

University of Houston

From the Selected Works of L. A. Witt

2012

Personality and reactions to organizational politics

L. A. Witt, *University of Houston - Main*



Available at: <https://works.bepress.com/witt/32/>

Politics in Organizations

Theory and Research Considerations

Edited by

Gerald R. Ferris

Florida State University

Darren C. Treadway

State University of New York at Buffalo

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
711 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10017

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
27 Church Road
Hove, East Sussex BN3 2FA

© 2012 by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
Version Date: 20111031

International Standard Book Number: 978-0-415-88213-2 (Hardback)

For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from this work, please access www.copyright.com (<http://www.copyright.com/>) or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For organizations that have been granted a photocopy license by the CCC, a separate system of payment has been arranged.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.


Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Politics in organizations : theory and research considerations / editors, Gerald R. Ferris, Darren C. Treadway.
p. cm. -- (SIOF organizational frontiers series)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-415-88213-2 (hardcover : alk. paper)
1. Office politics. 2. Organizational behavior. 3. Corporate culture. I. Ferris, Gerald R. II. Treadway, Darren C.

HD58.7.P647 2012
302.3'5--dc23

2011044088

Visit the Taylor & Francis Web site at
<http://www.taylorandfrancis.com>
and the Psychology Press Web site at
<http://www.psypress.com>

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
New York London

SECTION II Critical Research Issues in Organizational Politics

- Chapter 5** It's Fairly Political Around Here: Relationship Between Perceptions of Organizational Politics and Organizational Justice 133
Maureen L. Ambrose
- Chapter 6** Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Review of the Political Perspective..... 161
Mark C. Bolino and William H. Turnley
- Chapter 7** Abusive Supervision as Political Activity: Distinguishing Impulsive and Strategic Expressions of Downward Hostility 191
Bennett J. Tepper, Michelle K. Duffy, and Denise M. Breaux-Soignet
- Chapter 8** Organizational Politics and Stress: The Development of a Process Model..... 213
Pamela L. Perrewé, Christopher C. Rosen, and Christina Maslach
- Chapter 9** How Organizational Climates Reflect the Motives of Those in Power 257
Lawrence R. James and Rustin D. Meyer
- Chapter 10** Politics in and Around Teams: Toward a Team-Level Conceptualization of Organizational Politics..... 287
Eran Vigoda-Gadot and Dana R. Vashdi
- Chapter 11** Leadership and Organizational Politics: A Multilevel Review and Framework for Pragmatic Deals 323
Francis J. Yammarino and Michael D. Mumford

- Chapter 12** Power, Politics, and Social Networks in Organizations 355
Daniel J. Brass and David M. Krackhardt

- Chapter 13** Organizational Politics in Strategic Management and Entrepreneurship 377
Robert A. Baron, Sean Lux, Garry L. Adams, and Bruce T. Lamont

- Chapter 14** The Cultural Psychology of Social Influence: Implications for Organizational Politics 411
Lisa M. Leslie and Michele J. Gelfand

SECTION III Individual Differences in Organizational Politics

- Chapter 15** The Intersection of Race and Politics: A Framework for Racialized Organizational Politics Perceptions 451
Aitra C. Charles and Stella M. Nkomo

- Chapter 16** Political Skill in the Organizational Sciences 487
Gerald R. Ferris, Darren C. Treadway, Robyn L. Brower, and Timothy P. Munyon

- Chapter 17** Political Will in Organizations 529
Darren C. Treadway

- Chapter 18** Personality and Reactions to Organizational Politics ... 555
L. A. Witt and Paul E. Spector

- Index**..... 589

Contents

Series Foreword.....	xi
Preface	xiii
Acknowledgments	xvii
Editors	xix
Contributors.....	xxi

SECTION I Construct Specification, Theory Development, and Methodological Considerations

Chapter 1 Politics in Organizations: History, Construct Specification, and Research Directions	3
<i>Gerald R. Ferris and Darren C. Treadway</i>	
Chapter 2 The Positive Side of Organizational Politics	27
<i>Wayne A. Hochwarter</i>	
Chapter 3 Politics in Perspectives: On the Theoretical Challenges and Opportunities in Studying Organizational Politics	67
<i>Douglas A. Lepisto and Michael G. Pratt</i>	
Chapter 4 Measurement and Methodology in Organizational Politics Research	99
<i>Lynn A. McFarland, Chad H. Van Iddekinge, and Robert E. Ployhart</i>	

Personality and Reactions to Organizational Politics

L. A. Witt

University of Houston

Paul E. Spector

University of South Florida

A growing body of literature has shown that organizational politics can demonstrate detrimental effects on both people and organizations. Following the publication of Ferris, Russ, and Fandt's (1989) model of organizational politics, scholars have noted that individual differences not only act as antecedents of politics perceptions but also affect reactions to those perceptions (e.g., O'Connor & Morrison, 2001; Rosen, Chang, & Levy, 2006). Organizational politics can demonstrate effects on employees in two ways. First, politics is a form of stressor that can lead to strains in employees (Miller, Rutherford, & Kolodinsky, 2008; Vigoda, 2002). Hence, it might be considered an interpersonal conflict stressor (Siu, Spector, Cooper, & Lu, 2005).

Second, it has been argued that organizational politics will lead to reduced job performance (Chang, Rosen, & Levy, 2009), although the direct relationship between politics and performance is equivocal (Miller et al., 2008) and is likely due to individual differences (e.g., Treadway, Ferris, Hochwarter, Perrewé, Witt, & Goodman, 2005 found a relationship only for older workers). Thus, it is important to ascertain how individual differences generally, and personality in particular, play roles in both perceptions of, and reactions to, politics. Unfortunately, there has been little work conducted linking personality to perceived politics, so our discussion is largely speculative.

THE NATURE OF ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS

As reflected in other chapters in this volume, a considerable literature has highlighted the impact of perceived organizational politics; a facet of an organization's overall climate, reflecting the extent to which organization members promote self-interest without regard to, or even at the expense of, organizational goals or other people (Ferris et al., 1989; Mintzberg, 1983). In many ways, perceived organizational politics is the mirror image of the construct of perceived organizational support (Nye & Witt, 1993), a facet of an organization's overall climate, reflecting the extent to which organization members care about each other and share information and other resources (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Consistent with Lewin's (1936) notion that individuals respond to their perceptions of reality, not to reality itself, organizational politics researchers have focused on *perceptions* of organizational politics (e.g., Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Gandz & Murray, 1980; Miller et al., 2008).

Scholars have identified three dimensions of perceptions of organizational politics: (1) general political behavior; (2) going along to get ahead; and (3) pay and promotion policies (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997; Kacmar & Ferris, 1991). General political behavior stems from situations in which resources are scarce, there is an absence of clear rules and regulations, and considerable ambiguity concerning one's job or the organization's priorities. The idea is that in such environments workers default to self-serving behavior. In contrast, going along to get ahead reflects a conflict between two or more parties, which is an impetus to either retaliate or blend in. Finally, by not clearly linking employee performance with personnel decisions, poorly designed pay and promotion policies actually might encourage political behavior beyond pure task performance (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997; Kacmar & Ferris, 1991).

Scholars have described organizational politics as both functional (e.g., Buchanan & Badham, 1999) and dysfunctional (e.g., Gandz & Murray, 1980). However, the more common view is that it is dysfunctional. Indeed, reporting the results of their meta-analysis, Miller et al. (2008) concluded that perceptions of organizational politics are related to a number of negative organizational outcomes, including high levels of job dissatisfaction, job stress, and turnover intentions as well as low levels of organizational commitment. Although robustly related to work

attitudes, Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, and Toth (1997) observed that perceptions of organizational politics have been less consistently related to job behaviors. Perhaps explaining some of the lack of success linking perceived politics with behaviors are studies indicating that perceptions of organizational politics interact with individual variables in the prediction of important work outcomes (e.g., Hochwarter, Perrewé, Ferris, & Guercio, 1999; Kacmar, Bozeman, Carlson, & Anthony, 1999).

Scholars primarily have offered motivation-based explanations of how perceptions of organizational politics influence worker behavior. Some of the work has focused on social exchange theory (e.g., Hall, Hochwarter, Ferris, & Bowen, 2004; Vigoda, 2000), whereby, for example, unfavorable situations (i.e., high levels of politics) lead workers to retaliate with negative behavior, such as counterproductive work behavior (CWB) targeted toward individuals (e.g., Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004). The social exchange approach to linking both politics and support with work-related outcomes has yielded a considerable literature (e.g., Wayne, Coyle-Shapiro, Eisenberger, Liden, Rousseau, & Shore, 2009). However, social exchange theory may be limited in its capacity to fully explain how perceptions of organizational politics affect behavior directed toward individual employees, such as CWB.

