

Thinking and Acting in Anticipation: A Review of Research on Proactive Behavior

Chia Huei WU & Sharon K. PARKER

(UWA Business School (M252), University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Hwy, Crawley, 6009, WA, Australia)

Abstract: Being proactive involves self-initiated, future-focused, and change-orientated behaviors. Such proactivity has been recognized as a positive way of behaving that can lead to the increased performance and effectiveness of individuals and organizations, especially when employees operate in contexts of unpredictable and changing demands. Because of its well-documented benefits, the antecedents and mechanisms of proactive behavior have been widely examined in an effort to identify how to promote such behavior in organizations. In this article, the authors first review various ways of conceptualizing proactivity, which includes an individual differences perspective, a behavior perspective, and a process perspective. A behavior perspective is mainly adopted in this article as this perspective is dominant in literature. Next, three mechanisms representing “can do”, “reason to” and “energized to” processes that can trigger proactive behavior are introduced. A review on antecedents of proactive behavior, including dispositional factors, situational factors and their interactions, is followed. The authors also summarize consequences that proactive behavior can bring, including job attitudes and performance. In addition to providing reviews, as the second part, the authors introduce their recent research that considers expanded dispositional predictors of proactive behavior (i.e., need for cognition, attachment style) as well as how these predictors interact with the situation. To conclude, the authors summarize what is well established in the literature, as well as what warrants further inquiry.

Key words: proactive behavior; personality; organizational behavior

At the individual level, proactivity refers to the phenomena in which an individual self-initiates actions to master and change one’s situation or external environment (e.g., Crant, 2000; Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006). For example, in the theme of person-environment relationships, Bateman and Crant (1993) indicated that human beings not only passively respond to their environments, but they also actively seek to master their environments. Research on proactivity, therefore, concerns why an individual sets out to master and change one’s situation or external environment, how s/he can achieve this change, and what the consequences of proactivity are for individuals and organizations.

This article aims to review proactivity research and to introduce our approach to proactive behavior by reviewing three studies we have

conducted. We focus our reviews on proactive behavior at an individual level, rather than a team or organizational level. Discussion on proactivity at team and organizational level can be found in Bindl and Parker (2010) and Wu and Parker (2011). There are two parts in this review article. The first part is a general review of proactivity literature. Drawing on other recent review articles (Bindl & Parker, 2010; Parker, Bindl, & Strauss, 2010; Wu & Parker, 2011), we review how proactivity has been conceptualized, underpinning mechanisms that drive proactivity, antecedents, and outcomes of proactive behavior. The second part is a more focused review on some of our recent research concerning dispositional predictors of proactive behavior. We conclude by summarizing what we know from existing literature and suggesting what can usefully be explored in future studies.

Review of Proactivity Literature

In this section, we review conceptualizations

Received date: 2012-07-06

Correspondence author :

Chia Huei WU, E-mail: chiahuei.wu@gmail.com

of proactivity, motivational mechanisms that drive proactivity, more distal antecedents of proactivity, and outcomes of proactive behavior.

Characteristics of Proactivity

Proactivity has been examined from several different perspectives, including initially as an individual difference perspective (Bateman & Crant, 1993), followed by a behavioral perspective (Frese, Kring, Soose, & Zempel, 1996; Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006), and, more recently, a goal process perspective (Bindl, Parker, Totterdell, & Hagger-Johnson, 2012; Frese & Fay, 2001; Grant & Ashford, 2008).

Regarding the individual difference perspective, Bateman and Crant (1993) proposed the concept of proactive personality to describe a person “who is relatively unconstrained by situational forces and who effects environmental change.” These scholars indicated that “proactive people scan for opportunities, show initiative, take action, and persevere until they reach closure by bringing about change” (p.105). Supporting the validity of this individual difference approach, proactive personality has been shown to be different from big-five personality variables (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Major, Turner, & Fletcher, 2006) because it captures the dispositional tendency towards proactivity. Proactive personality has been widely examined as a predictor of different proactive behaviors, including job search behaviors (Brown, Cober, Kane, & Shalhoop, 2006); proactive work behaviors such as idea implementation, problem solving, innovation, and problem prevention (Parker et al., 2006; Thompson, 2005); and proactive strategic behaviors, including strategic scanning, issue selling credibility, and issue selling willingness (Parker & Collins, 2010). Two meta-analyses (Fuller & Marler, 2009; Thomas, Whitman, & Viswesvaran, 2010) support the importance of proactive personality as a strong dispositional predictor of various forms of proactive behavior.

