching staff's human cap-ital and diversity on team performance. *European Sport Management Quarterly,* , 4, 3-21.

Dalal, R. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 1,241-1,255.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role-making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13* , 46-78.

Dansereau, F., Jr., Graen, G., Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations-a longitudinal investigation of the role-making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13*, 46–78.

Day, D. V., and Schleicher, D. J. (2006). Self-monitoring at work: A motive based perspective. *Journal of Personality, 74* (3), 685-710.

Day, D. V., Schleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. (2002). Self-monitoring personality at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 390–401.

deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior.* New York: Academic Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.* New York: Plenum Publishing Co.

DeConinck, J. B. (2010). The effect of organizational justice, perceived organizational support, and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees' level of trust. *Journal of Business Research, 63*(12), 1349–1355.

Deluga, R. J. (1998). Leader-member exchange quality and effectiveness ratings: The role of subordinate-supervisor conscientiousness similarity. *Group and Organization Management, 23*, 189–216.

DeMarree, K. G., Wheeler, S. C., & Petty, R. E. (2005). Priming a new identity: Self-monitoring moderates the effects of nonself primes on self judgements and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 657–671.

Duarte, N.T, Goodson, J. R. (2012). The compensatory role of self-monitoring in performance appraisal. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(24). doi:2219-6021

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P.D. and Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 42-51.

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

Elliot, A.J., & Reis, H.T. (2003). Attachment and exploration in adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 317-331.

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

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

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

Erez, A., M. Mikulincer, M. van Ijzendoorn & P. Kroonenberg. (2008). Attachment, personality, and volunteering: placing volunteerism in an attachment theoretical framework. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*, 64-74.

Feeney, B.C., Vleet, m.V. (2010). Growing through attachmeent: The interplay of attachment and exploration in adulthood. *journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 226-234.

Fields, D. (2002). *Taking the Measure of Work: A Guide to Validated Scales for Organizational Research and Diagnosis.* . Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Fraley, R.C., & P.R. Shaver . (2008). Attachment theory and its place in contemporary personality theory and research. In R. R. In: O.P. John, *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 518-541). New York, N.Y.: Guilford Press.

Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 23,133-187.

Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in organizational behavior. Vol. 23 (pp.133–187)., Vol. 23* , (pp.133–187).

Fuller, J. B., Marler, L. E., & Hester, K. . (2006). Promoting felt responsibility for constructive change and proactive behavior: Exploring aspects of an elaborated model of work design. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 1089-1120. doi:10.1002/job.408

Fuller, J.B., Marler, L.E., & Hester, K. (2000). Promoting felt responsibility for constructive change and proactive behaviour: Exploring aspects of an elaborated model of work design. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 27*, 1089-1120.

Gabarro, J. J. (1987). *The development of working relationships. In J. W. Lorsch.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gagne´, M. and Deci, E.L,. (2005). "Self-determination theory and work motivation". *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*, 331-62.

Gangestad, S. W. (1985). ‘‘To carve nature at its joints’’: On the existence of discrete classes in personality. *Psychological Review,, 92*, 317–349.

Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M.. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 530–555.

Geller, D., & P. Bamberger. (2009). Bringing attachment and anxiety to the job: attachment style and instrumental helping behavior among co-workers. *Human Relations, 62*, 1,803-1,827.

Gerstner, C.R., & day, D.V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82* (6), 827-844.

Goleman, D., R. Boyatzis & A. McKee . (2002). Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Gouldner, A. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: a preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review, 47*, 73–80.

Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 9*, 175-208.

Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). *Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing.* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Graen, G., & Cashman, J. F. (1975). *A role-making model of leadership in role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach.* Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Grant, A. M., Parker, S., & Collins, C. (2009). Getting credit for proactive behavior: Supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. *Personnel Psychology, 62*, 31-55.

Greenhause, J.H., Parasuranman, A., & Wormley, W.M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 46*(1), 64-86.

Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Managment Journal, 50 (2)*, 327-347.

Griffin, M.A., Neal, A., & Parker, S.k. (2007). A new model of work work role performance: Positive behaviour in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*, 327-347.

Grouzet, F.M.E., Vallerand, R.J., Thill, E.E. and Provencher, P.J. (2004). “From environmental factors to outcomes: a test of integrated motivational sequence. *Motivation and Emotion, 28*(4), 331-46.

Hackett, R. D., Farh, J., Song, L. J., & Lapierre, L. M. . (2003). LMX and organizational citizenship behavior: Examining the links within and across Western and Chinese samples. In G. B. Graen, *Dealing with diversity (A volume in LMX leadership: The series)* (pp. 219–264). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 16*, 250-279. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7

Heller, D., Judge, T.A., & Watson, D. (2002). The confounding role of personality and trait affectivity in the relationship between job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 23*, 815-835.

