Proactive Personality and Organizational Change: Factors Affecting Retention

Veena P. Prabhu
California State University, Los Angeles

In today's borderless world where change is the only constant, organizations need to work on building a workforce, which can not only survive but also thrive in such a volatile environment. Proactive individuals actively create environmental change. The purpose of the present study was to empirically test the mechanism by which proactive personality is related to intent to remain with the organization through three important factors—managerial communication, affective commitment to change and job satisfaction. The results supported the mediating effect of all the three factors. Implications for organizations and future research are discussed.

OVERVIEW OF PROACTIVE PERSONALITY

In today's competitive world, change seems to be the only constant, competition the norm, and job security a day-dreamer's fantasy. In such a back-drop being proactive is a necessity rather than a luxury. Organizations are treating proactive behaviors as a role requirement, emphasizing its value to employees, and hiring applicants with a proactive orientation (Campbell, 2000). Proactive behavior entails a dynamic approach toward work (Frese, Kring, Soose, & Zempel, 1996; Parker, 2000) seeking to improvise the existing job along with developing personal prerequisites for furthering career success (Seibert, Crant, & Kraimer, 1999) and organizational effectiveness (Bateman & Crant, 1999). It encompasses behaviors such as taking charge (Morrison & Phelps, 1999) and personal initiative (Frese et al., 1996) and is closely associated with flexible role orientations (Parker, Wall, & Jackson, 1997).

The dispositional approach involves the measurement of personal characteristics and the assumption that such measures can aid in explaining individual attitudes and behavior. Also when traits and predispositions are strong there is a lesser likelihood they will be overridden by situational forces (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). Using this approach past research has conceived proactive personality as a relatively stable individual disposition toward proactive behavior (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Additionally, the extant work on proactive behavior advocates the fact that the construct *proactive personality* explicitly encompasses the varied aspects of proactive behavior and initiative (Crant, 2000).

Bateman and Crant (1993) defined the construct *proactive personality* "as a dispositional construct that identifies differences among people in the extent to which they take action to influence their environment" (p. 103). They further developed the Proactive Personality Scale (PPS) to measure this construct and provided evidence for the scale's convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity with results from three studies. Since then, a number of studies have consistently demonstrated the validity of the proactive personality construct, as assessed by the PPS (e.g., Becherer & Maurer, 1999; Crant, 1995, 1996; Crant & Bateman, 2000; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Parker & Sprigg, 1998).

Proactive personality is a unique disposition not captured by other typologies such as the five-factor model; Crant and Bateman (2000) found only moderate correlations with the five-factor model of personality. Furthermore, Crant (1995) found that proactive personality predicted sales performance above and beyond conscientiousness and extraversion. Additionally, Bateman and Crant (1993) showed that proactive personality is distinct from self-consciousness, need for achievement, need for dominance, and locus of control. All these studies provide further evidence for the discriminant validity of proactive personality.

Research in understanding this construct has been rapidly increasing. Its effects have been studied in varied fields like job performance through a social capital perspective (Thompson, 2005); transformational (Bateman & Crant, 1993) and charismatic leadership (Crant & Bateman, 2000); and job search success (Brown, Cober, Kane, Levy, & Shalhoop, 2006). Chan (2006) has explored the interactive effects of situational judgment effectiveness and proactive personality on work perceptions and outcomes. Parker and Sprigg (1998) found that proactive personality moderated the interactive effect of job autonomy and demands on employee strain. Their results were consistent with the premise that proactive employees take advantage of high job control to manage more effectively the demands they face, whereas passive employees do not take advantage of greater autonomy to this end.

Importance of Proactive Personality in Organizational Change

Several researchers have called for a more person-focused approach to the study of organizational change (e.g., Aktouf, 1992; Bray, 1994), especially since we are witnessing immense changes in the world of work with jobs in the 21st century requiring greater initiative, courtesy of global competition (Cascio, 1995; Frese & Fay, 2001; Howard, 1995). Recent years have therefore seen an escalating interest in studying the complexity of changes in the workplace, their causes, consequences, and strategies for change (for reviews, see Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999; Porras & Robertson, 1992). This is where the proactive stance plays an important role: as work becomes more dynamic and changeable, proactive personality and initiative become even more critical determinants of organizational success (Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leng, & Tag, 1997). Proactive personality is the degree to which individuals have an active role orientation. Rather than accepting their roles passively, proactive persons challenge the status quo and initiate change (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Thus employees with proactive personalities use initiative, persevere, and attempt to shape their environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993).

