

Organizational Psychology Review

<http://opr.sagepub.com/>

Personal lives? The effects of nonwork behaviors on organizational image

Elizabeth E. Umphress, Laszlo Tihanyi, Leonard Bierman and Celile Itir Gogus
Organizational Psychology Review 2013 3: 199 originally published online 25 January 2013
DOI: 10.1177/2041386612473014

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://opr.sagepub.com/content/3/3/199>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



e a w o p

[European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology](http://www.eawop.org)

Additional services and information for *Organizational Psychology Review* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://opr.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://opr.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://opr.sagepub.com/content/3/3/199.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Jul 19, 2013

[OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - Jan 25, 2013

[What is This?](#)

Personal lives? The effects of nonwork behaviors on organizational image

Organizational Psychology Review

3(3) 199–221

© The Author(s) 2013

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/2041386612473014

opr.sagepub.com



Elizabeth E. Umphress

University of Washington, USA

Laszlo Tihanyi

Texas A&M University, USA

Leonard Bierman

Texas A&M University, USA

Celile Itir Gogus

Bilkent University, Turkey

Abstract

Organizational leaders may respond to employee nonwork behaviors because of the possible influence on organizational image. We describe a typology of nonwork behaviors and discuss their potential implications for organizational image. We explore conditions under which organizational leaders may attempt to control employee nonwork behaviors and review the available alternatives for organizational control. We conclude by discussing the theoretical and practical implications of research on nonwork behavior.

Keywords

employee–organization relationships, job attitudes/beliefs/values, leadership

Should organizational leaders care about what their employees do in their free time outside the workplace? Some employers that have fired employees for the content of their personal

Paper received 7 December 2012; revised version accepted 9 December 2012.

Corresponding author:

Elizabeth E. Umphress, Foster School of Business, University of Washington, 587 Paccar Hall, Seattle, WA 98195-3226, USA.

Email: eu4@uw.edu

websites or blogs might argue for the importance of organizational involvement in the personal lives of employees (Gely & Bierman, 2007). For instance, Heather Armstrong was fired when her employer discovered that she had written disparaging things about her organization and coworkers, such as calling her supervisor “Her Wretchedness” on her personal blog (Bulkeley, 2006). Arguably defaming comments made outside the workplace such as those written by Heather Armstrong on her blog could potentially cause damage to an organization’s image. Also, consider the dilemma of a Broadway theater that employs an actress in a leading role in a children’s show when this actress is scrutinized by tabloid magazines for her partying lifestyle. Although the actress may receive critical acclaim for her show performance, parents from the audience who learn about the private life of this actress may pressure the theater to replace her with someone whose lifestyle is more acceptable to them.

Organizational leaders may be concerned about what their employees do in their personal lives because of the increasing permeability and flexibility of organizational boundaries (Scott, 2004). The options for organizations and employees to isolate their activities from their environment have become limited. The possible influence of employee behavior outside of organizational boundaries has been exaggerated by the increased transparency of the world due to technological advancements like the Internet, 24/7 cable news coverage, and devices like camera phones that allow the documentation of behavior in most, if not all, settings. Organizational leaders’ attempts to control nonwork behavior also have increasingly become subject to public scrutiny (Sutton & Galunic, 1996). Nevertheless, public opinion over organizational policies to control employee behavior outside the workplace has been divided; some stakeholder groups have been supportive of such policies but others have voiced their disapproval (Price, Gioia, & Corley, 2008).

The purpose of this manuscript is to draw attention to the organizational implications of

employee nonwork behavior and to explain why and how organizational leaders might choose to control such behavior (Staw, 1991). In doing so, we describe different types of nonwork behavior based on their relatedness to the employee’s job and their potential relevance for the organization. We use this conceptualization to explain how different nonwork behaviors influence organizational image (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994; Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000; Whetten & Mackey, 2002). Our framework specifically considers critical environmental conditions and individual characteristics that may motivate organizational leaders to control the nonwork behaviors of their employees. Further, we draw from the blame and attributions literature (e.g., Alicke, 2000) to determine when organizational leaders may attempt to control nonwork behavior.

Our arguments suggest that organizations and their leaders may have a much more pervasive influence on the nonwork lives of employees than the current literature implies. Organizational leaders can explicitly communicate expectations for nonwork behaviors, for instance, via hiring, firing, promoting, and reprimanding employees based on these behaviors. As the opening vignette illustrates, employers increasingly discipline employees for what they write on their off-duty Internet blogs (Gely & Bierman, 2007). Other forms of nonwork behaviors can also be the subjects of scrutiny by organizations. For instance, the County of Sarasota, Florida in the United States recently adopted a policy of not hiring any county workers who are smokers—and the State of Florida Supreme Court earlier approved its right to adopt such a policy (Anderson, 2008). Companies ranging from Scotts Miracle-Gro Co. and Weyco based also in the United States have adopted policies of this kind (Norbut, 2006). Other forms of nonwork behavior such as personal relationships and charitable activities also have become a subject of control. As Doug Schwarz, a lawyer from New York stated,

It used to be that as long as an executive performed well on the job, no one cared much about what they were doing in their free time . . . but a sea change has occurred, with every aspect of managers' conduct being scrutinized. (Hymowitz, 2007)

Our focus on organizational-level implications of nonwork behaviors supplements previous psychological or individual-level explanations by considering that individual behaviors operate under organizational constraints (Mowday & Sutton, 1993). As such, the arguments set forth in this paper arguably bridge micro- and macroliteratures. Possibly the most important theoretical contribution of this work is that our model describes how a type of behavior once not explicitly considered in the macro literature (i.e., nonwork behavior) could influence organizational image (Staw, 1991). Our typology of nonwork behavior could be used in future research to discern how organizational members view nonwork behaviors and to what extent organizational leaders attempt to control these behaviors.

In the next section, we characterize nonwork behaviors based on their relatedness to the employee's job and the organization. We also detail the influence of nonwork behaviors on organizational image. Next, we draw from the blame and attributions literature to discuss environmental- and individual-level factors that organizational leaders might consider in their attempts to control nonwork behaviors. We conclude with a discussion of theoretical implications for our propositions and suggest directions for future research.

Nonwork behaviors and their organizational relevance

Nonwork behaviors

We define nonwork behaviors as behaviors conducted by employees outside their organization and outside the role that they occupy as an employee. Our conceptualization of

nonwork behaviors includes only those behaviors that are conducted outside their organizations' boundaries. We acknowledge that the difference between work behavior and nonwork behavior is not always clear. Employees within certain professions, for example, have broad role responsibilities that extend beyond the walls of the organization. They attend conferences and various social functions as a part of their jobs. These functions are clearly important to employee and organizational development, and therefore, behaviors expressed within these environments fall outside our conceptualization of nonwork behaviors because they are included within job roles. Furthermore, our intention is not to claim that the possible influence organizations have over their employees' nonwork behaviors is either right or wrong. Our purpose is, rather, to acknowledge that employees exhibit nonwork behaviors that may or may not be related to their job, and that organizations may be positively or negatively influenced by the expression of these behaviors.

Developing a typology of nonwork behavior is warranted because some nonwork behaviors likely influence organizations differently than others. In an effort to understand the effects of nonwork behavior on organizations, we differentiate nonwork behavior based on whether the nonwork behavior (a) is related to the employee's job and (b) has potentially positive or negative implications for the organization. We chose these two dimensions versus other possibilities for conceptualizing nonwork behavior because they coincide with previous work on organizational image, our theoretical lens described in what follows (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Gioia et al., 2000). Related nonwork behaviors have a direct connection to the employee's specific job responsibilities and/or with the core functions of the organization; unrelated nonwork behaviors have either an unclear or indirect connection with the employee's role in the organization. For instance, an off-duty police officer giving immediate aid at the site of a car accident would be job related because this activity is connected to the

job responsibilities of a police officer. However, if this heroic act was performed by an accountant, this would not be job related.