Hobfoll, S. E. (2002). Social and psychological resources and adaptation. *Review of General Psychology, 6*(4), 307–324.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist, 49*, 493–504.

Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms.* New York:: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Ickes, W., & Barnes, R. D. (1977). The role of sex and self-monitoring in unstructured dyadic interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(5), 659-684.

Ickes, W., Holloway, R., Stinson, L.L., & Hoodenpyle, T.G. (2006). Self-monitoring in social interaction: The centrality of self-affect. *Journal of Personality, 74*(3), 659-684.

James, B.W., Scott, D.D., Michael, G.G., & Russell, C. (2005). A construct validity of comiitment and perceived support variables: A multifoci approach across different environments. *Group & Organization Management, 30*(2), 153-181.

Janssen, O. (2002). Job demands, perceptions of effort—reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology, 73*, 287-302.

Jeony, H. (2009). *Impact of Organizational Justice and Job Security on Organizational commitment (Commitment (A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the graduate school of the.* Minnesota: University of Minnesota ed.) University of Minnesota.

Johnston, M. (2000). Delegation and organizational structure in small businesses: influence of manager's attachment patterns. *Group and Organization Management, 25*, 4-21.

Judge T, Bono J.E. (2001). A rose by any other name...Are self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, neuroticism, and locus of control indicators of common construct? In BW Roberts & R Hogan(Eds). pp. 93-118.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & 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*, 693−710.

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

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

Judge, T.A., Locke, E.A., & Durham, C.C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluation approach. *Research in Organizational Psychology, 19*, 151-188.

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

Karatepe, O. M., & Kilic, H. (2007). Relationships of supervisor support and conflicts in the Relationships of supervisor support and conflicts in the work-family interface with the selected job outcomes of frontline employees. *Tourism Management, 28*, 238-252.

Keller, T., & Dansereau, F. (2001). The effect of adding items to scales: An illustrative case of LMX. *Organizational Research Methods, 4* (2), 131-143.

Ko, j.W., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1997). Assessment of Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment in South Korea. *Journal of Psychology, 82*, 961-973.

Konrad, A., & Mangel, R. l,. (2000). The impact of work-life programs on firm productivity. *Strategic Management Journal, 21*(12), 1225-1237.

Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Lester, S. W. (1997). Beyond helping: Do other-oriented values have broader implications in organizations? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 160–177.

Korsgaard, M., Meglino, B.M., Lester, S.W., & Jeong, S.S. (2010). Paying back or paying me forward: understanding rewarded and unrewarded orgaizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(2), 277-290. doi:10.1037/a0018137

Kossek, E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L.B. (2011). Workplace social support and work-family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work-family-specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(2), 289-313. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01211.x

Latham, G. P. (2003). Goal setting: A five-step approach to behavior change. *Organizational Dynamics, 32*(3), 309-318.

Lennox, R. D., & Wolfe, R. N. (1984). Revision of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(6), 1349–1364.

Lennox, R.D., & Wolfe, R.N. (1984). Revision of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(6), 1349-1364.

Lent, R.W., Brown, S.D., & Larkin, K.C. (1987). Comparison of three theoretically derived varibles in predicting career and acdemic behaviour: Self-efficacy, interest congruence, and consequence thinkging. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*, 293-298.

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(6), 853-868.

Li, N., Liang, J., & Crant, J.M. (2010). The role of proactive personality in job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour: A relational perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology,*, 95, 395-404.

Liden, R.C. & Maslyn, J.M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: anempirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management,, 24*(1), 43-72.

Liu, Y. (2009). Perceived organizational support and expatriate organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of affective commitment towards the parent company. *Personnel Review, 38*(3), 307–319.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation. *American Psychologist, 57*(9), 705-717.

Loewenstein, G. (1994). The psychology of curiosity: A review of interpretation. *Psychology bulletin, 116*, 75-98.

Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior* (12th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. Academy of Management journal. *43*(4), 738–748.

McCauley, C. D., & Van Velsor, E. (Eds.). (2004). *The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mehra, A., Kilduff, M. & Brass, D. J. (2001). 'The social networks of high and low self-monitors: implications for workplace performance'. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*, 121–46.

Mehra, A., Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. J. (2001). The social networks of high and low self-monitors: Implications for workplace performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*, 121–146.