There is an ever-increasing demand by organizations for proactive behavior as they expect employees to fix things that they see as wrong (Erdogan & Bauer, 2005). In this context the words of Bateman and Crant (1999) are apt:

> Proaction involves creating change, not merely anticipating it. It does not just involve the important attributes of flexibility and adaptability toward an uncertain future. To be proactive is to take the initiative in improving business. At the other extreme, behavior that is not proactive includes sitting back, letting others make things happen, and passively hoping that externally imposed change "works out okay." (p. 63)

Retaining Proactive Employees

From the above discussion it is evident that proactive employees are an asset to an organization. This led to understanding the factors affecting proactive employee retention. Based on the extant literature of both proactive personality and organizational change three factors were chosen for the present study— managerial communication, affective commitment to change and job satisfaction.). Also in the present study, instead of measuring turnover intentions a more positive variable was chosen i.e. intent to remain with the organization.

Proactive and Managerial Communication

An important factor in employees' support for change, which has gained importance in recent years, is managerial communication, which is also predominantly important in the entire organizational change

process (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Lewis, 1999). It is generally defined in terms of a process through which companies basically prepare employees for change by stating and clarifying issues related to the change (Lewis, 1999). Communication helps employees to gain a better understanding for the need for change, as well as to have some insights on the personal effects which may be caused by the proposed change (Armenakis & Harris, 2002). The process perspective suggests that *when* employees receive adequate and suitable communication in a change context (i.e. appropriate justification for, and information about, the change and timely feedback), they will have more favorable attitudes toward the change which, in turn, should impact their intention to stay with the organization.

Hence in the present study we anticipated the potential mediating effect of managerial communication.

> *Hypothesis 1: Managerial communication will mediate the relationship between proactive personality and intent to remain with the organization.*

Proactive Personality and Affective Commitment to Change

Commitment, in a broad sense, can be defined as "a force [mind set] that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to one or more targets" (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Conner and Patterson (1982) noted, that "the most prevalent factor contributing to failed change projects is a lack of commitment by the people" (p. 18). Thus commitment to organizational change is unquestionably one of the most imperative factors involved in employees' support for change projects (Armenakis, Harris, & Feild, 1999; Coetsee, 1999; Conner & Patterson, 1982; Klein & Sorra, 1996). Conner (1992) aptly described commitment to change as "the glue that provides the vital bond between people and change goals" (p. 147). Meyer and Allen (1991) argued that this force, or mind-set, could take different forms: desire (affective commitment), perceived cost (continuance commitment), or obligation (normative commitment). In the present study the affective form of commitment to change (desire to provide support for the change based on a belief in its inherent benefits) was used.

Bateman and Crant (1993) argued that proactive individuals actively create environmental change, while less proactive people take a more reactive approach toward their jobs. Thus, proactive personality refers to the general disposition to make active attempts to effect changes in one's environment, and is crucial in modern organizations characterized by fast changes and reduced supervision. Proactive people identify opportunities and act on them, show initiative, take action, and persevere until meaningful change occurs (Crant, 1996). Given the definition of proactive personality and the importance of commitment to change, it was predicted that commitment to change will mediate the relationship between proactive personality and intent to remain with the organization.

