2008

Examining the relationship between proactive personality and career success

Jeremy Owens

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.utc.edu/mps>

Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Owens, Jeremy (2008) "Examining the relationship between proactive personality and career success," *Modern Psychological Studies*: Vol. 13 : No. 3 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://scholar.utc.edu/mps/vol13/iss3/2>

This articles is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals, Magazines, and Newsletters at UTC Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Modern Psychological Studies by an authorized editor of UTC Scholar. For more information, please contact scholar@utc.edu.

Examining the Relationship between Proactive Personality and Career Success

Jeremy Owens

University of Tennessee-Chattanooga

With increasing levels of employee autonomy and responsibility in today's workforce, proactive behavior and the performance of discretionary, extra-role work behaviors are becoming vital to effective organizational functioning. This study examined how proactive personality relates to career success through extra-role behaviors including innovation, contextual performance, and organizational citizenship behavior by surveying 302 employees from a large manufacturing organization. Hierarchical regression and multiple mediation analyses showed that the relationship between proactive personality and career success is at least partially influenced by indirect effects via extra-role behaviors, even after controlling for demographic and personality variables (age, sex, and FFM traits).

In the constantly changing work environment of modern organizations, successful careers are increasingly defined by proactivity on the part of organizational members (Hall, 1996; Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001). Now more than ever, employees need to be more flexible and adaptable (Parker, 1998), as proactive behaviors are becoming more essential to career success as individuals move between occupations and employers (Chiaburu, Baker, & Pitariu, 2006).

Simultaneously, increasing levels of employee autonomy and responsibility have made the performance of discretionary, extra-role work behaviors crucial to effective organizational functioning (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Extra-role work behaviors are those that benefit an organization, but are not explicitly prescribed in or required by formal job-descriptions (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

These specific extra-role behaviors have been linked to a person's career progression and career satisfaction (Seibert et al., 2001). Proactive persons are especially likely to engage in beneficial extra-role behaviors such as identifying improvement opportunities, challenging the status quo, and demonstrating innovation and effective career management (Crant, 2000).

The Present Study

The relationship between proactive personality and career success is supported by an interactional perspective on personality theory (Terborg, 1981; Weiss & Adler, 1984). From this perspective, human behavior results from a dynamic interaction of personal, behavioral, and environmental influences (Bandura, 1986). Individuals within work environments can be

expected to behave in ways that allow them to select, interpret, and change their environments (Terborg, 1981). Because of this, highly proactive individuals can be expected to achieve career success by acting on their natural tendencies to take initiative to improve current conditions or actively create new ones (Crant, 2000; Seibert, Crant, & Kraimer, 1999).

Indeed, proactive personality may also be an important determinant of career success due to the fact that such success is a cumulative outcome that develops over time (Seibert et al., 1999). The reason for this is that the expression of one's personality is likely to influence levels of career success over objective factors as people work toward fulfilling their organizational duties (Miner, 1987; Weick, 1979). Consequently, personality is especially likely to influence career outcomes in the more flexible job roles of today where people must act with more discretion and fewer objective constraints (Snyder & Ickes, 1985).

Proactive Personality

A proactive personality is identified in someone who is relatively unaffected by situational forces, and who actively initiates environmental change (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Highly proactive persons are inclined to take personal action to ensure constructive outcomes by using positive, problem-focused strategies (Cunningham & De La Rosa, 2008; Parker & Sprigg, 1999). Instead of passively accepting roles, proactive persons challenge the status quo and initiate change (Bateman & Crant, 1993). In contrast, less proactive persons may be seen as complacent or passive, waiting for their environment to change under its own power (Bateman & Crant, 1993).

Bateman and Crant (1993) demonstrated that proactive personality is distinct from other personality traits such as those in the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality (i.e., self-consciousness, need for achievement, need for dominance, and locus of control). Crant (1995) also found that proactive personality predicted sales performance over and above the influence

of conscientiousness and extraversion, thus providing evidence for the incremental validity of proactive personality. Developing a model that links proactive personality to career success may provide understanding beyond what is currently available based on other personality typologies (e.g., the FFM).

Career Success and Proactive Personality

Career success can be measured both objectively and subjectively. Objective career success refers to observable career outcomes, such as salary and the number of promotions received (London & Stumpf, 1982). Subjective career success refers to a person's feelings of satisfaction and accomplishment with his/her career (Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1995). Past research has established that these two forms of career success are related, but do not necessarily covary as fully redundant (Seibert et al., 1999).