Our conceptualization of positive and negative nonwork behaviors aligns with the idea that some types of nonwork behaviors could influence the organization positively or negatively (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Grant, Dutton, & Rosso, 2008). For example, if an employee is convicted of illegal activities within their nonwork life, such as drug possession or theft, his or her organization might face criticism from the community and customers for employing this individual. Although the organization may be seen as a victim of the employee's criminal act, public scrutiny could stem from the perception that the organization hired a person capable of such a crime, which suggests that the organization's selection procedures could be faulty and/or the organization did not recognize any potential warning signs that could have prevented the crime. Also, third parties who hear about or witness the event could have negative perceptions of the organization because of the connection of the employee to the organization (Sutton & Galunic, 1996). As another example, if the public were aware that an employee of an organization known for its support of traditional values was gay, then this could influence the organization negatively. Conversely, organizations might receive praise for employing individuals who volunteer for a nonprofit agency such as Amnesty International, Greenpeace International, or Habitat for Humanity.

We consider four possibilities for nonwork behaviors based on their relatedness to the employee's job and their influence on the organization. The four types of nonwork behavior include supportive, respected, destructive, and compromising behaviors. Supportive nonwork behavior is related to the employee's job and has a positive influence on the organization. Respected nonwork behavior also has a positive influence on the organization but is unrelated to the job of the employee. Destructive nonwork

behavior is related to the employee's job and has a negative influence on the organization. The last nonwork behavior, compromising behavior, also negatively influences the organization but is unrelated to the employee's job. We present examples for each of these behaviors in Table 1.

Because job relatedness and organizational implications of nonwork behaviors are often based on subjective evaluations, the typology in Table 1 only partially captures the possibly wide range of behaviors employees may display outside their workplace. For instance, some employees may think their nonwork behaviors are unrelated to their jobs but the same behaviors are considered related by their supervisors or the media. Similarly, the boundaries between respected and compromising nonwork behaviors can be fuzzy. For example, leadership in a neighborhood association (a respected nonwork behavior) may turn into a compromising nonwork behavior when the association embraces a controversial position on a public issue (e.g., hostility toward immigrants in the local community). We will return to these possibilities after reviewing the specific organizational implications of supportive, respected, destructive, and compromising behaviors and the conditions under which organizational leaders may attempt to control them.

Organizational image implications

Nonwork behaviors are increasingly relevant for organizations because organizational boundaries have become less transparent and increasingly permeable in recent years (Bartel & Dutton, 2001; Scott, 2004). Organizations may no longer be able to separate their internal operations and services from the environment because they increasingly outsource jobs to their suppliers, have employees who work from home, and build closer relationships with their customers. The growing visibility of the personal life of employees is related to the emergence of Internet-based social networks, blogs, and the birth of specialized media outlets, ranging from

Table 1. Job relatedness and organizational implications of different nonwork behaviors.

Job relatedness	Related	<p>Destructive</p> <p>Example: Revealing unethical or harmful organizational practices in a personal blog</p>	<p>Supportive</p> <p>Example: Volunteering in a public school in military uniform Posting positive comments about the services and working conditions of the employer on a discussion board</p>
	Unrelated	<p>Compromising</p> <p>Example: Employing undocumented immigrant workers at home Being intoxicated in the public</p>	<p>Respected</p> <p>Example: Making a private donation to a local charity Taking a leadership position in a neighborhood association</p>
		Negative	Positive
Organizational implications			

business news to lifestyle. Given this enhanced visibility, external stakeholders, including customers, partners, community members, and resource providers may increasingly consider the nonwork behavior of employees in their view of organizations.

How external stakeholders view organizations has been a central question in management research (Albert, Ashforth, & Dutton, 2000; Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002; Fombrun, 1996; Gioia et al., 2000; Whetten & Mackey, 2002). Organizational image, in this line of research, is the stakeholders’ “shared cognitive representations or views of an organization” (Whetten, 2006, p. 228). The image of an organization is represented by its different attributes and actions that are evaluated based on the beliefs of the members and stakeholders of the organization (Price et al., 2008). When stakeholders have a positive image of an organization, they provide support to the organization, which, in

turn, may increase collective self-esteem among organizational members (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). When stakeholders view an organization negatively, however, every member of the organization may be affected by the damage. For example, Sutton and Callahan (1988) showed how a spoiled organizational image during bankruptcy transferred to organizational members. Here, we explore the possibility that nonwork behavior could influence organizational image.

Previous studies have conceptualized organizational image differently depending on how stakeholder groups perceive the organization and how leaders wish to project their organization’s actions to different stakeholders (e.g., Dukerich et al., 2002; Dutton et al., 1994; Gioia et al., 2000; Whetten & Mackey, 2002). Projected image is how organizational leaders would like external stakeholders to view the organization, and is our focus in this paper (Gioia & Thomas, 1996; Whetten, Lewis, & Mischel, 1992). We chose

projected image because we wish to better understand how organizational leaders attempt to control nonwork behavior due to potential concerns of how that behavior influences stakeholders' perceptions of the organization.

Although the relevance of acceptable employee behavior inside an organization is more evident for organizational image, we suggest that behaviors exhibited by employees outside organizational boundaries also have the potential to support or harm the image leaders would like to communicate to different stakeholder groups (Price et al., 2008). On the one hand, when employee nonwork behaviors are seen positively by some stakeholders, such as volunteering and leadership in a local charity, organizational leaders may perceive that the behaviors strengthen the image of their organization (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). On the other hand, nonwork behaviors may be damaging for organizational image if they are incongruent with the way leaders intend to depict the core attributes of their organization to stakeholders. For example, failure to provide an organizational response to concerns voiced by customer groups and community members over nonwork behaviors of employees may lead to a spoiled organizational image and result in boycotts or protests against the organization. The implications of public outrage can be illustrated by the boycott of Cinemark theaters in the United States (including a "Boycott Cinemark" site on Facebook) due to CEO Alan Stock's support of Proposition 8 in the 2008 California election that eliminated same-sex couples' right to marry. Members of various consumer groups elected to watch movies elsewhere, costing Cinemark considerable revenue (James, 2009).

The different assumptions of organizational image may have important implications for how leaders consider different nonwork behaviors of their employees. Next, we outline four types of nonwork behavior and their implications for organizational image. Then, we discuss environmental conditions and employee characteristics that might influence the control of nonwork behaviors.

Types of nonwork behavior

Supportive nonwork behavior. This type of nonwork behavior is related to the employee's job and has a favorable influence on the organization. Outside the workplace, employees have the opportunity to speak and act in accordance with the mission of their organization (Elsbach, 1994). This could include spreading goodwill or speaking positively about the organization to others such as their friends and neighbors (George & Brief, 1992), and loyalty or preserving the organization's reputation to outsiders and defending the organization (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000; van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994). Employees who engage in spreading goodwill or expressing loyalty to those outside the organization could influence current or future customers or clients of the organization. A particularly salient example of spreading goodwill is employees who post positive messages about their organizations on personal blogs or websites. Such positive expressions have the potential to boost the organization's image, especially if the employee is speaking from his or her own experiences and could be seen as a credible person to provide information about the organization.

Employees engaging in supportive nonwork behaviors display behaviors that exceed socially accepted norms in ways that make their audience aware of the employees' organizational affiliation. Nonwork behaviors that embody the values of the larger society tend to generate support from a wider range of stakeholders, such as customers, government agencies, members of other organizations, community members, owners, and donors. When stakeholders associate an employee's positive nonwork behavior with his or her organization, they may view the entire organization and its actions more positively (Sutton & Galunic, 1996).

Respected nonwork behavior. Some nonwork behaviors could reflect positively on the organization, but are not directly related to the

employee's job. An example of this type of nonwork behavior is employees who contribute to charities within the community or organize successful community events unrelated to their job responsibilities. An architect who chooses to volunteer for a fundraising for the homeless in her town and is recognized for this service reflects positively on the organization. When an employee volunteers for charities or other community activities in his or her personal life, he or she might help the organization signal that it is concerned about the community. Such positive nonwork behaviors support organizational leaders' efforts in shaping the image of the organization, but these behaviors do not provide direct information about the employee's job.

