EMOTIONAL LABOUR, WORK CONTROL AND WORK VICTIMIZATION AS PREDICTORS OF PROACTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR AMONG ACADEMIC STAFF

BY

ISIFE, ONYEKACHI GERALD
PG/M.Sc./14/69699

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
FACULTY OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES,
UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA,
NSUKKA.

DECEMBER, 2016

TITLE PAGE

EMOTIONAL LABOUR, WORK CONTROL AND WORK VICTIMIZATION AS PREDICTORS OF PROACTIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR AMONG ACADEMIC STAFF

AN M.Sc THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF SCIENCE (M.Sc) DEGREE IN INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY

ISIFE, ONYEKACHI GERALD
PG/M.Sc./14/69699

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
FACULTY OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES,
UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA,
NSUKKA

SUPERVISOR: DR. I. E. ONYISHI

DECEMBER, 2016

CERTIFICATION

I, ISIFE, ONYEKACHI GERALD, a post graduate student of the Department of Psychology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka with the registration number PG/M.Sc/14/69699 has satisfactorily completed the requirements for course and research work for the award of Master of Science (M.Sc.) degree honours in industrial/organisational Psychology.

é é é é é é é .
Dr. I.E. Onyishi
Supervisor

é é é é é é é é é
Dr. Chris. N. Uzondu
Head of Department

é é é é é é ..
Rev.Fr.Prof.Hillary.C.Achunike
Dean Faculty of the Social Sciences

é é é é é é é é é

External Examiner

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the Almighty God, the giver of life, to my Patron Saint, St. Anthony of Padua for all his intercessions to infant Jesus who loves to linger in his arms, and finally to my parents Chief Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Nnachi Isife.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I hereby acknowledge with deep sense of appreciations the ideas of many classical scholars whose work I consulted in the course of this research work. I owe a great debt of gratitude to my project supervisor Dr. I. E. Onyishi for his wonderful supervision, contribution, constructive criticism, fatherly guidance and encouragement that eventually brought this work to its readable state.

My gratitude goes to the Head of my Department, an amiable father, Associate Prof. C.N. Uzondu, for his fatherly advice. My un-alloyed gratitude goes to all my lecturers who have imparted a great deal of knowledge and information to me and for their support which have made me to pass through this citadel of learning in learning and in good behaviour. They include, Rev. Fr. Prof. M.C. Ifeagwazu, Prof. P.N. Ibeagha, Dr. L.I. Ugwu, Dr. P.C. Mefor, Dr. Val., C. Eze, Dr. J. Eze, Rev. Sr. Dr. M.B. Nwoke, Dr. C. Uguw, Dr. A.A. Agbo, Mrs. J. Ugwu, Mrs. Nneoma Obi, Mrs. Blessing Ome, Rev. Sir. C. Onyedibe, Miss. Azubuike, Ebele, Mr. Johnbosco Chukwuorji, Mr. Toochukwu Orjiakor. I thank them for the wealth of insights they have impacted in me. And to all the non academic staff, including Mrs. B.N. Ugwu,Mrs. Ngozi Chuke,Mrs. G. Ikeme, and Mrs. Onwudinjo for their assistance, prayers and encouragement.

I am greatly indebted to my parents Chief Stephen Nnachi Isife and Mrs. Evangeline Isife for they are the best of all the parents. Their moral and financial support, encouragement, love and care have kept me moving. My brothers, Rev. Fr. Evaritus Emeka Isife, Okey, Ifeanyi and my only sister Uju Ugwu (Nee Isife) deserve my special thanks for their understanding, support and care. To all the staff especially the ones who accepted to be part of the study, God bless you all.

Finally and most importantly I give praise, honour, thanks, adoration to Almighty God who makes all impossibilities become possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

List of Appendices

ABSTRACT

This study examined emotional labour, work control and work victimization as predictors of proactive work behaviour among staff. Two hundred and twenty nine staff (229) comprising 128 males and 101 females selected from Enugu State University of Science and Technology participated in the study. Their ages ranged from 25 to 70 years. Four instruments were used for data collection and they are Emotional Labour Scale, Work Control Scale, Work Victimization Scale and Proactive Work Behaviour Scale. The result of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses indicated that the two sub-dimensions of emotional labour (surface acting and deep acting), collectively accounted 4.1% variance in proactive work behaviour of staff. Surface acting significantly and negatively predicted proactive work behaviour of staff. Deep acting positively and significantly predicted proactive work behaviour of staff (β = .22, P= .002). Work control significantly and negatively predicted proactive work behaviour of staff. Work victimization significantly and negatively predicted proactive work behaviour of staff. The implications of these findings were highlighted, limitations were stated and suggestions were made for further studies.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The current labour market is characterised by flexibility, rapid, innovation and continuous changes.Organisations are therefore looking for specific competencies and behaviours of employees that facilitate adaptation to these new labour requirements. Proactive work beheviour is one of these specific behaviours and it is defined as taking initiative in improving current circumstances or creating new ones (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008). Employees can engage in proactive activities as part of their in-role in which they fulfill basic job requirement. Extra-role can also be proactive, such as efforts to redefine oneôs role in the organisation (Crant, 2000).

Proactive work behaviour can be defined as self-initiated and future oriented actions that aim to change and improve the situation or oneself. (Crant, 2000; Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006). It involves an attempt to reduce the knowledge gap in order to bring about change. It is usually needed in facing novelty, complexity, uncertainty and conflict (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007), and stems from the need to manipulate and control the environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993). It involves overcoming potential obstacles and costs, such as resistance from others and damages in oneôs reputation, which may lead to distress and frustration (Parker, Bindl, & Strauss, 2010).

Proactive work behaviour is a self-initiated action involving goal setting, information collecting to bring about change (Frese & Fay, 2001). Although there is reasonable agreement about the salience of active rather than passive behaviours in proactive work behaviour (Ashford & Cummings, 1983, 1985; Bateman & Crant, 1993),

there is no agreement on the operationalisation of proactive work behaviour . Some researchers consider proactive work as a personal disposition akin to personality (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Parker, 2000), whereas others focus on its contextual factors, considering proactive work behaviour as a function of situational cues (Morrison & Phelps 1999).

The current study follows the later view and considers proactive work behaviour in terms of personal initiative (Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leg,& Tag, 1997), which is a pattern whereby the individual takes an active self-starting approach to work, thereby going beyond formal job requirements. Proactive employees show personal initiative and are action-directed, goal-directed, seek new challenges, and are persistent in the face of obstacles.

Two people in the same position may tackle the job in very different ways, one talks change, launches new initiatives, generates constructive change, and leads in a proactive fashion, the other tries to maintain, get along, conform, keep his head above water, and be a good custodian of the status quo. The first tackles issues head-on and works for constructive reform, the ñsecond goes with the flowò and passively conducts business as usual. The first person is proactive, the second is not. To be proactive is to change things, in an intended direction, for the better. Proactive work behaviour distinguishes individuals from the pack, and organisations from the rest of the marketplace.

Proactive work behaviour involves creating change, not merely anticipating it. It does not just involve the important attributes of flexibility and adaptability toward an

uncertain future. To be proactive is to take the initiative in improving business. At the other extreme, behaviour that is not proactivity includes sitting back, letting others try to make things happen, and passively hoping that externally imposed change ñworks out okayò. People engage in many actions that can bring about change, but not all of them are truly proactivity. First, change can be evoked unintentionally, for a negative as well as a positive outcome,this is not proactivity. Second, people can engage in cognitive restructuring by psychologically reframing or reinterpreting situations. This can be useful and beneficial as when a threat is reconstructed as an opportunity, or a situation of high stress is viewed as controllable. It can also be detrimental, as when managers deny the existence of real problems, or convince themselves of the viability of an untenable strategy. This, too, is not proactivity because it changes perceptions without changing reality.

Third, people can make conscious decisions to leave and enter situations, as when they take a new job, make acquisition or divestment decisions, or enter new markets. This is a form of proactivity, it places people and organisations in different environment. Fourth and most important here, people can intentionally and directly change things through the creation of new circumstances, or the active alteration of current ones. This is what is meant by true proactivity.

Proactive work behaviour is rooted in the peopleôs need to manipulate and control their environment (Langer, 1983; White, 1959). Many other writers have alluded to similar processes whereby individuals can behave proactively. Among psychologists,

Bandura (1986) stated that, ñpeople create environments and set them in motion as well as rebut them. People are foreactive, not simply counteractiveò (p.22). Maddi (1986) categorizes some individuals as transcendent, that is, they transform or surmount environments rather than adjust or acquiesce to them. Weisz (1990) distinguish between primary and secondary control with primary control referring to attempt to change objective conditions, and secondary control attempts to accommodate to conditions. The distinction is akin to that of George Bernard Shawôs (Handy, 1990), who described people who changed the world and those who adapt to the world. Similarly, one of the Harreôs (1984) interpersonal orientation is active (an óagentô) versus passive (a ópatientô). In the present study, the researcher conceive proactive work bevhaviour as a process that is foreactive more than counteractive, transcendent more than acquiescent, a means of primary more than secondary control and as agency more than passivity.

In the present study, one variable that may influence employeesô proactive work behaviour is emotional labour (EL). This stems from the fact that emotional labour involves employeesô management of emotions order to conform to displays rules in the organisation. Positive emotional expression strengthens employees proactive work behaviour. There is a growing body of evidence that jobs involving high amounts of EL may have adverse consequences for employees, such as burnout (emotional exhaustion) (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002, 2003; Grandey, 1999, 2003; Totterdell & Holman 2003; Zammuner & Galli, 2005) and lowered job satisfaction (Brotherige & Lee, 2002). It is important therefore, for organisations to be proactive in

managing employees in jobs with high EL demands, particularly since EL has also been associated with employeesô intentions to leave an organisation (Grandey, 1999).

Hochschild (Hochschild, 1983, p.7) defined emotional labour as ñthe management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display.ò According to Hochschild, EL occurs when employees have face-to-face voice contact with the public, are required to produces a particular emotional state in another such as the customer or client, and these environmental adjustments are monitored by their manager. Despite divergent opinions as to how EL should be conceptualized, there is general agreement that EL involves the management of emotions in order to conform to implicit or explicit display rules in organizations (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005; Glomb & Tews, 2004; Grandey 1999; 2003).

Emotional labour focuses on the external display of emotions (Ashforth, 2000; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Wharton, 1999). EL is defined as ótheact of displaying appropriate emotion (i.e., conforming to a display rule)ô (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993, p.90).

In the past, emotions were ignored in the study of organisational behaviour (Arvey, Renz, & Watson, 1998; Putnam & Mumby, 1993). The workplace was viewed as a rational environment, where emotions would get in the way of sound judgment. Thus, emotions were not even considered as explanation of workplace phenomenon. This view is being dismantled as more researchers are finding how workplace emotions have to explain important individual and organisational outcomes (Avery et al., 1998). More specifically, researchers are beginning to explore how emotions are managed by

employees to improve work outcomes. One example is an employee changing how she/he feels, or what feelings she/he shows, in order to interact with customers or clients in an effective way. Managing emotions for a wage has been termed emotional labour (Hochschild, 1983).

Within this research stream, EL is seen to occur when there are emotional job demands in employee-customer interactions and EL is defined as ñthe effort, planning and control needed to expressed organisationally desired emotion during interpersonal transactionsò (Morris & Feldman, 1996a, p.987). Emotional labour is measured as the frequency, variety, length and intensity of the emotions required in particular occupations (Mann, 1997; Morris & Feldman, 1996a). The assumption is that the greater the frequency, variety, length and intensity of emotional display, the greater will be the emotional exhaustion experienced by employees. This conceptualisation provides useful information about the internal turmoil employees may experience during customer interactions. Based on the interactionist perspective, this conceptualization also provides little insight into how employees actually translate the emotional demands into the expression of the desired emotion, that is, the influence processes employees use to manage their emotions.

Emotional labour is defined as the act of displaying appropriate emotions (i.e., conforming to a display rule; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). These researchers argue that only observable emotion is unbiased and thus should be studied in the place of inner feelings that are subjective and difficult to measure accurately. Conceptualizing EL in this way provides useful insight into the types of emotions that may be displayed in

certain occupations. However, the approach provides little insight into the experienced difference between employees felt and expressed emotions or the mechanisms and coping strategies individuals in high EL occupations utilize. Contrary to other researchers, Ashforth and Humphrey, (1993) consider that EL is not always effortful arguing that managing EL can become routine in repetitive jobs and hence, employees no longer find it stressful.

Most recently, EL has been conceptualized as the internal regulation of emotion through surface acting and deep acting strategies. These researchers (e.g. Brothridge & Lee, 1998; 2003, Glomb & Telvs, 2004; Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983; Zammuner & Galli, 2005) define emotional labour as the process of regulating both feelings and expressions for national goals. This approach examines the strategies employees use to regulate emotions during customer interactions and therefore, provides a link between the need for EL (emotional job demands), the goal of EL (emotional expression or suppressing), and the state that may occur when performing EL (emotional dissonance), (Grandey, 1999). Conceptualizing EL in this way provides insight into employees internal processes and the coping mechanisms that occur during the interpersonal interactions.

Emotional labour may involve enhancing, faking, or suppressing emotions to modify the emotional expression. Generally, emotions are managed in response to the display rules for the organisation or job (Ekman & Friesen, 1975; Goffman, 1959, Hochschild, 1983). These rules regarding the expectations for emotional expression may be stated explicitly in selection and training materials, or known by observation of

coworkers. Many work roles have display rules regarding the emotions that employees should show the public (Best, Downey, & Jones, 1997; Hochshchild, 1983). For example, those who work in customer service may encourage repeat business by showing smiles and good humour, whereas those who work as bill collectors or in law enforcement may find that an angry demand results in the best ñcustomer responseò (Hochschild, 1983; Sutton, 1991; Vanmaanen & Kunda, 1989). For therapists or judges, a lack of emotional, responding may be needed when listening to clients in each case, the emotional expression (or suppression) results in more effective workplace interaction.

Although emotional labour may be helpful to the organisational bottom-line, there has been recent work suggesting that managing emotions for pay may be detrimental to the employee. Hochschild (1983) has proposed that emotional labour is stressful and may result in burnout.

Apart from emotional labour, another variable of interest that may influence proactive work behavior is work control. According to Crantôs (2000) integrative framework of the antecedents and consequences of proactive work behaviour, two broad categories of antecedents can be identified: contextual (i.e., job resources such as work control, feedback, and variety) and individual factors (i.e., intrinsic motivation). It appears that both factors are related since challenging and enriched jobs, in which employees can draw upon many resources, generate high level of intrinsic motivation, which, in turn spurs proactive work behaviour, (Parker, 2000).

In a similar vein, Frese and Fay (2001) present a comprehensive model of antecedents and consequences of personal initiative in which, among others, work

control, job complexity, and support are considered to be ôenvironmental supportô that enhance employeeôs level of personal initiative. They argue that these environmental supports along with personality factors such as achievement motivation and action orientation, positively influence levels of personal initiative through increased motivation and skill development.

Proactive work behaviour promotes employeesô work control because it aids employees to use their skills and abilities freely in the organisational setting. The achievement of high level of organisational productivity is inseparably linked with the improvement of work control. According to Karasek and Theorell (1991) work control refers to the extent that employee can exert influence over tasks and conduct during a normal working day. The notion of work control integrates the employee authority to make decisions on the job with their skills.