An alternative to focusing on the general tendency to be proactive is to consider proactivity as a way of behaving (e.g., Crant, 2000; Parker et al.,

2006). From this perspective, proactive behavior is defined as “self-initiated and future-oriented action that aims to change and improve the situation or oneself” (Parker et al., 2006, p.636). This definition indicates three defining elements that are argued to underpin multiple forms of proactive behavior (voice, taking charge, proactive socialization, etc.): self-initiation, future-focus, and change-orientation (Frese & Fay, 2001; Parker et al., 2006). First, proactive behavior is self-initiated, which means that this behavior is enacted without being told to or without requiring an explicit instruction. Second, proactive behavior is future-focused, which means that this behavior aims to deal with anticipated problems or opportunities with a long-term focus. Third, proactive behavior is change-oriented, involving not just reacting to a situation but being prepared to change that situation or oneself in order to bring about a different future.

From this behavioral perspective, the many forms of proactive behavior that have been investigated in distinct domains (e.g., careers, socialization, work performance) should be positively inter-related, even though they have often been studied in distinct literatures. Supporting this reasoning, Parker and Collins (2010) identified three higher-order categories of proactive behavior that all involve self-initiated, future-oriented, and change-oriented behaviors, but vary in the goals that are being pursued. The first category is *proactive person-environment fit behavior*, which includes proactive behaviors that aim to achieve a better fit between the person and the environment, such as feedback inquiry, feedback monitoring, job role negotiation, and career initiative. The second category is *proactive work behavior*, which includes behaviors that aim to improve the internal organizational environment, such as taking charge to bring about change, voice, innovation, and problem prevention. Finally, *proactive strategic behavior* includes proactive behaviors that aim to improve the fit of the organization with its wider environment, such as strategic scanning and issue selling. This integrative study shows that different forms of proactive behavior can be seen to share similar overarching goals, and therefore are likely to have antecedents and outcomes in common.

In an extension of the idea that proactivity is a way of behaving that can apply across multiple domains, scholars have recently conceptualized proactivity as a goal process (Bindl, Parker, Totterdell, & Hagger-Johnson, 2012; Frese & Fay, 2001; Grant & Ashford, 2008). In other words, when an individual tries to bring about a different future via change, they engage in conscious goal-directed processes, including both goal generation and goal striving (e.g., Chen & Kanfer, 2006). Goal generation involves, for example, envisioning a different future and planning to bring about a change, whereas goal striving involves concrete steps to bring about the change, as well as reflections on these actions and their consequences (Parker et al., 2010). From this perspective, proactivity is not only observable behavior but reflects a broader process that also involves unobservable elements like envisioning, planning, and reflecting. Recent studies have empirically supported the process view of proactivity. Within the context of career self-management, Raabe, Frese, and Beehr (2007) showed that goal commitment and information collection first contribute to career planning, which then leads to active career self-management behavior that helps to eventually achieve career success. Based on two longitudinal studies using samples of graduates making the transition from college to work, De Vos, De Clippeler, and Dewilde (2009) also illustrated that career progress goals sustain career planning, which then contributes to networking behaviors, and with one step further, leads to higher career success in the end, supporting the chain of envisioning-planning-performing process in proactivity. Most recently, Bindl, Parker, Hagger-Johnson and Totterdell (2012) showed that envisioning, planning, enacting, and reflecting are four distinct processes involved in both proactive work behavior and proactive career behavior.