Social exchange relationships involve reciprocal exchanges between employees and other parties (i.e., the employing organization and individual customers, vendors, coworkers, supervisors, and managers; Blau, 1964). As noted by Chang et al. (2009), "perceptions of organizational politics represent evaluations of social aspects of organizational settings (i.e., witnessing members politicking and receiving rewards)" (p. 795). Thus, perceptions of high levels of politics may not represent something the organization or any particular organization member is doing to the employee but instead reflect "how things are done around here." With no clear exchange partner, social exchange theory is insufficient to explain how organizational politics affects behavior targeted toward individuals.

Researchers also have applied stress theories to understand the impact of organizational politics (e.g., Vigoda, 2002). From this perspective, politics is a job stressor (i.e., a condition at work that elicits a negative emotional response; Spector, 1998), and dysfunctional outcomes typically linked to high levels of organizational politics are seen as behavioral responses that help employees cope with the stressor or the concomitant negative emotions. As pointed out by David, Witt, and Penney (2011), this approach

does not predict the specific manner in which employees will respond to stressors (e.g., whether employees will engage in person- or organization-focused CWB). Hence, stress theories also are insufficient to explain how organizational politics affects worker behavior.

Consistent with Chang et al.'s (2009) argument that perceptions of organizational politics is an assessment of social nuances of the organizational context, it is suggested that perceptions of organizational politics provide cues that communicate behavioral norms that are expected (Cialdini & Trost, 1998; Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004). Therefore, social learning theories are used to provide a third possible mechanism with which to explain how perceptions of organizational politics affect worker behavior. Social cognitive and social information processing theories explain how individuals make sense of themselves and their environment. The idea is that individuals observe and model others' behavior and simultaneously link these acts with information about environmental incentives (Bandura, 1971). These contextual cues make it possible for individuals to interpret events, to understand norms, and to make decisions accordingly (Crick & Dodge, 1994). Hence, contextual cues lead to the development of socially constructed realities, which indicate what behaviors are acceptable, appropriate, expected, and therefore required for survival.

As personal assessments of social aspects of organizations, how might perceptions of organizational politics influence behavior at work? Bandura (1991) identified two categories of motivational processes—namely, achievement-striving behavior and social and moral behavior. Self-efficacy (i.e., perceived capability) is a critical element of the former but not the latter. Whereas many aspects of organizational climate are linked with achievement-striving behavior (e.g., climate for service), perceptions of organizational politics is unusual in that it may influence both achievement-striving and social and moral behavior. For example, CWB clearly falls into the category of social and moral behavior.

Social cues affect social and moral behavior in three ways (Bandura, 1986). First, they establish the standards for social and moral conduct. Second, they establish the support in the social collective for adherence to those standards. Third, they permit selective activation and disengagement of moral self-regulation. In other words, contextual cues may override personal standards of moral conduct. This “enables otherwise considerate people to perform self-serving activities that have detrimental social effects” (Bandura, 1991, p. 280). As these processes indicate how cues

shape behavioral responses, it is suggested that social cognitive theory is a viable approach for explaining the links between organizational politics and performance-related work behavior.

ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS AND PERFORMANCE

For more than 50 years, scholars have articulated the importance of examining interactions between ability and motivation as determinants of key work outcomes (e.g., Gagne & Fleishman, 1959; Pinder, 1984; Vroom, 1964). Most point to Maier (1955) as having formalized the notion that job performance is an interactive function of motivation and ability with the formula $P = f(M \times A)$. That is, greater ability has greater effect at higher levels of motivation. In other words, capable individuals who make little effort because they are unmotivated perform poorly. Similarly, if individuals are incapable of performing, they will perform poorly (e.g., make mistakes or cause accidents) even if they are highly motivated. Studies testing the interaction hypothesis have yielded mixed results (e.g., Sackett, Grays, & Ellingson, 1998; Wright, Kacmar, McMahan, & Deleuw, 1995).

Hollenbeck, Brief, Whetener, and Pauli (1988) reported that personality traits used as motivation proxies interacted with general mental ability in some samples to predict job performance but not in others. They concluded that external constraints should be added as a third variable in the equation (i.e., $P = f[M \times A \times C]$). Similarly, Hirschfeld, Lawson, and Mossholder (2004) made the distinction between general trait motivation and context-specific motivation in their tests of interactive hypotheses. They found that whereas general trait motivation combined additively with ability, context-specific motivation combined interactively.

Combining the logic of these two studies, and consistent with the person-situation interaction literature (e.g., Endler & Magnusson, 1976; Lewin, 1936; Pervin, 1989; Schneider, 1983), David and Witt (2010) posited that one of the reasons that researchers have found inconsistent results in testing the $P = f(M \times A)$ is the failure to take into consideration a key determinant of behavior, namely, the context. They then revised Hollenbeck et al.'s (1988) expansion of the formula, suggesting that the third element, *C*, refer to the context rather than constraints per se. David and Witt argued that because some environmental factors might be neutral rather

than negative (i.e., presence of constraints), *context* rather than *constraints* might better represent the situational component of the formula.

In this chapter, the focus is on organizational politics as an important contextual variable and how it might relate to personality, which is done largely by applying the $P = f(M \times A \times C)$ formula to explain how constellations of personality traits likely affect how workers respond to organizational politics. Specifically, the influences of politics and personality are discussed on the following five performance–relevant work behaviors: task performance, team player behavior, adaptive performance, counterproductive work behavior (CWB), and withdrawal behavior.

First, three theoretical approaches are described that explain the effects of organizational politics on individual-level behavior. Second, these theoretical approaches are applied to describe how perceptions of organizational politics influence our five criterion behaviors of interest. Third, interactions among dimensions of the five-factor model (FFM; Digman, 1990) with perceptions of organizational politics are discussed:

- Conscientiousness \times emotional stability \times perceptions of organizational politics
- Agreeableness \times emotional stability \times perceptions of organizational politics
- Openness to experience \times emotional stability \times perceptions of organizational politics

THE CONTEXT: HOW DOES ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS INFLUENCE WORKER BEHAVIOR?

Following Campbell, Gasser, and Oswald (1996), we argue that it is necessary to differentiate specific facets of performance and to link them with the relevant personality traits. Furthermore, it is necessary to differentiate performance outcomes from performance behaviors. Clearly, organizational constituents care more about business outcomes (e.g., sales made) than behaviors (e.g., conversations with customers). However, because workers have more control over their behavior (Campbell, McCloy, Opler, & Sager, 1993) than performance outcomes (e.g., a worker may make an effective sales pitch but is unlikely to make the sale if the products were

not delivered to the store), organizational scientists typically operationalize performance in terms of performance behaviors. For the same reason, the focus here is on five behaviors: task performance, team player behavior, adaptive performance, CWB, and withdrawal behavior. In doing so, different combinations of traits are positioned to interact with organizational politics to influence worker behavior.

Task Performance

Following Campbell (1990), Borman, Motowidlo, and their colleagues firmly established the distinction between task performance and contextual performance as distinct dimensions of job performance across types of jobs (e.g., Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Borman & Motowidlo, 1997a, 1997b; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000). Task performance refers to behaviors involving the set of core substantive tasks and duties central to a job. Hence, task performance behaviors are unique to each job. Relationships of task performance to perceptions of organizational politics have been equivocal, with some studies finding significant relationships (e.g., Witt, 1998) and some not (Treadway et al., 2005).

Miller et al.'s (2008) meta-analysis found a nonsignificant $-.10$ mean correlation between the two variables. Treadway et al. (2005) found in three samples that the performance and politics relationship was moderated by age, such that there was a negative relationship for older but not younger employees. Their explanation is that the effects of politics are cumulative over time, as it tends to wear down employees by consuming resources. Thus, the relationship of organizational politics is likely to be dynamic.

Team Player Behavior

In contrast to task performance, contextual performance behaviors are not explicitly or formally prescribed by a specific job. Rather, they are inherent in all jobs and support the social fabric of the organization. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) described contextual performance in terms of helping, cooperating, following rules, volunteering, and so forth, which are behaviors resembling organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ, 1988, 1997). Later, Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996) purported that contextual performance consists of two dimensions, namely, job dedication and interpersonal facilitation. According to Van Scotter and Motowidlo, job

dedication refers to “self-disciplined behaviors such as following rules, working hard, and taking the initiative to solve a problem at work,” and interpersonal facilitation refers to “interpersonally oriented behaviors that contribute to organizational goal accomplishment” (p. 526).

David and Witt (2010) described team player behavior as a combination reflecting both job dedication and interpersonal facilitation. Following considerable discussion of team players in both the empirical literature (e.g., Parker, 1996) and the popular press (e.g., Brookman, 2007; White, 2004, 2007), they suggested that the contemporary use of the term *team player* refers to employees who cooperate with the social, tactical, and strategic zeitgeist of the work group. In other words, they argued that team players put aside personal ambitions, proactively cooperate with others, and adhere to informal norms designed to maintain order and accomplish common goals. Such behaviors are the antithesis of political behavior in that they are not self-serving.