Fox, Dwyer, and Gangster (1993) emphasized that it is the belief in personal control in the workplace that has the most significant impact on experienced strain. Karasek (1979) points out that high level of work control protects the employee from the harmful effect of demanding job.

The application of control in the workplace include the scheduling individual rest breaks, utilizing flextime, choosing holiday, leave and personalizing work areas. The level of work control experienced by employees may be related to the degree of autonomy that they are often given in the workplace. This proposition is supported by Karasekôs (1979) who suggested that job control is related to organisational structure. Individuals who have work control have the ability to influence the planning and

execution of work tasks. As a result, employees tend to prefer jobs that give them opportunity to use their skills and abilities and offer a variety of tasks, freedom and feedback on how well they are doing. Under conditions of moderate challenge, most employees will experience pleasure and satisfaction (Katzell, Thompson, & Guzzo, 1992).

Work victimization is another variable of interest that may influence proactive work behavior. When employees prepare to go to work to perform their daily roles they should not have to be concerned about risks to their personal security or well-being. Unfortunately, workplaces are not guaranteed safe places, and employees are not immune to experiences of harmful or negative behaviour. One common negative experience is the occurrence of workplace aggression. The diversity of workplace victimization constructs related to workplace aggression emphasizes the complexity of the phenomenon in relation to the type of aggression, who the aggressor and the target are, and the intensity of the aggressive act. However, given that each of these constructs refers to similar interpersonal behaviours in the workplace aimed at purposefully inflicting harm, there has been a growing movement to view these as part of a larger latent construct (Aquino & Lamertz, 2004; Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Hershcovis, 2011; Lapierre, Spector, & Leck, 2005). Specifically, in their annual review of psychology article, Aquino and Thau (2009) used workplace victimization as the construct to encompass aggressive behaviours in the workplace from the perspective of the target.

Workplace victimization is defined as the degree to which employees perceive themselves as being hurt by an aggressive act in the organisation that was deemed to be

intentional (Aquino & Thau, 2009). This definition includes three important components that are necessary for the understanding of perceived work victimization: subjective, perceived harm and perceived intent.

First, as explained above, workplace victimization is subjective (Aquino et al, 1999), indicating that there will be variance in how individual employees interpret a situation. Although one person interprets the situation as victimizing, and other people may not find it victimizing. Similarly, the degree to which one considers a situation to be victimizing or whether intent exists may range in severity depending on the individual or the specific point in time the behaviour occurred. Therefore, in terms of perceived work victimization, researchers cannot impose an objective threshold to determine if a situation or behaviour will lead an individual to identify as having been victimized.

Second, this definition focuses on the individualôs experience of perceived harm rather than the cognitive realization of specific social survival needs being thwarted (as was suggested in Aquino & Thau, 2009). In support of the inclusion of harm within the definition, Ochbergy (1988, p.3-19) indicates ñvictims of crime should think of victim status in psychological termsò. He goes on to specify that victims are more likely to suffer from psychological symptoms, including shame, self-blame, morbid hatred, subjugation, defilement, resignation, second injury and sexual inhibition. In consideration of these psychological symptoms of work victimization proposed by Ochbery (1988), it is proposed that when placed in a situation of aggression, an individual is likely to focus on the experience of harm rather than a cognitive processes deducing that harm has occurred. Therefore, work victimization should focus on the extent to which

psychological responses to harm were experienced in order to understand if an individual identifies as having been victimized.

Finally, this definition of perceived work victimization includes the individual targetôs perception that the perpetrator intended to commit harm with his/her aggressive behaviour (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010). In cases where a target perceives that the perpetrator did not intend to inflict harm, this is labeled as an accident and is not deemed to be a form of victimization. However, the target may perceive the perpetrator to have intended to cause harm whether harm was inflicted or not. Thus, the perpetratorôs intention is less important than the targetôs perception of the perpetratorôs purpose; consequently, it is the targetôs perception of the situation that leads to feeling of being mistreated or victimized (Aquino & Thau, 2009).

Aggressive and victimizing behaviour in the workplace are of concern to individuals experiencing the s, and the organisations these behaviours occur in, due to potential physical, psychological, and emotional harm that may result as a consequence of experiencing aggression (Aquino & Thau, 2009; Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001). Being the target of workplace aggression can lead to anxiety and depression (Bjorkquist, Osterman, & Hjelt-Back, 1994; Cortina et al., 2001; Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2001; Tepper, 2000, Zapf, 1999), burnout (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007; Grandey, Kern, & Frone, 2007; Tepper, 2000), frustration, negative emotions at work, somatic symptoms (LeBlanc & Kelloway, 2005, Frone, 2000; Rogers & Kelloway, 1997, Schat & Kelloway, 2005), lower self-esteem, and reduced life and job satisfaction of the target (Agervold & Mikkelsen, 2004; Kenshly et al., 1997; Tepper,

2000, Vartia & Hyyti, 2002). In addition to these personal outcomes, the organization is also affected by the occurrence of workplace aggression. For instance, victimized employees may experience reduced organisational commitment and leave the organisation, damaging the human capital of the organisation (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Frone, 2008). The consequences of workplace aggression present significances risks to individual health and well-being, as well as potential costs to organisational success.

Although there are many cases of employees being exposed to aggressive acts of various levels of intensity in the workplace, (e.g, incivility, bullying interpersonal conflict), not all of the employees who experience these behaviours perceive themselves to be victimized. Experiencing a form of aggression does not immediately result in an individual feeling victimized. For example, a supervisor may make the same rude comment to two employees; one employee recently hired by the organisation may feel that the supervisor intended to be harmful with the comment and therefore feel mistreated. The second employee who has been with the organisation for many years and knows this is not the usual way this supervisor may disregard the supervisorôs comment and attribute to the supervisor being stressed. The second employee may continue working during the rest of the day, unaffected by the comment. In the first case, the employee is more likely to identify as a victim and feel more victimized by the supervisor than in the experience of the second employee.

Work victimization was developed from a review of victimization literature, Aquino et al (1999, p.260-272) operationalized victimization as an ñindividualôs perception of having been exposed, either momentarily or repeatedly, to the aggressive

acts of one or more other personsò. The current study further explains that because victimization is based on the targetôs perception, it is typically a subjective evaluation as to whether one feels victimized by an aggressive act.

Aggression occurs when an individual directs a behaviour at another person or group with the purpose of causing physical (e.g shoving, punching, use of a weapon, or the destruction of a targetôs property), psychological or emotional harm (e.g. gossiping about, insulting, yelling at, criticizing, alienating, or directing rude gestures or behaviours towards a target), (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Bowling, Beehr, Bennett, & Watson, 2010; Lapierre et al., 2005). An individual who instigates an aggressive act is labeled the perpetrator and the individual who the aggressive act is directed towards is labeled the target. Only when harm is deemed to have occurred (i.e., the target is unable to achieve essential psychological and physiological needs as a result of the act) is the target then labeled a victim (Aquino & Thau, 2009). Therefore, the term victim is not necessarily synonymously applied to the label target in this relationship. An individual may be targeted by a perpetrator but not experience any physical or physiological harm. In this situation the target would not feel victimized or deem himself or herself as a victim.

Statement of the Problem

Being proactive involves self-initiated, future-focus and change-oriented behaviours. Proactive has been recognised as a positive way of behaving that can lead to the increased performance and affective of individuals and organisations, especially when employee operates in the context of unpredictable and unchanging demands. Because of its documented benefits, the antecedent and mechanisms of proactive work behaviour

have been widely examined in an effort to identify how to promote such in an organisation. Therefore, the researcher is curious to determine as follows:

1a. Will surface acting have any significant predictive relationship with proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology?

1b. Will deep acting have any significant predictive relationship with proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology?

2. Will work control have any significant predictive relationship with proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology?

3. Will work victimization have any significant predictive relationship with proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology?

Purpose of the Study

The research aim is to investigate whether:

1a. Surface acting will significantly predict proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology.

1b. Deep acting will significantly predict proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology.

2. Work control will significantly predict proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology.

3. Work victimization will significantly predict proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology.

Operational Definition of Terms

Emotional Labour: In this study emotional labour means emotions which employees feel or pretend to feel in order to meet their job requirements, irrespective of whether or not they are different from their true emotion as measured by Kruml and Geddesôs (2000) Emotional Labour Scale.

There are two dimensions of emotional labour which employees use to manage emotional expression; they are surface acting and deep acting.

Surface Acting: In this study, it means the adjustment of the outward expression of emotion to create the appropriate emotional display as determined by the organisational display rules as measured by Kruml and Geddesôs (2000) Emotional Labour Scale.

Deep Acting: In this study, it means the adjustment of internal emotion in order to display the appropriate emotional expression as measured by Kruml and Geddesôs (2000) Emotional Labour Scale.

Work Control: It is the ability of an employee to influence what happens in his/her work environment without external interferences, in particular to influence matters that are relevant to his/her personal goal, work tasks, work pace, physical movement and supervision as measured by Dwyer and Gansterôs (1991) Work Control Scale.

Work Victimization: It is the degree to which individuals perceive themselves as being hurt by an aggressive act in the organisation that was deemed to be intentional as measured by Aquino and Thauôs (2009) Work Victimization Scale.

Proactive Work Behaviour. It means a self-initiated and future oriented action that aim to change and improve the situation or oneself as measured by Bateman and Grantôs (1993) Proactive Work behaviour Scale.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

The review of literature is examined from two perspectives theoretical and empirical reviews.

Theoretical Review

The following theories are reviewed in this research. They include:

- Broaden-and-build theory
- Job design theory
- Social comparism theory
- Stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work
- Bottom-up victimization theory
- Self-determination theory (SDT)
- Job demand-resources theory (JD-R)
- An affect theory of social exchange

Broaden-and-Build Theory

Proactive behaviour is fostered through an affective pathway. Drawing on Fredricksonôs (1998) broaden-and-build theory of positive emotion, Parker (2007) proposed that positive affect is likely to influence the selection of proactive goals because it expands thinking and result in more flexible cognitive processes (Fredrickson, 1998, 2001; Isen, 1999), which in turn help individual to think ahead and rise to the challenge in pursuing proactive goals. Consistent with these ideas, positive affect has been linked with the setting of more challenging goals (Ilies & Judge, 2005). Regarding build

mechanism, Parker (2007) argued that the impact of positive affect in broaden mechanism over time is more helpful in building enduring individual characteristic thereby reducing the employeesô perceived work victimization. For example, an individual can develop higher self-efficacy after achieving challenging goals and be more resilient when encountering obstacles in goal achievement. Several studies have supported the idea that positive affect can influence proactive work behaviour. For example, Ashforth, Sluss, and Saks (2007) reported a positive correlation between positive affectivity and proactive socialization behaviours. Madjar, Oldham, and Pratt (2002) also reported that positive affect was associated with more individual creative performance rated by their supervisors. Within-person studies also suggest the benefits of positive affect for proactive work behaviour. Fritz and Sonnentag (2009) found positive affect related to taking charge behaviours both on the same and following day. Moreover, high-activated positive mood not only contributes to proactive work behaviour but also other cognitive elements in proactive process and enhances positive employees display rules or emotional expressions which promotes organisational bottom-line.

Job Design Theory of Hackman and Oldham (1976)

Job characteristics or work control can facilitate proactive work behaviour . In line with job design theory, it would be good to increase job autonomy or work control to structurally empower employees (e.g., Biron & Bamberger, 2010, Spreitzer, 1996; Thorlakson &Murray, 1996; Wall, Cordey, & Clegg, 2007), and to cultivate their proactive work behaviour regardless of their dispositions. Nevertheless, there are some jobs where it is very difficult to increase autonomy, yet proactivity is still important. For

example, jobs in safety critical industries often have highly standardized work procedures with very low method autonomy, and yet employee proactivity in the work systems is vital in the prevention of latent errors or injuries (e.g., Grote, 2007, Mark, Hughes, Belyea, Chang, Hofmann, Jones & Bacon, 2007). Recruiting individuals with a high need for cognition might be a way of achieving proactivity within such highly constrained environments in which it s highly challenging to increase job autonomy.

Job design theory has often been criticized for failing to take account of factors that influence and constrain the choice of work design (Clerg, 1984). Such factors can be internal to the organisation, such as the style of management, technology, nature of the tasks, information systems, human resource practices, strategy, history, and culture. For example, a directive style of management, an assembly-line technology or intensive performance monitoring can each act to constrain employee autonomy (Cordery, 1999). Of course, these organisational factors are in turn influenced by aspects external to the organisation, such as the uncertainty of the environment, customer demands, the available technology, social and cultural norms, economic circumstances, the nature of the labour market, and political and labour instructions. Illustrating the last factor, Garen (1999) described how national trade-union agreements can affect work design by opposing payment schemes that are important for more autonomous and flexible jobs.

An important practical contribution of expanding job design theory to include contextual antecedents is that this makes salient the many easy over and above directly manipulating job characteristics that work design might be alter reed, such as by

removing demarcation barriers, running management of development programs, or promoting cultural change. Moreover, taking account of contextual antecedents also enables us to better predict the types of work designs that will be found in various settings and to understand how wider changes taking place in modern organisations might impinge on work design.

Job redesign is a structural intervention at the organisational level that aims to change the source of employee wellbeing- their job demands and job resources. Job design describes ñhow jobs, tasks, and roles are structured, enacted, and modified, as well as the impact of these structures, enactments, and modifications on individual, group, and organisational outcomesò (Grant & Parker, 2009, p.319). Job design usually represents a top-down process in which organisations create jobs and form the conditions under which the job holders/incumbents execute their tasks. Job redesign is usually seen as the process through which the organisation or supervisor changes something in the job, tasks, or the conditions of the individual. An example of a traditional work redesign effort is the increase of individual and team autonomy in the production process. A more contemporary example concerns the introduction of project work where individuals within and outside an organisation work interdependently on the development of a product-often under time pressure. In each case, the structure and content of the work can redesigned by the organisation or by employees themselves, with the ultimate goal to improve outcomes such as employee wellbeing, work engagement, and job performance.

Social Comparism Theory, Festinger (1984)

Social comparism theory propose that high-performing employees instigate unfavourable upward social comparison from fellow group members (i.e., potential perpetrators), which results in harmful behaviours against high performers. Across multiple organisational settings and jobs, high performers are generally treated as key or star players in a work group because of their significant influence on work group or organisation performance (Cappeli, 2000; Michaels, 2001; Sturman Trevor, Bourdreas & Gernart, 2003). People who are working smarter and harder are more likely to be high performers and achieve career success (see Judge, Klinger, & Simon, 2010; OôReilly & Chatman, 1994; Schmidt & hunter, 2004). Given that employees spend much of their work hours interacting and collaborating with other work group members to accomplish their tasks in most workplace settings (See Grant & Parker, 2009; Kozlowski & Bell, 2003), work group members are easily aware of other membersô performance compared with their own (see Molleman, Nauta, & Bunk, 2007). Following unfavourable social comparison with high performers, other work group members may experience negative psychological states (e.g., lowered self-evaluations, emotions of envy), which results in harmful behaviours against high performers.