Previous research has linked proactive personality and both objective and subjective career success (Erdogan & Bauer, 2005; Ng, Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2005; Seibert et al., 1999). Proactive personality is also linked to several career-advancing qualities such as job performance (Crant, 1995), leadership effectiveness (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Crant & Bateman, 2000; Deluga, 1998), stress coping ability (Cunningham & De La Rosa, 2008; Parker & Sprigg, 1999), and innovation (Seibert et al., 2001). Proactive persons are also likely to engage in behaviors such as developmental feedback-seeking and job mobility preparedness, which can aid in establishing career networks, coping with work stressors, and adjusting to organizational change (Mirvis & Hall, 1994). Thus,

Hypothesis 1. Proactive personality will positively predict subjective/objective career success.

In- and Extra-role Behaviors

Extra-role behaviors are defined as positive, discretionary behaviors that are not specified by job role requirements (Katz, 1964). These

behaviors are not recognized by formal reward systems, nor do they pose a punitive risk for people who choose not to exhibit them. Despite this, extra-role behaviors are often informally valued within an organization because they fill important performance gaps that cannot be fully specified or anticipated by supervisors in dynamic working environments. Extra-role behaviors also are linked positively to individual performance (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

Performance researchers have argued that there is a need to distinguish between extra- and in-role performance and that both elements contribute significantly to overall performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Borman, White, & Dorsey, 1995; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). In-role performance directly impacts the organization's technical core by carrying out or maintaining its technical processes. Conversely, extra-role behaviors, such as contextual performance or organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), act to support the broader organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core functions (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994).

Linking Proactive Personality, Extra-role Behavior, and Career Success

Individuals with proactive personalities are motivated to engage in positive extra-role behaviors such as identifying improvement opportunities and challenging the status quo, and more specific behaviors such as innovation and career management (Crant, 2000). Proactive individuals also act to volitionally create positive change in their environment regardless of situational constraints (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Because extra-role behaviors can be defined as individual contributions in the workplace that go beyond role requirements, it is likely that highly proactive persons will exhibit extra-role behaviors due to their personal tendencies to act beyond role requirements and initiate environmental change.

It is possible, therefore, that the relationship between proactive personality and career success is influenced by intervening extra-role behaviors.

The present study considers this possibility, extending previous research by focusing more directly on possible indirect effects of proactive personality on career success via extra-role behaviors such as Innovation, Contextual performance, and OCB (Figure 1).

Innovation in the occupational context occurs when employees create novel ideas or concepts that further organizational goals (Jex, 2002). Innovation is highly valued in organizations because it involves actively identifying a problem or opportunity, generating novel ideas or solutions to this problem, and implementing these ideas (Kanter, 1988; Van de Ven, 1986). Seibert et al. (2001) also found innovation to be significantly related to proactive personality and career success. Bateman and Crant (1993) describe the propensity to locate opportunities for improvement as a crucial characteristic of proactive personality. Parker (1998) found a significantly positive relationship between proactive personality and an individual's involvement in continuous improvement initiatives. Seibert et al. also noted a strong emphasis in the product innovation literature on the proactivity of individuals who engage in change initiatives or product championing (Frohman, 1997; Howell & Higgins, 1990). These findings highlight aspects of proactive personality that can lead to Innovative behavior (Seibert et al.).

Contextual performance is a form of extra-role behavior that contributes to organizational functioning by lubricating the organizational, social, and psychological environment outside of role-prescribed task performance. These behaviors include volunteering for task activities that are not formally part of the job, helping and cooperating with others, doing one's work with enthusiasm, and supporting organizational objectives (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). These volitional behaviors are beneficial to the overall success of an employee and the organization because they are the foundation of the social and motivational context in which work is accomplished (Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996).

Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) found

personality variables were more highly correlated with contextual performance than with in-role performance. In part, this is because contextual performance is less likely to be strongly related to individual differences in knowledge, skills, or abilities, but more strongly influenced by personality characteristics associated with interpersonal skills or motivation (Jex, Cunningham, De La Rosa, & Broadfoot, 2006; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Proactive persons have been shown to successfully engage in both interpersonal and motivational activities. For example, highly proactive persons establish beneficial career networks (Mirvis & Hall, 1994), seek sponsorship and career support from others (Freeze, Fay, Hilburger, Leng, & Tag, 1997), and are motivated to initiate positive environmental change (Bateman & Crant, 1993). The potential for personality variables such as proactive personality, to predict discretionary performance behaviors has not been fully examined.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors are a third general form of extra-role behaviors considered to be discretionary (i.e., not formally part of an employee's job duties and not explicitly recognized by formal reward systems; Organ, 1988). Although not explicitly required in a job, OCBs have practical importance for organizations in that they improve organizational efficiency and effectiveness by stimulating innovativeness and adaptability (Organ, 1988). Although there is little empirical support yet for the relationship between proactive personality and extra-role behaviors, the theoretical link is clear. Crant (2000) suggested that proactive people are less likely to passively adapt to undesirable conditions and are more likely to create new circumstances in response. Because proactive individuals act to create this positive change regardless of situational or role constraints, it can be expected that these individuals would engage in OCBs in the workplace that goes beyond normal role expectations (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Thus,

Hypothesis 2. There will be a positive relationship between Proactive personality

and extra-role behaviors of Innovation, Contextual performance, and OCB.

Extra-role behaviors may also be associated with career success. Previous research shows OCB to be strongly associated with measures of satisfaction (Jones, 2006; Organ, 1988). In a meta-analysis, Organ and Ryan (1995) demonstrated that the relationship between satisfaction and OCB was even stronger than the relationship between satisfaction and in-role performance. Apart from perceived satisfaction, OCBs may also contribute to more objective measures of career success such as promotions and wage increases. In this way, it is likely that extra-role behaviors may help to explain the relationship between proactive personality and career success. Thus,

Hypothesis 3. Extra-role behaviors will mediate the relationship between proactive personality and career success.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants ($N = 302$) were from a large manufacturing organization in the Midwestern United States employing 3,500 people nationally. Average age was 43.5 years ($SD = 9.89$) and 83 percent of respondents identified themselves as White/Caucasian. Seventy percent of the sample was male and the average tenure with the present company was 10.6 years ($SD = 10.6$). To ensure a sufficient career history for development of subjective and objective indications of career success, only participants with at least two years work experience (not necessarily on the same job) were considered. Data were collected via internet-based survey including the following.

Measures

Proactive personality was assessed using a 10-item version of Bateman and Crant's (1993) Proactive Personality Scale. Participants indicated their level of agreement with each item on a seven-point scale from *Strongly disagree* to *Strongly agree*. Higher scores reflected higher levels of proactive personality. Internal

consistency for this scale was excellent ($\alpha = .92$).

Career success was measured via objective and subjective approaches. Objective career success was indicated by self-reported salary and number of promotions. Subjective career success was measured with Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley's (1990) seven-item career satisfaction scale, along with two additional items designed to address the participants' satisfaction with their opportunities for career advancement. Participants indicated their level of satisfaction with each item on a seven-point scale from *Very dissatisfied* to *Very satisfied*. Higher scores reflected higher levels of subjective career success. Internal consistency for this scale was high ($\alpha = .88$).

Innovation was measured with Scott and Bruce's (1994) six-item Innovative Behavior Measure. Participants indicated the extent to which each item was characteristic of them on a seven-point scale from *Not at all characteristic* to *Very characteristic*. Higher scores reflected higher levels of innovativeness. Internal consistency for this scale was high ($\alpha = .92$). *Contextual Performance* was measured using Van Scotter and Motowidlo's (1996) 15-item contextual performance questionnaire. Participants indicated how likely they would be to engage in certain behaviors while performing their job on a seven-point scale from *Not at all Likely* to *Extremely Likely*. Higher scores reflected higher levels of contextual performance. The internal consistency of this scale was high ($\alpha = .89$).

Organizational citizenship behavior was measured with Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter's (1990) OCB Questionnaire. All items were modified from third to first person to correspond with the questionnaire's self-report nature. Participants indicated how characteristic each item was of themselves on a seven-point scale from *Not at all characteristic* to *Very characteristic*. Higher scores reflected higher levels of OCB. Internal consistency for this scale was high ($\alpha = .83$).