David and Witt (2010) emphasized that supervisors and managers, like team players, are concerned with influencing a group to meet a common goal; however, they do so external to the work group. In contrast, team players may hold any rank in the organization and often perform the tasks themselves rather than directing others to do so. Workers manifesting high levels of team player behavior often are the members of the work team who are willing to make sacrifices and are unlikely to attribute blame to others. Moreover, they exert the effort and “right attitude” necessary for the team to be successful. It is argued herein that high levels of organizational politics are likely to reduce levels of team player behavior.

Adaptive Performance

Griffin, Neal, and Parker (2007) pointed out that the interdependence and uncertainty of work systems require new and expanded models of job performance. Emphasizing that dealing with workplace change is an important element of performance, they identified three facets of work behavior: proficiency, proactivity, and adaptivity. They viewed proficiency as task performance, proactivity as “self-directed action to anticipate or initiate change in the work system or work roles” (p. 329), and adaptivity as adjustment to “changes in a work system or work roles” (p. 329).

Further differentiating between proactivity and adaptivity, Griffin, Parker, and Mason (2010, p. 175) described proactivity as self-initiated

change to “alter the external environment so that it fits with individual needs” (i.e., primary control; Rothbaum, Weisz, & Snyder, 1982) and adaptivity as “accepting the change and adapting oneself to it” (i.e., secondary control; Rothbaum et al., 1982). Clearly, there are times when organizations need each of these approaches, with proactivity being valuable for innovation and problem solving and adaptivity as being necessary for individuals to perform day-to-day functions at work.

Adaptive performance involves efforts to enhance one’s skill set in response to a changing environment as well as to cooperate with workplace changes, such as the implementation of new policies (Griffin & Hesketh, 2003; Johnson, 2001; Ployhart & Bliese, 2006; Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000). Furthermore, adaptive performance is strategically relevant to the organization compared with adaptive behavior that is intended to promote the career of the individual without concern for the benefit to the organization. Krischer and Witt (2010) emphasized that adaptive performance encompasses a set of behaviors, not ability or intent. Moreover, they emphasized that organizations need workers to successfully deal with the ambiguity and anxiety that change yields and also to be capable to develop and apply new skills. The next section explains how high levels of organizational politics are likely to reduce levels of adaptive performance.

Counterproductive Work Behavior

CWB is a form of performance that consists of acts that run counter to the legitimate interests of an organization (Sackett & DeVore, 2002). CWB can be targeted toward organizations (e.g., wasting time, theft, performing work incorrectly, and withholding effort), or it can be targeted toward individuals (e.g., spreading false rumors, insulting, ignoring, and making fun of others). High levels of organizational politics are likely to promote CWB, and it has been found that perceptions of organizational politics are associated with high levels of interpersonal CWB (Vigoda, 2002). Furthermore, political behavior at times might involve acts of CWB, such as spreading false rumors to undermine a rival’s reputation with management.

Withdrawal Behavior

Although some scholars include withdrawal as a form of CWB (e.g., Spector, Fox, Penney, Brurursemma, Goh, & Kessler, 2006 treated

withdrawal as a CWB dimension), it is treated here as a separate dimension of performance that consists of behavior that results in absence from work in the forms of tardiness, absenteeism, or turnover that stems from a voluntary decision to be absent. In other words, involuntary absence (i.e., induced by management decision or health-related issues) is not considered here. Moreover, for purposes of understanding the link between organizational politics and withdrawal behavior, dysfunctional and not functional withdrawal behavior (Dalton, Krackhardt, & Porter, 1981) is being considered. The literature has shown that perceptions of organizational politics are positively related to turnover intentions (Miller et al., 2008) and actual turnover (Witt, 1999).

THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS FOR THE EFFECTS OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS

Three possible explanations are offered for how perceptions of organizational politics affect task performance, team player behavior, adaptive performance, counterproductive work behavior, and withdrawal behavior. First, and consistent with social exchange theory, the less-than-clear links between performance and valued personnel outcomes (e.g., merit raises and promotion) associated with high levels of organizational politics adversely affect motivation and lead employees to withhold work effort and cooperation, which leads to lower team player behavior and adaptive performance. Such unclear links also may lead workers to focus on self-promotion rather than task activities, leading to lower core task performance. They likely also lead to increased CWB, absenteeism, and tardiness, and they act as a “shock” (Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Mobley, 1977) that reduces the desire to remain a member of the organization (i.e., turnover).

Second, organizational politics serve as an interpersonal or social stressor that leads to increased negative emotions and other strains (Kacmar et al., 1999; Miller et al., 2008; Siu et al., 2005; Vigoda, 2002). The negative emotions associated with perceiving high levels of politics can have detrimental effects on performance directly. For example, high levels of emotions can serve as a distraction that can reduce an individual’s capacity (i.e., ability in the $M \times A \times C$ model) to complete job tasks. Research has shown that individuals reporting high levels of work strains showed attentional and

cognitive deficits on cognitive tasks (van der Linden, Keijzers, Eling, & van Schaijk, 2005), and cognitive deficits have been linked to workplace performance errors (Wadsworth, Moss, Simpson, & Smith, 2003).

Furthermore, perceptions of organizational politics have been shown to relate to job attitudes, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions (Miller et al., 2008). Such attitudes are likely to be associated with the motivation component of the performance model. In addition, interpersonal conflicts among employees have been linked to perceptions of organizational politics (Siu et al., 2005), and conflict has been shown to relate to CWB, particularly directed at other individuals (Spector et al., 2006). Finally, exposure to stressful job conditions has been linked to withdrawal behaviors (Spector et al.). Not surprisingly, individuals experiencing stressful job conditions are likely to avoid work to escape them.

Third, and consistent with social cognitive theory, perceptions of low levels of politics likely indicate that the norms for (1) mutual accountability is strong, such that the goals and efforts of workers are aligned and interdependent; and (2) interpersonal treatment is one of respect for common interests and mutual support. As situational cues identify what is appropriate, expected, and required for success (Bandura, 1977; Miller & Dollard, 1941; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), workers perceiving these norms are likely to recognize that hard work, cooperation, and positive interpersonal conduct are valued and expected. Furthermore, the paths to success and failure are likely to be relatively clear.

In contrast, perceptions of high levels of politics are likely to indicate that self-interested behavior leads to rewards, and there are few norms for being loyal to the organization and treating others with respect. Accordingly, workers in highly political organizations may follow suit by exploiting others in the organization (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997; Miller et al., 2008). Hence, they are likely to have a high tolerance for self-interest as a method of getting ahead and have a corresponding belief that political behavior is normatively appropriate. Consequently, those experiencing high levels of perceptions of organizational politics are likely to withdraw from the organization when it is convenient to do so. Similarly, they are likely to conclude that withholding effort on activities that may not enhance career progression (i.e., low task and adaptive performance) is not inappropriate and is likely to go unpunished.

In such environments, workers may be motivated to let go of personal standards through the psychological processes of displacement or diffusion of responsibility and may disregard or even distort the consequences

of their actions. The cognitive restructuring of moral conduct "not only eliminates self-deterrents but engages in self-approval in the service of deleterious conduct" (Bandura, 1991, p. 280). Hence, workers who lower their task effort withhold organization-relevant adaptive behaviors. For example, they may exert effort to build competencies that enhance their own career mobility, even at the expense of ignoring competencies that are of benefit to the organization. This focus on their own career building can lead to reduced effort on required performance, to being absent from work to engage in self-serving activities (e.g., learning new skills), and eventually to turnover when career-enhancing opportunities present themselves.

Whereas the social cognitive theory explanations of the links of organizational politics with task performance, adaptive performance, and withdrawal behavior are relatively straightforward, the explanation for how high levels of politics affect team player behavior and CWB are not. High levels of organizational politics yield an environment in which high visibility in touting unpopular positions can be dangerous. Because team player behavior was defined in terms of cooperation with the social, tactical, and strategic zeitgeist of the workgroup, it seems logical that high levels of organizational politics give birth to many pseudo-team players. Indeed, behaving consistent with the political winds is inherent in lay definitions of *team player*. However, behaviors associated with low levels of team player behavior include openly complaining, expressing little interest in considering others' points of view, putting their own interests first, and calling attention to the errors of others.

Whereas the risks inherent in a political environment are suspected to induce some workers to "pretend" to be team players, it is argued that situational cues indicating that self-interested behavior is the norm actually will reduce true team player behavior. Indeed, high levels of organizational politics signal to workers that it is "every person for himself"; that is, all individuals are exclusively looking after their own interests, which inherently is at odds with team player behavior. Similarly, it was mentioned that high levels of team player behavior include adherence to informal norms designed to maintain order and accomplish common goals. In a highly political environment, this is hard to accomplish because the informal norms designed to maintain order and accomplish common goals are likely to be weak or nonexistent.

David et al. (2011) argued that contextual cues rarely signal that organization-targeted CWB is a path to success because they threaten both work unit performance and individual job security. Acting in self-interest is one thing, but explicit sabotage directed toward the organization is another. Hence, social cognitive theory is inappropriate for explaining a link between politics and organization-targeted CWB. In contrast, it is argued that social cognitive theory is appropriate for explaining the link between politics and person-targeted CWB; that is, highly political environments sometimes indicate that person-targeted CWB may lead to resource acquisition and career success (e.g., Ferris et al., 1989).

THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS OF PERSONALITY EFFECTS

The Five Factor Model (FFM; Digman & Takemoto-Chock, 1981; Fiske, 1949; Goldberg, 1992; John & Srivastava, 1999; Norman, 1963) is a useful framework for classifying personality traits into a manageable set of underlying dimensions. Although there has been some variability among researchers, the dimensions typically have been labeled extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience.

Despite the relative popularity of the FFM in organizational research, meta-analytic studies have revealed that correlations of the five dimensions with performance typically vary from weak to moderate and that moderators may affect the personality-performance relationships (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Salgado, 2002; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). In part, this might be because studies merely relating personality to performance fail to recognize the complexities involved, as personality might be relevant to all of the components of the $M \times A \times C$ model. Also, it is important to match the individual personality variable to the specific aspect of performance rather than assuming a given variable will be related to all aspects of performance in all circumstances.

FFM Dimensions Defined

Agreeableness refers to such traits as tolerance, helpfulness, selflessness, cooperativeness, generosity, courtesy, and sympathy (Digman, 1990) as

well as congeniality, amiability, and friendliness (Costa, McCrae, & Dye, 1991). High-agreeableness individuals tend to maintain social affiliations, deal with conflict cooperatively or collaboratively, and strive for common understanding (Digman, 1990). Low-agreeableness individuals tend to act defiantly and even go out of their way to be uncooperative. Moreover, they care little about others' feelings and thoughts and can be low in empathy. Agreeableness has been shown to relate negatively to CWB, particularly directed toward other people (Berry et al., 2007).

McCrae and John (1992) applied such adjectives as organized, planful, reliable, thorough, responsible, and efficient to describe conscientiousness. As noted by John and Srivastava (1999, p. 121), "conscientiousness describes socially prescribed impulse control that facilitates task- and goal-directed behavior, such as thinking before acting, delaying gratification, following norms and rules, and planning, organizing and prioritizing tasks." Similarly, Goldberg (1993a) observed that conscientiousness is associated with such traits as thoroughness and dependability versus negligence and carelessness.

Considering these descriptions, it is not surprising that scholars testing the interaction hypothesis have operationalized motivation in terms of conscientiousness. Some researchers have argued that with the exception of cognitive ability, conscientiousness is the strongest personality predictor of job performance (e.g., Behling, 1998; Dunn, Mount, Barrick, & Ones, 1995). Also, it relates negatively to CWB, especially directed toward organizations (Berry et al., 2007).

Emotional stability is the extent to which individuals vary in their tendency to experience negative emotions across time and situations. It contrasts such traits as nervousness and moodiness with stability and imperturbability (Goldberg, 1993b). Other labels for this dimension have included emotional control (Fiske, 1949), adjustment (Hogan & Hogan, 1992), and neuroticism (inflected; Costa & McCrae, 1992). Individuals low in emotional stability tend to have irrational perfectionistic beliefs, low self-esteem, and pessimistic attitudes; they tend to be worrying, tense, anxious, touchy, unstable, and self-pitying (McCrae & John, 1992). Such individuals see themselves as victims, experience less satisfaction and more strain, doubt their abilities, and require considerable emotional support from others. In contrast, persons high in emotional stability tend to be relatively calm across most situations and are less likely to experience distress.

Openness to experience reflects "a broad range of intellectual, creative, and artistic inclinations, preferences, and skills found foremost in highly original and creative individuals" (John & Srivastava, 1999, p. 114). It refers to such traits as imagination and creativity versus imperceptiveness and shallowness (Goldberg, 1993b) and "describes the breadth, depth, originality, and complexity of an individual's mental and experiential life" (John & Srivastava, p. 121). Openness to experience is distinct from cognitive ability, although they are not uncorrelated (Holland, Dollinger, Holland, & MacDonald, 1995). Individuals high in openness to experience are predisposed to work independently (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999; Saucier, 2000), think out of the box (Judge et al.), and embrace change (Wanberg & Banas, 2000). In contrast, persons low in openness to experience prefer routine and tradition and maintain cognitive inflexibility (i.e., they are stubborn).

Extraversion is characterized by such traits as assertiveness, activity, and sociability and reflects an "energetic approach to the social and material world" (John & Srivastava, 1999, p. 121). McCrae and Costa (1999) noted that high-extraversion individuals typically have numerous friendships and enterprising vocational interests. Whereas they seek out interpersonal interaction, persons low in extraversion typically need "quiet time" to "reenergize their batteries." It is not proposed that extraversion will be related to performance or perceptions of organizational politics, and it will not be dealt with further.

How Personality Influences Performance

The predominant approach to addressing how personality influences performance has relied on a motivational explanation and has focused on the cognitive processes underlying goal-setting and defined motivation in terms of the arousal, direction, intensity, and persistence of goal-directed actions. Barrick and his colleagues (e.g., Barrick, Mitchell, & Stewart, 2003; Barrick & Mount, 2005; Barrick, Stewart, & Piotrowski, 2002) described three motivational mechanisms that influence workplace behavior. One is communion striving, which refers to goals involving favorable interpersonal relationships. Another is status striving, which refers to "goals directed toward obtaining power and dominance within a status hierarchy" (Barrick et al., p. 66). The third motivational

mechanism is accomplishment striving, which refers to goals related to performance-related achievement. Empirical work has shown that personality traits influence the type of environments to which workers are attracted (Barrick, Mount, & Gupta, 2003; Judge & Cable, 1997), such that personality affects whether an individual seeks an environment to fulfill their goals for communion, status, or accomplishment.

Barrick and Mount (2005) argued that personality can affect motivation by influencing either the direction or the intensity of the behavior. Considerable work has focused on the link between personality and the intensity of work behavior, and nearly all of it has focused on conscientiousness (e.g., Gellatly, 1996). Schmidt and Hunter (1998) even cited conscientiousness as the most important trait-based motivation variable in organizational science. Scholars have employed conscientiousness as a proxy for motivation, noting that high-conscientiousness workers tend to be more proactive (Barrick, Mount, & Strauss, 1993) and persevere longer and more effectively engage in self-discipline (Colquitt & Simmering, 1998) than low-conscientiousness workers.

Barrick et al. (2003) posited that the other FFM dimensions also may affect job performance through their effect on one or more proximal motivational variables. Agreeableness is associated with communion striving (i.e., high-agreeableness individuals tend to strive for communion). Because openness to experience is not related to many work outcomes and is the least understood of the FFM dimensions, Barrick et al. (2003) did not link it with motivation. However, Barrick et al. (2003) did link emotional stability with accomplishment striving. Consistent with Malouff, Schutte, Bauer, and Mantelli's (1990) finding that individuals high in instability, hopelessness, and depression (i.e., low emotional stability) are unlikely to be goal oriented, they argued that low-emotional stability persons are relatively unconcerned with completing tasks.

We advocate an alternative perspective here. Rather than viewing emotional stability solely in motivational terms, it is seen also as influencing capability (i.e., or "ability" in the $M \times A \times C$ model). Individuals low in emotional stability will tend to experience negative emotions that can interfere with their ability to perform tasks. As noted earlier in the chapter, such emotional experiences can affect attention and cognitive functioning adversely (van der Linden et al., 2005), which will reduce an individual's capacity to perform many tasks, at least during the time that the negative emotion is aroused.

APPLYING THE $P = F(M \times A \times C)$ FORMULA

In reporting the results of their meta-analysis, Miller et al. (2008) concluded that there is no clear evidence of a relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and job performance and that "moderators are likely to impact this relationship" (p. 215). It is suggested that personality might well moderate the effects of perceptions of organizational politics on performance-related behavior. Furthermore, it is argued that different personality variables likely are relevant to specific dimensions of performance. Conscientiousness is most strongly related to task performance, CWB, and withdrawal. Openness to experience is most strongly related to adaptive performance. Agreeableness is most strongly related to team player behavior and CWB. It is argued that all of these proposed connections are due primarily to the influence of personality on motivation—that is, a functional dispositional motivation. Emotional stability, which influences capability, is most relevant to CWB and withdrawal as well as to task performance and adaptive performance.

Although some of these links between personality and performance might be direct, in many cases it is the interaction of personality and perceptions of organizational politics that is more important. In predicting each of the criterion behaviors, ability (i.e., or more accurately stated, capability) is operationalized in terms of emotional stability. How does emotional stability affect the impact of dispositional motivation (i.e., agreeableness, conscientiousness, or openness to experience) on the negative relationship between organizational politics and favorable workplace behavior? To begin with, individuals low in emotional stability are more sensitive to adverse job conditions, including perceptions of organizational politics, and they tend to experience negative emotions in response.