Because respected nonwork behaviors are not related to the employees' jobs and, therefore, are indirectly relevant for organizational functioning, it is likely that these behaviors might allow organizational leaders to reinforce the positive core attributes and activities of their organization. Put differently, the unrelatedness of volunteering in the community to the employee's job makes this nonwork behavior a particularly useful means for organizational leaders to develop a positive image for their organization in the minds of their stakeholders. For example, nonwork behaviors that indicate good citizenship or other positive qualifications may help leaders to convey a positive organizational image to broad stakeholder groups.

Destructive nonwork behavior. Nonwork behaviors that are relevant to the employee's job and have the potential to be unfavorable to the organization could be destructive for the organization if they violate assumptions of the employees' role such that employees express one sentiment within their work life, but an entirely different sentiment in their nonwork life. Consider the example of a bank employee who won a well-advertised gambling tournament in Las Vegas. The public could perceive that gambling is related to banking because both involve monetary transactions and risk assessment. Gambling

could suggest that the bank employee is reckless with money, which is a characterization that could negatively influence the bank's business. Customers might choose to take their money elsewhere if they were aware that bank employees aggressively gambled in their free time. Employees who engage in destructive nonwork behaviors could send the signal that the organization is not trustworthy, or at least stakeholders could be more cautious and questioning when interacting with the organization.

Nonwork behavior that is related to an employee's job while portraying the organization negatively may adversely influence the image of an organization. The potential negative implications of destructive nonwork behavior is increasing, in part, because of the growing popularity of Internet blogs, e-mails, and postings on publicly accessible social networking sites. These means of communication are almost inseparable from some types of work because of the broadening scope of work from the home office and the unrestricted online access by employees in most organizations. For instance, when employees experience unfairness within the workplace they may post their views on their personal websites such as the opening example illustrated. Blogging and other types of online communication allow employees to share potentially damaging information quicker and to a wider audience than previous forms of technology (Miceli & Near, 1992).

Because destructive nonwork behaviors are work related, they may be particularly troubling to external stakeholders because these behaviors indicate that the organization has the potential to be deficient or untrustworthy. In such cases, destructive nonwork behavior may damage the efforts of organizational leaders in creating a favorable image for their organization.

Compromising nonwork behavior. Compromising nonwork behaviors are devalued behaviors because they run counter to the values of the organization and its leaders; thus, having the

potential to damage the organization. Also, compromising nonwork behaviors are not related to the employee's job. Compromising nonwork behaviors could comprise behaviors associated with a stigma or "an attribute that produces a social identity that is devalued or derogated by persons within a particular culture at a particular point in time" (Paetzold, Dipboye, & Elsbach, 2008, p. 186; see also Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998; Goffman, 1963; Hudson, 2008). Examples of compromising nonwork behavior are prevalent within the media such as extramarital affairs (e.g., John Edwards, Mark Sanford), promiscuous behavior (e.g., Dominique Strauss-Kahn, Tiger Woods, Wilt Chamberlain), and drug use (e.g., Tara Conner). Other possible compromising nonwork behaviors with stigmas include smoking (Paetzold et al., 2008), or engaging in a lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgendered (LGBT) lifestyle outside of work (Ragins, 2008). For example, in 1991 the U.S. restaurant chain Cracker Barrel established a company policy to employ individuals who exhibited only heterosexual preferences, actively discriminating against gay and lesbian employees. In a public notice, Cracker Barrel stated that it would not employ those individuals "whose sexual preferences fail to demonstrate normal heterosexual values which have been the foundation of families in our society" (Kilborn, 1992). Having a LGBT lifestyle is not related to job performance at a restaurant, but Cracker Barrel's executives perceived that these individuals would reflect negatively on their restaurant's values. Examples of compromising nonwork behavior are not limited to only behavior conducted by the individual employee. Compromising nonwork behavior could include engaging in a friendship or other nonwork relationship with a member of a stigmatized group (i.e., stigma by association; Kulik, Bainbridge, & Cregan, 2008). For instance, if an employee is a friend or relative of a known criminal, then this could negatively influence the organization.

A large segment of nonwork behavior involves lifestyles that are unrelated to the employee's job but are potentially unfavorable to the organization. For example, Tamara Hoover, a schoolteacher in Austin, Texas was suspended for the presence of several partially nude art photographs of her posted on a website by an art photographer. Although she did not place the pictures on the website and did not direct students to visit the site, Ms. Hoover "went from award winning teacher to scandal of the week" and was forced out of the classroom for violating "standards of professional conduct" (May, 2006). According to the school district, Ms. Hoover's pictures violated desired conduct and morals that the local public deemed acceptable for schoolteachers.

Our previous discussion suggests the following propositions:

P1a: Supportive and respected nonwork behaviors positively influence organizational image.

P1b: Destructive and compromising nonwork behaviors negatively influence organizational image.

Boundary conditions for organizational control of nonwork behavior

Organizational leaders' attention to employee nonwork behavior may vary based on whether leaders perceive that the nonwork behavior could be responsible for changes in organizational image. We looked to the literature on blame and attributions of responsibility (e.g., Alicke, 2000; Fienberg, 1970) to determine which factors could influence when organizational leaders deem employee nonwork behavior responsible, and will subsequently attempt to control the behavior. According to this literature, characteristics of the environment and the employee conducting the behavior could influence the extent to which they are held

responsible or blameworthy (Efran, 1974; Kelley, 1972; Sigall & Ostrove, 1975; for a review see Alicke, 2000).

Previous literature suggests that organizational leaders could hold employees more or less responsible for nonwork behaviors depending on the level of their organization's social approval (Fombrun, 1996). Some organizations may receive high social approval or enjoy high reputation or celebrity status. The social approval of new organizations and organizations operating in changing environments can be more uncertain. Furthermore, a subset of organizations in every society may not receive social approval at all. These organizations are "core-stigmatized" by the public (Hudson, 2008). Leaders of such organizations may not need to be concerned about the effects of different nonwork behaviors. In addition to the social approval of their organization, organizational leaders' attention to nonwork behavior may depend on the variation in the status of their employees engaged in nonwork behavior. Next, we discuss how these factors might influence the extent organizational leaders attempt to control nonwork behavior out of their concern for maintaining organizational image.

Social approval

We consider the implications of three levels of social approval for the control of nonwork behavior, including high, uncertain, and low social approval. Leaders of organizations with *high social approval* might be concerned that blame for employee nonwork behavior would be attributed to their organization. For example, *Playboy Magazine* approached Wal-Mart's associates to appear in its "Women of Wal-Mart" feature in 2003. The company, which is known for its conservative policies regarding the content of magazines and music it sells in its stores, was in a particularly difficult position. When asked about the magazine's offer to its employees, a spokesperson declined to say whether Wal-Mart would take any actions against them if they would appear in the

magazine. However, he noted that the feature was "not the ballpark Wal-Mart wants to play in" (CNN Money.com, 2003).

Organizations that enjoy high social approval are often called celebrity or high-reputation organizations (Pfarrer, Pollock, & Rindova, 2010). While both types of organizations are highly visible, celebrity organizations tend to attract positive emotions by different stakeholder groups. The celebrity status of these organizations is often reinforced by media accounts (Rindova, Pollock, & Hayward, 2006). Organizations located in smaller communities often enjoy a celebrity status. Local community members may support the organization because of its contributions to employment, taxes, and the development of infrastructure. This organizational support by stakeholders is likely to be extended in the cases of respected and supportive employee nonwork behaviors. If, for instance, employees engage in charities in small towns, then organizational members might perceive that the organization supports those types of nonwork behavior. Organizational leaders of high social approval organizations may encourage supportive and respected forms of nonwork behavior to receive the benefits granted by these nonwork behaviors.