> *Hypothesis 2: Affective commitment to change will mediate the relationship between proactive personality and intent to remain with the organization.*

Proactive Personality and Job Satisfaction

Dispositional characteristics incline people to a certain level of satisfaction (see Bowling, Beehr, Wagner, & Libkuman, 2005). In fact two important studies found that genetic factors, which apparently affect disposition, may account for as much as 30% of the variance in job satisfaction (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, & Abraham, 1989; Arvey, McCall, Bouchard, Taubman, & Cavanaugh, 1994). Dispositions may have a direct effect on job satisfaction or may influence the way in which employees perceive their jobs, which, consequently affects job satisfaction (Bowling et al., 2005). In the present study job satisfaction was defined as an individual's global feeling about his or her job (Spector, 1997). Proactive personality will probably affect job satisfaction as "proactive individuals will be more satisfied with their jobs because they will remove obstacles preventing satisfaction" (Erdogan & Bauer, 2005, p. 861)

Research linking job performance with satisfaction and other attitudes has been studied since at least 1939, with the Hawthorne studies (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). Organ (1988) found that the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction follows the social exchange theory; employees'

performance is giving back to the organization from which they get their satisfaction. Thus it seems to be a common assumption that employees who are happy with their job should also be more productive at work (Spector, 1997) and therefore should be less inclined to leave the organization.

Hence, it was anticipated that job satisfaction would mediate the relationship between proactive personality and intent to remain with the organization.

> *Hypothesis 3: Job satisfaction will mediate the relationship between proactive personality and intent to remain with the organization.*

METHODOLOGY

Research Setting and Participants

Data for this study was collected from a non-profit organization located in the United States, having approximately 900 employees working in offices spread out throughout a southeastern state. This organization was chosen because it had recently experienced a major restructuring.

Data was collected via a self-report online survey wherein respondents were informed that participation in the survey was voluntary and that the survey responses would be completely anonymous. The on-line survey resulted in 275 usable questionnaires, which gave a decent response rate of 31.3%. A sizeable amount of respondents used in our analyses aged over 50 years (42.6%) while the lowest range was between 20-29 years (4.6%), and 60.6 percent of the respondents were women, 63.5% were Caucasian while 26.6% were African Americans. Table 1 provides a demographic profile of the respondents.

TABLE 1
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Variable	N	%
Gender		
Females	171	62.2
Race		
Caucasian	177	64.4
African American	75	27.3
Hispanic	1	.4
Native American	2	.7
Asian	1	.4
Other	4	1.5
Age		
20 – 29 years	13	4.7
30 – 39 years	38	13.8
40 – 49 years	100	36.4
> 50 years	118	42.9
Tenure (Organization)		
< 1 year		
1 – 5 years	11	4
6 – 10 years	47	17.1
11 – 20 years	53	19.3
> 20 years	88	32
	72	26.2

Note: N = 275

TABLE 1 Continued
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Variable	N	%
Tenure (Job position)		
< 1 year		
1 – 5 years	20	7.3
6 – 10 years	125	45.5
11 – 20 years	49	17.8
> 20 years	53	19.3
	20	7.3
Job Position		
County Extension Coordinator		
Regional Extension Agent	46	16.7
Regional Specialist		
State Specialist/University	73	26.5
Faculty	13	4.7
State-wide Administrators	29	10.5
Administrative Staff		
Para-profession	4	1.5
(Locally funded Agents &	47	17.1
Agent Assistants)	35	12.7
Others		
	17	6.2

Note: N = 275

Measures

Proactive Personality

Proactive personality was measured by using the shortened version of Bateman and Crant's (1993) 17-item Proactive Personality Scale (PPS) created by Seibert, Crant, and Kraimer, (1999). The shortened version consists of 10 items, which were selected as they had the highest average factor loadings across the three studies reported by Bateman and Crant (1993). These three studies presented evidence for the scale's reliability (Cronbach's alpha across three samples ranged from .87 to .89, and the test-retest reliability coefficient was .72 over a 3 month period) and convergent, discriminant, and criterion validity. Seibert et al (1999) mentioned that the deletion of 7 items did not result in a major effect on the reliability of the scale (17-item α = .88; 10-item α = .86). These items were summed to arrive at a proactive personality score. Responses were indicated on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 7 ("strongly agree"), with such items as "I excel at identifying opportunities" and "No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen." Internal consistency (coefficient alpha) obtained in the current study was .89, in line with that reported by Bateman and Crant (1993).