FFM personality traits were measured to serve as covariates in the present analyses and to allow for testing of the incremental validity of proactive personality above FFM traits (Crant & Bateman, 2000). The Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI) (Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003) was used, and participants indicated their agreement with two descriptive word pairs for each of the five dimensions of the FFM of personality. Internal consistencies are misleading when fewer than three items exist on a single dimension. For this reason, they are not reported here. Evidence for the validity of these items is present in the descriptive statistics and characteristic pattern of correlations with these variables (Table 1).

Finally, job titles and further details about participants' jobs and demographic information were also recorded to allow for exploratory comparison of the model across different types of positions and to facilitate description of the sample.

Results

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the study variables. Hypotheses were tested with a combination of hierarchical regression analyses and a new technique for multiple mediation evaluation (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). All analyses first controlled for sex, age, and FFM traits. The multiple mediation analysis technique addresses several limitations of the more common causal steps approach to mediation testing (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Among these limitations is the tendency for the total indirect effect to be non-normally distributed and in violation of an underlying assumption for the causal steps analysis (Preacher & Hayes). This new approach is also more appropriate at identifying indirect effects via mediators that exist, even when a significant simple correlation between the independent and dependent variable does not exist (e.g., Collins, Graham, & Flaherty, 1998; Shrout & Bolger, 2002). Interested readers are directed to recent discussions of these issues by Shrout and Bolger (2002); more details

regarding appropriate analytical techniques for multiple mediation models are presented clearly by Preacher and Hayes (2004; 2008).

In partial support of Hypothesis 1, proactive personality significantly predicted Career satisfaction. However, proactive personality did not predict Salary or Number of promotions. Table 2 summarizes the full results of this analysis. In support of Hypothesis 2, proactive personality did significantly predict OCB, Innovation, and Contextual performance. Full results of this analysis are summarized in Table 3.

Hypothesis 3 predicted indirect effects of proactive personality on career success via three extra-role behavior mediators. An SPSS macro for multiple mediation (Preacher & Hayes, 2008) was used to generate the indirect effect estimates summarized in Table 4. Statistical significance of the indirect effects in this table can be identified by examining the bias-corrected 95-percent confidence intervals (CI). These CI estimates are based on bootstrapped estimates from 5,000 iterations. Bias-correction is to improve the power and reduce Type I error rates (see Efron, 1987 for more details). A point estimate can be considered statistically significant if the CI does not include 0. In the present analysis approach, the indirect effect of a specific mediator reflects its influence after controlling for all other mediators in the model. The contrasts provide an indication of whether the indirect effects via each mediator differ from one another.

As a set, these results partially support Hypothesis 3. They do not support an overall indirect effect of proactive personality on Career satisfaction, though consideration of the individual indirect effects suggests OCB may be an influential mediating factor. With Salary as the outcome, all three extra-role behaviors as a set contributed to a significant overall indirect effect, point estimate = 173.05, CI ranging from 38.72 to 438.14. Closer consideration, however, shows that only Innovation was a mediator in this case, as its CI is the only one that excludes 0. Indeed contrasts between indirect effects on Salary show that the influence of OCB is

significantly less than Innovation, and that Innovation is significantly more influential than Contextual performance.

Finally, with respect to Number of promotions, there is again evidence for an overall significant indirect effect via the hypothesized mediators. Consideration of the individual indirect effects, however, suggests Innovation is again the only significant contributor, point estimate = 222.08, CI from 81.49 to 508.21. Further contrasts between the indirect effects also suggest that the influence of OCB is significantly less than Innovation and Innovation is significantly more influential than Contextual Performance regarding this indicator of career success.

Discussion

The increasing attention to issues of proactive personality and career success is encouraging (e.g., Erdogan & Bauer, 2005; Ng et al., 2005; Seibert et al., 2001). Together, these studies highlight the importance of identifying and modeling the key antecedents, mechanisms, and outcomes associated with successful careers. The present study contributes to this by exploring the relationship between proactive personality and career success, via multiple extra-role behavior mediators.

The results supported the majority of the hypotheses. The direct effect of proactive personality on career success (Hypothesis 1) was shown with respect to the subjective outcome of Career satisfaction, but not for the objective outcomes of Salary and Number of promotions. Fully supporting Hypothesis 2, proactive personality significantly predicted all three extra-role behaviors (Innovation, OCB, and Contextual performance), over and above the influence of demographic and personality covariates. These two findings are important, as they offer additional evidence for the incremental validity (over FFM traits and demographic information; Seibert et al., 1999; Crant, 1995) of proactive personality as a predictor of performance behaviors and career success outcomes.