In summary, proactivity has been conceptualized as an individual difference variable, a distinct way of behaving, and as a goal process. Focusing on proactivity as a way of behavior has an advantage beyond an exclusive emphasis on proactivity as a disposition because the behavioral perspective recognizes that proactivity is shaped by environmental factors. The process view of

proactivity, though proposed and tested in a few studies, is still relatively undeveloped.

Motivational Mechanisms of Proactive Behavior

Drawing on various existing motivational theories, as well as evidence regarding motivational determinants of proactive behaviors, Parker, Bindl and Strauss (2010) proposed that proactive goal generation and striving will depend on whether individuals feel capable of being proactive (a 'can do' pathway), whether they have some sense that they want to bring about a different future (a 'reason to' pathway), and whether they have positive affect to foster their proactive actions (an 'energized to' pathway). These three motivational mechanisms are consistent with the motivational system theory (Ford, 1992) by mapping on to the three forces in an individual's motivation system: personal agency belief, intrinsic motivation, and emotional force.

Within the "can-do" pathway, the beliefs that an individual has capability to perform a certain behavior (i.e., self-efficacy), beliefs that action is feasible (e.g., control appraisals), and perceived low costs of action are key constructs (Parker et al., 2010). Among the three constructs, the role of self-efficacy in shaping proactive behavior has been the most frequently examined. Self-efficacy refers to "people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives" (Bandura, 1994, p.71). Drawing on expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), Morrison and Phelps (1999) suggested that behaving proactively can be risky — it can damage one's reputation if the action fails or incurs disapproval from others. Individuals with high self-efficacy will be more likely to weigh positively the costs of such risky action against the benefits, to believe they can cope with any potential setbacks, and will perceive a higher likelihood of success. Therefore, self-efficacy has been proposed as a key cognitive-motivational process that drives proactive action (Parker et al., 2006). Empirically, studies have shown that self-efficacy predicts personal initiative (e.g., Bledow & Frese, 2009; Frese, Garst, & Fay, 2007; Ohly & Fritz, 2007; Speier & Frese, 1997), job search behavior (Brown et al., 2006; Kanfer, Wanberg, & Kantrowitz, 2001; Saks & Ashforth,

1999), and other proactive behaviors, such as innovation (e.g., Axtell et al., 2000), new comers' proactive socialization behavior (Gruman, Saks, & Zweig, 2006), and taking charge (e.g., Morrison & Phelps, 1999).

However, as stated by Eccles and Wigfield, (2002) "even if people are certain they can do a task, they may have no compelling reason to do it" (p.112). Thus, it is important to consider individuals' reasons for behaving proactively. Drawing on self-determination theory, Parker et al. (2010) argued for the importance of internalized or autonomous, rather than controlled, forms of motivation for prompting proactivity. In a broad view, internalized or autonomous motivation can be expressed in various forms, such as motives, aspirations, desires, commitment, or felt responsibility, which in common convey an intrinsic force to engage proactive behavior. For example, proactive socialization tactics (e.g., information seeking, networking, job change negotiation) are partly led by a desire for control (Ashford & Black, 1996); personal initiative is associated with aspiration for control (Fay & Frese, 2001); feedback seeking is led by the desire for useful information (Tuckey, Brewer, & Williamson, 2002); and initiative at work and voice are influenced by pro-social motives (Grant & Mayer, 2009). One's commitment towards career, teams, and organizations also provide reasons to enact proactive behavior. For example, Belschak and Den Hartog (Belschak & Den Hartog, 2010; Den Hartog & Belschak, 2007) reported that different foci of commitment (career, supervisor, team, and organization) were positively related to personal initiative and proactive behavior at personal, interpersonal, and organizational level. An individual's belief that he or she is personally obligated to bring about environmental change has been repeatedly and positively linked with personal initiative (Bledow & Frese, 2009) and proactive behaviors, such as taking charge (e.g., Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Parker & Collins, 2010), voice (Fuller, Marler, & Hester, 2006; Grant & Mayer, 2009; Parker & Collins, 2010; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008), and continuous improvement (Fuller et al., 2006). Recently, drawing on the concept of possible

self (Markus & Nurius, 1986), Strauss, Griffin, and Parker (2012) proposed and found that future work selves provide a strong intrinsic reason to lead an individual to be proactive in building career. They reported that individuals with more salient future work selves, as well as more elaborate future work selves, are more likely to engage in proactive career behavior, including career planning, skill development, networking, and consulting.