Social comparison theorists argue that in the case of abilities or performance, people are generally involved in upward comparison rather than in downward comparison (i.e., upward drive; Festinger, 1954). Festinger (1954) proposed that ñgiven a range of possible persons for comparison, someone close to oneôs own ability or opinion will be chosen for comparisonò (p.121). since most people, however, have more

favorable views of themselves than objective evidence warrants (Greenwald, 1980; Taylor & Brown, 1988), they generally choose high performers as targets of comparison (i.e., upward comparison, Lam, Van Her Vege, Waiter & Hilling, 2011). Furthermore, individuals are more likely to select a ñstandard setterò who has high levels of competence as the target of comparison (Feldman & Ruble, 1981; Goethals, 1986; Goethals & Darley 1977). In addition, given that high performance is valued in organisations and has concomitant valued outcomes fuelled by organisational evaluation and reward systems, high performers are likely to receive more attention and visibility in their work group, thus, inviting upward social comparison (See Weick, 1995)

Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work (Spector & Fox, 2005)

The phenomenon of workplace victimization refers to a gradual evolving process, whereby an individual ends up in an inferior position and becomes the target of systematic negative social acts by one or more perpetrators (Brodsky, 1976). Workplace victimization consist of repeated and prolonged exposure to predominantly psychological mistreatment, directed at a target who is typically teased, badgered and insulted, and who perceives himself or herself as not having the opportunity to retaliate in kind (Einarsen, Hoel, Zalf, & Cooper, 2003). Workplace victimization can take the form of direct acts, such as verbal abuse, accusations and public humiliation, but it can also be of a more subtle and indirect nature in the form of gossiping, rumour spreading and social exclusion (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009). However, when frequently and persistently directed at the same individual, even such subtle and indirect behaviour can be experienced as an

extreme source of social stress at work (Zapf, 1999). Exposure to workplace victimization has repeatedly been shown to have detrimental consequences for affected individuals and to have wide-ranging negative consequences for affected individuals and organisations at large (cf. Aquino & Thau, 2009; Bowling & Beehr, 2006).

Several explanations have been put forward to account for why individuals engage in victimization of others at work. Engaging as a perpetrator of workplace victimization has been proposed to be a consequence of oneself being exposed to victimization and as a problem-focused coping strategy in defending oneself against further acts of mistreatment (cf Aquino & Thau, 2009; Lee & Brotherridge, 2006). Others have proposed that victimization develops as a result of lack of social competencies and as a result of micro-political behaviour within organizations, and further as a self-regulatory process with regard to protection of oneôs self esteem (See Zapf and Einarsen, 2003 for a comprehensive discussion). However, although Zapf and Einarsen argue that individual and personality factors on the part of the perpetrator probably do play a role in the development of workplace victimization, they strongly argue against one-sided and mono-causal explanations. Explanations for why such behaviours takes place within workplaces will probably be too simplistic without also taking into account work-related and organisational factors. In this sense, the stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behaviour may prove useful (cf. Sepctor & Fox, 2005).

According to the stressor-emotion model, stressors experienced in the work environment may induce negative emotions in some individuals, which, in turn, may lead

them to engage in aggressive behaviour towards others. Processes leading up to aggressive behaviour are further related both to individual characteristics and to whether the individual perceives him or herself to be in control of the situation inducing the experience of stress and negative emotions. While several studies have shown a range of work-related factors to be related to being exposed to workplace victimization (see e.g., Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007 for a review), few studies have so far explored how such factors may relate to being a perpetrator of victimization. Still, reviewing studies relating to counterproductive work behaviour, Spector, and Fox (2005) identified experienced role ambiguity, role conflict and interpersonal conflicts as important precipitating conditions for engaging in aggressive behaviour targeted towards other individuals in the organisation, thus corresponding to work-related factors that are normally found as strong correlates of exposure to workplace victimization (cf. Bowling & Beehr, 2006).

Bottom-Up Victimization Theory (Leymann, 1990 & Einarsen, 1999)

The theory above suggests that target personality could influence temporal stability in victimization. In addition, the presence of one source of victimization might result in an increase over time in other sources of victimization. That is, victimization could start with one source or type of perpetrator, and then another source might join in. Leymann (1990; 1996) and Einarsen (1999), proposed a theory, which they call the Bottom-Up Victimization theory, suggesting that victimization from co-workers would result in subsequently increased victimization from supervisors. According to this

approach, victimization typically begins in the organisation from co-workers would result in subsequently increased victimization from supervisors. According to this approach, victimization typically as a minor conflict between two individuals who are relatively similar in their levels in the organisational hierarchy, but after a while, supervisors also join the conflict by victimizing the victim. Consistent with the just world hypothesis (Lerrner, 1980), especially a brief in a just world for others (Begue & Bastounis, 2004), some people tend to blame victims for the problems they encounter. In this case, if supervisors believe in a just world, they will attribute the cause of the victimization by co-workers to the target and will be more willing to act harshly towards the target themselves. Consistent with this, Lehmann (1990; 1996) argues that previous victimization from co-workers causes the target to become stigmatized, which results in subsequent victimization from supervisors.

In short, this Bottom-Up Victimization Theory suggests that initial co-worker victimization will result in subsequent supervisor victimization**.** Although this bottom-up phenomenon was hypothesized by other researchers (Einarsen, 1999; Leymann, 1990, 1996). Victimization of a target by co-workers may be responsible for leading supervisors to victimize the target as well. This can be a serious practical concern for organisations, because supervisors can be seen more clearly as an agent of the organisation than co-workers are, suggesting organizational responsibility and liability. Supervisors would often be expected to stop victimization rather than join in victimization. We suggest that supervisors may thus benefit from victimization awareness training or empathy and support training in order to help them make a

conscious effort to reduce victimization in the workplace. Explanatory mechanisms behind the bottom-up spread of victimization are currently unknown and future research should address it. It propose, for example, that supervisors are more likely to join in the victimization when the target is a low job performer rather than a productive one, when the supervisor is under stress himself or herself, or under conditions such as high organisational tolerance of victimization. Such issues are yet to be addressed. Target personality plays an important role in models of workplace victimization, it is important to clarify that target characteristics predict only a relatively small percentage of the variance in victimization. Much of the unexplained variance in victimizations likely due to environmental factors (e.g., organisational culture) and perpetrator characteristics. Indeed, it found that situational variables particularly role stressors, also were related to victimization, which is consistent with a recently proposed model of workplace victimization (Bowling & Beehr, 2006). It also found, however, that target personality was related to supervisor victimization after the effects of environmental variables were controlled. When employees are victimized at work setting, it reduces the employeesô level of displaying proactive work behavior thereby affecting both the employeesô and the organisational performance.

Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

Central to self-determination theory of Deci and Ryan (2000) is the distinction between autonomous and controlled motivation. Autonomy involves acting with a sense of volition and having the experience of choice. In the words of philosophers such as

Dworkin, (1988), autonomy means endorsing oneôs actions at the highest level of reflection. Intrinsic motivation is an example of autonomous motivation when people engage an activity because they find it interesting, they are doing the activity wholly volitionally (e.g., I work because it is fun). In contrast, being controlled involves acting with a sense of pressure, a sense of having to engage in the actions. SDT postulates that autonomous and controlled motivations differ in terms of both their underlying regulatory processes and their accompanying experiences, and it further suggests that behaviours can be characterized in terms of the degree to which they are autonomous versus controlled. Autonomous and controlled motivations are both intentional and together they stand in contrast to motivation, which involves a lack of intention and motivation. Activities that are not interesting (i.e, that are not intrinsically motivating) require extrinsic motivation, so their initial enactment depends upon the perception of a contingency between the behaviour and a desired consequence such as implicit approval or tangible rewards.

Porter and Lawler (1968) advocated structuring the work environment so that effective performance would lead to both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, which would in turn produce total job satisfaction. This was to be accomplished by enlarging jobs to make them more interesting and thus more intrinsically rewarding and by making extrinsic rewards such as higher pay and promotions clearly contingent upon effective performance. Implicit in this model is the assumption that intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are addictive yielding total job satisfaction. The ability of employee to influence or being fully in charge of what happens in his/her work environment without external

interferences enhances an employee to take self-initiated and future oriented actions or behaviours that will bring change to the organisation and to oneself.

Job Demand-Resources (JD-R) of Bakar and Demerouti (2007)

According to job Demand-Resources Theory (Baker, Demerouti, &Verbeke, 2004), all working environments or job characteristics can be modeled using two different categories, namely job demands and job resources. Thus, the theory can be applied to all work environments. Job demands refers to those physical, psychological, social, or organisational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological effort and are therefore associated with certain physical and/or psychological costs (Demerouti, Bakar, Nachreiner & Schaufeli, 2001). Examples are a high work pressure and emotionally demanding interactions with clients or customers. Although job demands are not necessarily negative, they may turn into hindrance demands when meeting those demands requires high effort from which the employee has not adequately recovered (Meijman & Mulder, 1998). Job resources refer to those physical, psychological, social, or organisational aspects of the job that are:

a. Functional in achieving work goal
b. Reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs, or
c. Stimulate personal growth, learning, and development (Bakker, 2011; Baker & Demerouti, 2007).

Hence resources are not only necessary to deal with job demands, but they are also important in their own right. Whereas meaningful variations in levels of certain specific job demands and resources can be found in almost every occupational group

(like work pressure, autonomy), other job demands and resources are unique. For example, whereas physical demands are still very important job demands nowadays for construction workers and nurses, cognitive demands are much more relevant for scientists and engineers.

JD-R theory has consistently shown that employees achieve the best job performance in challenging, resourceful work environments, since such environments facilitate their proactive work behaviour. Organisations should offer their employees sufficient job challenges, and job resources, including feedback, social support, and skill variety. It is important for employee to mobilize their own resources, and to show proactive in the form of work control. Interesting jobs promotes employees proactive work behaviour thereby increasing organisational bottom line and employeesô job satisfaction. When an employee take full charge of his/her working environment, he/she will design the work environment to be interesting and motivating to him/herself which thereby enhances or promotes proactive work behaviour and reduces employees perceiving themselves to be treated unfairly or victimized.

Note that it is also possible to ask employees to fill in an electronic version of the JD-R questionnaire and to offer them online and personalized feedback on their computer or smartphone about their most important job demands and resources (Bakker, Oerlemans, & Ten Brummellius, 2012). The feedback may include histograms of and written information about the specific demands and resources identified as important for engagement in the organisation under study. The personal JD-R profile can be used as

input for interviews with human resources manager and personal coaches. In this way, it becomes also possible to optimize the working environment for individual employees.

An Affect Theory of Social Exchange of Lawler and Thye (1990)

The theory moves beyond the traditional Skinnerian foundation (Homans, 1961; Emerson, 1972a) of exchange theory, as well as its more recent rational choice variants (Cook & Whitemeyer, 1992). It argues that emotions produced by exchange structures and processes are critical to an understanding of how and when social exchange promote or inhibit solidarity in relations or groups.

Social exchange is conceptualized as a joint activity of two or more actors in which each actor has something the other values. The implicit or explicit task in exchange is to generate benefit for each individual by exchanging behaviours or goods that actors cannot achieve alone (Inibaut & Kelley, 1959; Homans, 1961; Emerson 1972b). The affect theory of social exchange expands outcomes-rewards and punishments are construed as having emotional effect that varies in form and intensity. When exchanges occur successfully, actors experience an emotional uplift (a ñhighò), and when exchange do not occur successfully, they experience emotional ñdownsò (Lawler & Yoon, 1996). Mild everyday feelings, therefore, are intertwined with exchange. Positive emotions include excitement, pleasure, pride, and gratitude, and negative emotions include sadness, shame, and anger. Second, social exchange is a quintessential joint activity, but the nature and degree of jointness varies. Interdependencies embedded in exchange task. The theory argues that, contingent on the exchange structure, emotions or

feelings from exchange influence how actors perceive and feel about their shared activity, their relation, and/or their common group affiliations. It has been theorized that exchange theoryôs actors respond to both past rewards, costs, and punishments and also to anticipated future rewards, costs, and punishments (Molm & Cook, 1995), that is they are both backward looking and forward looking (Macy, 1993). However, they are not necessarily fully rational profit maximizers (Molm & Cook, 1995). The goals of the actors is to generate more valued goods, profit, and utility than they currently have, which makes it possible for them to consummate exchange that provide each with more benefit than otherwise, but that are sub optional (Macy, 1993). A positive social exchange enhances employees proactive work , promotes employees emotional display and reduces employees perceiving themselves to be treated unfairly in the organisational workforce.

Empirical Review

Emotional Labour and Proactive Work Behaviour

Brotheridge and Lee (1998; 2000) developed the surface and deep acting strategies. They found different links between surface and deep acting and employeesô proactive work behaviour outcomes, providing evidence of the discriminate validity of these two EL emotion regulation strategies. Several studies have used the Emotion Labour Scale (ELS) to study such antecedents as display rules (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Dietendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand. 2005; Grandey 1999; Grandey, 2003), social support from supervisors and co-workers (Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Grande, 1999; Tofferdell & Holman, 2003), Emotional job demands (Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Dietendorff et al, 2005; Grandey, 1999, Zammuner & Galli, 2005) self-

monitoring (Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Diefendorff et al, 2005) and job satisfaction (Grandey, 2003). Outcome variables studies include burnout (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2002; Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Erickson & Ritter, 2001; Grandey, 1999; Grandey, 2003; Zammuner & Gali, 2005), turnover intentions (Grandey, 2003), and job satisfaction (Grandey, 1999). Burnout has received the most attention and it seems that, contrary to Hockschildôs (1983) expectation surface actors suffer greater emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge & Grandey 2002; Brotheridge & Lee 2002; Grandey, 2000; Tofferdell & Holman 2003; Zammuner & Galli, 2005).

As suggested by Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) and Morris and Feldman (1996), and supported by the emotion regulation literature, the environment is a very important factor in understanding emotion management and employeesô proactive work behaviour. It is very possible that the situation in which employees work may affect the level and type of emotional labour and proactive work behaviour in which they engage.

Furthering our understanding of the relationship between affect and proactivity, Bindl et al. (2012) differentiated affect into four quadrants of affective complex model (created via combinations of high vs. low activation and positive vs. negative valence) and examined the impact of each affect category on different stages in a proactive goal process. They found that high- activated positive mood was positively associated with all elements of the proactive process, whereas low-activated positive mood was not an important predictor, supporting the energized to pathway proposed by Parker et al., (2010). In addition, low-activated negative feelings, such as depression, positively predicted employeesô envisioning of proactive goals but no other elements of proactivity,

suggesting that depressed feelings might prompt day dreaming or rumination about future change possibilities, but not actual action. These findings suggest that activation levels of affect should be taken into account when investigating how emotional expressions influence proactive work behaviours. Moreover, their findings also suggest that high-activated positive mood not only contributes to proactive work behaviour but also other cognitive elements in proactive process.

Emotional labour is intended to facilitate the attainment of organisational goals by contributing to a positive service experience for the customer (e.g. Diefendorff and Richard, 2003), and by allowing service providers to detach themselves cognitively from negative emotions so that they may maintain their objectivity and emotional equilibrium. Referring to the functionality of EL, Thayer et al. (1994) suggest that EL allows for the flexible adaptation of the organism to changing environmental demands. Indeed, previous studies have found EL to be positively associated with well-being and task effectiveness (e.g. Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993).

Other studies (e.g., Morris & Feldman, 1996; Wharton, 1993), however, view EL as a double-edged sword. First, the transformation ï almost unconsciously ï of what is typically a private act into a public act, and one conforming to rules set by others, causes both a loss of personal control and self-alienation (Hochschild, 1983). Second, as a result of obeying display rules, employees may experience emotional dissonance, or a conflict between expressed and experienced emotions (Morris and Feldman, 1996). Such emotional dissonance has been found to be negatively associated with well-being and performance (e.g. Cote and Morgan, 2002).