Meyer, C. S., Mukerjee, S., & Sestero, A. (2001). Work-family benefits: Which ones maximize profits? *Journal of Managerial Issues, 13*(1), 28-44.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. . (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mone, M. A., & Shalley, C. E. . (1995). Effects of task complexity and goal specificity on change in strategy and performance over time. 8: . *Human Performance*, 243–252.

Monge, P. R., Cozzens, M. D. & Contractor, N. S. (1992). Communication and motivational predictors of the dynamics of organizational innovation. *Organization Science, 3*, 250–274.

Moon, H. K. (2008). Me 0r We? The role of personality and justice as other- centred antecedents to innovative citizenship behaviours within organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 84-94.

Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. W. (1998). *Organizational Behavior: Managing people and organizations* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Morrison, E. W. (2006). Doing the job well: An investigation of pro-social rule breaking. *Journal of Management,*, 32, 5–28.

Morrison, E.W.,&Phelps, C. . (1999). Taking charge: Extra-role efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal,* , 42, 403–419.

Moss, S. E., Valenzi, E., & Taggart, W. (2003). Are you hiding from your boss? The development of a taxonomy and instrument to assess the feedback management behaviors of good and bad performers. *Journal of Management, 29*, 487–510.

Ning, L., Jian, L., & Crant, J. (2010). The role of proactive personality in job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviouir: A relational perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(2), 395-404. doi:10.1037/a0018079

Northouse, P. (2010). Public administration theory as discours. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 132-139.

Nunnally, J.C. & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Ohly, S, Sonnentag, S., & Plunk, F. (2006). Routinization, work characteristics and their relationships with creative and proactive behaviours. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 607-277.

Oldham, G.R., & Cummings, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual and personalfactors at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*, 607-632.

Onyishi, I. E. (2006). The role of perceived organizational support, psychological empowerment and status on organizational citizenship behaviour. *Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Nigeria, Nsukka*.

Onyishi, I.E., & Ogbodo, E. (2012). The contributions of self-efficacy and perceived organizational support when taking charge at work. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 38*(1). doi:10.4102/sajip.v8i1.979

Onyishi, I.E., Ugwu, F.O., & Ogbonne, I.P. (2012). Empowering employees for change-oriented behaviours: The contribution of psychological empowerment to taking charge at work. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 27*(3), 301-308. doi:10.2345.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour:.* Lexington, M.A:: Lexington Books.

Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviors. *Journal of Management, 36 (3)*, 633-662.

Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K., & Strauss, K. (2010). Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. *Journal of Management, 36*((4)), 827-856.

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

Perry-Smith, J. E., & Blum, T. C. (2000). Work-family human resource bundles and perceived organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(6), 1107-1117.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 879-902.

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

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviour and their effects on followers, trust in leaders, satisfaction and organizationa citizenship behaviour. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*, 107-142.

Popper, M., & Mayseless, O. (2003). Back to basics: Applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 797-809.

Powell, T. (2011). Behaviour Strategy. *Journal of Strategic Management, 32*(13), 1369-1366.

Richards, D. A., & Schat, A.C. (2011). Attachment at (not to) work: Applying attachment theory to explain individual behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 169-182.

Richer, S. F., & Vallerand, R. J. (1995). Supervisors' interactional styles and subordinates' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*(6), 707-722.

Rousseau, V., & Aube, C. (2010). Social support at work and affective commitment to the organization: The modeling effect of job resource adequacy and ambient condirtions. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 150*(4), 321-340. doi:10.1080/00224540903365380

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). . Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 68−78.

Schein, E. H. (1971). Occupational socialization in the professions: The case of role innovation. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 8*, 521–530.

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(3), 580-607. doi: 10.2307/256701

Scott, S.G., & Bruce, R.A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behaviour: A path of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 580-607.

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden, R. C. (2001). A social capital theory of career success. *Academy of Management Journal, l*(44), 219–237.

Settoon, R.P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R.C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 219–227.

Sheldon, K.M., Elliot, A.J., Kim, Y. and Kasser, T. (2001). "What is satisfying by satisfying events? Testing 10 candidate psychological needs",. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 325-39.

Shuptrine, F. K., Bearden, W. O., & Teel, J. E. (1990). An analysis of the dimensionality and reliability of the Lennox and Wolfe revised self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 54*, 515–522.

Simsek, Z., Heavy, C., & Veiga, J.F. (2010). The impact of CEO core self-evaluation on the firm's entrepreneurial orientation. *Strategic Management Journal110-119, 31*.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 526-537.