Proactive behavior is fostered through an affective pathway. Drawing on Fredrickson's (1998) broaden-and-build theory of positive emotion, Parker (2007) proposed that positive affect is likely to influence the selection of proactive goals because it expands thinking and result in more flexible cognitive processes (Fredrickson, 1998, 2001; Isen, 1999), which in turn help individuals to think ahead and rise to the challenge in pursuing proactive goals. Consistent with these ideas, positive affect has been linked with the setting of more challenging goals (Ilies & Judge, 2005). Regarding build mechanism, Parker (2007) argued that the impact of positive affect in broaden mechanism over time is helpful in building more enduring individual characteristics. For example, an individual can develop higher self-efficacy after achieving a challenging goal and be more resilient when encountering obstacles in goal achievement. Several studies have supported the idea that positive affect can influence proactive behavior. For example, Ashforth, Sluss, and Saks (2007) reported a positive correlation between positive affectivity and proactive socialization behaviors. Madjar, Oldham, and Pratt (2002) also reported that positive affect was associated with more individual creative performance rated by their supervisors. Within-person studies also suggest the benefits of positive affect for proactive behavior. Fritz and Sonnentag (2009) found positive affect related to taking charge behaviors both on the same and following day.

Furthering our understanding of the relationship between affect and proactivity, Bindl et al. (2012) differentiated affect into four quadrants of the affective circumplex model (created via combinations of high vs. low activation and positive vs. negative valence) and examined the impact of each affect category on different stages in a proactive goal process. They found that high-activated positive mood was positively

associated with all elements of the proactive process, whereas low-activated positive mood was not an important predictor, supporting the ‘energized to’ pathway proposed by Parker et al., (2010). In addition, low-activated negative feelings, such as depression, positively predicted employees’ envisioning of proactive goals but no other elements of proactivity, suggesting that depressed feelings might prompt day dreaming or rumination about future change possibilities, but not actual action. These findings suggest that activation levels of affect should be taken into account when investigating how affect influences proactive behaviors. Moreover, their findings also suggest that high-activated positive mood not only contributes to proactive behavior but also other cognitive elements in proactive process.

In summary, “can do,” “reason to,” and “energized to” are three main motivational mechanisms of proactive behavior that have been supported in existing literature. Although each mechanism has been well established, the unique effects and the interplays of these three mechanisms have rarely been examined. Future studies are encouraged to incorporate all these mechanisms to provide a comprehensive examination.

Antecedents of Proactive Behavior

We now turn to review more distal antecedents of proactivity, including both individual attributes and work context factors. We also review findings about how individual and situational factors will jointly shape an individuals’ proactive behavior.

Individual antecedents.

Given that proactive behavior is self-initiated, not imposed or required by others, individual’s attributes are likely to be important in shaping one’s proactive behavior. We discuss in turn knowledge/abilities and personality as two relevant categories of individual attributes.

Knowledge/abilities.

The importance of knowledge/abilities for proactive behavior was outlined by Fay and Frese

(2001): “To be able to take initiative, one needs a good and thorough understanding of what one’s work is, that is, one needs job-relevant knowledge, skills, and cognitive ability” (p.104). Previous studies have found that a positive relation between knowledge / abilities-relevant constructs and proactive behavior, such as job qualification and personal initiative (Fay & Frese, 2001), cognitive ability and personal initiative (Fay & Frese, 2001), educational background and job search behavior (Kanfer et al., 2001), and educational background and voice (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998). In highlighting the importance of deep-level knowledge of the task, Ohly, Sonnentag, and Pluntke (2006) found a positive effect of routinization on creativity and innovation, suggesting that “routinization enables employees to develop new ideas while working and to implement them” (p.271).