The inconclusive evidence regarding the effect of EL on exhaustion may reflect our incomplete understanding of the different types of EL. From a JD-R perspective (Demerouti et al., 2001), EL often requires effort and leads to the depletion of resources used for emotional control (Muraven and Baumeister, 2000). Yet, as noted above, this may not always be the case. Consistent with recent research in the JD-R tradition (e.g. Xanthopoulou et al., 2007), which suggests that the possession of personal resources may be crucial in buffering the impact of job demands on emotional exhaustion, they examine whether a cognitive-behavioural-patternï namely, psychological flexibility ï may enable employees to better handle their emotions at work, over and above surface and deep acting. Notably, while most studies on the JD-R model have been restricted to external/organisational job resources, in the current study we focus on internal, personal resources ï aspects of the self that are generally linked to resiliency, or to individualsô sense of being able to influence their environment successfully (Hobfoll, 2002). Such personal resources may serve the same three functions as job resources: aid in achieving work goals; reduce job demands and their associated physiological and psychological costs; and/or stimulate personal growth, learning and development (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007).

Work Control and Proactive Work Behaviour

Proactive work behaviour, which is typically seen as anticipatory behaviour with the aim to influence either oneself or the work environment (Grant &Ashford, 2008), is beneficial for the organisation because it is related to individual and organisational performance, such as overall performance, career-related outcomes, sales and

organisational success (Fay & Frese, 2001; Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006; Raabe, Frese, & Beehr, 2007; for meta-analysis see Thomas, Whitman, & Visewesvaran, 2010; Tornau & Frese, in press). Consequently, the search for the predictors of this performance-related behaviour is a much needed effort.

Although predictors referring to individual characteristics are well elaborated, research on workplace characteristics is usually limited to workplace characteristics, such as job control, work complexity, leadership, and organisational support for proactive work behaviour (Fay & Frese, 2001; Frese, Garst, & Fay, 2007; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Parker et al., 2006; Strauss, Griffin, & Rafferty, 2009). However, research has shown that proactive work behaviour is also positively predicted by job stressors, predominantly seen as negative workplace characteristics (e.g., time pressure, situational constraints; Fay & Sonnentag, 2002; Fay, Yan, & West, 2007; Ohly, Sonnentag & Pluntke, 2006; Sonnenrag, 2003). Finally, research that integrates positive as well as negative workplace characteristics as predictors of proactive work behaviour hardly exists. Thus, we present an integrative model that Combines work control (as a typical example of positive workplace characteristics) and job stressors (as negative workplace characteristics) as predictors of proactive behaviour.

A core supportive aspect of the environment and pivotal predictor of proactive work behaviour is work control (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Work control is defined as ñthe degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in

carrying it outò (Hackman & Oldham, 1976, p.258). First, work control directly predicts to what extent proactive work behaviour is allowed to be shown. Although lack of work control may hinder goal accomplishment, employees who experience substantial work control can set and pursue a broader range of work-related goals and feel more responsible for work-related problems and goals than employees with lower levels of work control (Parker, 2000; Parker, Wall, & Jackson, 1997).

Thus, it should be easier for employees with higher work control to initiate behaviours that goes beyond formal job requirements, including proactive work behaviour. Second, as argued in the job characteristics model (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), work control enhances internal work motivation, which promotes task performance and proactive work behaviour. Indeed, meta-analytical results showed positive relationships between work control, on one hand, and intrinsic work motivation and performance, on the other hand (Humphrey, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007). Furthermore, several studies found positive relationships between work control and proactive work behaviours (e.g., Den Hartog & Belshaak, 2012; Fay & Frese, 2001, Frese et al., 2007; Parker et al, 2006).

Models of proactive behaviour propose psychological states as linking mechanisms between job control and proactive work behaviour (Frese et al, 2007; Grant & Ashford, 2008; Parker et al., 2006; Speier & Frese, 1997). Role breadth self-efficacy is a core psychological state that is relevant for proactive work behaviour (Parker, 1998). First, individuals working in jobs with high job control are granted responsibilities and

decision latitude by their supervisors. Therefore, employees with high work control should assume that their supervisor is convinced that they have got enough knowledge, skills, and abilities to fulfill the tasks in their jobs and to carry out a broad range of task and roles. Hence, their own confidence to carry out broad roles should be increased, that is they should experience a higher level of role breadth self-efficacy than employees with low job control. Second, high work control should enable employees to use a broader set of skills and abilities. Indeed, Leach, Wall, and Jackson (2003) showed that empowerment (i.e provision of higher work control, among other aspects) increases job knowledge. Parker (1998) argued that the acquisition of skills through job promotes enactive mastery, which is a core source of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982). Consequently, work control should enhance role breadth self efficacy. Indeed, Parker (1982) demonstrated that work control predicted an increase in role breadth self-efficacy over 18 months and cross-sectional relationships were found repeatedly (Parker, & Sprigg, 1999; Parker et al, 2006). As previously discussed, role breadth self-efficacy is a core predictor of proactive work behaviour. Consequently, we propose role breadth self-efficacy as a core linking mechanism in the positive relationship between work control and proactive work behaviour. Parker et al, (2006) showed positive effects of work control on proactive work behaviour mediated by role breadth self-efficacy. However, other constructs may also function as potential linking mechanisms, for instance, the setting of broader goals or increased internal work motivation may link work control with proactive work behaviours.

Job characteristics or employeesô work control play an important role in shaping oneôs motivation and well-being (Latham & Pinder, 2005; Morgeson & Campion, 2003; Parker & Ohly, 2008), and have been linked to various forms of proactive work behaviour. Both positive and negative job characteristics can trigger proactive work behaviour. For example, job autonomy and control is a positive job characteristics that concerns degrees to which employees can decide what to do and choose how to perform their work has been found to be positively related to proactive work behaviour (e.g, Axtell, Holman, Unsworth, Wall, Waterson & Harrington, 2000; Ohly, Sonnentag & Pluntke, 2006; Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006; Speier & Frese, 1997; Wu, Parker, & De Jony, in Press). This is because job autonomy can promote oneôs self-efficacy at work (Parker, 1998) and thus help the enactment of proactive work behaviour (Parker et al; 2006), promote intrinsic motivation and engagement in bringing changes by motivating an individual to redefine tasks (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008), and enhancing felt responsibility at work (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Some job stressors or job characteristics denoting a deviation between a desired and an actual situation, can also have positive effect on proactive work behaviour because these stressors motivate employees to take an active approach in order to decrease the difference between the desired and actual states (Fay & Sonnentag, 2002). Supporting this view, job stressors, such as time pressure or situational constraints, have been shown to be positively related to various proactive s (Binnewies, Sonnentag, & Mojza, 2009; Fay & Sonnentag, 2002; Fritz & Sonnentag, 2009; Ohly & Fritz, 2010; Ohly et al, 2006).

Studies have shared that organisational climate that denotes a supportive and psychologically safe environment is helpful to foster proactive work behaviour. For example, individuals who report being satisfied with or supported by others (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007; Kanfer et al, 2001; Lepine & VanDyne, 1998) are more likely to engage in proactive work behaviour. Similarly, Axtell et al (2000) also found climate constructs at team level, such as participative safety, supports for innovation, management support, and perception of capability in influencing team and the organisation, were generally positive to suggestion and implementation of ideas. Scott and Bruce, (1994) reported that employees who perceived higher levels of support for innovation in organization are more likely to exhibit innovation behaviours. In a longitudinal study, Axtell, Holman, and Wall, (2006), further reported that change in management support was positively related to change in team support for innovation was positively related to change in implementing innovation. Focusing on the supportive organisational practices, Dorenbosch, Van Engen, and Verhagen, (2005) further suggested that commitment based human resource management, characterized by

1. Employee participation,
2. Wages
3. Training and development
4. Information sharing
5. Supervisor support, can form a strong employee psychological link (i.e, Commitment) to organisations, which makes employees more willing to take responsibility and engage in proactivity.

Finally, Parker et al (2006) showed that employeesô trust in their colleagues predicted proactive problems solving and idea implementation via individualôs flexible role orientation (reason to). Collectively, these findings reveal that having a positive and safe environment is important for an individual to be willing to challenge status quo and effect change.

Recently, Den Hartog and Belschak (2012) indicated a three-way interaction effect among transformational leadership, role breadth self-efficacy and job autonomy in predicting proactive. Specifically, their study showed that transformational leadership is more effective in driving proactive work behaviour for employees with higher role breath self-efficacy when job autonomy is high, but it is more effective to lead to proactive work behaviour for employees with lower breath of self efficacy when job autonomy is low. This finding suggests that whether transformational leadership functions to facilitate individuals to exhibit a tendency towards being proactive (low self-efficacy) depends on job characteristics. Their investigation thus provides a more fine-grained interaction model to understand the joint impact of individual and situational factors in shaping proactivity.

Feeling a lack of control over events has been identified a source of life stress (Rodin, 1986) as well as job stress which hinders employeesô proactive work behaviour. Hochschild (1983) discussed the unpleasantness of having the organisation control oneôs personal feeling state. A few studies have tested the idea that job autonomy minimizes the stress of the emotion regulation process and promotes employeesô proactive work behaviour. Wharton, (1993) found that those who reported high autonomy had lower

emotional exhaustion in both high and low emotional labour typed jobs. Morris and Feldman (1996) reported that job autonomy was negatively related to emotional dissonance and emotional exhaustion and positively related to job satisfaction. A recent court case with a major grocery store chain involves emotional autonomy in particular; customer service employees are suing the company because they must smile at customers even though that has led to sexual harassment by customers. Organizations who take away emotional autonomy may find negative outcomes emerge.

Work Victimization and Proactive Work Behaviour

Work victimization and proactive work behaviour have a relationship based on two social psychological mechanisms. The first is the norm of reciprocity. The norm of reciprocity arises from the duties that people believe they owe to one another because of their history of previous interaction (Gouldner, 1960). When one person does something to benefit another, a norm of positive reciprocity can be initiated whereby the recipient feels obligated to retain the favour (Gouldner, 1960; Trivers, 1971). Conversely, when someone harms another person, a norm of negative reciprocity can be invoked, leading the injured party to retaliate against the harm-doer (Adersson & Pearson, 1999; Axelrod, 1984). There is considerable evidence supporting the universality of these norms (e.g, Axelrod, 1984; Cialdim, 2001; Trivers, 1971) and the operation of positive reciprocity in organisations provides a theoretical rationale for predicting that proactive work behaviour is negatively related to work victimization. In making this argument, it conceptualized that proactive work behaviour is a social resource that by definition, benefits others.

On the other hand, employees who withheld proactive work behaviours are less likely to establish relationships built on positive reciprocity. In the absence of social obligations to reciprocate positive treatment, fellow employees may be undeterred from victimizing someone who is perceived as a vulnerable or deserving target of mistreatment. Furthermore, less proactive employees may be viewed in a negative light because they fail to exhibit minimal standards of cooperativeness and social sensitivity. Such perceptions can decrease their social attractiveness and increase their risk of being victimized. Studies show that socially attractive people are more likely to be valued as partners, friends or allies (Gilbert, 1997) and are less likely to be victimized (Furr & Funder, 1999; Parker & Asher, 1987). Because proactive work behaviours can enhance social attractiveness (Bolino, 1999), it follows that such behaviours should be negatively related to workplace victimization.

In addition, membership in a salient social category, such as being a racial minority or a woman, indicates oneôs status in an organisation (Pettigreur & Martin, 1987). Moderating the effects of these socially constructed indicators (Eig, 1995) are derived from status characteristic theory (Berger, Fiske, Nroman & Zeldith, 1977). Applying this theory to work victimization and proactive work behaviour, diffuse status characteristics like race and gender can lead observers to make more favourable inferences of underlying traits like cooperativeness, generosity, or dependability when these behaviours are performed by people from high-as compared to low-status groups. In turn, these inferences will enhance employsô proactive social attractiveness (Arggle

1991; Gilbert, 1997), making them less vulnerable to victimization (Furr & Funder, 1999; Parker & Asher 1987). There is some evidence supporting these findings. Roborits and Maehr (1973), for example, found that teachers gave preferential treatment to ñgiftedò students, but only if they were white. In contrast, non gifted African-American students were treated more positively than gifted African-American students, who were generally treated negatively. Their findings suggest that race may moderate the relationship between proactive work behaviour and workplace victimization. However, this prediction assumes that African-Americans are widely perceived as having low social status relative to whites.

Due to difficulties in collecting and obtaining valid and reliable information, existing empirical knowledge on perpetrators and perpetrator characteristics is scarce and has mainly been obtained from self-reforms of targets of workplace victimizations while less evidence has been presented reflecting self-reports from perpetrators themselves (Mattiesen & Eincasen, 2007; Lapf & Einarsen, 2003). The existing evidence shows perpetrators to be males more often than females (e.g. De P Cuyper, Baillien & De With, 2007; Herscovis, Turmor, Barling, Arnold, Dupre & Inness, 2007; Rayner, 1997), and to be supervisors and managers more often than subordinates (e.g. Hoel, Cooper & Faragner, 2001), although Scandinarian studies in general report approximately equal numbers of perpetrators among supervisors and subordinates (cf. Zapf, Einarsen, Hoel & Vartia, 2003). Engaging in aggressive behaviour is also frequently associated with age. It is assumed that with increasing age, individuals better understand the consequences of

their behaviour and that they therefore are more likely to exert controls over their anger (e.g. De Cuyper et al., 2009; Inness, Barling, & Turner, 2005) while other studies have found no significant relationship between age and engaging in aggressive behaviour at work (e.g. Glomb & Liao, 2003).

Only a few studies have reported prevalence rates of perpetrators of workplace victimization. In a UK study, prevalence rates varied largely from 19.3% when applying a sole self report measure to 2.7% . When applying a more stringent criterion reflecting both self- and peer-reported behaviour (Coyne, Chong, Seigne, & Randall, 2003). None of the perpetrators in the UK study report being both a target and a perpetrator of workplace victimization.

In a Norwegian study, Mattiesen and Einarsen (2007) found perpetrators to yield a total prevalence of 7.5%. In addition to non-involved individuals, they further distinguished between respondents who were perpetrators only, and perpetrators who were both perpetrators and targets of workplace victimization, constituting 5.4% and 2.1% of the sample, respectively. This letter group of targets, who also engage in work place victimization, has been characterized by a combination of both anxious and aggressive reaction patterns. Their behaviour may cause irritation and tension in their surroundings, and corresponds to that of those who, in school research have been labeled proactive victim or bully/targets (Olwens, 2003). Matthiesen and Einarsen (2007) showed that the victim/targets group reported significantly lower levels of self-esteem and higher levels of role stress than did both the perpetrator only group and non-involved individuals

A few studies have examined the relationship between target personality and various form of workplace victimization (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Cogne, Seigne & Randall, 2000; Glaso, Mattheisen, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2007; Matthiase & Einargen, 2001; Milam. Spitzmueller, & Penney, 2009), for example, found that emotional stability and agreeableness were both negatively associated with incivility. Similarly, Glaso et al (2007) found that compared with non-victims, victims of workplace victimization scored lower on measures of emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness and extraversion. A meta-analysis by Bowling and Beehr (2006) examined target personality as a predictor of workplace victimization. Examining several different forms of workplace victimization,(e.g. bullying, social undermining, interpersonal conflict, etc). They found that target negative affectivity (NA) (P = .25 and target self-esteem (P= -.21) were related to workplace victimization, with target positive affectivity (PA), (P = - .09) yielding a relatively weaker relationship with workplace victimization.