Snyder, M., & Copeland, J. (1989). *Self-monitoring processes in organizational setting.settings. In R. A. Giacolone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.),*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(1), 125-139. Retrieved 10 22, 2014

Sosik, J. J., & L.E. Megarian. (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance: the role of self-other agreement on transformational leadership perceptions. *Group Organization Management, 24*, 367-390.

Sparrowe, R.T., & Liden, R.C. (1997). Process and structure in leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management, 22*(2), 522-552.

Spreitzer, Gretchen M. and Robert E. Quinn,. (1996). "Empowering Middle Managers to be Transformational Leaders. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 32*(3), 237-261.

Srivastava, A., Locke, E.A., Judge, T.A., & Adams, J.W. (2010). Core self-evaluatios as causes of satisfaction: The mediating role of seeking task complexity. *Journal of Vocattional behaviour, 77*, 255--265.

Staw, B. M., & Boettger, R. D. (1990). Task revision: A neglected form of work performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 534–559.

Staw, B. M., & Boettger, R. D. (1990). Task revision: A neglected form of work performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 534–559.

Straub, C. (2012). Antecedents and organizationall consequences of family supportive supervisor behavior: A multilevel conceptual framework for research. *Human resource management Review, 22*(1), 15-26. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2011.08.001

Strauss, K., Griffin, M. A., & Parker, S. K. (2009). Solving the Initiative Paradox: Leader vision and the collective future self. *Paper presented at the 14th European Congress of Work and Organizational Psychology.* Santiago de Compostela, Spain.

Suazo, M. (2011). Implications of psychological contract breach: " A perceived organizational support perspective". *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 26*(5), 366-382.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *In W.G. Austin & S.Worchel (Eds), The social psychology of intergroup relations*, pp. 33-47.

Thompson, J. A. (2005). Proactive personality and job performance: A social capital perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 1011-1017.

Tubbs, M. E. (1993). Commitment as a moderator of the goal-performance relation: A case for clearer construct definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 86–97.

Tucker, A. (2007). An imperical study of system improvement by frontline employees in hospital units. *Manufacturing and Service Operations Management, 9(4)*, 492-505.

Tyler, T. R. (1999). Why people concentrate with organization: An identity-based perspective. *R. I. Sutton and B. M. Staw (EDs)*, pp. 201-247.

Van der Heijden, B. K.-B. (2010). The impact of social support upon intention to leave among female nurses in Europe: Secondary analysis of data from the NEXT survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 47*(4), 434-445.

Van der Heijden, B.I.J.M., Kümmerling, A., Van Dam, K., Van der Schoot, E., Estryn-Béhar, M. and Hasselhorn, H.M. (2010). The impact of social support upon intention to leave among female nurses in Europe: Secondary analysis of data from the NEXT survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 47*(4), 434-445.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors:Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 108–119.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L.L., & Parks, J.M. (1995). Extra role behaviours:In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity. In L.L. Cummings, & B.M. Staw (Eds). *Research in organizational behaviour, 17*, 215-285. Retrieved 10 25, 2014

Van Yperen, N. W., & Janssen, O. (2002). Fatigued and dissatisfied or fatigued but satisfied? Goal orientations and responses to high job demands. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(6), 1161-1171.

VandeWalle, D. (2001). Goal orientation: Why wanting to look successful doesn't always lead to success. *Organizational Dynamics, 30*(2), 162-171.

Vermunt R, van Knippenberg D, van Knippenberg B, Blaauw E. (2001). Self-esteem and outcome fairness: Differential importance of procedural and outcome considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 621-628.

Viswesvaran, C. N. (2001). *Assessment of individual job performance: A review of the past century and a look ahead.* (Vols. (Vol. 1,). CA: Sage: Thousand Oaks.

Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation.* New York: Wiley.

Wang, H., Law, K.S., Hackett, R.D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z.X. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(3), 420–432.

Wang, Z. (2014). Perceived support and organizational citizenship behaviour: The role of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 5*(1), 210-214.

Wayne, S., Shore, L., & Liden, R. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective . *Academy of Management Journal*, 82-111.

Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M. & Liden, R.C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*(1), 82-111.

White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review, 66*, 297−333.

Wickramasinghe, V. a. (2010). Impact of career plateau and supervisory support on career satisfaction: A study in offshore outsourced IT firms in Sri Lanka. *Career Development International, 15*(6), 544-561.

Wickramasinghe, V. and Jayaweera, M. (2010). Impact of career plateau and supervisory support on career satisfaction: A study in offshore outsourced IT firms in Sri Lanka. *Career Development International, 15*(6), 544-561.

Williams, G. C., Gagné, M., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). Facilitating autonomous motivation for smoking cessation. *Health Psychology, 21*(1), 40-50.