Intent to Remain

Employee's intent to remain with the organization was measured using a scale from Robinson (1996). This four-item scale asked employees to respond to Likert-type questions about how long the employee intends to remain with the employer, the extent to which they would prefer to work for a different employer, the extent to which they have thought about changing companies, and one binary question ("If you had your way, would you be working for this employer three years from now?"). We found a rather modest reliability with Cronbach's alpha measuring .68.

Affective Commitment to Change

This variable was measured using a sub-scale of the scale developed by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) to measure commitment to change. The scale consisted of 22 items of which seven items assessed affective commitment (e.g., "I believe in the value of this change"), which was used in this study. Responses were made using a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). This scale exhibited strong reliability with Cronbach's alpha measuring .95.

Managerial Communication

Managerial communication was measured by using a subscale of the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) (Downs & Hazen, 1977). Although several factors are identified by Downs and Hazen (1977) as indicators of overall communication satisfaction in the workplace, the focus of the present study was specifically related to the dimension that assesses employees' satisfaction with communication with their immediate supervisor or manager. It assesses how satisfied employees are with information they receive about their job, recognition of their efforts, and how well supervisors understand problems faced by employees. A 7-point Likert response format (ranging from 1 = very dissatisfied to 7 = very satisfied) was used to measure employees' satisfaction to the five items. The reliability found in the present study was in tune with these studies as Cronbach's alpha was .90.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured by using a nine-item scale developed by Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli and Lynch (1997). Respondents indicated the extent of their agreement with each item on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly agree,* 7 = *strongly disagree*). Cronbach's alpha measured for this scale was $\alpha = .89$.

Demographic Data

The survey also included items inquiring about the subjects' age, gender, ethnicity, and job tenure. (See Table 1 for a summary of the measures).

Data Analysis

In the present study the data was analyzed by using hierarchical linear regression. To test for mediation Barron and Kenny (1986) suggested a three-step procedure: 1) the mediator was regressed on the independent variable, 2) the dependent variable was regressed on the independent variable, and finally 3) the dependent variable was regressed on both the independent variable and on the mediator. However, to test for complete mediation the independent variable needs to be controlled in the third step. Hence a simple regression was performed for step one, but for steps two and three a hierarchical linear regression was employed. A formal test of the significance of mediation was provided by the Sobel test (1982) (see MacKinnon, Warsi, & Dwyer, 1995).

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 displays means, standard deviations and correlations among all the variables. Correlations among the independent and mediator variables had a median value of .07 and a maximum value of .40, with a maximum variance-inflation factor less than 2; hence, multicollinearity was not a severe problem that would preclude interpretation of the regression analyses (Neter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1983). Proactive personality was significantly and positively related to intent to remain with the organization ($r = .13$, $p = .05$) and the three factors managerial communication ($r = .19$, $p = .01$); affective commitment to change ($r = .18$, $p = .01$); and job satisfaction ($r = .22$, $p = .01$). Given the proposed mediational framework managerial communication ($r = .31$, $p = .01$); affective commitment to change ($r = .17$, $p = .01$); and job satisfaction ($r = .63$, $p = .01$) were significantly correlated with intent to remain.

TABLE 2
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS AMONG VARIABLES

	Variables	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4
1	Intent to remain	5.39	1.25	-			
2	Proactive Personality	5.48	0.81	.13*	-		
3	Managerial Communication	4.28	1.25	.31**	.19**	-	
4	Affective Commitment to Change	5.01	1.4	.17**	.18**	.43**	-
5	Job Satisfaction	5.75	1.01	.63**	.22**	.56**	.43**

Note. N = 275
$^*p < .05.$ $^{**}p < .01.$

Hypotheses Testing

For testing hypothesis 1, which suggested the mediating role of managerial communication in the relationship between proactive personality and intent to remain with the organization, we first regressed managerial communication on proactive personality. This was followed by a two-step hierarchical linear regression (see Table 3). In step one, intent to remain with the organization was regressed on proactive personality, followed by step two wherein proactive personality was controlled and managerial communication was introduced. Finally we calculated the Sobel's test (Preacher & Leonardelli, 2001). Formula for the test was drawn from MacKinnon, Warsi, and Dwyer (1995). The above steps were repeated for analyzing hypotheses 2 and 3 related to the mediating effect of affective commitment to change and job satisfaction respectively. Tables 3, 4 & 5 summarize the results of the regression analyses.

TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION ANALYSES: MEDIATION OF THE EFFECT OF PROACTIVE PERSONALITY ON INTENT TO REMAIN BY MANAGERIAL COMMUNICATION

				Sobel Test	
		ß	ΔR^2	*z*	*p*
Regression 1[a]			.04**		
	Proactive Personality	.19**			
Regression 2[b]					
	Step 1		.02*		
	Proactive Personality	.13*			
	Step 2		.09***		
	Proactive Personality	.07		2.71	.006
	Managerial Communication	.30***			

[a]Dependent variable is Managerial Communication
[b]Dependent variable is Intent to Remain with the Organization
Note. N = 275. *p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.

As shown in Table 3, the regression coefficient for managerial communication was significant in contributing to intent to remain with the organization when proactive personality was controlled indicating the mediating role of managerial communication (ß = .30, *p* = .001; $R^2\Delta$ = .09, *p* = .001).

Proactive personality was statistically insignificant in step 2, which suggested that managerial communication completely mediated the relationship between proactive personality and intent to remain with the organization. The Sobel test (1982) revealed significant evidence of complete mediation by managerial communication, $z = 2.71$, $p = .006$.

TABLE 4
SUMMARY OF HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION ANALYSES: MEDIATION OF THE EFFECT OF PROACTIVE PERSONALITY ON INTENT TO REMAIN BY AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT TO CHANGE

				Sobel Test	
		ß	ΔR^2	z	p
Regression 1[a]			.05***		
	Proactive Personality	.21***			
Regression 2[b]					
	Step 1		.37***		
	Proactive Personality	.13*			
	Step 2		.01*		
	Proactive Personality	.05		3.18	.001
	Affective Commitment to Change	.38***			

[a]Dependent variable is Affective Commitment to Change
[b]Dependent variable is Intent to Remain with the Organization
Note. $N = 275$. *$p<.05$. ***$p<.001$.

TABLE 5
SUMMARY OF HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION ANALYSES: MEDIATION OF THE EFFECT OF PROACTIVE PERSONALITY ON INTENT TO REMAIN BY JOB SATISFACTION

				Sobel Test	
		ß	ΔR^2	z	p
Regression 1[a]			.05***		
	Proactive Personality	.22***			
Regression 2[b]					
	Step 1		.02*		
	Proactive Personality	.13*			
	Step 2		.17***		
	Proactive Personality	.07		3.28	.001
	Job Satisfaction	.42***			

[a]Dependent variable is Job Satisfaction
[b]Dependent variable is Intent to Remain with the Organization
Note. $N = 275$. *$p<.05$. ***$p<.001$.

Similarly as seen in Tables 4 & 5, the regression coefficient for affective commitment to change and job satisfaction were significant in contributing to intent to remain with the organization when proactive personality was controlled indicating the mediating role of affective commitment to change (ß = .38, $p = .001$; $R^2\Delta = .01$, $p = .05$) and job satisfaction (ß = .42, $p = .001$; $R^2\Delta = .17$, $p = .001$). Proactive personality was statistically insignificant in step 2 for both the variables, which suggested that affective commitment to change and job satisfaction completely mediated the relationship between proactive personality and

intent to remain with the organization. The Sobel test (1982) revealed significant evidence of complete mediation by affective commitment to change ($z = 3.18$, $p = .001$) and job satisfaction ($z = 3.28$, $p = .001$).

DISCUSSION

The present study aimed at delineating the process/mechanism through which proactive personality affects intent to remain through three factors—managerial communication, affective commitment to change and job satisfaction thereby providing evidence for the importance of these three factors in retaining an organization's proactive employees. The present study has made an important contribution to both the proactive personality and the change literature. Interestingly we found that all the three factors completely mediated the relationship between proactive personality/intent to remain, which implied that in the absence of these three factors there would be no relationship between proactive personality and intent to remain.