Ragner and Kenshly, (2005) noted that because no published prospective studies has examined the relationship between target characteristics and workplace victimization, little is known about whether target personality is a cause or consequence of being victimized. Bowling and Beehr (2006) study provided evidence that target personality could be one of the causes of victimization, because the data supported the temporal sequence of personality leading to victimization rather than victimization leading to personality.

Coyne, Seigne and Randall, (2000) looked at the link between target personality and victimization. Personally traits, for example, may predispose targets to engage in victimizing behaviour.

Douglas and Martinko, (2001) found that negative affectivity (NA) and trait anger were both positively related to the extent to which one engage in aggressive behavior at work.

Felson and Steadman (1983) study suggests that three broad categories of victim-centered variables can reliably predict experience of workplace victimization in the organisation. The first consists of personality characteristics like aggressiveness, (Olwens, 1978), Self-esteem (Egan & Perry, 1998) or negativity (Aquino, Grover, Broadfield & Allen, 1999; Furr & Funder, 1998). Past studies show that people who possess certain characteristics may knowingly or unknowingly create the social conditions that lead them to become frequent targets of othersô harmful actions. A seemed category of victim variables consists of strategies behaviours that people might use to defend themselves from interpersonal mistreatment. Example include tactical renge (Tripp & Bies, 1997), social accounts (Bies, 1987), and apologies (Schlenker, 1980). Finally, there is evidence that indicators of social status, such as hierarchical position (Aquino, 2000; Aquino et al., 1999), race (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), or gender (Daly, 1994) can predict workplace victimization.

Previous victimization literature has more often examined the person- and situation-based antecedents (e.g., negative affectivity, work constraints), negative psychological and physiological consequences (e.g., depression, physical symptoms) and

prevention and coping strategies (e.g., forgiveness, alcohol consumption) of workplace victimization (e.g. for view, see Aquino & Thau, 2009; Bowling & Beehr, 2006).

Studies by Kim and Glomb (2010), found that high-cognitive-ability employees experience more workplace victimization, and Lan, Vander Vegt, Walter and Huang, (2011), found that subjective perceptions of upwards social comparisms were positively related to interpersonal harming behaviours against high performers. These findings are consistent with the ñtall poopyò syndrome (Feather, 1994) and echo popular press reports suggesting high performers often experience victimization and subsequents negative outcomes including diminished well-being, productivity, retention and organisational performance (see Bruzzese, 2002; Namie & Namie, 200; Bulton, 2007).

Job satisfaction and proactive work consistently is negatively related to experiences of victimization and workplace aggression (e.g. Frone, 2000; Keashly, Hunter & Harvey, 1997; Tepper, 2000; Vartia & Hyyti, 2002). Individuals who experience aggression from their fellow individuals in their place of employment are less likely to enjoy their work and their work environment thereby hindering employeesô proactive personality.

Research have indicated that a negative correlation between levels of satisfaction and employee perceptions of danger and risk (McLain, 1995) when employees experience aggression at the hands of those they work with, it is likely that they will have negative attitudes about their colleagues which inhibits employeesô proactive work behaviour.

Summary of the Literature Review

According to Fredricksonôs (1998) broaden-and-build theory positive affect is likely to influence the selection of proactive goals because it expands thinking and result in more flexible cognitive processes.

Job design theory of Hackman and Oldhalm (1976) opines that it will be good to increase job autonomy to structurally empower employees and to cultivate their proactive work behaviour regardless of their dispositions.

Self-determination theory (SDT) of Deci and Ryan (2000) postulates that autonomous and controlled motivations differ in terms of both their underlying regulatory processes and their accompanying experiences, and it further suggests that behaviours can be characterized in terms of the degree to which they are autonomous versus controlled.

Job Demand-Resources Theory (JD-R) of Bakker and Demerouti (2007) opine that employees achieve the best job performance in challenging, resourceful work environment, since such environments facilitate their work engagement.

An affect theory of social exchange by Lawler and Thye (1990) means a joint activity of two or more actors in which each actor has something the other valves.

Social Comparism Theory of Festinger, (1984) opines that high-performing employees instigate that unfavourable upward social comparism from their fellow group members (i.e., potential perpetrators).

Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive work behaviour of Spector and Fox (2005) stressed that Stressors experienced in the work environment may induce negative

emotions in some individuals which, in turn may lead them to engage in aggressive behaviour towards others.

Bottom-up victimization theory of Leymann, (1990) and Einarsen, (1999) opines that the presence of one source of victimization might result in an increase over time in another source of victimization.

Actively trying to take charge of oneôs self or the environment to bring about a different future or being proactive is an increasing vital way of behaving in todayôs work place.

Scholars have suggested that proactivity is a goal-oriented process that involves cognitive and behavioural elements including goal envisioning, planning, enacting, and reflecting (Bindl et al, 2012; Frese & Fay, 2001; Grant & Ashford, 2008). From this perspective being proactive involves not only doing, but also thinking, such as imagining how things might be different and generating new ideas or alternative way to do jobs (Frese & Fay, 2001). As such, it is important to consider thinking-oriented dispositions over and above action-oriented ones like proactive personality.

Hypotheses

1a. Surface Acting will significantly and positively predict proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology.

1b. Deep Acting will significantly and negatively predict proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology.

2. Work Control will significantly and positively predict proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology.
3. Work Victimization will significantly and negatively predict proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology

CHAPTER THREE

Method

Participants

Two hundred and sixty seven (267) academic staff comprising 128 males and 101 females participated in the study. The participants were drawn from Enugu State University of Science and Technology. They comprised of categories of employees who are working in different departments and faculties. The samples were comprised of male and female employees. Information on their marital status, age, and organisational tenure was also obtained.Their age ranges from 30-70,their educational qualification was classified into senior and non-senior. More so, one hundred and eighty three (183) staff who participated in the study were married while fourty six (46) were singles.

Instruments

A questionnaire comprising four measures was used in the study. The measures are Proactive Work Behaviour Scale, Emotional Labour Scale, Work Control Scale, and Work Victimization Scale.

Proactive Work Scale (Appendix A)

This measure was developed by Bateman and Crant, (1993), and describes the self-initiated and future oriented actions of employees that aimed to change and improve the situation or oneself. It comprises seventeen items which includes statements such as ñI am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life and I am always looking for a better ways to do thingsò. Items were rated from 1=Not True to 5= Very

True. Bateman and Crant (1993) obtained a cronbach alpha of .87. High score on this scale shows high level of proactive work behaviour.

A pilot study was conducted involving 105 academic staff of University of Nigeria Nsukka and data were collected and analyzed. For the present study, the researcher got a reliability coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) of .86.

Emotional Labour Scale (Appendix B)

Perceptions of emotional labour was measured with the Emotional Labour Scale developed by Kruml and Geddes (2000). Grandey, (1999) suggested that Hochschildôs, (1983) acting perspective seems to be the most useful way of measuring the concept of emotional labour when the research purpose is to understand the individual and organisational outcomes (Grandey, 1999). Originating in this acting perspective, Kruml and Geddes, (2000) developed a six-items emotional labour scale, which measures the underlying mechanisms of performing emotional labour. In their study, they identified two dimensions of emotional labour: deep acting (emotive effort) and surface acting (emotive dissonance). Four items measure emotional effort (a = .66) which represent deep acting and another two items measure emotional dissonance (a = .68) which place surface acting and genuine acting at opposite ends of a continuum (Kruml & Geddes, 2000). Items were rated from 1 = very little to 5 = extremely. High score on the scale shows how high level of emotional labour.

Pilot study was conducted involving 105 academic staff of University of Nigeria Nsukka and data were collected and analyzed. For the present study, the researcher got a

reliability coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) of .78, for the deep acting and .67 for surface acting dimensions of emotional labour respectively.

Work Control Scale **(Appendix C)**

This measure developed by Dwyer and Ganster (1991), describes the extent to which workers perceive how they have control over numerous aspects of their work environment. These aspects include control over the variety of tasks performed, the order of task performance, and the pace of tasks, task scheduling, task procedures, and arrangement of the physical layout/environment. The scale comprises of twenty two items and includes statements such as ñhow much control do you have over how you do your work and how much are you able to decorate, rearrange, or personalize your work areaò. Items were rated from 1= very little to 5= very much. Dwyer and Ganster (1991) obtained a Cronbach alpha of .87. High score on the scale shows high level of work control.

For the present study, the researcher got a reliability coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) of .86 after a pilot study conducted involving 105 academic staff of University of Nigeria Nsukka.

Work Victimization Scale (Appendix D)

This measures the degree to which individuals perceive themselves as being hurt by an aggressive act that was deemed to be intentional.Work victimization scale was developed by Aquino and Thau, (2009) and it comprises eight items which includes statements such as ñI was purposefully humiliated and I was intentionally treated poorly.

Item were rated from 1=not at all to 5=extremely. Aquino and Thau (2009) obtained a cronbach alpha of .94. High score on the scale shows high level of work victimization.

A pilot study was conducted involving 105 academic staff of University of Nigeria Nsukka and data were collected and analyzed. For the present study, the researcher got a reliability coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) of .94 was obtained.

Procedure

The researcher with a letter from the department of psychology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka obtained the permission from the heads of the departments of all the faculties of Enugu State University of Science and Technology. An assurance was given to the participant that the study was on academic purposes and their responses will be treated with confidentiality. The participants were informed not to include their names but to indicate their gender, age, position, marital status, job tenure and organizational tenure. Participation in the study was voluntary. Thecompleted questionnaires were collected after the participants had filled them correctly. Out of three hundred (300) questionnaires shared, two hundred and sixty seven questionnaires were returned while two hundred and twenty nine questionnaires were properly filled after cross checking and were used for data analysis.

Design/Statistics

The design of the study will be cross-sectional design while hierarchical multiple regression analysis will be use to analyze the data. Statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) shall be employed in the data analyses.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

The data obtained from respondents were analysed with the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 21.0. Means, standard deviations, along with inter-correlations of the study variables are presented in Table 1. The results of hierarchical multiple regression for predictors of proactive behaviour appear in Table 2.

Table 1

Means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables

	Variable	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Gender	1.41	.49	ð							
2	Marital Status	1.20	.40	.05	ð						
3	Job tenure	4.38	2.98	.05	-.17*	ð					
4	Age	42.00	8.77	.07	-.47***	.41**	ð				
5	Surface Acting	7.07	2.01	-.02	-.12	.10	.12	ð			
6	Deep Acting	13.43	3.44	-.05	-.13*	-.06	.08	.39**	ð		
7	Work control	73.49	16.94	.06	.01	.13	-.05	.21**	.09	ð	
8	Work victimization	17.09	7.83	-.02	-.16*	.16*	.21**	.20**	.33**	.24**	ð
9	Proactive Behaviour	64.31	11.38	.07	.18**	.08	-.03	-.01	.15*	.06	.08

Note. $N = 229$, * = $p < .05$ (two-tailed), ** = $p < .01$ (two-tailed), *** = $p < .001$ (two-tailed). Gender was coded 1 = male, 2 = female; marital status: 1 = married, 2 = single. Job tenure and age were coded in years, such that higher scores represent higher job tenure or older age.

The results in Table 1 indicated that among the socio-demographic variables (gender, marital status, job tenure, and age), only marital status had a positive significant and weak association with proactive behaviour (r = .18, p = .006). Meanwhile, gender, job tenure, and age were not significantly associated with proactive behaviour. Among the emotional labour sub-dimensions, only deep acting had a positive significant and weak association with proactive behaviour (r = .15, p = .020). There was no significant association between surface acting and proactive behaviour. Both work control and work victimization were not significantly associated with proactive behaviour. There was a positive significant and association between surface acting and deep acting (r = .39, p < .001).

Table 2

Hierarchical multiple regression for predictors of proactive behaviour

Variable	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
	ɗ	ɗ	ɗ	ɓ
Controls				
Gender	.05	.06	.05	.06
Marital status	.21**	.23**	.23**	.23**
Job tenure	.10	.13	.12	.12
Age	.03	.02	.02	.02
Predictors				
Surface acting		-.08	-.09	-.09
Deep acting		.22**	.22**	.21**
Work control			.04	.03
Work victimization				.03
Adjusted R^2	.032**	.066	.063	.060
æR^2	.049	.041**	.001	.001
æF	2.879	5.064	.356	.207

Note. ** = p < .01.

The results of the hierarchical multiple regression in Table 2 in which proactive behaviour was the criterion variable indicated that the demographic variables (i.e., gender, marital status, job tenure, and age), entered in Step 1 of the equation as controls collectively account for 3.2% variance in proactive behaviour. Marital status was the only control variable that made unique, positive and significant contribution to the prediction of proactive behaviour (ϐ = .21, p = .005), indicating that those who are single more likely to engage in proactive behaviour in comparison to those who are married. When the two sub-dimensions of emotional labour (surface acting and deep acting) were entered in Step 2 of the equation, they collectively explained 4.1% additional variance in proactive behaviour over and above the control variables. However, only deep acting positively and significantly predicted proactive behaviour (ϐ = .22, p = .002). Thus, H_{1a} was not confirmed whereas H_{1b} was confirmed. The entry of work control in Step 3 of the equation accounted for only .1% variance in proactive behaviour well below the control variables and emotional labour sub-dimensions. Work control was not a significant predictor of proactive behaviour. Thus, H_2 was not confirmed. The entry of work victimization in Step 4 of the equation accounted for only .1% variance in proactive behaviour just like work control. Work victimization was not a significant predictor of proactive behaviour. Thus, H_3 was not confirmed.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

This study examined emotional labour, work control and work victimization as predictors proactive work behaviour among academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology. In this study there are two dimension of emotional labour, namely surface acting and deep acting. The result of the findings showed that surface acting is not a significantly positively predictor of proactivce work behavior among staff. The first hypothesis (H1a) of the study, that surface acting will significantly and positively predict proactive work behaviour among staff was not confirmed. This finding is consistent with an extant finding by Butler, Egloff, Wilheml, Smith and Erickson, (2003), indicating that surface actors have been taking the harder way. It is because, owing to an undisclosed emotional dissonance, surface acting will result in high stress levels and stress will actuate physiological processes acting to inhibit the emotion control process itself as well as the functioning of the immune system. Surface acting will lead to an impaired self evaluation by the surface actors and depression in the long run, reducing motivation at work, inhibiting employees proactive work behaviour while increasing the number of days on sickness-leave and the probability of a job change. A negative impact of surface acting is corroborated by several studies (e.g. by Brotheridge and Grandey, 2002; Zapf, 2002).

Although, surface acting may be helpful to the organisation bottom-line, there has been recent work suggesting that managing emotions for pay may be detrimental to the

employee. Hochschild (1983) indicates that surface acting is stressful and will result in burnout thereby discouraging employees proactive work behaviour.

If an employee feels that meeting emotion demands (surface acting) at work requires a lot of effort and feels detached from customers, then that employee may also feel a lower sense of personal accomplishment which discourages employees proactive work behaviour. Researchers have suggested that surface acting stifles personal expression and as such is unpleasant (Hochschild, 1983; VanMaanen & Kunda, 1989) and the emotional regulation to achieve display rule is negatively related to job satisfaction.