The analyses testing Hypothesis 3 provided partial support for the expectation that the three extra-role behaviors would mediate the relationship between proactive personality and each of three career success outcomes. After controlling for sex, age, and FFM traits, significant overall indirect effects of proactive personality on career success through the extra-role behavior mediators as a set were identified for Salary and Promotions. Examination of specific indirect effects showed Innovation to be the primary mediating variable. There was also some indication that OCB may mediate the path from proactive personality to career satisfaction, but additional research is needed to confirm these findings, given that the observed overall indirect effects in this study only approached significance with respect to Career satisfaction.

It is interesting to see Innovation play such a large role over and above all other variables in the present model (Figure 1). These findings open many doors for future research regarding Innovation's role as a determinant of individuals' career success. As has been observed with proactive individuals, innovative people actively identify problems or opportunities, generate novel ideas or solutions to these problems, and implement their ideas or solutions (Kanter, 1988; Van de Ven, 1986). Further study of the links between proactive personality and innovation are likely to prove fruitful.

Limitations

There are several limitations to the present study, including the risk of common method bias due to self-reported information, and a potential lack of generalizability due to the homogeneity of the sample. Regarding these potential limitations, consideration of the zero-order correlations does not show undue inflation, as would be expected in severe cases of method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). In addition, the use of a field sample may help to mitigate some concerns about the generalizability of these findings.

Certainly there remains some concern about our ability to test a causal hypothesis with cross-

sectional data. The temporal ordering of the variables in the present study is supported by theory, in that proactive personality is believed to be a trait, and the other variables reflect changeable behaviors and outcomes. For this reason, we encourage further replications and extensions of this study, but expect to see these results repeated.

As Preacher and Hayes (2008) note, indirect effects will be attenuated when multiple mediators are correlated. Such was the case in the present study for Contextual performance and OCB ($r=.68$). Future studies will benefit by identifying and including other, non-related mediators of the proactive personality-to-career success relationship. Despite these limitations, the present research offers new insights into the process by which proactive personality affects career progression and satisfaction. We eagerly await future developments in this promising line of personality and performance research.

References

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Baron, 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(6), 1173-1182.
- Bateman, T.S., & Crant, J.M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 103-118.
- Bateman, T.S., & Organ, D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). New

- York: Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10, 99-109.
- Borman, W.C., White, L.A., & Dorsey, D.W. (1995). Effects of ratee task performance and interpersonal factors on supervisor and peer performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 168-177.
- Chiaburu, D.S., Baker, V.L., & Pitariu, A.H., (2006). Beyond being proactive: What (else) matters for career self-management behaviors? *Career Development International*, 11, 619-632.
- Collins, L.M., Graham, J.W., & Flaherty, B.P. (1998). An alternative framework for defining mediation. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 33(2), 295-312.
- Crant J.M. (1995). The proactive personality scale and objective job performance among real estate agents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 532-537.
- Crant, J.M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26, 435-462.
- Cunningham, C.J.L., & De La Rosa, G. (2008). Proactive personality as a complex moderator in the stress process. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(3), 271-282
- Efron, B. (1987). Better bootstrap confidence intervals (with discussion). *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82, 171-20.
- 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 Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70, 139-161.
- Frohman, A.L. (1997). Igniting organizational change from below: The power of personal initiative. *Organizational Dynamics*, 25, 39-53.
- Greenhaus, J.H., Parasuraman., S., & Wormley, W.M. (1990) Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 64-86.
- Hall, D.T. (1996). Protean careers of the 21st century. *Academy of Management Executive*, 10, 8-16.
- Howell, J.M., & Higgins, C.A. (1990). Leadership behaviors, influence tactics, and career experiences of champions of technological innovation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 249-264.
- Jex, S.M. (2002). *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Jex, S.M., Cunningham, C.J.L., De La Rosa, G., & Broadfoot, A. (2006). Stress and employee effectiveness. In A.M. Rossi, P.L. Perrewé & S.L. Sauter (Eds.), *Stress and quality of working life: Current directions in occupational health* (pp. 101-119). Greenwich: Information Age Publishers.
- Jones, M.D. (2006). Which is a better predictor of job performance: Job satisfaction or life satisfaction? *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*. 8, 20-43.
- Judge, T.A., Cable, D.M., Boudreau, J.W., & Bretz, R.D. (1995). An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 485-519.
- Katz, D. (1964). Motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131-146.
- Kenny, D.A., Kashy, D.A., & Bolger, N. (1998). Data analysis in social psychology. In D. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, (pp. 233-265). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Miner, A.S. (1987). Idiosyncratic jobs in formalized organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, 327-351.
- Mirvis, P.H., & Hall, D.T. (1994). Psychological success and the boundaryless career. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 365-80.
- Motowidlo, S.J., & Van Scotter, J.R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 475-480.
- Ng, T.W.H., Eby, L.T., Sorensen, K.L., & Feldman, D.C. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 367-408.

- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D.W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775-802.
- Parker, S.K. (1998). Enhancing role breadth self-efficacy: The roles of job enrichment and other organizational interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 835-852.
- Parker, S.K., & Sprigg, C.A. (1999). Minimizing strain and maximizing learning: The role of job demands, job control, and proactive personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 925-939.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- 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.
- Preacher, K.J., & Hayes, A.F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 36, 717-731.
- Preacher, K.J., & Hayes, A.F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 879-891.
- Scott, S.G., & Bruce, R.A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 580-608.
- Seibert, S.E., Crant, J.M., & Kraimer, M.L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 416-427.
- Seibert, S.E., Kraimer, M.L., & Crant, J.M. (2001). What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 845-875.
- Shrout, P.E., & Bolger, N. (2002). Mediation in experimental and nonexperimental studies: New procedures and recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 7(4), 422-445.
- Snyder, M., & Ickes, W. (1985). *Personality and social behavior*. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (3rd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Terborg, J.R. (1981). Interactional psychology and research on human behavior in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 569-576.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J.A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 108-120.
- Van Scotter, J.R., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 525-531.
- Weick, K.E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Welbourne, T.M., Johnson, D.E., & Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale: Validity analysis and theory-based measure. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 540-555.

Figure 1. Conceptual Model Linking Proactive Personality, Extra-role Behaviors, and Career Success

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations between All Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.
1. Sex	1.29	0.45													
2. Age	43.95	9.64	-.03												
3. Extraversion	2.40	2.73	.06	.00											
4. Agreeableness	3.15	2.28	.21 **	.15 **	.13 *										
5. Neuroticism	3.59	2.29	-.04	.04	.07	.36 **									
6. Conscientiousness	4.79	1.50	.08	.16 **	.10	.31 **	.36 **								
7. Openness	3.95	1.89	-.02	-.05	.37 **	.12 *	.25 **	.19 **							
8. Proactive personality	17.15	8.60	-.01	-.07	.13 *	.15 **	.12 *	.11	.28 **						
9. OCB	95.21	12.33	.08	.06	.28 **	.29 **	.34 **	.36 **	.39 **	.28 **					
10. Innovation	24.28	7.30	-.18 **	-.14 *	.23 **	-.05	.14 *	.12 *	.54 **	.39 **	.42 **				
11. Contextual performance	76.77	8.67	.07	-.02	.32 **	.27 **	.26 **	.23 **	.43 **	.34 **	.68 **	.49 **			
12. Career satisfaction	4.80	8.36	.04	-.08	.06	.07	.02	.05	.03	.21 **	.25 **	.12 *	.18 **		
13. Salary	77404.24	32036.62	-.34 **	.16 **	.16 **	.01	.12 *	.14 *	.09	.13 *	.09	.25 **	.10	.22 **	
14. # of promotions	2.03	1.10	-.06	.14 *	.08	-.03	.15 *	.13 *	.08	.02	.07	.19 *	.09	.15 **	.26 **

Note. N ranges from 287-289; ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$; Sex coded 1=Male, 2=Female; OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behaviors; # of promotions = square root of raw # of reported promotions

Table 2. Three Career Success Outcomes Regressed on Covariates and Proactive Personality