As noted earlier, such emotional states can interfere with engaging in positive workplace behaviors, such as performance. It should be kept in mind that under conditions of low perceptions of organizational politics and other adverse conditions, such individuals will not likely experience high levels of emotion. Thus, it is mainly the combination of personality and perceptions of organizational politics that reduces performance-related behavior. In general, emotionally stable workers are expected to behave favorably if they possess a functional dispositional motivation, perceive the situation to be favorable (i.e., low levels of organizational politics), or both.

The high levels of emotional stability permit either the favorable work climate or functional dispositional motivation (or both) to provide the motivation to behave favorably. That is, because these workers are not focused on experiencing and coping with their negative emotions, they are emotionally capable of responding favorably to positive motivational influences. Emotionally stable workers who both possess a functional dispositional motivation and perceive a favorable work climate are likely to behave at the highest levels of functionality (i.e., high levels of task performance, team player behavior, adaptability, and low levels of CWB and withdrawal). It is argued that in the absence of one but not both motivational forces, the presence of one compensates for the absence of the other. Thus, these workers will behave functionally.

Emotionally stable workers in unfavorable situations (i.e., high levels of organizational politics) are certainly capable of adopting a dysfunctional motivation and behaving dysfunctionally. However, they are less sensitive to perceptions of organizational politics and thus are less likely to experience adverse emotional responses. Therefore, they are less likely than individuals low in emotional stability to adopt a dysfunctional motivation. When they adopt such a motivation, perhaps because their political environment provides cues indicating that norms for interpersonal mistreatment are expected, likely to go unpunished, and sometimes necessary to enhance career mobility, they are likely to withhold positive performance while engaging in CWB and withdrawal. Moreover, they are likely to do so more calmly and with less angst than their low-emotional stability counterparts, at least until reaching a much higher threshold for provoking strong negative emotion.

The interpersonal circumplex now is used to discuss how perceptions of organizational politics and emotional stability interact with the specific traits that have been identified as representing dispositional motivation (i.e., agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience) in the prediction of the criterion behaviors of interest. The interpersonal circumplex (Leary, 1957) is an alternative to the principal components analysis approach to personality. Traits on the two-dimensional circumplex appear on a circle around the bipolar, orthogonal coordinates of extraversion and agreeableness (e.g., Lorr & Youniss, 1974; Wiggins, 1982). In contrast, on the three-dimensional circumplex, traits appear around extraversion, agreeableness, or emotional stability (Saucier, 1992), or extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (Peabody & Goldberg, 1989).

An advantage of the circumplex approach is that it provides "much more opportunity for identifying clusters of traits that are semantically cohesive" (Hofstee, de Raad, & Goldberg, 1992, p. 146). Accordingly, it provides detailed personality descriptions (Becker, 1999). However, a disadvantage is that facet scores add no additional variance beyond what is explained by the major factors (see Hofstee, Ten-Berge, & Hendriks, 1998). Another disadvantage is that they are missing at least two of the five general personality factors (Hofstee et al., 1992). As a consequence, organizational scientists have seen little utility in applying circumplex models.

Recognizing these limitations, Hofstee et al. (1992) and Johnson and Ostendorf (1993) offered an integration of the FFM and circumplex models: the Abridged Big Five Dimensional Circumplex (AB5C). It consists of 10 two-dimensional circumplexes including all possible pairs of the FFM factors as coordinates. It presents the facets in terms of their two highest factor loadings; that is, each trait is characterized by its loadings on a subset of two of the five factors at a time. The AB5C is distinct from the traditional personality assessment that has relied solely on the FFM, which essentially has yielded a loss of precision in measurement and a corresponding error in prediction. In contrast, the application of the AB5C allows the examination of interactions among the FFM dimensions and, thus, assessment of the extent to which any particular personality dimension affects the relationship between any other personality dimension and behavior.

As noted by Hogan, Hogan, and Roberts (1996), the joint impact of multiple traits should be explored if our goal is to more fully explain behavior. As argued by Penney, David, and Witt (in press), there are at least two reasons for investigating the joint impact of at least two traits. First, items designed to assess specific traits may have meaningful secondary loadings on other traits (Hofstee et al., 1992; Johnson & Ostendorf, 1993). In other words, the FFM may not be as orthogonal as once thought (Ones, Viswesvaran, & Dilchert, 2005). Second, despite studies showing the validity of the AB5C, and calls for research examining trait interactions (Barrick & Mount, 2005; Hogan et al., 1996; John & Srivastava, 1999), only a handful of studies have investigated the interaction of FFM factors in predicting performance-relevant work outcomes (e.g., Judge & Erez, 2007; Witt, 2002). In these studies, the interaction between two factors explained incremental variance in performance beyond the main and additive effects of individual factors.

In the following sections, each possible combination of the dispositional motivation variables and emotional stability is discussed at low and high levels of organizational politics. In so doing, the empirically derived adjectives associated with the ABC are listed to describe the personality characteristics reflecting the combinations of the dispositional motivation variables and emotional stability.

Conscientiousness by Emotional Stability

Four studies were found that examined a conscientiousness \times emotional stability interaction to predict workplace behavior (King, George, & Hebl, 2005; Perry, Lorinkova, & Witt, 2010; Witt, 2001; Witt & Jones, 2003). In general, conscientiousness was positively related to favorable outcomes among emotionally stable workers and negatively related (or unrelated) to favorable outcomes among emotionally unstable workers. Thus, low levels of emotional stability seemed to counteract the tendency of the highly conscientious to be productive. The following sections discuss the possible combinations of conscientiousness and emotional stability.

Low Conscientiousness, Low Emotional Stability

Adjectives associated with individuals low in both conscientiousness and emotional stability include weak-willed, unstable, quitting, careless, impractical, wasteful, absent-minded, forgetful, scatterbrained, erratic, inconsistent, impulsive, unstable, self-indulgent, hypocritical, gossipy, moody, and jealous (Hofstee et al., 1992; Johnson & Ostendorf, 1993). Because of their low levels of motivation (i.e., low conscientiousness), these workers are unlikely to either exert much focused effort on work tasks. Given their emotional reactivity, high levels of perceptions of organizational politics would reduce their capabilities, thus further reducing their effectiveness.

Low Conscientiousness, High Emotional Stability

The adjective associated with individuals low in conscientiousness and high in emotional stability is informal (Hofstee et al., 1992). It is argued that among these workers, their low motivation is likely to lead to low levels of task performance, team player behavior, and adaptive performance regardless of perceptions of organizational politics. At high levels

of organizational politics, these workers likely exert minimal levels of effort toward tasks and take opportunities to withdraw.

High Conscientiousness, Low Emotional Stability

The adjective associated with individuals high in conscientiousness and low in emotional stability is particular (Hofstee et al., 1992). Because of their low emotional stability, these workers are incapable of effectively leveraging their high levels of motivation (i.e., high conscientiousness) when they are experiencing adverse situations, such as perceptions of organizational politics. As a consequence, under high levels of perceptions of organizational politics, their task performance is likely to suffer and withdrawal behavior is likely to increase.

High Conscientiousness, High Emotional Stability

Adjectives associated with individuals high in both conscientiousness and emotional stability include practical, persevering, self-disciplined, stable, well read, rational, objective, steady, consistent, logical, decisive, poised, concise, thorough, economical, systematic, precise, and efficient (Hofstee et al., 1992; Johnson & Ostendorf, 1993). Accordingly, these individuals are likely to be highly motivated to achieve and to be capable of focusing on the task across most situations.

In terms of the three theories, relative to other workers, these workers are likely to want to achieve (i.e., high task performance and refraining from withdrawal behavior) despite an unclear effort-reward link (i.e., social exchange theory), to be unaffected by stressors (i.e., stress theories), and to somewhat ignore workplace cues (i.e., social cognitive theory) that point to the appropriateness of dysfunctional behavior. However, it is expected that low levels of organizational politics have some moderate influence by creating additional motivation to further activate the high levels of conscientiousness. Consequently, these workers are likely to work harder and withdraw less in low- than high-political climates.

Agreeableness by Emotional Stability

Social exchange, stress, and social cognitive theories provide slightly different explanations for how high levels of organizational politics yield

high levels of person-targeted CWB. That is, high levels of organizational politics give rise to the desire to retaliate (i.e., social exchange theory), act as a stressor that create negative emotions requiring an emotional or instrumental coping response (i.e., stress theories), or provide cues that interpersonal mistreatment is acceptable and likely to go unpunished. The focus here is on social cognitive theory. As mentioned earlier, Bandura (1991) listed achievement-striving behavior and social and moral behavior as two categories of motivational processes.

In a high-politics situation, in which interpersonal mistreatment is acceptable, workers might engage in person-targeted CWB as an instrumental means of achieving goals, therefore fulfilling achievement-striving needs. We believe that agreeableness and emotional stability are particularly relevant for explaining responses to organizational politics in terms of social and moral behavior. In line with Bandura's (1991) arguments, it is suggested that high levels of organizational politics (1) establish standards that promote, if not permit, social and moral conduct, (2) indicate that most others do not consider such behavior inappropriate, and (3) drive selective activation and disengagement of moral self-regulation (i.e., override personal standards of moral conduct), a process that is affected by agreeableness and emotional stability.