The available data supports this finding that experience of emotional dissonance which is conceptually similar to surface acting was negatively related to job satisfaction thereby inhibiting employees proactive work behaviour (Abraham, 1988; Morris & Feldman, 1997)

Rutter and Fiedling (1988)) supported this finding that suppressing true emotions (surface acting) was a source of stress for prison officers and suppression related to lowered job satisfaction which discourages proactive work behaviour.

Those employees who engage in high level of surface acting may be more inclined to desire a different job. In fact, the need to regulate emotions regularly at work may act as a signal to the employee that this environment is not a good match for the individual (Edwards, 1991; Schwarz & Clore, 1983).

In contrast to the first finding, the second finding of the study shows that deep acting will significantly and positively predict proactive work behaviour among staff. Hence, the second hypothesis (H1b) that deep acting will significantly and positively contribute to proactive work behaviour among staff was confirmed. This finding is consistent with an extant finding by Brotheridge and Grandey, (2002) indicating that deep acting improves employees perception of efficiency and self image at work thereby contributing to employees proactive work behaviour in an organization.

Drawing from Fredricksonôs (1998) broaden-and-build theory of positive emotion, Parkar (2007) proposed that positive affectivity influences the selection of proactive goals because it expands thinking and result in more flexible cognitive processes (Fredrickson, 1998, 2001; Isen, 1999), which in turn helps employee to think ahead and rise to the challenge in pursuing proactive goals.

The third hypothesis that work control will significantly and positively predict proactive work behaviour among staff was not confirmed by the finding. Hence, the finding of the study indicated that work control is a significantly negative predictor of proactive work behaviour among staff. This finding supports the recent finding of Clerg, (1984) indicating that work control will not contribute to proactive work behaviour because of the internal factors in the organisation that inhibits proactive work behaviour such as the style of the management, technology, nature of the tasks, information systems, human resource practices, strategy, history and culture. For example, a directive style of management and assembly-line technology or intensive performance monitoring

can each act to constrain employee work control (Cordery, 1999). Of cause, these organisational factors are in turn influence by aspect of the external to the organisation, such as the uncertainty of the environment, customers demands, the available technology, social and cultural norms, economic circumstance, nature of labour market and political and labour instructions. Illustrating to the last factor, Garen, (1999) describes how national trade union agreement can affect work control by opposing payment schemes that are important for more work control and flexible jobs.

According to job demands-resources (JD-R) Model assumes that burnout develops irrespective of part of occupation, when job demands are high and when job resources are limited because such negative working conditions lead to energy depletion and undermines employees proactive work behaviour.

Feeling a lack of control over events have been identified as a source of life stress, (Rodin, 1986) as well as job stress which hinders employees proactive work behaviour. Huchschild (1983) indicates that the unpleasantness of having the organisational control oneôs personal feeling state. Moreover, fragmented empirical evidence for this differential pattern of relationships between specific job demands, specific job resources and burnout has been reported in the literature. For example, regarding job demands, physical workload (Janssen, Bakker & De Jong, 2001), poor environmental conditions (Friedman, 1991) demanding client (Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Whitehead, 1987), time pressure and unfavourable shift-work schedules (Kandolin, 1993) have all been related to feelings of (emotional) exhaustion. Regarding job resources, performance feedback

(Astrom, Nilsson, Norgery, Sandman & Winblad, 1990), rewards (Landsbergis, 1988), job security (Dekker & Schaufeli, 1995), work control (Landsbergis, 1988), Participation in decision making (Jackson, Turner & Brief, 1987) and support from supervisors (Leiter, 1989) have all been related to depersonalization (disengagement) which in turn discourages employees proactive work behaviour.

The fourth hypothesis that work victimization will significantly and positively predict proactive work behaviour among staff was not confirmed. Hence, the finding of the study indicated that work victimization is a significantly negatively predictor of proactive work behaviour among staff. This finding is consistent with an extant finding by Bolino, (1999) indicating that proactive work behaviour can enhance social attractiveness, which follows that such behaviours should be negatively related to work victimization.

Based on the norm of reciprocity, which arises from the duties that people believe they owe to one another because of their history of previous interaction, (Gouldner, 1960). When one person does something to benefit another a norm of positive reciprocity can be initiated whereby the recipient feels obligated to retain the former (Goulnder, 1960, Trivers, 1971). Conversely, when someone harms another person a norm of negative reciprocity can be invoked, leading the injured party to retaliate against the harm doer (Adersson & Pearson, 1999; Axelrod, 1984). There is considerable evidence supporting the universality of this norms (e.g., Axelrod, 1984, Cialdim, 2001; Trivers, 1971) and the operation of positive reciprocity in organisations provides a theoretical

rationale for predicting that proactive work behaviour is negatively related to work victimization.

Job satisfaction and proactive work behavior consistently is negatively related to experiences of work victimization and work place aggression (e.g Frone, 2000, Keashly, Hunter & Harvey, 1997; Tepper, 2000; Vartia & Hyyti, 2002). Individuals who experience aggression from their fellow individuals in their place of employment are less likely to enjoy their work and their work environment thereby hindering employees proactive work behaviour.

Research have indicated correlation between levels of satisfaction and employees perception of danger and risk (Mclain, 1995). When employee experiences aggression at the hands of those they work with, it is likely that they will have a negative attitude about their colleagues which in turn inhibits proactive work behaviour.

Implications of the Study

The finding of this study have some practical implications in our society today. Firstly, surface acting was found to be a negative significant predictor of proactive work behaviour. The practical implication of this is that for an efficient and production turnover in an organisational setting, management should be proactive in managing emotional expressions especially surface acting so as to resolve the issue of undisclosed emotional dissonance experienced by the employees which leads to high stress level and depression. Stress as a result of surface acting can actuate physiological processes acting to inhibit emotional control processes itself as well as the function of the immune systems

which in the long run reduces employees motivation, proactive work behaviour, increasing the number of days on sickness-leave and employees turn-over intentions.

The finding also showed that deep acting is a positive significant predictor of proactive work behaviour among staffs. A practical application of this is that in our great country, Nigeria, institutions or organisations should encourage academic staff positive emotional expressions which boosts their self-efficiency and self image at work thereby promoting their proactive work behaviour in the organisation which in turn increases organisational bottom-line.

Another practical implication of this study follows that work control is a negative significant predictor of proactive work behaviour among staff. The practical implications for this is that there are internal factors in the organisation such as the style of management, technology, nature of the tasks, information systems, human resource practices, strategy, history and culture. For example, a direct style of management, assembly-line technology or intensive performance monitoring can each act to constrain academic staff performance and organisational bottom-line. Management should adopt an effective management styles and the effective training and development in order to boost employees work control.

The finding of this study also showed that work victimization is a negative significant predictor of proactive work behaviour among staffs. A practical implication of this is that workplace victimization creates cost to the individuals, organisations and societyôs worldwide. Management can reduce the likelihood of envy and the consequent

victimization by promoting work group identification. To increase group identity, managers can provide experiences that put the focus on the team such as team ï building training sections, frequent social gatherings and fostering friendly rivalries with other teams.

Limitation of the Study

This study has some practical limitations. The sample for this study was limited. Large sample size may be necessary to allow for more generalization and possible conclusions. Another limitation is the choice of using only academic staff from Enugu State University of Science and Technology out of numerous academic University staff in the country. Although, the study targeted at academic staff as participants of interest for the study, the use of staff from other locations especially other regions of the country may be efficient.

Suggestions for Further Study

In view of these limitations given above, the researcher makes the following suggestions for further or future research. Future researcher interested in this depended variables should look at other variables like envy, group identification, task performance, personality type, job resources, work engagement, role of leader support, job stressor, and role breadth self-efficacy, work placement, ethnic group and gender as factors of and their link with proactive work behaviour. The inclusion of larger sample is necessary to give room for more generalization and conclusion. Samples size involving academic staff of other geographical regions in Nigeria can used for better generalization of findings.

Summary/Conclusion

This study provided evidence that emotional labour, work control and work victimization as predictors of proactive work behaviour among staff. The role staff plays are enormous and it has been shown that this factor are paramount in making staff achieve their goals, as well as the goals of our educational system. The findings of this research have given proof that human resources are the most strategic asset of an organisation. This is in line with already stated views that in recent times, the new approaches to management of organisational behaviour have shown that responsible, committed, brave, wise and proactive academic staff is considered one of the most basic factors of organisational success. To achieve efficient educational system in our country, the study advocates for organisations to be proactive in managing academic staff in jobs with high emotional labour demands, since EL has been associated with employees intention to leave an organisation (Grandey, 1999).

Also, the study advocates that academic staff should be structural empowered so as to use their skills and abilities freely in the organisational settings. The study also advocates that workplace should be a guaranteed safe place for employees and employees should not be immune to the experience of harmful or negative behaviour in the organisation. More still, the study solicits for outright restructuring of our institutional settings such that academic staff will be freely secure, proactive, contented and happy giving their best in their work.

REFERENCES

Abraham, R. (1998). Emotional dissonance in organisations: Antecedents, consequences, and moderators. *Genetics, Social, and General Psychology Monographs. 124* (2), 229-246

Agervold, M., & Mikkelsen, E. G. (2004). Relationships between bullying, psychosocial work environment and individual stress reactions. *Work & Stress,18,* 336-351.

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53,* 27ï 51.

Anderson, C. A., Anderson, K. B., & Deuser, W. E. (1996). Examining an affective aggression framework: Weapon and temperature effects on aggressive thoughts, affect, and attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22,* 366ï 376.

Anderson, C. A., Deuser, W. E., & DeNeve, K. M. (1995). Hot temperatures, hostile affect, hostile cognition, and arousal: Tests of a general model of affective aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21,* 434ï 448.

Anderson, L. M., & Pearson C. M. (1999). Tit-for ï tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *AcademicManagement Review*, *24,* 452-471

Aquino, K. (2000). Structural and individual determinants of workplace victimization. The effects of hierarchical status and conflict management style. *Journal of Management, 26,*171-193.

Aquino, K., & Thau, S. (2009). Workplace victimization: Aggression from the targetôs perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60,* 717-741.

Aquino, K., Grover, S. L., Bradfield, M., & Allen, D. G. (1999). The effects of negative effectivity, hierarchical status, and self-determination on workplace victimization. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(3), 260-272.

Argyl, M. (1991). *Cooperation: The basis of sociability.* London, U.K: Rotledge.

Arvey, R. D., Renz, G. L., & Watson, T. W. (1998). Emotionality and job performance: Implications for personnel selection. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 16,* 103-147.

Ashford, S. J, & Cummings, J. L. (1985). Proactive feedback seeking: The instrumental use of the information environment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 58*, 67-79.

Ashford, S. J. & Cummings, J. L. (1983). Feedback as an individual resources: A resources perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 29*, 465-487.

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review, 18*, 88ī 115.

Ashforth, B. E. (2000). Foreword. In N. Ahkanasy, C.E.J., Hartel and W. J. Zerbe (Eds.), Emotions in the workplace. London: Quorum.

Astrom, S., M., Norgerg, A. Sandman, P. O., & Winblad, B. (1990). Staff burnout in dementia care: Relations to empathy and attitudes. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 28,* 65-77.

Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation.* New York: Basis Books.

Bakker A. B & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology 22*(3): 309ī 328.

Bakker, A. B., (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*, 265-269.

Bakker, A. N., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the Job Demans Resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management,43,* 83-104

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37,* 122-14.7

Bateman, T. S. & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organisational : A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organisational , 14*, 103-118.

Bateman, T. S. & Crant, J.M. (1993). The proactive component of organisational . A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organisational . 14(2),* 103-118.

Berger, J., Fiske M. H., Norman R. Z., Zelditch, M., Jr. (1977). *Status characteristics and social interaction: an expectation states approach.* New York: Elsevier.

Berkowitz, L. (1990). On the formulation and regulation of anger and aggression: A cognitive neo-associationistic approach. *American Psychologist, 45,* 494ï 503.

Bies, R. J. (1987). The predicament of injustice: The management of moral outage, L. L. Cummings, B.M. Staw. (Eds.), *Research in organisational ,* Vol. 9., Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 289-319.

Bies, R. J., & Tripp, T. M. (2005). The study of revenge in the workplace: Conceptual, ideological, and empirical issues. In S. Fox and P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behaviour: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 65ï 81). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M., & Kramer, R. M. (1997). At the breaking point: Cognitive and social dynamics of revenge in organisations. In R. A. Giacalone and J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behaviour in organisations,* (p. 43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bindl, U.K., Parker, S. K., Totterdell, P., & Hagger-Johnson, G. (2012). Fuel of the self-starter: How mood relates to proactive goal regulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*, 134-150.

Binnewies, C., Sonnentage, S. & Mojza, E. J. (2009). Daily performance at work: Feeling recovered in the morning as a predictor of day-level job performance. *Journal of Organisational , 30*, 67-93.

Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., & Hjelt-Back, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive , 20*, 173-83.

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

Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace of harassment from the victimôs perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology,91*(5), 998-1012.

Brodsky, C. M. (1976). *The harassed worker.* Toronto, ON: Lexington Books.

Brotheridge, C. M. & Lee, R. T. (1998). Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of ñpeople workò. *Journal of Vocational , 60,* 17-39.

Brotheridge, C. M. & Lee, R. T. (2002). Testing a conservation of resources model of the dynamics of emotional labour. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,7(1*), 57-67.

Brotheridge, C. M. & Lee, R. T. (2003). Development and validation of the emotional labour scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology, 76*, 365-379.

Brown, D. J., Cober, R. T., Kane, K., Levy, P. E. & Shalhoop, J. (2006). Proactive personality and the successful job search: A field investigation with college graduates. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(3),* 717-726.

Butler, E. A., Eglott, B., Wihum, F. H; Smith, N. C; Erickson, E. A & Gross J. J. (2003). The social Consequences of Expressive Suppression Emotion, *3* (11), 48.

Cappelli, P. A. (2000), Market-driven approach to retaining talent. *Harvard Business Review, 8,* 103-113.

Ciadini, R. B. (2001) *Influence: Science and practice.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Clegg, C. W. (1984). The derivation of job designs. *Journal of Occupational s, 5*, 131-146

Cohen, S. G., & Bailey, D. E. (1997). What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of Management, 23*, 239-290.

Cook, Karen, S., & Joseph W. (1992). Two approaches to social structure: Exchange theory and network analysis. *Annual Review of Sociology, 18*, 109-127.

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*(1), 64-80.

Cote, S. and Morgan L. M. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of the association between emotional regulation, job satisfaction, and intentions to quit. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 23*(8), 947ī 962.

Coyne, I., Chong, P. S. L., Siegne, E., & Randall, P. (2003). Self and peer nominations of bullying: An analysis of incident rates, individual differences and perceptions of the working environment. *European Journal of Work and organisational Psychology, 12*(3), 209-228.

Coyne, I., Seigne, E., & Randall, P. (2000). Predicting workplace victim status from personality, *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology, 9,* 335-349.

Crant, J. (2000). Proactive in organisations. *Journal of Management, 26,* 435-462.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience.* New York: Harper and Row.

Daly, K. (1994). *Gender, crime, and punishment*. New Haven, CT:Yale University Press

De Charms, R. (1998). *Personal causation.* New York: Academic Press.