Practical Implications

The above findings have several practical implications; especially from an applied perspective this type of research is important, as it gives more insight on how organizations can recognize and leverage from those exhibiting proactive personality. This is even more important in the backdrop of change— hence companies need to invest in retaining their proactive employees, if they want their organizational change process to be more effective and smooth. There is hardly any doubt in the fact that proactive employees are an asset to the company, however it is up to the company to make sure that they do not lose such an asset. Our results have shown that proactive individuals will intend to remain with the company if their supervisors/managers communicate with them, they understand the change and are committed to it and are satisfied with their job.

Limitations of the Study

Data for this study was collected anonymously. Although limiting any inference of causality among the study variables, protecting respondents' anonymity provided benefits by potentially reducing the method bias (see P. M. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & N. P. Podsakoff, 2003). This is a particularly important aspect in the present study as it related to organizational change which is often characterized by high levels of distrust and uncertainty and which may lead to biased responses if participants believe their identity could be revealed to management. This, in turn, may result in a less of internal validity if respondents are hesitant to provide honest responses to the survey questions for fear of repercussion (Green & Feild, 1976).

Data was collected from a single organization, even though a limitation but conducting the study in one organization helped avoid impending confounding factors, such as type of industry, resources, and markets (Pritchard, Jones, Roth, Stuebing, & Ekeberg 1988; Mukherjee, Lapre', & Wassenhove, 1998). Additionally, the measure of intent to remain with the organization had disappointingly low reliability (α =.68) in this study although it was close to the recommended minimum threshold of .70 (Nunnally, 1978). An alternative measure could be used in future research. Finally, the data was collected from a non-profit organization and hence generalizability may be an issue.

Future Research

There is considerable agreement in the organizational change literature that people are concerned with the amount of impact change will have on themselves, their job, and their work colleagues (e.g., Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Lau & Woodman, 1995; Weber & Manning, 2001). When discussing the impact of change in the workplace, authors have drawn a fundamental distinction between incremental or first-order change and transformational or second-order change (e.g., Bartunek & Moch, 1987; Levy, 1986). As seen from the results proactive personality has a robust relationship with job outcomes. Proactive personality is indeed a blessing for both transformational and incremental changes. Although

the present paper concentrates on transformational change it would be interesting to replicate this study in an organizational setting characterized by incremental change. Also, authors in the field of organizational change have argued that individuals are concerned with the timing of change in the workplace, and whether change occurs very frequently or infrequently (Glick, Huber, Miller, Doty, & Sutcliffe, 1990; Monge, 1995). Future study can observe a proactive employee's reaction to both frequent and infrequent changes as Glick et al. argued that changes which occur infrequently will help employees to identify a clear beginning and end point of change. On the contrary, when changes are frequent, organizational members will find the change highly unpredictable.

The present paper shed light into the mechanism by which proactive personality affects intent to remain, and it is also evident from the literature on turnover that intentions are one of best predictors of turnover behavior (Armitage & Conner, 2001). However, research has found that intentions do not always result in turnover behavior (Allen, Weeks, & Moffitt, 2005). Hence it would be interesting to replicate this study using turnover behavior as the outcome variable.

In today's borderless and competitive world it would greatly help if this study could also be replicated by comparing data across cultures example U. S. and Japan as Japanese employees exhibit higher work centrality, and give greater importance to job security and stability than do employees in the U.S.(England & Misumi 1986; Lundberg & Peterson 1994).

Further it would be interesting to observe how the results of this study vary across demographic variables especially age. Although in the present study we collected data for age we hardly had any variation in the age as a major portion of the respondents were either above 40 or 50 years. Age plays an important role as seen in the organizational change literature with older workers being more resistant to changes in job changes since they are worried that they may have to start afresh especially if there is no significant value for their job experience of past working skills (Campbell & Cellini 1981; Hansson, DeKoekkoek, Neece, & Patterson 1997). Finally, the effect of organizational change is better captured by longitudinal data. It would be interesting to observe if the present results would differ in a longitudinal study.