Because the high social approval of celebrity organizations is based on emotions, they may lose their approval if their employees engage in destructive or compromising nonwork behaviors. Consider the example of a celebrity apparel maker scrutinized by an interest group for its unfair competitive practices. If an employee posts information about the organization's exploitative labor practices on her Internet blog, she may trigger protests and lawsuits by interest groups. To protect its celebrity status thus the organization may need to provide a stronger response to nonwork behavior. Similarly, famous museums and charities may be more vulnerable to changes in broader public support and, therefore, may need to carefully consider damages to their image caused by nonwork behaviors. The scrutiny of

stakeholders may involve increased monitoring of organizational performance, interruptions of organizational activities, and persistent questions about events and their explanations (Sutton & Galunic, 1996).

In contrast to celebrity organizations, high-reputation organizations receive social approval for their consistent services and reliable actions (Rindova et al., 2006). Perceived quality and performance attributes may compensate for negative influences, such as the potential harm of destructive or compromising nonwork behavior. Celebrity firms depend on the emotion-based support of stakeholders and positive reports from the media, both of which can be transitory; whereas, high-reputation organizations rely on the quality associated with their activities and positivity associated with their actions, which can be seen as more stable and enduring. Therefore, the attributes of high-reputation organizations may constitute a stronger buffer for organizational image than the benefits afforded by emotions and media accounts for celebrity organizations (Pfarrer et al., 2010). Based on the aforementioned, we suggest that:

P2: High social approval of an organization strengthens organizational leaders' control of employee nonwork behavior.

P3: Leaders of celebrity organizations are more likely to control destructive and compromising nonwork behaviors than leaders of high-reputation organizations.

Leaders of organizations that operate under conditions of *uncertain social approval* have limited opportunities to control nonwork behavior of their employees. For example, organizations in high technology industries, emerging service sectors, or newly industrialized countries may have difficulties in gauging the opinion of their stakeholders. Because establishing organizational image takes time, organizational leaders may need to cope with higher level of uncertainty regarding the opinion of their stakeholders. Under

uncertain conditions, it is not only difficult for leaders to maintain their organization's image, they likely have difficulty prescribing, a priori, the behaviors that their employees need to accomplish to lead to organizational success (e.g., Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007). Because of the difficulty of determining behaviors that will lead to social approval, organizational leaders may allow employees more discretion over role requirements (Griffin et al., 2007). This assumption is supported in the literature on blame, which suggests that in uncertain conditions where different causal forces could be attributed to an event, then less blame is assessed (Alicke, 2000; Kelley, 1972). Multiple causal forces may create a higher tolerance of nonwork behavior because the consequences of the event are less predictable; whereas the consequences of the event will be foreseen under more stable conditions (Alicke, 2000).

Similar to their job-related behavior, employees might enjoy greater discretion in their personal lives when employed by organizations that operate under uncertain conditions. Increased employee discretion will result in organizations having more flexible requirements for nonwork behavior when organizational leaders are uncertain about the social approval of their organization. As a result of increased employee discretion, organizational leaders may experience more difficulties in defining, rewarding, or punishing nonwork behaviors that influence organizational image. Also, leaders might not have the time to devote to, assess, or acknowledge changes in organizational image owing to nonwork behavior under uncertainty.

P4: Higher level of uncertainty in social approval by stakeholders weakens organizational leaders' control of employee nonwork behavior.

Some organizations in every society may receive little or no social approval. These organizations receive persistent negative social evaluations or

are “core-stigmatized” because of what they do or whom they serve (Hudson, 2008; Yoon, Gürhan-Canli, & Schwarz, 2006). Social groups view organizations with such a tainted image as unacceptable and inappropriate. Core-stigmatized organizations include abortion clinics, casinos, men’s bathhouses, and tobacco companies (Hudson, 2008). In a broader sense, some multinational companies may also be core-stigmatized by certain groups of stakeholders, owing to their labor practices and destructive competitive behavior in foreign markets. Because their image is already in question, organizational leaders of core-stigmatized organizations may continue to operate regardless of what their employees do in their personal life. Controlling nonwork behavior thus may be less important for core-stigmatized organizations than for other organizations with stronger public support, and this type of organization could be an exception to the aforementioned propositions regarding social approval.

P5: Lack of social approval leads to limited control of employee nonwork behavior by organizational leaders.

Employee status

As employees move up in the organizational hierarchy, “private life thus becomes penetrable and not very private” (Kanter, 1977, p. 121). Executives are the “face” of the organization and, therefore, what they do in their personal lives is relevant for the image of their organization. Moreover, the symbolic representation of the company may even trickle down to the private lives of spouses and children of executives. The lives of these individuals are often shaded by the position the executive holds within the organization. For example, wives or husbands of executives become heads of charities and entertain clients as unpaid agents of their spouses’ organizations.

Organizations may rely on corporate family’s lives “to a degree perhaps much greater than systems themselves officially admit” (Kanter,

1977, p. 120). Indeed, a court in the state of Connecticut ruled that because the role of being a “GE wife” was so pervasive, the spouse of top General Electric Corporation executive Gary Wendt was entitled to an unusually large portion of his \$100 million in assets upon their divorce. This was so because the judge determined that Lorna Wendt gave her “husband’s career priority in her life,” which the judge concluded, “was the General Electric way, since G.E. is a family organization tending to treat spouses and employees as a part of a team” (Herring, 1998).

Although employees at low levels in the organizational hierarchy, at times, are free to disentangle their organizations from their nonwork behaviors, those at the top do not generally have the same luxury. Interestingly however, those at the top have more power and influence within the organization, and potentially have a greater opportunity to leave the organization because of enhanced job opportunities. The higher status of these employees may constrain organizations in reacting to the nonwork behavior of these employees. Executives, for instance, tend to receive idiosyncrasy credits arising from their status within the organization. When the mistress of the copresident of Oracle, Charles Phillips, broadly advertised their 8.5-year affair via billboards and the Internet, a prominent analyst commented that “It’s immaterial because Chuck is doing good work at Oracle . . . Whatever he does after 5, it’s none of our business” (Poletti, 2010). As this example illustrates, superior job performance and his executive status could buffer sanctions for his extramarital affair or compromising nonwork behavior.

Hollander (1958) first described idiosyncrasy credits as “the degree to which an individual may deviate from the common expectancies of the group” (1958, p. 120). That is, those employees who have these valuable credits have more discretion to express actions that potentially harm an organization’s image than those who do not hold such credits. Hollander (1958) proposed that these credits arise from two sources, (a) task

performance or competence and (b) characteristics outside of task performance that contribute to the workplace (e.g., social capital, extrarole performance). Because organizations may tolerate nonwork behaviors that deviate from their image from those employees who have idiosyncrasy credits, organizations might be less likely to attempt to correct their image by responding negatively to destructive, or compromising nonwork behaviors of high performers. For example, organizational leaders might tolerate a highly productive employee expressing controversial values on a personal website, and do nothing to control this behavior. Thus, organizational leaders may be less willing to respond to negative nonwork behavior if employees possess important resources that facilitate organizational activities or gain their status by being high performers. However, when those credits turn to debits, employees may lose this discretion within their nonwork lives and be faced with increasing control over their nonwork behaviors. Therefore, employee status might play an important role in whether or not organizational leaders attempt to control nonwork behavior.

Research focused on blame supports the view that an individual's status influences attributions of blame and responsibility for events (Alicke, 2000; Shaw & Skolnick, 1996). Yet, the effect of status in this literature is more complex than discussed before. Specifically, the relationship between status and culpability for behavior is influenced by the degree to which the behavior is job related (Shaw & Skolnick, 1996). For behavior that is unrelated to their job, status grants a shield such that individuals with high status are held less blameworthy than those with low status. However, for behaviors that are related to their job, status serves as a liability as high-status individuals are held more accountable than low-status individuals.