De Cuyper, N., Baillien, E., & De Witte, H. (2009). Job insecurity, perceived to employability and targetsô and perpetratorsô experiences of workplace bullying. *Work & Stress, 23*(3), 206-224

Dekker, S. W. A., & Schaufeli, W.B. (1995). The effects of job insecurity on psychological health and withdrawal: A longitudinal study. *Australian Psychologist, 30,* 57-63.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2011). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of applied Psychology, 86,* 499-512.

Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). When does transformational leadership enhance employee proactive behaviour? The role of autonomy and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97,* 194-202.

Diefendorff, J. M., & Richard, E. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of emotional display rule perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2),s 284ī 294.

Diefendorff, J. M., Croyle, M. H., & Gosserand, R. H. (2005).The dimensionality and antecedents of emotional labour strategies. *Journal of Vocational , 66*, 339-357.

Dollard, D., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer, O., & Sears, R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dorenbosch, L. Van Engen, M. L. & Verhagen, M. (2005). On-the-job Innovation: The impact of job design and ownership. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 14,* 129-141.

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

Dworkin, G. (1988). *The theory and practice of autonomy.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, J. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organisational psychology, vol, 6* (pp. 283-357). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Egan, S. K. & Perry, D. G., (1998). Does low self-regard invite victimization? *Development Psychology, 34,*299-309.

Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and cause of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower, 20,* 16-27

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress, 23*(1), 24-44.

Ekman, P. & Friesen, W. V. (1975). *Unmasking the face.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ely, R. (1995). The power I demography: Womenôs social constructions of gender identity at work. *Academic Management Journal, 38,* 589-634.

Emerson, R. M. (1972a). Exchange theory part I: A psychological basis for social exchange. In J. Berger, M. Zelditch, Jr., and B. Anderson (Eds.) *Sociological theories in progress* (Vol. 2 pp. 38-57). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Emerson, R. M. (1972b). Exchange theory part 2: Exchange Rules and Networks. In J. Berger, M. Zelditch, Jr., and B. Anderson (Eds.) *Sociological theories in progress* (Vol. 2 pp. 58-87). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Erickson, R. J. & Ritter, C. (2001). Emotional labour, burnout, and in authenticity: Does gender matter? *Social Psychology Quarterly, 64*(2), 146-163.

Fay, D. & Sonnetag, S. (2002). Rethinking the effects of stressors: A longitudinal study on personal initiative. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology.7*(3), 221-234.

Fay, D., & Frese, M. (2010). The concept of personal initiative: An overview of validity studies. *Human Performance, 14*, 97-124.

Fay, D., & Sonnentag, S. (2002). Rethinking the effects of stressors: A longitudinal study on persona initiative. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*, 221-234.

Fay, D., Yan, X. J., & West, M. A. (2007, April). A *differential approach to work stressors for innovation implementation: Stressors as promoting and impairing factors?* Paper presented at the 22nd Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, New York, NY

Feather, N. T. (1994). Attitudes towards high achievers and reactions to their fall: Theory and research concerning tall poppies. *Advance in Experimental Social Psychology, 26,* 1-73.

Felson, R. B. & Steadman H. J. (1983). Situational factors in disputes leading to criminal violence. *Criminology, 21,*59-74.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations, 7,* 117-140.

Fieldman, N. S., & Ruble, D. N. (1981). Social comparison strategies: Dimensions offered and options taken. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7* 11-16.

Folger, R., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2005). Beyond counterproductive work behaviour: Some parallels between counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) and organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). *Human Resource Management Review, 12,* 269ï 292.

Fox, A. Dwyer, D. J., & Gangster, D. C. (1993). Work control and autonomy in organisations. *Journal of Organisational , 67*, 87-99.

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

Frees, M., Kring, W., Sose, A. & Zempel, J. (1996). Personal initiative at work: Differences between East and West Germany. *Academy of Management Journal,* 39, 37-63.

Frese, M., Garst, H., & Fay, D. (2007). Making things happen: Reciprocal relationships between work characteristics and personal intuitive in a four-wave longitudinal structural equation model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 1084-1102.

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

Furr, R. M., Funder D. C. (1999). A multi-modal analysis of personality negativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,*180-1591.

Garen, J. (1999). Unions, Incentive systems, and job design. *Journal of Labour Research,* XX (4), Fall, 589-603.

Gilbert, P. (1997). The evolution of social attractiveness and its role in shame, humiliation, and guilt therapy. *British Journal ofMedical Psychology, 70,* 113-147.

Glomb, T. M., & Tews, M. J. (2004). Emotional labour: A conceptualization and scale development. *Journal of Vocational , 64*, 1-23.

Glomb, T. M., & Liao, H. (2003). Interpersonal aggression in work groups: Social influence, reciprocal, and individual effects. *Academy of Management Journal, 46* (4), 486-496.

Goethals, G. R., & Darley, J. (1977). Social comparison theory: An attributional approach. In J. Suls, and R. L. Miller, (Eds), *Social comparison process: Theoretical and empirical perspectives (*pp. 259-278). Washington, DC: Hemisphere Chicago, IL: St. Clair Press

Goldberg, L. S., & Grandey, A. A. (2007). Display rules versus display autonomy: Emotion regulation, emotional exhaustion, and task performance in a call centre simulation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(3), 301-318.

Goudner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review, 25,*161-178.

Grandey, A. A., Kern, J. H. & Frone, M. R. (2007). Verbal abuse from outsiders versus insiders: Comparing frequency, impact on emotional exhaustion and the role of emotional labour. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(1), 63-79.

Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactively at work. *Research in organisational , 28*, 3-34

Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2009). Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *Academy of Management Annals, 3,* 273-331.

Green, D. E., Walkey, F. H., & Tayor, A. J. W. (1991). The three-factor structure of the Maslash Burnout Inventory. *Journal of Science and Personality,6*, 453-472.

Greenwald, A. G. (1980). The totalitarian ego: Fabrication and revision of personal history. *American Psychologist, 35, 603-618,*

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

Grover, S., Bradfield, M., & Allien, D. G. (1999). The effects of negative affectivity, hierarchical status, and self-determination on workplace victimization. *Academic Management Journal, 24,* 260-272.

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

Hamel, G., & Prahalad, C. K. (1994). *Competing for the future.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Handy, C. (1990). *The age of unreason.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harre, R. (1984). *Personality and environment: Assessment of human adaptation.* New York: Wiley.

Hauge, L. J., Skotstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Relationships between stressful work environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study. *Work & Stress, 21* (3), 220-242.

Herschcovis,, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupre, K. E., & Inness, M. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92* (1), 228-238.

Hershcovis, M. S. (2010). Towards a multi-foci approach to workplace aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators. *Journal of Organisational Psychology , 31*, 24-44.

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

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling,* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hoel, H., Cooper, C. L., & Faragher, B. (2001). The experience of bullying in Great Britain: The impact of organisation status. *European Journal of work and Organisational Psychology, 10* (4), 443-465.

Humans, G. L. (1961). *Social : Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, ,and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 1332-1356.

Jackson, S. E., Turner, J. A., & Brief, A. P. (1987). Correlates of burnout among public service lawyers. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 8,* 339-349.

Judge, T. A., Klinger, R. L., & Simon, L. S. (2010). Time is on my side: Time, general mental ability, human capital, and extrinsic career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95,* 92-107

Kandolin, I. (1993). Burnout of female and male nurses in shiftwork. Ergonomics, 36, 141-147.

Kanfer, R. Wanberg, C. R., & Kantrowitz, T. M. (2001). Job search and employment: A personality-motivational analysis and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology,86*(5), 837-855.

Karasek, R. & Theorell, T. (1991). *Health work. stress, productivity and the reconstruction of working life.* New York: Basic Books.

Karasek, R. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative science Quarterly, 24*, 285-308.

Kelley, R. E. (1998). *How to be a star at work.* New York: Times Books.

Klim, E., & Glomb, T. M. (2010). Get smarty pants: Cognitive ability, personality, and victimization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95,* 889-901.

Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Bell B. S. (2003). Work groups and teams in organisations. In W. C. Borman, D. R. llgen, and R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial an organizational psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 333-375). London, England: Willey.

Kyan, K. M., & Fredrick, C. M. (1997). On energy, personality, and health. Subjective vitality as a dynamic reflection of well-being. *Journal of personality, 65*, 529-565.

Lam, C. K., Van deer Vegt, G. S., Waiter, F., & Huang, X. (2011). Harming high performers: A social comparison perspective on interpersonal harming in work teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96,* 588-601.

Landsbergis, P. A. (1988). Occupational stress among health care workers: A test of the job demands-control model. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 9,* 217-239.

Langer, E. (1983). *The Psychology of Control.* Beverly Hils: Sage Publications.

Lapierre, L. M., Spector, P. E., & Leck, J. D. (2005). Sexual versus nonsexual workplace aggression and victimsô overall of satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 155-169.

Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual review of psychology,56*, 485-516.

Lawler, E. J. (1996). Commitment in exchange relations: Test of a theory of relational cohesion. *American Sociological Review, 61*, 89-108.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping.* New York. Springer.

Leach, D. J., Wall, T. D., & Jackson, P. R. (2003). The effect of empowerment on job knowledge: An empirical test involving operators of complex technology. *Journals of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76,* 575-594.

Leblanc, M. M. & Kelloway, E. K. (2002). Predictors and outcomes of workplace violence and aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 444-453.

Leiter, M. P. (1989). Conceptual implications of two models of burnout. A response to Golembiewski. *Group & Organisation Studies, 14,* 15-22.

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (1988) . The impact of interpsonal environment of burnout and organizational commitment, *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 9*, 297-308.

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

Lerner, M. J. (1980). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims, 5*, 119-126.

Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*, 165-184.

Macy, M. W. (1993). Backward looking social control. *American Sociological Review, 58*, 81-86.

Maddi, S. (1989). *Personality theories: A comparative analysis.* Chicago, IL: Dorsey Press.

Maijman, T.F., & Murder, G. (1998). Psychological aspects of workload In P. J. Dreth, H. Therry, and C.J. De Wolf (Eds), *Handbook of work and organisational psychology* (2nd Ed.; pp. 5-33). Hove, U.K: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Major, D. A., Turner, J. E., & Fletcher, T. D. (2006). Linking proactive personality and the Big Five to motivation to learn and develop activity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 9*(4), 927-935.

Martinko, M. J., Gundlach, M. J., & Douglas, S. C. (2002). Toward an integrative theory of counterproductive workplace behaviour: A causal reasoning perspective. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10,* 36ï 50.

Mathiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2001). MMPI-2 configurations among victims of bullying at work. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology, 10*, 467-484.

McLain, D. L. (1995). Responses to health and safety risk in the work environment. *Academy of Management Journal,38*(6), 1726-1746.

Metthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Perpetrators and targets of bullying at work: Role stress and individual differences. *Violence and Victims, 22* (6), 735-753.

Michaels, E., Handfield-Jones, H., & Axelrod, B. (2001). *The war for talent.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Molleman, E., Nauta, A., & Bunk, B. P. (2007). Social comparison-based thoughts in groups: Their associations with interpersonal trust and learning outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37,* 1163-1180.

Molm, L. & Karen, C. (1995). Social exchange and exchange networks. In K. S. Cook, G. A. Fine, and J. S. House (Eds), *Sociological perspectives on social psychology, (*Pp. 209-235). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Morgeson, F. P. & Campion, M. A. (2003). Work design. In Borman, W.C., Ilgen D. R, & Kimoski, R. J. (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology, (*Pp.423-452). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Morris, J. A & Feldman, D. C. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(4), 986ī 1010.

Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1997). Managing emotions in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 9*(3), 257-274.

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

Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extra role efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(4), 403-419.

Muraven, M. & Baumeister R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin 126*(2), 247ī 259.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2000). *The bully at work.* Napeville, IL: Source-books

Neuman, J. H., and Baron, R. A. (1997). Aggression in the workplace. In R. A. Giacalone & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Antisocial behaviour in organisations,* (pp. 37ī 67).

Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of Management, 24,* 391ï 419.

Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (2005). Aggression in the workplace: A social psychological perspective. In S. Fox, and P. E. Spector (Eds.), C*ounterproductive work behaviour: Investigations of actors and targets,* (p. 45).

OõLeary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organisation-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review, 21,* 225ï 253.

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

Ochberg, F. M. (1988). Post-traumatic therapy and victims of violence. In F.M. Ochberg (Ed.), *Post-traumatic therapy and victims of violence.* New York: Brunner/Mazel Inc.

Ohly, S., & Fritz, C. (2010). Work characteristics, challenge appraisal, creativity, and proactive : A multi-level study. *Journal of Organisational , 31*, 543-565.

Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., & Plunke, F. (2006). Routinization, work characteristics and their relationships with creative and proactive behaviours. *Journal of Organisational , 27,* 257-279

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in schools: Bullies and whipping Boys.* Washington, D.C: Hemisphere.

Olweus, D. (2003). Bully/Victim problems in school: Basic facts and an effective interventions programme. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C.L. Cooper (Eds), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace. International perspectives in research and practice (*pp.62-78). London: Taylor & Francis.

Parker, J. G. & Asher, S. R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low accepted children at risk? *Psychology Bulletin*. *102,*357-389.

Parker, S. K. & Ohly, S. (2008). Designing motivating work. In R. Kanfer, G. Chen, and R. Prichard (Eds.), *Work motivation: Past present and future.* Hillsdale, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Parker, S. K. (1998). Enhancing role breadth self-efficiency: The role of job enrichment and other organisational interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(6), 835-852.

Parker, S. K. (2000). From passive to proactive motivation: The importance of flexible role orientations and role breadth self-efficacy. *Applied Psychology, 49,* 447-469.

Parker, S. K., & Sprigg, C. A. (1999). Minimizing strain and maximizing learning: The role of job demands, job control, and proactive personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84,* 925-939.

Parker, S. K., Wall, T. D., & Jackson, P. R. (1997). ñThatôs not my jobò: Developing flexible employee work orientations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *40,* 899-929.

Parker, S. K., Williams, H. M., & Turner, N. (2006). Modelling the antecedents of proactive behaviour at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 636-652.

Pettigrew, T. F. & Martin, J. (1987). Shaping the organisational context. Boston. MA: Business School Press

Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie S. B. (1989). *A second generation measure of organisational citizenship* . Indiana University.

Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. III. (1968). *Managerial attitudes and performance.* Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey.

Putnam, L. L., & Mumby, D. K. (1993). Organisations, emotion and the myth of rationally. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organisations (*36-57). London: Sage

Raabe, B., Frese, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2007). A general multilevel SEM framework for assessing multilevel mediation. *Psychological Methods, 15,* 209-233.

Rayner, C. (1997). The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 7,* 199-208.

Rayner, C., & Keashly, L. (2005). Bullying at work: A perspective from North America. In S. Fox and P.E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behaviour. Investigations of actos and targets (*pp. 271-296). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Rodin, J. (1986). Aging and health: effects on the sense of control. *Science, 233*, 1271-1276.

Rogers, K. A. & Kelloway, E. K. (1997). Violence at work: Personal and organisational outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 2*, 63-71.

Rubovits, P. C., & Maehr, M. L. (1973). Pygmalion black and white. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25,*210-218.

Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive . *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19*(1), 116-131.

Salanova, M., Lorens, S, Cifre, E., Martinez, I., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2003). Perceive collective efficacy, subjective well-being and task performance among electronic work group. An experimental study. *Small Group Research, 34*, 43-73.