Crant (2000) aptly states the importance of proactive personality which can be rightly applied to an organization undergoing change—as change relates to dynamism and uncertainty: "As work becomes more dynamic and decentralized, proactive behavior and initiative become even more critical determinants of organizational success" (p. 435). This study provides an initial attempt to delineate the process/mechanism through which proactive personality affects certain job–related outcomes in the backdrop of a change setting. The "bottom line" is to prevent organizations from losing one of their most important assets—its proactive employees.

REFERENCES

Aktouf, O. (1992). Management and theories of organizations in the 1990s: Toward a critical radical humanism? *Academy of Management Review.* 17*: 407-431*

Allen, D. G., Weeks, K. P., & Moffitt, K. R. (2005). Turnover intentions and voluntary turnover: The moderating roles of self-monitoring, locus of control, proactive personality, and risk aversion. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 980-990.

Armenakis, A. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (1999). Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management.* 25: 293-315.

Armenakis, A. A., & Harris, S.(2002). Crafting a change message to create transformational readiness. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 15*(2)*,* 169-183.

Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S., & Feild, H. (1999). Making change permanent: A model for institutionalizing change interventions. In W. Passmore & R. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* Vol. 12). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analytic review. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 40,* 471-499.

Arvey, R. D., Bouchard, T. J., Segal, N. L., & Abraham, L. M. (1989). Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 187-192.

Arvey, R.D., McCall, B.P., Bouchard, T.J., Jr., Taubman, P., & Cavanaugh, M.A. (1994). Genetic influences on job satisfaction and work values. *Personality and Individual Differences, 17,* 21–33.

Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 14(2): 103-118.

Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1999). Proactive behavior: Meanings, impact, and recommendations. *Business Horizons.* 63–70.

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

Bartunek, J. M., & Moch, M. K. (1987). First-order, second-order, and third-order change and organization development interventions: A cognitive approach. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 23,* 483–500.

Becherer, R.C., & Maurer, J.G. (1999). The proactive personality disposition and entrepreneurial behavior among small company presidents. *Journal of Small Business Management, 38* (1), 28–36.

Bowling, N. A., Beehr, T. A., Wagner, S. H., & Libkuman, T. M. (2005). Adaptation-level theory, opponent process theory and dispositions: An integrated approach to the stability of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 1044-1053.

Bray, D.W. (1994). Personnel-centred organizational diagnosis. In Howard, A. (Eds), *Diagnosis for Organizational Change*, Guilford Press, New York, NY. 152-71.

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

Campbell D. J. (2000). The proactive employee: Managing workplace initiative. *Academy of Management Executive,* 14(3): 52–66.

Campbell, R. E., & Cellini, J. V. (1981). A diagnostic taxonomy of adult career problems. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 19,* 175-190.

Cascio, W. F. (1995). Whither industrial and organizational psychology in a changing world of work? *American Psychologis.,* 50: 928-939.

Chan, D. (2006). Interactive effects of situational judgment effectiveness and proactive personality on work perceptions and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology.,* 91(2*)*: 475-481.

Coetsee, L. (1999). From resistance to commitment. *Public Administration Quarterly, 23,* 204-222.

Conner, D. R. (1992). *Managing at the speed of change: How resilient managers succeed and prosper where others fail.* New York: Villard Books.

Conner, D. R., & Patterson, R. W. (1982). Building commitment to organizational change. *Training and Development Journal, 36,* 18-30.

Covey, S. R. (2004). *The 7 habits of highly effective people.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Crant, M. J. (1995). The Proactive Personality Scale and objective job performance among real estate agents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 80: 532-537.

Crant, M. J. (1996). The proactive personality scale as a predictor of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Small Business Management*. 34: 42-49.

Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management.* 26: 435-462.

Crant, M. J., & Bateman, T. S. (2000). Charismatic leadership viewed from above: The impact of proactive personality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 21: 63-75.