Hollander (1958) also alluded to the possibility that status will act as a liability for job-related norm violations; he noted that individuals "could readily lose credits and find his influence diminished if he were to show idiosyncratic behavior in

terms of expectancies associated with his role" (1958, p. 125). Because high-status individuals and their employing organizations will be deemed more responsible for job-related nonwork behaviors than low-status individuals we propose that organizational leaders will attempt to control destructive and supportive (job-related) nonwork behavior for high- versus low-status individuals. Such a response will enable organizational leaders to promote in the case of supportive, and dissuade in the case of destructive, future incidences of the nonwork behavior in question. Conversely, high-status individuals will be shielded from organizational leader control over nonwork behavior that is job unrelated, such that employee status weakens the relationship between organizational leaders' control of compromising and respected nonwork behavior. Specifically, we suggest that:

P6a: For compromising and respected nonwork behaviors, employee status weakens organizational leaders' control of employee nonwork behavior.

P6b: For destructive and supportive nonwork behaviors, employee status strengthens organizational leaders' control of employee nonwork behavior.

Organizational leader control mechanisms

When organizational leaders are concerned that their organization's image is influenced by nonwork behavior, they may use different mechanisms to control or influence the behavior. Some large corporations, for example, have high moral expectations regarding the behavior of their employees outside the workplace. Chick-fil-A, a large fast-food chain based in the United States, often interviews spouses and children of prospective franchise operators about their relationships at home (Schmall, 2007). S. Truett Cathy, Chick-fil-A's founder and chairman, argues that he would likely fire any employee "who has been sinful or done something harmful to their family

members” because “if a man can’t manage his own life, he can’t manage a business” (Schmall, 2007). These moral expectations have made some Chick-fil-A employees uncomfortable. According to one franchise operator, these expectations make the hiring of a good manager who perhaps in his free time “moonlights at a strip club” difficult (Schmall, 2007).

We define control mechanisms as any action instituted by the organization to attempt to influence, promote, or dispel employee nonwork behavior. These mechanisms may serve as attempts to shape stakeholder perceptions of the organization and its image (Elsbach, 2003). If leaders decide to attempt to control nonwork behaviors, they have the option to respond either externally (involving external stakeholders and the media) or internally (procedural changes). Possible external responses are communications with the media such as promoting the specific positive employee nonwork behavior in the local media. Internal responses could be initiated in the creation of organizational procedures or policies for nonwork behavior, recognition of the employee internally via company memoranda, promotion, or termination of the employee. Whether the organization chooses internal or external responses, the key rationale for the response will be to attempt to control or influence future employee nonwork behavior and/or to modify stakeholder perceptions of the nonwork behavior.

Organizational leaders may decide to generate an external response to threats or benefits to organizational image that stem from nonwork behavior. Due to the image benefits associated with supportive nonwork behavior, organizations might choose to promote this nonwork behavior to the public. For instance, a tax preparation service organization might highlight on its website that employees volunteer to assist members of low-income communities with financial advice and money management. When destructive nonwork behavior results in a loss of organizational image such as the example of an employee blogging

disparaging comments about the organization, the organization might send out a press release, hire an advertising agency, or employ an Internet image consultant to dispel the negative proclamations of the employee. In response to image threats, the organization may attempt to gear external messages to its stakeholders to depict the organization as a victim of the destructive behavior.

Also, organizational leaders may engage in an internal response to the nonwork behavior if they believe organizational image will be influenced by it. Changes in image might make organizational members question if they are projecting the most positive image of the organization. To help inhibit such concerns, the organization could devise a sustained response to the nonwork behavior via changes in policies regarding the nonwork behavior. Alternatively, the organization can reward or punish employees displaying the nonwork behavior.

An internal response will allow organizational members to have an improved sense of the image that organizational leaders wish to project to stakeholders. For instance, an organization might decide to give employees who consistently volunteer for charities (a form of respected nonwork behavior) special recognition, time off, or monetary awards in order to send a signal to employees that volunteerism is important for the organization’s image. Similarly, an internal response would occur after changes in image due to compromising or destructive nonwork behavior. As noted, destructive and compromising nonwork behaviors could lead those within the organization to question the image that organizational leaders are projecting to outsiders. To reaffirm insider perceptions of image in response to a threat to image, leaders could even decide to fire the employee guilty of the destructive nonwork behavior or develop a policy detailing forms of compromising nonwork behavior that are unacceptable to the organization. In summary, organizational leaders have a variety of

internal and external mechanisms at their disposal to attempt to control nonwork behavior.

Discussion

We discussed a range of behaviors that employees may express outside the boundaries of their workplace. Using examples, we explored how nonwork behaviors are related to the employees' job and have implications for the organization. We illustrated the possible effects of nonwork behaviors on organizational image. In doing so, we highlighted the distinct possibility organizational leaders consider nonwork behavior when attempting to maintain their organization's image. Furthermore, we detailed environmental conditions and employee characteristics that may influence organizational leaders' attempts to control nonwork behavior. In this section, we discuss the theoretical and practical implications of our conceptualization of nonwork behavior.

Theoretical implications

Understanding the organizational implications of nonwork behaviors might contribute to the organizational literature in different ways. Whereas recent studies have noted the continuity of organizational processes, such as outsourcing of activities and business partner relationships outside organizational boundaries, our focus on nonwork behavior conceptualizes the changes in organizational boundaries for organizational members (Scott, 2004). That is, we consider the permeability of organizational boundaries between the work and nonwork dimensions of society. Studying the organizational implications of different behaviors by employees outside their workplace thus offers a novel approach to understand how organizations operate with less transparent boundaries.

Our focus on nonwork behaviors provides an interesting opportunity for extending research on employee behavior. We suggest that what employees do in their private lives may

influence organizations more than this literature currently acknowledges. Specifically, our conceptualization of nonwork behavior may extend microliterature by outlining how nonwork behavior has favorable or unfavorable consequences for organizational image. Previous organizational literature acknowledges that nonwork behavior is relevant for employee work-life balance, life-work balance, stress, and other individual-level outcomes (Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, & Lockwood, 2007; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005). Using our typology, researchers could broadly consider how nonwork behaviors influence organizations via their effects on organizational image. That is, we help define when and why nonwork behaviors at the individual level could be relevant to understand organizational-level phenomena (Staw, 1991).

We classified nonwork behavior by job relatedness (related vs. unrelated) and its potential organizational implications (positive vs. negative). Our focus on these two dimensions allowed us to consider how types of nonwork behavior will influence organization image, and when organizational leaders will attempt to control nonwork behavior. Thus, a potential strength of this typology is the ability for organizational researchers to better understand how some types of nonwork behaviors potentially enhance while others damage the organizational image leaders would like to project to their stakeholders.

Our typology could open up some intriguing possibilities for future research. Typically, organizational scholars investigate employee behaviors within work settings. Our typology suggests that nonwork behavior could also have implications for organizations, and we encourage researchers to better understand how organizations might shape employee nonwork behavior. In particular, we think that researchers could explore how organizations might motivate certain types of nonwork behaviors in the first place. For instance, it is possible that employees engage in some forms of destructive or compromising

nonwork behavior to retaliate against the organization for unfair treatment (e.g., Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Previous research has examined some forms of nonwork behavior such as talking negatively about the organization. However, our conceptualization could offer organizational justice researchers a conceptual framework to examine different types of nonwork behaviors such as gambling or drug abuse. If this is so, then one might suspect that destructive or compromising nonwork behavior could be prevalent when organizations institute a pay decrease or layoff. Conversely, employees might decide to engage in supportive or respected nonwork behavior in response to fair treatment from the organization. For example, employees might be more likely to volunteer or contribute to charities when treated fairly by their organizations. These and other possibilities could be examined by using our typology.

Another direction to extend our typology is to investigate the fuzzy boundaries of different nonwork behaviors. By discussing the core characteristics of supportive, respected, destructive, and compromising nonwork behaviors, we wanted to demonstrate the complex organizational implications of different nonwork behaviors. However, our typology likely has missed some nonwork behaviors that fall between the four basic categories. Others may also develop alternative typologies that capture simultaneous positive and negative organizational implications or consider a broader range of effects at the organizational and societal levels.