Schat, A. C. H. & Kelloway, E. K. (2005). Workplace aggression. In j. Barling, E. K. Keloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress, (*pp. 189-218.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. (2002). The measurement of burnout and engagement: A confirmatory factory analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*, 71-92.

Schimdts, F. L., & Hunter, J. (2004). General mental ability in the world of work: Occupational attainment and job performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86,* 162-173.

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression Management.* Monterey *CA:* Books/Cole.

Schwarz, N., & Clore, G. L. (1983). Mood, misattribution, and judgments of well-being: Informative and directive functions of affective states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45,* 513-523.

Sidanius, J. F. & Pratto. (1999). *Social dominance: An Intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 434ï 443.

Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behaviour: A new look at the interface between nonwork and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 518-528

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behaviour (CWB). In Fox, S. &. Spector, P. E (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behaviour: Investigations of actors and targets,* (p. 46).

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behaviour. In Fox S. & Spector, P. E. (Eds), *Counterproductive behaviour,*

*investigations of actors and targets (*pp. 151-174). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

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

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

Strauss, K., Griggin, M. A., & Rafferty, A. E. (2000). Proactivity directed toward the team and organization: The role of leadership, commitment and role-breadth self efficacy. *British Journal of Management,20, 279-291.*

Sturman, M. C., Trevor, C. O., Boudreau, J. W., & Gerhart, B. (2003). Is it worth it to win the talent war? Evaluating the utility of performance-based pay . *Personnel Psychology*, *56*, 997-1035.

Sutton, R. I. (1991). Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 245-268.

Sutton, R. I. (2007). *The no asshole rule: Building a civilized workplace and surviving one that isn't.* New York, NY: Grand Central

Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspectives on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin, 103,* 193-210.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43, 178-190.*

Thayer, R. E, Newman, J. R & McClain, T. M. (1994). Self-regulation of mood: Strategies for changing a bad mood, raising energy, and reducing tension. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(5), 910ī 925.

Theorell, I., & Karasek, R. A. (1996). Current issues relating to psychosocial job strain and cardiovascular disease research. *Journal f Occupational Health Psychology, 1*, 9-26.

Thibaut, J. W. & Harold, H. K. (1959). *The social psychology groups.* New York: Wiley.

Thomas, J. P., Whitman, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (2010). Employee proactivity in organizations: A Comparative meta-analysis of emergent proactive constructs. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology, 83,* 275-300.

Totterdel, P., & Holman, D. (2003). Emotional regulation in customer service roles: Testing a model of emotional labour. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8*(1), 55-73.

Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (1997). Whatôs good about revenge: The avengerôs perspective. R. J. Lewicki, R. J. Bies, B. H. Sheppard (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organisations,* vol. 6. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 145-160.

Trivers, R. (1971). The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *Quarterly Review of Biology, 46,*35-56.

VanMaanen, J., & Kunda, G. (1989). Real feelings: Emotional expression and organisational culture. *Research in Organisational , 11*, 43-103.

Vartia, M., & Hyyti, J. (2002). Gender differences in workplace bullying among prison officers. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology, 11,* 113-126.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organisations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weisz, J. R. (1990). ôDevelopment of Control-related beliefs, goals, and styles in childhood and adolescence: A clinical perspectiveô. In: Rodin, J., Schooler, C. and Schaie, K.W. (Eds) *Self-directedness: Cause and effects throughout the life Course.* Hillsdale, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wharton, A. S. (1993). The affective consequences of service work: Managing emotions on the job. *Work and occupations, 20*(2), 205-232.

White, R. W. (1959). ôMotivation reconsidered: The concept of competenceô, *Psychological Review, 66***,** 297-333.

Whitehead, J. T. (1987). Probation officer job burnout: A test of two theories. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 15,* 1-16

Xanthopoulou D, Bakker A. B, Demerouti E & Schaufeli W. B (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management, 14*(2), 121ī 141.

Zapf, D. (1999). Organizational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower, 20 (*12), 70-85.

Zapf, D., & Einasen, S. (2003). Individual antecedents of bullying: Victims and perpetrators. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying*

and emotional abuse in the workplace. International perspectives in research and practice (Pp. 165-184). London: Taylor & Francis.

Zapf, D., Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Vartia, M. (2003). Empirical findings on bullying in the workplace. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace. International perspectives in research and practice* (Pp. 103-126). London: Taylor & Francis.

Zapf, D., Vogt, C. Seifert, C., Mertini, H., & Isic, A. (1999). Emotion work as a source of stress: The concept and development of an instrument, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*(3), 371-400.

Department of Psychology,
University of Nigeria,
Nsukka.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a postgraduate student of the above department and the questionnaire below is part of my M.Sc project work. Please the following statements are designed to elicit your feelings towards your work. It is solely for academic exercise. Indicate the extent to which the statements apply to you. Tick (ã) in the corresponding space across each item.

Please respond with all sincerity.

Thanks.

Yours sincerely,

Isife, Onyekachi Gerald

Demographic Data

Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )

Age: _____

Marital status: Single ( ) Married ( )

Position: _____

How long have you been in the current position? _____

How long have you been in the organisation? _____

Appendix A

Proactive work behaviour scale

Please respond to the following statement by indicating to what extent your own behaviour agrees with the statements. Response Options are: (1) Not True At All (2) Rarely True (3) Somewhat True (4) True (5) Very True

S/N	ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5
1	I am constantly on the lookout new ways to improve my life.					
2	I feel driven to make a difference in my community, and maybe the world.					
3	I tend to let others take the initiative to start new projects.					
4	Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change.					
5	I enjoy facing and overcoming obstacles to my ideas.					
6	Nothing is more exciting than seeing my ideas turn into reality.					
7	If I see something I donôt like, I fix it.					
8	No matter the odds, if I believe in something I make it happen.					
9	I love being a champions for my ideas, even against others opposition.					
10	I excel at identifying opportunities.					
11	I am always looking for better ways to do things.					
12	If I believe in an idea, no obstacles will prevent me from making it happen.					
13	I love to challenge the status quo.					
14	When I have a problem, I tackle it head on.					
15	I am great at turning problems into opportunities.					
16	I can spot a great opportunity long before others can.					
17	If I see something in trouble, I help it out anyway I can.					

Appendix B

Emotional Labour Scale

Below are a number of words that describe how you feel about your job. Tick as it affects you. Response options are: (1) Very little (2) Little (3) A moderate amount (4) Much (5) Very much

S/N	ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5
1	I try to talk myself out of feeling what I really feel when helping customers.					
2	I work at conjuring up the feelings I need to show to customers					
3	I try to change my actual feelings to match those that I must express to customers.					
4	When working with customers, I attempt to create certain emotions in myself that present the image my company desire.					
5	I show the same feelings to customers that I feel inside					
6	The emotion I show the customer match what I truly feel.					

Appendix C

Work Control Scale

Below are listed number of statements which could be used to describe a job. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which each is an accurate or an inaccurate description of your job by writing a number in front of each statement. Response options are: (1) Very little (2) Little (3) Moderately amount (4) Much (5) Very much

S/N	ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5
1	How much control do you have over the variety of methods you use in completing your work?					
2	How much can you choose among a variety of tasks or projects to do?					
3	How much control do you have personally over the quality of your work?					
4	How much can you generally predict the amount of work you will have to do on any given day?					
5	How much control do you personally have over how much work you get done?					
6	how much control do you personally have over how much work you get done?					
7	How much control do you have over the scheduling and duration of your rest breaks?					
8	How much control do you have over when you come to work and leave?					
9	How much control do you have over when you take vacation or days off?					
10	How much are you able to predict what the results of decisions you make on the job will be?					
11	How much are you able to decorate, rearrange, or personalize your work area?					
12	How much can you control the physical condition of your work station (lighting, temperature)?					
13	How much control do you have over how you do your work?					
14	How much can you control when and how much you have to interact with others at work?					
15	How much control do you have over the sources of information you need to do your job?					
16	How much control do you have over the sources of information you need to do your job?					

17	How much are things that affect you at work predictable, even if you canôt directly control them?					
18	How much control do you have over the amount of resources (tools, material) that you get?					
19	How much can you control the number of times you are interrupted while you work?					
20	How much control do you have over how much you earn at your job?					
21	How much control do you have over how your work is evaluated?					
22	In general, how much overall control do you have over work and work-related matters?					

Appendix D

Work Victimization Scale

Please respond to the following statements by indicating how you are treated in your organization Response options are: (1) Not at all (2) Somewhat (3) Moderately

(4) A lot (5) Extremely

S/N	ITEMS	1	2	3	4	5
1	I was purposefully humiliated					
2	I was intentionally subjected to a hurtful experience					
3	A conscious effort was made to make me feel mistreated					
4	I was intentionally wounded by hostle behaviour					
5	I felt deliberately accosted					
6	I was intentionally treated poorly					
7	I was intentionally belittled					
8	My feelings were hurt by an antagonistic act directed against me					

Appendix E

Statistical Analysis of the Study

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	135	59.0	59.0	59.0
	Female	94	41.0	41.0	100.0
	Total	229	100.0	100.0	

Marital Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	183	79.9	79.9	79.9
	Single	46	20.1	20.1	100.0
	Total	229	100.0	100.0	

Job Position

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Senior	97	42.4	42.4	42.4
	Non Senior	132	57.6	57.6	100.0
	Total	229	100.0	100.0	

Descriptives

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Gender	229	1	2	1.41	.493
Marital Status	229	1	2	1.20	.402
Number of Yrs spent on the job	229	1	20	4.38	2.984
Age	229	24	69	42.00	8.770
Surface Acting	229	2	10	7.07	2.006
Deep Acting	229	4	20	13.43	3.439
Work control	229	24	241	73.49	16.935
Work victimization	229	8	40	17.09	7.833
Proactive Behaviour	229	41	85	64.31	11.382
Valid N (listwise)	229				

Correlations

		Gender	Marital Status	Number of Yrs spent on the job	Age	Surface Acting	Deep Acting	Work control	Work victimization	Proactive Behaviour
Gender	Pearson Correlation	1	.047	.049	.069	-.022	-.046	.055	-.017	.066
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.480	.465	.296	.740	.492	.406	.803	.320
	N	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229
Marital Status	Pearson Correlation	.047	1	-.166*	-.471**	-.117	-.133*	.009	-.159*	.182**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.480		.012	.000	.078	.044	.888	.016	.006
	N	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229
Number of Yrs spent on the job	Pearson Correlation	.049	-.166*	1	.409**	.102	-.055	.129	.164*	.081
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.465	.012		.000	.123	.404	.052	.013	.225
	N	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229
Age	Pearson Correlation	.069	-.471**	.409**	1	.119	.084	-.052	.209**	-.025
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.296	.000	.000		.072	.206	.435	.002	.707
	N	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229
Surface Acting	Pearson Correlation	-.022	-.117	.102	.119	1	.386**	.214**	.195**	-.007
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.740	.078	.123	.072		.000	.001	.003	.916
	N	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229
Deep Acting	Pearson Correlation	-.046	-.133*	-.055	.084	.386**	1	.088	.330**	.154*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.492	.044	.404	.206	.000		.184	.000	.020
	N	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229

Work control	Pearson Correlation	.055	.009	.129	-.052	.214**	.088	1	.235**	.060
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.406	.888	.052	.435	.001	.184		.000	.364
	N	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229
Work victimization	Pearson Correlation	-.017	-.159*	.164*	.209**	.195**	.330**	.235**	1	.079
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.803	.016	.013	.002	.003	.000	.000		.232
	N	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229
Proactive Behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.066	.182**	.081	-.025	-.007	.154*	.060	.079	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.320	.006	.225	.707	.916	.020	.364	.232	
	N	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229	229

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Regression

Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status[b]	.	Enter
2	Surface Acting, Deep Acting[b]	.	Enter
3	Work control[b]	.	Enter
4	Work victimization[b]	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: Proactive Behaviour
b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.221[a]	.049	.032	11.199	.049	2.879	4	224	.024
2	.301[b]	.090	.066	11.001	.041	5.064	2	222	.007
3	.303[c]	.092	.063	11.017	.001	.356	1	221	.551
4	.304[d]	.093	.060	11.037	.001	.207	1	220	.649

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status
b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status, Surface Acting, Deep Acting
c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status, Surface Acting, Deep Acting, Work control

d. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status, Surface Acting, Deep Acting, Work control, Work victimization

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1444.365	4	361.091	2.879	.024[b]
	Residual	28094.998	224	125.424		
	Total	29539.362	228			
2	Regression	2670.208	6	445.035	3.677	.002[c]
	Residual	26869.154	222	121.032		
	Total	29539.362	228			
3	Regression	2713.467	7	387.638	3.193	.003[d]
	Residual	26825.896	221	121.384		
	Total	29539.362	228			
4	Regression	2738.707	8	342.338	2.810	.006[e]
	Residual	26800.655	220	121.821		
	Total	29539.362	228			

a. Dependent Variable: Proactive Behaviour
b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status
c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status, Surface Acting, Deep Acting
d. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status, Surface Acting, Deep Acting, Work control
e. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status, Surface Acting, Deep Acting, Work control, Work victimization

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	52.277	5.927		8.820	.000
	Gender	1.136	1.515	.049	.750	.454
	Marital Status	5.957	2.103	.210	2.833	.005
	Number of Yrs spent on the job	.386	.273	.101	1.417	.158
	Age	.038	.104	.029	.364	.716
2	(Constant)	44.887	6.747		6.653	.000
	Gender	1.298	1.489	.056	.872	.384
	Marital Status	6.495	2.077	.229	3.127	.002
	Number of Yrs spent on the job	.495	.270	.130	1.830	.069
	Age	.022	.102	.017	.213	.832
	Surface Acting	-.457	.398	-.081	-1.149	.252
	Deep Acting	.741	.233	.224	3.182	.002
3	(Constant)	43.138	7.364		5.858	.000
	Gender	1.239	1.495	.054	.829	.408
	Marital Status	6.508	2.080	.230	3.128	.002
	Number of Yrs spent on the job	.469	.274	.123	1.710	.089
	Age	.030	.103	.023	.290	.772
	Surface Acting	-.503	.406	-.089	-1.240	.216
	Deep Acting	.736	.233	.222	3.156	.002
	Work control	.027	.045	.040	.597	.551
4	(Constant)	43.324	7.389		5.863	.000
	Gender	1.259	1.498	.055	.840	.402
	Marital Status	6.544	2.086	.231	3.138	.002
	Number of Yrs spent on the job	.458	.276	.120	1.659	.099
	Age	.024	.104	.019	.230	.818
	Surface Acting	-.504	.406	-.089	-1.240	.216
	Deep Acting	.704	.244	.213	2.885	.004
	Work control	.022	.046	.033	.484	.629
	Work victimization	.047	.104	.033	.455	.649

a. Dependent Variable: Proactive Behaviour

Excluded Variables[a]

Model		Beta In	T	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics
						Tolerance
1	Surface Acting	.005[b]	.074	.941	.005	.977
	Deep Acting	.193[b]	2.966	.003	.195	.971
	Work control	.046[b]	.686	.493	.046	.967
	Work victimization	.096[b]	1.438	.152	.096	.943
2	Work control	.040[c]	.597	.551	.040	.920
	Work victimization	.040[c]	.574	.567	.039	.841
3	Work victimization	.033[d]	.455	.649	.031	.802

a. Dependent Variable: Proactive Behaviour

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status, Surface Acting, Deep Acting

d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Age, Gender, Number of Yrs spent on the job, Marital Status, Surface Acting, Deep Acting, Work control