Previously, it was posited that although the social cognitive theory explanations of the links of organizational politics with task performance, adaptive performance, and withdrawal behavior are relatively straightforward, the explanation for how high levels of politics affect team player behavior and CWB are not. It is argued here that the application of the ABC suggests that there may be slightly different ways agreeableness and emotional stability affect how workers respond to high levels of organizational politics in terms of team player behavior and person-targeted CWB.

Low Agreeableness, Low Emotional Stability

Adjectives associated with individuals low in both agreeableness and emotional stability include critical, negativistic, stubborn, uncooperative, inflexible, vengeful, irritable, envious, moody, distrustful, suspicious, selfish, high-strung, excitable, impatient, temperamental, quarrelsome, crabby, cranky, grumpy, and defensive (Hofstee et al., 1992; Johnson & Ostendorf, 1993). Because of their low levels of motivation to engage in cooperative behavior (i.e., low agreeableness) and low capability to do so

(i.e., low emotional stability), these workers are unlikely to express team player behavior, regardless of the level of organizational politics. Moreover, these excitable, impatient, and temperamental workers are likely to engage in CWB across most situations, especially when high levels of perceptions of organizational politics provoke them.

Low Agreeableness, High Emotional Stability

Adjectives associated with individuals low in agreeableness and high in emotional stability include unemotional, insensitive, unaffectionate, passionless, and masculine (Hofstee et al., 1992). At high levels of organizational politics, these workers are likely to engage in very low levels of team player behavior and high levels of CWB. Contextual cues that signal utility in person-targeted CWB are likely to activate these personality characteristics, leading the workers to calmly and impassionedly manifest CWB. Although by nature these workers are uncooperative, low levels of organizational politics position them to express at least moderate levels of team player behavior. Similarly, capable of recognizing the risk of CWB, they are likely to manifest somewhat lower levels of CWB in low-politics situations.

High Agreeableness, Low Emotional Stability

Adjectives associated with individuals high in agreeableness and low in emotional stability include gullible, lenient, sentimental, affectionate, sensitive, soft, passionate, romantic, feminine, and emotional (Hofstee et al., 1992; Johnson & Ostendorf, 1993). Although their basic tendency is to be team players, high levels of perceptions of organizational politics will induce negative emotion that will interfere with their performance. However, given their sensitive, gullible, and emotional characteristics, they are likely to engage in moderate levels of CWB to defend threatened compatriots (or retaliate against those who have attacked them) in high-politics situations because cues indicate that doing so is appropriate.

High Agreeableness, High Emotional Stability

Adjectives associated with individuals high in both agreeableness and emotional stability include patient, relaxed, undemanding, uncritical, optimistic, conceitless, down-to-earth, unpretentious, trustful, pleasant,

tolerant, peaceful, generous, easygoing, fair, charitable, flexible, cooperative, forgiving, good-natured, steady, poised, composed, even-tempered, and unselfish (Hofstee et al., 1992; Johnson & Ostendorf, 1993). Therefore, these individuals are likely to be highly motivated to cooperate and to be capable of doing so across most situations.

However, low levels of organizational politics likely have some moderate influence by creating additional motivation to further activate the high levels of agreeableness. Consequently, these workers are likely to make greater efforts to be team-players in low- than high-political climates. Furthermore, this personality profile likely acts as a self-regulatory governor against dysfunctional interpersonal behavior, even in dysfunctional situations, thus resulting in low levels of CWB and withdrawal.

Openness to Experience by Emotional Stability

Because adaptive performance is about change and adaptation to it, openness to experience is likely to be the appropriate proxy for motivation. There do not appear to have been any previous studies examining an openness to experience \times emotional stability experience interaction, but speculation concerning the anticipated outcomes of such research are provided in the following sections.

Low Openness to Experience, Low Emotional Stability

Adjectives associated with individuals low in both openness to experience and emotional stability are inartistic and contemptuous (Hofstee et al., 1992; Johnson & Ostendorf, 1993). Neither interested in making change (i.e., low openness to experience) nor capable of dealing with adverse conditions (i.e., low emotional stability), these workers are unlikely to engage in adaptive performance behaviors, even when perceptions of organizational politics is low. The contextual cues largely are irrelevant to them.

Low Openness to Experience, High Emotional Stability

Adjectives associated with individuals low in openness to experience and high in emotional stability include imperturbable, unreflective, unsophisticated, imperceptive, and provincial (Hofstee et al., 1992). Such individuals are not particularly interested in making change and are likely to

exhibit low levels of adaptive performance. Because they are high in emotional stability, the effects of perceptions of organizational politics will be attenuated because they will not induce an emotional response. However, in a low-politics environment, cues may signal that adaptive performance is expected and rewarded, and thus it might tend to induce a moderate level of adaptive performance. In a high-politics environment, cues may signal the opposite and thus slightly reduce this aspect of performance.

High Openness to Experience, Low Emotional Stability

The adjective associated with persons high in openness to experience and low in emotional stability is underdeveloped (Hofstee et al., 1992). However, generally, it is anticipated that these highly angst-ridden workers are particularly sensitive to perceptions of organizational politics. When perceptions of organizational politics are low, their motivation to engage in new activities would result in high levels of adaptive performance. When perceptions of organizational politics are high, it would result in emotionality that interferes with adaptive performance.

High Openness to Experience, High Emotional Stability

Adjectives associated with individuals high in both openness to experience and emotional stability include versatile, intellectual, inventive, innovative, ingenious, and aesthetic (Hofstee et al., 1992; Johnson & Ostendorf, 1993). Hence, these individuals are likely to be highly motivated to adapt and to be capable of doing so creatively across most situations. Again, it is expected that low levels of organizational politics provide additional motivation to further activate the high levels of openness to experience. Consequently, these workers are likely to engage in the highest levels of adaptive performance.

CONCLUSION

As suggested in this chapter, the effects of perceptions of organizational politics on people's performance are complex, as perceptions of organizational politics interact with personality in its effects that can vary

depending on the specific dimension of performance. From an FFM perspective, specific personality dimensions can be linked to particular aspects of performance, with conscientiousness being most relevant to task performance, CWB, and withdrawal, agreeableness being most relevant to team player behavior and CWB, openness to experience being most relevant to adaptive performance, and emotional stability being relevant to all five of our performance dimensions.

In general, the first three personality dimensions are associated with the motivation to engage in the various forms of performance behavior. For example, those high in openness to experience seek out new experiences and would be motivated to innovate and try new things at work in response to challenges that require adaptation. In contrast, those low in agreeableness have little motivation to cooperate with others, so they likely engage in low levels of team player behavior. Emotional stability has to do more with capability, as those low on this dimension have a low threshold for emotional arousal, thus they might experience frequent negative emotions that interfere with positive performance behaviors. Furthermore, the experience of negative emotions is likely to motivate CWB and withdrawal.

Relationships of personality with performance generally have been rather small and in some cases disappointing. This is likely because personality does not work in a vacuum but is relevant to only part of the $P = f[M \times A \times C]$ model. What is important is how people with varying personality characteristics, particularly in combination with one another, react to situations, with perceptions of organizational politics being an important situational or contextual variable. High levels of perceptions of organizational politics induce high levels of negative emotion, particularly among those low in emotional stability. Such working environments also signal information about acceptable norms. To the extent these norms are consistent with an individual's personality, they will enhance their tendencies to either engage or avoid engaging in both productive and counterproductive behavior. Thus, high perceptions of organizational politics, for example, likely will encourage low-agreeableness behavior in those inclined to be low in agreeableness.

Comparatively little research has explored configurations of personality variables. Interactions between emotional stability and other FFM dimensions were discussed, speculating that certain combinations might interact

with perceptions of organizational politics. As noted earlier, low levels of emotional stability might well counteract the tendencies of high conscientious individuals to perform at high levels. This might well explain at least in part why the conscientiousness–performance relationship has been disappointing in past research. Additional research might explore the extent to which the interaction between these two personality variables relates to performance and other behaviors.

Consideration of three-way interactions among two personality dimensions and an environmental variable like perceptions of organizational politics might prove to be particularly enlightening and might well account for more performance variance than individual personality variables in isolation or combined with others additively. In other words, performance-related behavior can best be understood by considering complex interactions. Thus, it might not be the case that low emotional stability counteracts conscientiousness in all situations, but instead it might work this way only when individuals are exposed to high levels of stressful job conditions like politics.

Also, it is worth going beyond the FFM in exploring personality relationships with various aspects of performance. The FFM dimensions tend to be rather broad, encompassing sets of distinct traits. It is possible that within some dimensions the component traits relate differentially to performance. One example of this is Hastings and O'Neill (2009), who showed such within-dimension variability among individual traits in predicting CWB. Other researchers have extended the FFM to include additional dimensions that are likely relevant to various aspects of job performance. For example, Marcus, Lee, and Ashton (2007) applied the HEXACO model of personality to the prediction of CWB. This model includes an additional dimension of honesty–humility that in their study predicted CWB more strongly than any of the FFM dimensions.