As noted, this paper attempts to bridge the gap between micro- and macroresearch by examining the organizational implications of employee nonwork behavior. Although theorizing across levels is challenging, we think that such a theoretical exercise is necessary because employee behavior clearly has important implications for organizations and vice versa. Possibly an important theoretical contribution of our manuscript is the introduction of nonwork behavior into the organizational image literature. Work on organizational image has noted that

employees help shape organizational image through the expression of attitudes and behaviors at work (e.g., Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Dutton et al., 1994; Gioia et al., 2000; Rafaeli & Pratt, 1993). Our model extends this literature by illustrating how nonwork behaviors could impact organizational image and how organizational leaders may attempt to control nonwork behaviors in an effort to influence stakeholder perceptions of the organization (Elsbach, 2003). Such extensions are potentially salient to future work on this area because they highlight how behaviors performed outside the boundaries of the organization could influence organizational image and organizational leaders' reactions to image. Of course, we do not wish to propose that nonwork behaviors have a stronger influence on organizations than work behaviors, but both types of behaviors likely influence organizational image.

Organizational leaders' attempts to control nonwork behavior have important implications for organizational identity, or what is distinctive, central, and enduring to the organization (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). Organizational identity can serve as a point of reference for organizational members to judge organizational events (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991), and an organization's response (or lack thereof) to nonwork behavior might not be consistent with organizational identity. If this is the case, organizational leaders' attempts to control nonwork behavior could generate a change in organizational identity. For example, if an organization that espouses a strong commitment to personal freedom and the free expression of ideas fires an employee for blogging online about his or her boss, then organizational members might begin to question the organization's commitment to these ideals. Organizational identity in this situation could be transformed such that organizational members no longer perceive that free expression of ideas is central or distinctive about their organization. Conversely, an organization choosing to reward and celebrate an employee who engages in a

heroic act in his/her nonwork life could have positive implications for organizational identity, such that the employee's action reflects positively on the whole group allowing the organization to "bask in the glory" of the heroic act. This suggests that organizations should be careful to consider how organizational responses could augment organizational identity for the better or worse.

Stakeholder heterogeneity is an issue that requires further investigation when considering how stakeholders view organizational responses to nonwork behaviors. Stakeholder heterogeneity refers to the conception that an organization has a diverse group of stakeholders that may be hard to satisfy simultaneously (Massey, 2001). Stakeholder perceptions of organizational responses may not necessarily be uniform and the same organizational response may be viewed positively by some groups of stakeholders and negatively by other groups (Price et al., 2008). When judging organizational responses, fairness perceptions as well as values and beliefs of these different stakeholder groups are likely to play a role. For example, when Disney decided to offer similar benefits to its employees living as same-sex couples, customer groups that opposed gay rights called for boycotts of Disney's theme parks and movies. Other customer groups tolerated or supported the compromising nonwork behavior of Disney employees. These customers may stop attending the theme parks or buying merchandise if they believe that Disney mistreats gay or lesbian employees by failing to offer same-sex benefits. Organizations could try to anticipate their stakeholders' perceptions of different organizational responses by understanding various stakeholder preferences and how they might be influenced by a specific response through establishing links with them before nonwork behavior occurs (Pearson & Clair, 1998).

We also note that organizational responses could present a dilemma for organizations. Some organizational leaders may be less concerned about the implications of certain nonwork behaviors and decide not to control their employees' conduct outside the workplace. Leaders of

other organizations might overrespond to given nonwork behaviors. Further, organizational leaders might underrespond to nonwork behaviors, for instance, by failing to communicate effectively to external stakeholders once the destructive nonwork behavior committed by their employees becomes public. An organization's stance on issues relevant to certain nonwork behaviors thus may influence the nature and level of its responses. Employees, in turn, may feel more comfortable working for and identify with organizations that tolerate their personal lives.

Literature on crisis management indicates that when faced with a crisis organizational leaders should share key information with stakeholders (Pearson & Clair, 1998). Failing to share this information could lead to rumors and speculation, but sharing key information could help the organization avoid blame. The same could be true for nonwork behaviors such that organizations could face a backlash from stakeholders if they attempt to ignore destructive nonwork behaviors and fail to communicate with external stakeholders about the event. In turn, organizations that share information with external stakeholders could help dispel rumors and associated blame for destructive nonwork behavior. After deciding to respond to nonwork behavior, organizational leaders likely consider the level of response that is necessary. One factor that may generate an elevated response from organizational leaders is the frequency of the nonwork behavior within the organization. For instance, if a group of employees are visiting strip clubs then this might generate an enhanced attempt to control the nonwork behavior than if the behavior is conducted by just a few individuals. Indeed, organizational leaders might feel compelled to respond to nonwork behaviors that are being conducted by a group or team of employees because the nonwork behavior will likely have a stronger influence on organizational image when conducted by a team versus an individual employee.

Practical implications

Our framework has important implications for managers as well. Organizational leaders could use our conceptualization of nonwork behavior in order to determine whether or not an external organizational response is needed. Organizational leaders may launch an external response to nonwork behavior that includes a public campaign to attempt to change stakeholders' perceptions of the organization and enhance organizational image (Heath, Larrick, & Klayman, 1998). Such a response might not be as beneficial in the case of nonwork behavior that is unrelated to the employee's job (respected and compromising nonwork behavior). For instance, stakeholder groups could react negatively to a broad marketing campaign advertising employees' respected nonwork behaviors because the organization is attempting to take undue credit for nonwork behaviors that has no organizational relevance. Furthermore, external responses might not yield equivalent results for all stakeholder groups. When an organization provides a broad external response to an event to which only some groups are aware, then the organization might make an event salient that is not currently in the minds of all external stakeholder groups. If the event has negative implications, such as compromising nonwork behavior, making the event salient to those external to the organization could harm the organizational image that was not originally affected. In this situation, an organization's external response to the compromising nonwork behavior could actually tarnish the organization's image more so than if the organization did nothing in response to the nonwork behavior. This suggests that the potential success of an organization's internal or external response could be based on whether organizational leaders correctly determine if the nonwork behavior influences organizational image and tailor a response to affected stakeholder groups.

Organizational leaders need to be aware of the possible influence of their explicit and

implicit signals when they internally respond to nonwork behavior. For example, sending a memorandum to all employees stressing the importance of "traditional family values" may lead some employees to perceive that their organization does not support nontraditional unions (e.g., gays and lesbians) or divorce. Such communications may lead employees to display negative behaviors toward nontraditional groups both inside and outside the workplace. Further, the memorandum would likely alienate employees who are supportive of gay, lesbian, and bisexual rights within society. These employees could choose to leave the organization because they do not share the organization's values, or the employees might openly protest such as wearing t-shirts or signs supportive of the gay, lesbian, and bisexual community (see Colella, Paetzold, Zardkoohi, & Wesson, 2007).

In addition to implicit signals within their communications, organizational leaders should consider their explicit attempts to control nonwork behavior. Previous research suggests that communicating how often an activity is performed (e.g., 92% of employees contribute to organization-sponsored charities) can be more effective at promoting the behavior than providing information about the positive social value of the activity (e.g., employees should contribute to the organization-sponsored charities; Cialdini, 2003). However, the current frequency of the event is important because if the activity is performed infrequently or is not the norm, then information about the frequency will lead to lower levels of the behavior. Therefore, organizational leaders should carefully consider the messages regarding nonwork behaviors they may be transmitting to employees.