Downs, C. W., & Hazen, M. (1977). A factor analysis of communication satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication, 14,* 63-74.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review.* 95: 256-273.

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(5),* 812-820.

England, P. & J. Misumi. (1986). Work centrality in Japan and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology.* 17: 399-416.

Erdogan B, Bauer, T. N. (2005). Enhancing career benefits of employee proactive personality: The role of fit with jobs and organizations. *Personnel Psychology,* 58: 859–891.

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

Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K. & Tag, A. (1997). The concept of personal initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal of Organizational and Occupational Psychology,* 70, 139-161.

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

Glick, W. H., Huber, G. P., Miller, C. C., Doty, D. H., & Sutcliffe, K.M. (1990). Studying changes in organizational design and effectiveness. *Organization Science, 1,* 293-312

Green, S, & Feild, H. (1976). Assessing group change under conditions of anonymity : A problem in personal research. *Journal of Occupational Psychology,* 49:155-159.

Hansson, R. O., DeKoekkoek, P. D., Neece, W. M., & Patterson, D. W. (1997). Successful aging at work: The older worker and transitions to retirement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51,* 202–233.

Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 474-487.

Howard, A. (Ed.) (1995). *The changing nature of work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kirkman, B.L. & Rosen, B. (1999). Beyond self-management: Antecedents and consequences of team empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal* 42: 58–74.

Klein, K. J., & Sorra, J. S. (1996). The challenge of innovation implementation. *Academy of Management Review, 21,* 1055-1080.

Lau, C., & Woodman, R. W. (1995). Understanding organizational change: A schematic perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 537–554.

Levy, A. (1986). Second-order planned change: Definition and conceptualization. *Organizational Dynamics, 15,* 5–20.

Lewis, L. (1999). Disseminating information and soliciting input during planned organizational change: Implementers' targets, sources, and channels for communication. *Management Communication Quarterly, 13*(1), 43-77.

Lundberg, C. D. and M. F. Peterson. (1994). The meaning of working in the U.S. and Japanese local governments at three different hierarchical levels. *Human Relations.* 47(12): 1459-1487.

MacKinnon, D. P., Warsi, G., & Dwyer, J. H. (1995). A simulation study of mediated effect measures. *Multivariate Behavioral Research.* 30(1): 41-62.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1,* 61-89.

Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review, 11,* 299-326.

Monge, P.R. (1995). Global network organizations. In R. Cesaria & P.S. Shockley-Zalabak (Eds.), *Organization means communication.* (Pp. 135-151). Rome, Italy: SIPI.

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

Mukherjee, A. S., Lapre', M. A., & Wassenhove, L. N.V. (1998). Knowledge driven quality improvement. *Management Science, 44(1),* 35-50.

Neter, J., Wasserman, W., & Kutner, M. H. (1983). *Applied linear regression models.* Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Pyschometric theory.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

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

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

Parker, S. K., & Sprigg, C. A. (1998). A move backwards? The introduction of a moving assembly line. *In Proceedings of the occupational psychology conference,* Eastbourne, UK: 139-144. Leicester, UK: British Psychological Society.

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

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

Porras, J. I., & Robertson, P. J. (1992). Organization development: Theory, practice, and research. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* 2nd edition (3):719–822. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Preacher, K. J., & Leonardelli, G. J. (March, 2001). Calculation for the Sobel test: An interactive calculation tool for mediation tests. From http://www.unc.edu/~preacher/sobel/sobel.htm

Pritchard, R. D., Jones, S. D., Roth, P. L., Stuebing, K. K., & Ekeberg, S. E.)1988). Effects of group feedback, goal setting, and incentives on organizational productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73,* 337-358.

Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 41: 574-599.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the worker.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kraimer, M. L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84: 416-427.

Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic intervals for indirect effects in structural equations models. In S. Leinhart (Ed.), *Sociological methodology 1982*: 290-312. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Thompson, J. A. (2005). Proactive personality and job performance: A social capital perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5): 879-903.

Weber, P. S., & Manning, M. R. (2001). Cause maps, sensemaking, and planned organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 37,* 227–251.