The literature suggests that organizational politics can have a detrimental effect on organizations and their members. Those effects can be particularly significant for individuals whose personalities render them vulnerable. As suggested, those effects can be complex and can vary across different performance-related behaviors. It is recommended that future researchers look more closely at how individual differences interact with perceptions of organizational politics in determining its effects, not only on performance but also on people's attitudes, cognitions, emotions, and well-being.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1971). *Social learning theory*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations for thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 248-287.
- Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (2005). Yes, personality matters: Moving on to more important matters. *Human Performance*, 18, 359-372.
- Barrick, M.R., Mitchell, T.R., & Stewart, G.L. (2003). Situational and motivational influences on trait-behavior relationships. In M.R. Barrick & A.M. Ryan (Eds.), *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations* (pp. 60-82). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K., & Strauss, J.P. (1993). Conscientiousness and performance of sales representatives: Test of mediating effects of goal setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 715-722.
- Barrick, M.R., Stewart, G.L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 43-51.
- Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K., & Gupta, R. (2003). Meta-analysis of the relationship between the five-factor model of personality and Holland's occupational types. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 45-74.
- Becker, P. (1999). Beyond the Big Five. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26, 511-530.
- Behling, O. (1998). Employee selection: Will intelligence and conscientiousness do the job? *Academy of Management Executive*, 12, 77-86.
- Berry, C.M., Ones, D.S., & Sackett, P.R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 410-424.
- Biau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W.C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1997a). Introduction: Organizational citizenship behavior and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10, 67-69.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1997b). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10, 99-109.
- Brookman, F. (2007). Team player. *Stores*, 89, 82.
- Buchanan, D., & Badham, R. (1999). Politics and organizational change: The lived experience. *Human Relations*, 52, 609-629.
- Campbell, J.P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Campbell J.P., Gasser M.B., & Oswald F.L. (1996). The substantive nature of performance variability. In K.R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual differences and behavior in organizations* (pp. 258-299). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, J.P., McCloy, R.A., Oppler, S.H., & Sager, C.E. (1993). A theory of performance. In N. Schmitt & W.C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 35-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chang, C.H., Rosen, C.C., & Levy, P.E. (2009). The relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and employee attitudes, strain, and behavior: A meta-analytic examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 779-801.
- Cialdini, R., & Trost, M. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance. *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vols. 1 & 2, pp. 151-192). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Colbert, A.E., Mount, M.K., Harter, J.K., Witt, L.A., & Barrick, M.R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of work situation on workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 599-609.
- Colquitt, J., & Simmering, M. (1998). Conscientiousness, goal orientation, and motivation to learn during the learning process: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 654-665.
- Costa Jr., P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *NEO-PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa Jr., P.T., McCrae, R.R., & Dye, D.A. (1991). Facet scales for agreeableness and conscientiousness: A revision of the NEO personality inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 887-898.
- Crick, N.R., & Dodge, K.A. (1994). A review and reformulation of social-information processing mechanisms in children's development. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 74-101.
- Cropanzano, R., Howes, J., Grandey, A., & Toth, P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 159-180.
- Dalton, D.R., Krackhardt, D.M., & Porter, L.W. (1981). Functional turnover: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66, 716-721.
- David, E.M., Witt, L.A., & Penney, L.M. (2011). *Self-regulation in dysfunctional situations: Beware the socially unskilled*. Working Paper, University of Houston.
- David, E., & Witt, L.A. (2010, August). *P = f(M x A x C): A three-way interaction predicting team-player behavior*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Academy of Management, Montreal.
- Digman, J.M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440.
- Digman, J.M., & Takemoto-Chock, N.K. (1981). Factors in the natural language of personality: Re-analysis, comparison, and interpretation of six major studies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 16, 148-170.
- Dunn, W.S., Mount, M.K., Barrick, M.R., & Ones, D.S. (1995). Relative importance of personality and general mental ability in managers' judgments of applicant qualifications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 500-510.
- Ehrtart, M., & Naumann, S. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in work groups: A group norms approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 960-974.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.

- Endler, N.S., & Magnusson, D. (1976). Toward an interaction psychology of personality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 83, 956-974.
- Ferris, G.R., & Kacmar, K.M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational politics. *Journal of Management*, 18, 93-116.
- Ferris, G.R., Russ, G.S., & Fandt, P.M. (1989). Politics in organizations. In R.A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 143-170). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fiske, D.W. (1949). Consistency in the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 44, 329-344.
- Gagne, R.M., & Fleishman, E.A. (1959). *Psychology and human performance*. New York: Holt.
- Gandz, J., & Murray, V. (1980). The experience of workplace politics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, 237-251.
- Gellatly, I. (1996). Conscientiousness and task performance: Test of a cognitive process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 474-482.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 26-42.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1993a). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-34.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1993b). The structure of personality traits: Vertical and horizontal aspects. In D.C. Funder, R.D. Parke, C. Tomlinson-Keasey, & K. Widaman (Eds.), *Studying lives through time: Personality and development* (pp. 169-188). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Griffin, B., & Hesketh, B. (2003). Adaptable behaviours for successful work and career adjustment. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 55, 65-73.
- Griffin, M.A., Neal, A., & Parker, S.K. (2007). A new model of work role performance and positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 327-347.
- Griffin, M.A., Parker, S.K., & Mason, C.M. (2010). Leader vision and the development of adaptive and proactive performance: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 174-182.
- Hall, A.T., Hochwarter, W.A., Ferris, G.R., & Bowen, M.G. (2004). The dark side of politics in organizations. In R.W. Griffin & A.M. O'Leary-Kelly (Eds.), *The dark side of organizational behavior* (pp. 237-261). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hastings, S.E., & O'Neill, T.A. (2009). Predicting workplace deviance using broad versus narrow personality variables. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 289-293.
- Hirschfeld, R., Lawson, L., & Mossholder, K. (2004). Moderators of the relationship between cognitive ability and performance: General versus context-specific achievement motivation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 2389-2409.
- Hochwarter, W.A., Perrewé, P.L., Ferris, G.R., & Guercio, R. (1999). Commitment as an antidote to the tension and turnover consequences of organizational politics. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55, 277-297.
- Holtsiee, W.K.B., de Raad, B., & Goldberg, L.R. (1992). Integration of the Big Five and circumplex approaches to trait structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 563-576.
- Holtsiee, W.K.B., Ten-Berge, J.M.F., & Hendriks, A.A.J. (1998). How to score questionnaires. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 897-909.
- Hogan, R.T., & Hogan, J. (1992). *Hogan personality inventory manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.
- Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Roberts, B.W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and answers. *American Psychologist*, 51, 469-477.
- Holland, D.C., Dollinger, S.J., Holland, C.J., & MacDonald, D.A. (1995). The relationship between psychometric intelligence and the five-factor model of personality in a rehabilitation sample. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 51, 79-88.
- Hollenbeck, J.R., Brief, A.P., Whittener, E.M., & Paul, K.E. (1988). An empirical note on the interaction of personality and aptitude in personnel selection. *Journal of Management*, 14, 441-451.
- Hurtz, G.M., & Donovan, J.J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869-879.
- John, O.P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L.A. Pervin & O.P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford.
- Johnson, J.A., & Ostendorf, F. (1993). Clarification of the five-factor model with the abridged big five dimensional circumplex. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 563-576.
- Johnson, J.W. (2001). The relative importance of task and contextual performance dimensions to supervisor judgments of overall performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 984-996.
- Judge, T.A., & Cable, D.M. (1997). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organization attraction. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 359-394.
- Judge, T.A., & Erez, A. (2007). Interaction and intersection: The constellation of emotional stability and extraversion in predicting performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 573-596.
- Judge, T.A., Higgins, C.A., Thoresen, C.J., & Barrick, M.R. (1999). The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 621-652.
- Kacmar, K.M., & Carlson, D. (1997). Further validation of the Perception of Politics Scale (POPs): A multiple sample investigation. *Journal of Management*, 23, 627-658.
- Kacmar, K.M., & Ferris, G.R. (1991). Perceptions of Organizational Politics Scale (POPs): Development and construct validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51, 193-205.
- Kacmar, K., Bozeman, D., Carlson, D., & Anthony, W. (1999). An examination of the perceptions of organizational politics model: Replication and extension. *Human Relations*, 52, 383-416.
- King, E.B., George, J.M., & Hebl, M.R. (2005). Linking personality to helping behaviors at work: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 72, 585-607.
- Krischer, M., & Witt, L. A. (2010, April). *Achieving adaptive performance in the workplace: The compensatory effects of general mental ability and adaptive leadership*. Paper presented at the conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta.
- Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Lee, T.W., & Mitchell, T.R. (1994). An alternative approach: The unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *Academy of Management Review*, 19, 51-89.
- Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lott, M., & Yountiss, R.P. (1974). An inventory of interpersonal style. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 37, 165-173.
- Maier, N.R.E. (1955). *Psychology in industry* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