Also, organizational leaders should be careful not to decrease organizational performance or alienate employees when implementing some internal responses to nonwork behaviors. For instance, we have suggested that one internal organizational response is promoting or firing employees if their nonwork

behavior enhances or impairs organizational image. Yet, promoting employees based on criteria unrelated to work performance such as nonwork behavior could lead to selection errors and threaten organizational performance. Failing to promote the highest performers is very costly in terms of a loss in potential human resources. Also, hiring, firing, or promoting based on nonwork criteria could threaten employees' perceptions of fairness, which has been shown to be an important motivator of various types of work performance (e.g., Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Further, perceptions of fairness could be negatively influenced if some employees are sanctioned for their nonwork behaviors, while other employees are not because they possess idiosyncrasy credits. Similar to problems caused by differentially rewarding or sanctioning work performance, differentially rewarding or sanctioning employees for their nonwork behavior would likely cause issues of fairness within the organization. Therefore, it is possible that the best way to ensure organizational fairness while employing an internal response strategy for nonwork behavior is to develop policies and procedures that are applied consistently across all employees. Previous research has considered how consistently applied policies and procedures regarding work-related behaviors positively influence fairness perceptions (for a review, see Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Future research should investigate if these effects transfer into the nonwork behavior realm.

Finally, we think it important to determine how employees respond to any type of internal control of nonwork behavior. Even if policies and procedures regarding nonwork behavior are applied consistently across employees, employees might react negatively to organizational leaders attempting to control their behaviors outside of the workplace. Some employees might perceive that organizational leaders are intruding too much into their personal lives when

implementing an internal response to nonwork behavior. When the organization promotes and emphasizes an organization-wide charitable campaign, employees who are already financially stretched might feel compelled to give and might resent such a perceived obligation. Conversely, employees who feel they have the extra funds to spare and have positive perceptions of the charity might feel a stronger connection to the organization after giving to the charitable campaign. In sum, we encourage organizational research to focus on the possible positive and negative implications associated with internal, as well as external, responses to nonwork behavior.

Implications for empirical research

We outlined four different types of nonwork behavior, but employees within the same organization may not exhibit all four types of nonwork behavior. When testing our propositions within one organization, researchers might decide to focus on one type of nonwork behavior such as employees' blogging negative information about their organization (i.e., destructive nonwork behavior). Then, researchers could assess how this type of nonwork behavior influences employee perceptions of organizational image. One could also assess organizational leaders' perceptions of the likelihood that their organization would engage in different attempts to control the nonwork behavior. Also, researchers could engage in a longitudinal study of one organization and assess how nonwork behaviors shape its image over time.

To examine all four types of nonwork behavior within one study, researchers will likely require access to multiple organizations. Examining our propositions within multiple organizations will allow researchers to test how different types of nonwork behaviors impact organizational image, and how internal and external responses to organizational image evolve across organizations. Also, to test our propositions researchers would require access to employees within organizations that are

located within environments with different levels of social approval.

We draw attention to the organizational consequences of employee nonwork behavior, and in doing so we focused on the effects of this behavior on projected organizational image. The organizational literature, however, conceptualizes image in a number of ways by emphasizing the perceptions of different stakeholders and organizational members (e.g., Dukerich et al., 2002; Gioia et al., 2000; Whetten & Mackey, 2002). Researchers of organizational image might be interested in investigating the perceptions of different stakeholders and the influence of nonwork behavior on image, reputation and other related constructs. For example, future research could consider how organizational leader's perceptions of how nonwork influences project image coincide with actual changes in stakeholder perceptions (or reputation). Along this line of reasoning, a recent study found that companies that employed Tiger Woods to endorse their products lost an estimated 2–3% of their market value as a result of his negative nonwork behavior (Knittel & Stango, 2009).

Future research might also explore the nature of nonwork behavior and its effects on organizational image across industries and cultures. Empirical studies could extend our model by testing some of these variations on different organizational populations. We think two directions could be particularly insightful. Researchers might want to examine the nonwork behavior phenomenon in organizations located in different countries. A multicountry study could help explain how employees perceive the boundaries between their work and personal lives. As well, a survey of employees in organizations from different cultural traditions could reveal how organizational leaders control nonwork behavior in different cultures. In another line of research, researchers could study the variances in nonwork behavior and organizational responses to this type of behavior within a large multinational organization.

For example, the expectations for nonwork behavior as well as the consequences of the behavior to organizational image might vary significantly across organizational units in different countries. Leaders of a multinational organization may perceive the image implications of local nonwork behavior in some countries differently than managers of foreign subsidiaries or local employees displaying the nonwork behavior. We expect that these perceptual differences have an important influence on the overall image of an organization operating in multiple countries.

Additionally, researchers should consider when organizational leaders exhibit mechanisms to attempt to control nonwork behavior. It is possible, for instance, that organizational leaders initiate proactive attempts to control nonwork behavior. This might be likely in the case of destructive and supportive nonwork behaviors because nonwork behaviors that are job related may be particularly salient to organizational leaders. Further, organizational leaders might look to media accounts or the experiences of similar organizations regarding employee nonwork behavior, and such information could generate a proactive response to employee nonwork behavior. For instance, if a similar organization experiences organizational image changes due to its employees' engaging in volunteer work, then organizational leaders might initiate an internal response to this behavior and encourage volunteer work within their organization. Future research should examine when organizational leaders decide to engage in proactive or reactive attempts to control nonwork behavior.

Finally, researchers should consider if rewarding or reprimanding employees for nonwork behavior creates a shift in the behavior such that it is considered part of the work role. In terms of our definition, we noted that nonwork behaviors are conducted by employees outside their organization and outside the role that they occupy as an employee. If a given nonwork behavior is rewarded or sanctioned by

organizational leaders, then one might consider the nonwork behavior as part of the employee's role (for a discussion of a similar debate in the organizational citizenship behavior literature see Organ, 1997; Tepper, Lockhart, & Hoobler, 2001; Turnipseed & Wilson, 2009). To assess whether this is the case, future research should examine employee perceptions of their job roles regarding the nonwork behavior in question. If employees consider the nonwork behavior a part of their job role, then it may no longer be considered a dimension of nonwork behavior.

Conclusion

Our model is just one step toward a greater understanding of the influence of employee nonwork behavior on organizations. We wish to encourage researchers to study the possible effects of nonwork behavior on organizational image. Organizational leaders may decide how to influence, promote, or dispel employee nonwork behaviors to manage their organizations' image. Indeed, nonwork behaviors may impact organizations to a greater extent than current organizational literature suggests and we theorize when and why this might be so.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- Albert, S., Ashforth, B. E., & Dutton, J. E. (2000). Organizational identity and identification: Charting new waters and building new bridges. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*, 13–17.
- Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 263–295). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Alicke, M. D. (2000). Culpable control and the psychology of blame. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *126*, 556–574.
- Anderson, Z. (2008, May 20). County: Smokers need not apply. *HeraldTribune.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.heraldtribune.com/article/20080520/NEWS/805200406/1661>
- Bartel, C., & Dutton, J. (2001). Ambiguous organizational memberships: Constructing organizational identities in interactions with others. In M. Hogg & D. J. Jerry (Eds.), *Social identity processes in organizational contexts* (pp. 115–130). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Bulkeley, W. M. (2006, April 3). The inside view: Employee blogs can put a human face on companies; but that's not always a good thing. *Wall Street Journal*.
- Casper, W. J., Eby, L. T., Bordeaux, C., & Lockwood, A. (2007). A review of research methods in IO/OB work–family research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 28–43.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2003). Crafting normative messages to protect the environment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *12*, 105–109.
- CNN Money.com. (2003, September 15). *Playboy wants Wal-Mart women*. Retrieved from http://money.cnn.com/2003/09/15/news/companies/wal-mart_playboy/
- Colella, A., Paetzold, R. L., Zardkoohi, A., & Wesson, M. J. (2007). Exposing pay secrecy. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 55–71.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 425–445.
- Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. (1998). Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 504–553). New York, NY: McGraw–Hill.
- Dukerich, J. M., Golden, B. R., & Shortell, S. M. (2002). Beauty is in the eye of the beholder: The impact of organizational identification, identity, and image on the cooperative behaviors of physicians. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *4*, 507–533.
- Dutton, J. E., & Dukerich, J. M. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*, 517–554.

- Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *39*, 239–263.
- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980–2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *66*, 124–197.
- Efran, M. G. (1974). The effect of physical appearance on the judgment of guilt, interpersonal attraction, and severity of recommended punishment in a simulated jury task. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *8*, 45–54.
- Elsbach, K. D. (1994). Managing organizational legitimacy in the California cattle industry: The construction and effectiveness of verbal accounts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *39*, 57–88.
- Elsbach, K. D. (2003). Organizational perception management. In R. M. Kramer & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 25, pp. 297–332). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Feinberg, J. (1970). *Doing and deserving: Essays in the theory of responsibility*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fombrun, C. J. (1996). *Reputation: Realizing value from the corporate image*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gely, R., & Bierman, L. (2007). Social isolation and American workers: Employee blogging and legal reform. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, *20*, 287–331.
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good – Doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*, 310–329.
- Gioia, D. A., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. (2000). Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*, 63–81.
- Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (1996). Identity, image and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*, 370–403.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Grant, A. M., Dutton, J. E., & Rosso, B. (2008). Giving commitment: Employee support programs and the prosocial sensemaking process. *Academy of Management Journal*, *51*, 898–918.
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*, 327–347.
- Heath, C., Larrick, R. P., & Klayman, J. (1998). Cognitive repairs: How organizational practices can compensate for individual shortcomings. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *20*, 1–37.
- Herring, H. B. (1998, January 25). The Wendt divorce: What's a corporate wife worth in court? *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/1998/01/25/weekinreview/word-for-word-the-wendt-divorce-what-s-a-corporate-wife-worth-in-court-go-figure.html>
- Hollander, E. P. (1958). Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review*, *65*, 117–127.
- Hudson, B. A. (2008). Against all odds: A consideration of core-stigmatized organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*, 252–266.
- Hymowitz, C. (2007, June 18). Personal boundaries shrink as companies punish bad behavior. *Wall Street Journal*.
- James, S. (2009, October 22). Movie bears' boycott is small growl in larger gay roar. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/23/us/23sfmetro.html>
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women in the corporation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kelley, H. H. (1972). Attribution in social interaction. In E. E. Jones, et al. (Eds.), *Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior* (pp. 1–26). Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Kilborn, P. T. (1992, April 9). Gay rights group takes aim at restaurant chain that's hot on Wall Street. *The New York Times*.

- Knittel, C. R., & Stango, V. (2009). *Shareholder value destruction following the Tiger Woods scandal*. Working paper, University of California Davis.
- Kulik, C. T., Bainbridge, H. T., & Cregan, C. (2008). Known by the company we keep: Stigma-by-association effects in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*, 216–230.
- Massey, J. E. (2001). Managing organizational legitimacy: Communication strategies for organizations in crisis. *Journal of Business Communication*, *38*, 153–183.
- May, M. (2006, June 23). Hoover: Caught in the flash. *The Austin Chronicle*. <http://www.austin-chronicle.com/news/2006-06-23/378611/>
- Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1992). *Blowing the whistle: The organizational and legal implications for companies and employees*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Mowday, R. T., & Sutton, R. I. (1993). Organizational behavior: Linking individuals and groups to organizational contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *44*, 195–229.
- Norbut, M. (2006, March 20). More workers must pay for unhealthy habits. *Amednews.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.ama-assn.org/amed-news/2006/03/20/bi120320.htm>
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, *10*, 85–97.
- Paetzold, R. L., Dipboye, R. L., & Elsbach, K. D. (2008). A new look at stigmatization in and of organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*, 186–193.
- Pearson, C. M., & Clair, J. A. (1998). Reframing crisis management. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 59–76.
- Pfarrer, M. D., Pollock, T. G., & Rindova, V. P. (2010). A tale of two assets: The effects of firm reputation and celebrity on earnings surprises and investors' reactions. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*, 1131–1152.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, *26*, 513–563.
- Poletti, T. (2010, January 26). Does Silicon Valley care about a tabloid scandal? *Market Watch. The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.marketwatch.com/story/silicon-valley-finally-has-a-juicy-scandal-2010-01-26?reflink=MW_news_stmp
- Price, K. N., Gioia, D. A., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Reconciling scattered images: Managing disparate organizational expressions and impressions. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *17*, 173–185.
- Rafaeli, A., & Pratt, M. G. (1993). Tailored meanings: On the meaning and impact of organizational dress. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*, 32–55.
- Ragins, B. R. (2008). Disclosure disconnects: Antecedents and consequences of disclosing invisible stigmas across life domains. *Academy of Management Review*, *33*, 194–215.
- Rindova, V. P., Pollock, T. G., & Hayward, M. L. A. (2006). Celebrity firms: The social construction of market popularity. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*, 50–71.
- Schmall, E. (2007, July 23). The cult of Chick-fil-A. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/forbes/2007/0723/080.html>
- Scott, W. R. (2004). Reflections on a half-century of organizational sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *30*, 1–21.
- Shaw, J. I., & Skolnick, P. (1996). When is defendant status a shield or a liability? *Law and Human Behavior*, *20*, 431–442.
- Sigall, H., & Ostrove, N. (1975). Beautiful but dangerous: Effects of offender attractiveness and nature of the crime on juridic judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *31*, 410–414.
- Staw, B. M. (1991). Dressing up like an organization: When psychological theories can explain organizational action. *Journal of Management*, *17*, 805–819.
- Sutton, R. I., & Callahan, A. L. (1988). The stigma of bankruptcy: Spoiled organizational image and its management. In K. S. Cameron & R. I. Sutton (Eds.), *Readings in organizational decline: Frameworks, research, and prescriptions* (pp. 241–263). New York, NY: Ballinger/Harper & Row.
- Sutton, R. I., & Galunic, D. C. (1996). Consequences of public scrutiny for leaders and their

- organizations. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 18, pp. 201–250). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Tepper, B. J., Lockhart, D., & Hoobler, J. (2001). Justice, citizenship, and role definition effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 789–796.
- Turnipsee, D. L., & Wilson, G. L. (2009). From the discretionary to require: The migration of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 15*, 201–216.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 765–802.
- Whetten, D. A. (2006). Albert and Whetten revisited: Strengthening the concept of organizational identity. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 15*, 219–234.
- Whetten, D. A., Lewis, D., & Mischel, L. J. (1992, August). *Towards an integrated model of organizational identity and member commitment*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, NE.
- Whetten, D. A., & Mackey, A. (2002). A social actor conception of organizational identity and its implications for the study of organizational reputation. *Business & Society, 41*, 393–414.
- Yoon, Y., Gürhan-Canli, Z., & Schwarz, N. (2006). The effect of corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities on companies with bad reputations. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 16*, 377–390.

Author biographies

Elizabeth E. Umphress is an Associate Professor of Management in the Foster School of Business at the University of Washington. Her research focuses on three related themes: organizational justice, ethical behavior, and diversity. Her work has appeared in journals such as the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, and *Organization Science*. Also, she serves on the editorial boards of *Academy of Management Review*, *Academy of Management Journal*, and *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*.

Laszlo Tihanyi is the B. Marie Oth Professor in Business Administration in the Mays Business School at Texas A&M University. His current research explores the involvement of institutional investors in foreign direct investment, the institutional environment of internationalization decisions, and the effects of social movements on multinational firms. His papers have been published in the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Organization Science*, *Strategic Management Journal*, and others.

Leonard Bierman is a Professor of Management in the Mays Business School, Texas A&M University. He teaches and does research in the areas of labor relations, negotiations, the service economy (particularly the role of professional service firms) and the business/government interface (including corporate governance). He has published in journals such as the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, and *Harvard Business Review*. He currently serves on the editorial board of the *Academy of Management Review*.

Celile Itir Gogus is an Assistant Professor of Management at Bilkent University in Ankara, Turkey. She has completed her PhD in Management at Mays Business School, Texas A&M University in 2005. She also holds a BS degree in Management from Bilkent University (1999) and a MS degree in Human Resource Management from Texas A&M University (2001). Her research interests include organizational justice, teams and groups, family businesses and entrepreneurship. She has published in journals such as the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Small Group Research*, and *Applied Psychology: An International Review*.