	Career satisfaction		Salary		# of Promotions	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
Sex	0.02	0.03	-0.35 **	-0.34 **	-0.04	-0.03
Age	-0.10	-0.08	0.14 *	0.15 **	0.14 *	0.14 *
Extraversion	0.05	0.04	0.17 **	0.16 **	0.07	0.07
Agreeableness	0.07	0.04	-0.02	-0.03	-0.14 *	-0.14 *
Neuroticism	-0.01	-0.01	0.06	0.06	0.15 *	0.15 *
Conscientiousness	0.04	0.03	0.11	0.11	0.08	0.08
Openness	0.00	-0.06	-0.01	-0.03	0.02	0.02
Proactive personality		0.21 **		0.11		0.01
ΔR^2	0.02	0.04	0.19	0.01	0.07	0.00
F Δ	0.72	11.57 **	9.13 **	3.56	2.91 **	0.01
Adjusted R ²	0.00	0.03	0.17	0.17	0.04	0.04
F	0.72	2.10 *	9.13 **	8.51 **	2.91 **	2.54 *

Note. *N* ranges 289-294; Sex coded Male = 1, Female = 2; OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behaviors; Because of positive skew, the square root of the raw data for # of Promotions was used in keeping with guidelines of Cohen et al. (2003)

Table 3. Three Mediators Regressed onto Demographic and Personality Covariates and Proactive Personality

	OCB				Innovation		Contextual performance	
	β		β		β		β	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
Sex	0.04	0.05	-0.16 **	-0.15 **	0.03	0.04		
Age	0.01	0.03	-0.12 *	-0.10 *	-0.04	-0.02		
Extraversion	0.14 **	0.14 *	0.06	0.06	0.17 **	0.17 **		
Agreeableness	0.11 *	0.09	-0.09	-0.13 *	0.15 **	0.13 *		
Neuroticism	0.15 **	0.15 **	0.02	0.02	0.09	0.09		
Conscientiousness	0.20 **	0.20 **	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.08		
Openness	0.25 **	0.21 **	0.50 **	0.44 **	0.31 **	0.26 **		
Proactive personality		0.15 **		0.26 **		0.20 **		
ΔR^2	0.30	0.02	0.35	0.06	0.28	0.04		
F Δ	17.15 **	8.41 **	21.54 **	27.81 **	15.26 **	14.82 **		
Adjusted R ²	0.28	0.30	0.33	0.39	0.26	0.29		
F	17.15 **	16.46 **	21.54 **	24.12 **	15.26 **	15.86 **		

Note. N = 289; Sex coded Male = 1, Female = 2.

Table 4. Summary of Indirect Effect Tests for Each Career Success Outcome

			Bias Corrected 95% CI	
	Point estimate	SE	Lower	Upper
<i>Proactive personality - Mediators - Career satisfaction</i>				
OCB	0.039	0.026	0.008	0.111
Innovation	0.003	0.025	-0.051	0.051
Contextual Performance	-0.001	0.02	-0.04	0.041
TOTAL	0.042	0.034	-0.006	0.129
OCB vs. Innovation	0.036	0.037	-0.016	0.133
OCB vs. Contextual Performance	0.04	0.036	-0.005	0.136
Innovation vs. Contextual Performance	0.004	0.036	-0.072	0.075
Full model Adjusted R ² = .07, F(11, 277) = 2.97, p < .01				
<i>Proactive personality - Mediators - Salary</i>				
OCB	-33.086	55.319	-183.153	44.852
Innovation	222.082	109.358	81.488	508.21
Contextual Performance	-15.951	64.386	-162.375	106.388
TOTAL	173.045	97.251	38.727	438.142
OCB vs. Innovation	-255.168	137.558	-613.413	-82.227
OCB vs. Contextual Performance	-17.135	96.496	-226.177	168.109
Innovation vs. Contextual Performance	238.033	140.725	48.618	603.339
Full model Adjusted R ² = .19, F(11, 275) = 7.27, p < .01				
<i>Proactive personality - Mediators - Promotions</i>				
OCB	-0.002	0.002	-0.009	0.001
Innovation	0.008	0.004	0.003	0.018
Contextual Performance	0.001	0.003	-0.003	0.007
TOTAL	0.007	0.004	0.002	0.017
OCB vs. Innovation	-0.01	0.005	-0.023	-0.004
OCB vs. Contextual Performance	-0.003	0.004	-0.014	0.004
Innovation vs. Contextual Performance	0.007	0.005	0	0.019
Full model Adjusted R ² = .07, F(11, 277) = 2.89, p < .01				

Note . The procedures followed for this analysis are summarized in Preacher & Hayes (2008) and described in the manuscript itself; BC = bias corrected estimates, based on 5,000 bootstrap samples