- Malouff, J., Schutte, N., Bauer, M., & Mantelli, D. (1990). Development and evaluation of a measure of the tendency to be goal oriented. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11, 1191-1200.
- Marcus, B., Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2007). Personality dimensions explaining relationships between integrity tests and counterproductive behavior: Big five, or one in addition? *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 1-34.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 175-216.
- Miller, B., Rutherford, M., & Kolodinsky, R. (2008). Perceptions of organizational politics: A meta-analysis of outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22, 209-222.
- Miller, N. E., & Dollard, J. (1941). *Social learning and imitation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in an around organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 237-240.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 71-83.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66, 574-583.
- Nye, L. G., & Witt, L. A. (1993). Dimensionality and construct validity of the perceptions of organizational politics scale (POPS). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 821-829.
- O'Connor, W., & Morrison, T. (2001). A comparison of situational and dispositional predictors of perceptions of organizational politics. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 135, 301-312.
- Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C., & Dilchert, S. (2005). Personality at work: Raising awareness and correcting misconceptions. *Human Performance*, 18, 389-404.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviors: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10, 85-97.
- Parker, G. (1996). *Team players and teamwork: The new competitive business strategy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Peabody, D., & Goldberg, L. R. (1989). Some determinants of factor structures from personality-trait descriptors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 552-567.
- Penney, L. M., David, E. M., & Witt, L. A. (in press). A review of personality and performance: Identifying boundaries, contingencies, and future research directions. *Human Resources Management Review*.
- Perry, S. J., Lorinkova, S., & Witt, L. A. (2010, April). Emotional stability and conscientiousness as moderators of the virtuality-performance relationship. In S. J. Perry & L. A. Witt (Chairs), *Predicting virtual team effectiveness: Focusing on the micro-level*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta.
- Pervin, L. (1989). Persons, situations, interactions: The history of a controversy and a discussion of theoretical models. *Academy of Management Review*, 3, 350-360.
- Pinder, C. C. (1984). *Work motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Ployhart, R. E., & Bliese, P. D. (2006). Individual adaptability (I-ADAPT) theory: Conceptualizing the antecedents, consequences, and measurement of individual differences in adaptability. *Advances in Human Performance and Cognitive Engineering Research*, 6, 3-39.
- Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 612-624.
- Rosen, C., Chang, C., & Levy, P. (2006). Personality and politics perceptions: A new conceptualization and illustration using OCBs. In E. Vigoda-Gadot & A. Drory (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational politics* (pp. 29-52). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J. R., & Snyder, S. S. (1982). Changing the world and changing the self: A two-process model of perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 5-37.
- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 145-164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sackett, P. R., Gays, M. L., & Ellingson, J. E. (1998). Ability-personality interactions when predicting job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 545-556.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 224-253.
- Salgado, J. E. (2002). The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 117-125.
- Saucier, G. (1992). Openness versus intellect: Much ado about nothing? *European Journal of Personality*, 6, 381-386.
- Saucier, G. (2000). Isms and the structure of social attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 366-385.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 262-274.
- Schneider, B. (1983). Interactional psychology and organizational behavior. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 5, pp. 1-31). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Siu, O.-L., Spector, P. E., Cooper, C. L., & Lu, C.-Q. (2005). Work stress, self-efficacy, Chinese work values, and work well-being in Hong Kong and Beijing. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 12, 274-288.
- Spector, P. E. (1998). A control theory of the job stress process. In C. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of organizational stress* (pp. 153-169). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruunsema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 446-460.
- Tett, R. E., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 703-742.
- Treadway, D. C., Ferris, G. R., Hochwarter, W. A., Perrewe, P. L., Witt, L. A., & Goodman, J. M. (2005). The role of age in the perceptions of politics-job performance relationship: A three-study constructive replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 872-881.
- van der Linden, D., Keijsers, G. P., Eling, P., & van Schaijk, R. (2005). Work stress and attentional difficulties: An initial study on burnout and cognitive failures. *Work & Stress*, 19, 23-36.

- Van Scotter, J.R., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 525-531.
- Van Scotter, J.R., Motowidlo, S.J., & Cross, T.G. (2000). Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 526-535.
- Vigoda, E. (2000). Organizational politics, job attitudes, and work outcomes: Exploration and implications for the public sector. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 57*, 326-347.
- Vigoda, E. (2002). Stress-related aftermaths to workplace politics: the relationships among politics, job distress, and aggressive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 571-591.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wadsworth, E.J., Moss, S.C., Simpson, S.A., & Smith, A.P. (2003). Preliminary investigation of the association between psychotropic medication use and accidents, minor injuries and cognitive failures. *Human Psychopharmacology: Clinical and Experimental, 18*, 535-540.
- Wanberg, C.R., & Banas, J.T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 132-142.
- Wayne, S., Coyle-Shapiro, J., Eisenberger, R., Liden, R., Rousseau, D., & Shore, L. (2009). Social influences. In H.J. Klein, T.E. Becker, & J.P. Meyer (Eds.), *Commitment in organizations: Accumulated wisdom and new directions* (pp. 253-284). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- White, E. (2004). On the job: Master the culture at a new employer. *Wall Street Journal*, December 24, p. 3.
- White, E. (2007). How a company made everyone a team player. *Wall Street Journal*, August 13, p. B1.
- Wiggins, J. (1982). Circumplex models of interpersonal behavior in clinical psychology. In P.C. Kendall & J.N. Butcher (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in clinical psychology* (pp. 183-221). New York: Wiley.
- Witt, L.A. (1998). Enhancing organizational goal congruence: A solution to organizational politics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 666-674.
- Witt, L.A. (1999, August). *I am outta here: Organizational politics vs. personality predicting turnover*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Academy of Management, Chicago.
- Witt, L.A. (2001, November). *Emotional stability and conscientiousness as interactive predictors of job performance*. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Management Association, New Orleans.
- Witt, L.A. (2002). The interactive effects of extraversion and conscientiousness on job performance. *Journal of Management, 28*, 835-851.
- Witt, L.A., & Jones, J.W. (2003, April). *Very particular people quit first*. Unpublished paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando.
- Wright, P.M., Kacmar, K.M., McMahan, G.C., & Deleeuw, K. (1995). $P = f(M \times A)$: Cognitive ability as a moderator of the relationship between personality and job performance. *Journal of Management, 21*, 1129-1139.

- Van Scotter, J.R., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 525-531.
- Van Scotter, J.R., Motowidlo, S.J., & Cross, T.G. (2000). Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 526-535.
- Vigoda, E. (2000). Organizational politics, job attitudes, and work outcomes: Exploration and implications for the public sector. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 57*, 326-347.
- Vigoda, E. (2002). Stress-related aftermaths to workplace politics: the relationships among politics, job distress, and aggressive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 571-591.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wadsworth, E.J., Moss, S.C., Simpson, S.A., & Smith, A.P. (2003). Preliminary investigation of the association between psychotropic medication use and accidents, minor injuries and cognitive failures. *Human Psychopharmacology: Clinical and Experimental, 18*, 535-540.
- Wanberg, C.R., & Banas, J.T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 132-142.
- Wayne, S., Coyle-Shapiro, J., Eisenberger, R., Liden, R., Rousseau, D., & Shore, L. (2009). Social influences. In H.J. Klein, T.E. Becker, & J.P. Meyer (Eds.), *Commitment in organizations: Accumulated wisdom and new directions* (pp. 253-284). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- White, E. (2004). On the job: Master the culture at a new employer. *Wall Street Journal*, December 24, p. 3.
- White, E. (2007). How a company made everyone a team player. *Wall Street Journal*, August 13, p. B1.
- Wiggins, J. (1982). Circumplex models of interpersonal behavior in clinical psychology. In P.C. Kendall & J.N. Butcher (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in clinical psychology* (pp. 183-221). New York: Wiley.
- Witt, L.A. (1998). Enhancing organizational goal congruence: A solution to organizational politics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 666-674.
- Witt, L.A. (1999, August). *I am outta here: Organizational politics vs. personality predicting turnover*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Academy of Management, Chicago.
- Witt, L.A. (2001, November). *Emotional stability and conscientiousness as interactive predictors of job performance*. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Management Association, New Orleans.
- Witt, L.A. (2002). The interactive effects of extraversion and conscientiousness on job performance. *Journal of Management, 28*, 835-851.
- Witt, L.A., & Jones, J.W. (2003, April). *Very particular people quit first*. Unpublished paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando.
- Wright, P.M., Kacmar, K.M., McMahan, G.C., & Deleuw, K. (1995). $P = f(M \times A)$: Cognitive ability as a moderator of the relationship between personality and job performance. *Journal of Management, 21*, 1129-1139.