Personality.

In addition to knowledge and abilities, personality also has an impact on proactive behavior. The most relevant construct is proactive personality (Bateman & Crant, 1993), and its predictive effect on proactive behavior was referred to above. Big-five personality traits have been linked to proactive behavior. For example, conscientiousness — tendencies and behaviors related to dependability, conformity, and perseverance — has been shown to be positively related to personal initiative (Fay & Frese, 2001), proactive job search (Kanfer et al., 2001), overt performance and task information seeking (Tidwell & Sias, 2005), career planning behaviors (Carless & Bernath, 2007), and voice (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). In contrast, when other more salient predictors of proactivity were included in the model (such as learning goal orientation and future orientation), Parker & Collins (2010) showed that conscientiousness was unimportant in predicting a range of proactive behaviors. Extroversion, characterized by a need for stimulation, assertiveness, and activities, is positively related to voice (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001), overt and covert relational information seeking, covert task and performance information

seeking (Tidwell & Sias, 2005), feedback seeking and relationship building among newcomers (Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000), and personal initiative (Fay & Frese, 2001). Results regarding the predicting effect of openness to experiences, agreeableness, and neuroticism on proactive behavior are less consistent (see Wu & Parker, 2011). We discuss extensions to this literature on dispositional predictors of proactivity in the second part of our review.

Situational antecedents.

Situational factors are also crucial for proactive behavior because they represent conditions which allow or encourage (or constrain or inhibit) an individual to enact proactive behavior. In this section, we summarize findings concerning job characteristics, leadership, and organizational climate.

Job characteristics.

Job characteristics play an important role in shaping one's motivation, behavior, and well-being (Latham & Pinder, 2005; Morgeson & Campion, 2003; Parker & Ohly, 2008), and have been linked to various forms of proactive behavior. Both positive and negative job characteristics can trigger proactive behavior. For example, job autonomy and control is a positive job characteristic that concerns degrees to which employees can decide what to do and choose how to perform their work has been found to be positively related to proactive behaviors (e.g., Axtell et al., 2000; Ohly et al., 2006; Parker et al., 2006; Speier & Frese, 1997; Wu, Parker, & de Jong, in press). This is because job autonomy can promote one's self-efficacy at work (Parker, 1998) and thus help the enactment of proactive behavior (Parker et al., 2006), promote intrinsic motivation and engagement in bringing changes by motivating an individual to redefine tasks (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008), and enhancing felt responsibility at work (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Some job stressors, or job characteristics denoting a deviation between a desired and an actual situation, can also have positive effects on proactive behavior because these

stressors motivate employees to take an active approach in order to decrease the difference between the desired and actual states (Fay & Sonnentag, 2002). Supporting this view, job stressors, such as time pressure or situational constraints, have been shown to be positively related to various proactive behaviors (Binnewies, Sonnentag, & Mojza, 2009; Fay & Sonnentag, 2002; Fritz & Sonnentag, 2009; Ohly & Fritz, 2010; Ohly et al., 2006).

Leadership.

Employee proactive behavior is also tied to leaders' managerial style, attitudes, expectations, and the leader-subordinate relationship. In general, leaders who tend to express their supportive considerations of subordinates, provide opportunities for subordinates to engage in decision-making, and have a positive attitude and openness towards changes are more likely to promote employee's proactive behavior. Participative leadership emphasizes the value of subordinates' contributions and involvement in decision-making. Contingent reward leadership emphasizes the recognition and approval for subordinate effort or performance. Transformational leadership emphasizes motivating employees to challenge the status quo. All three were found to have positive relationships with employee's proactive behavior (e.g., Belschak & Den Hartog, 2010; Bettencourt, 2004; Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012; Rank, Carsten, Unger, & Spector, 2007; Strauss, Griffin, & Rafferty, 2009). In addition, Scott and Bruce (1994) found that when leaders expected their subordinates to be an innovator or supporter of innovation, their subordinates displayed more innovative behavior, revealing a Pygmalion effect. Morrison and Phelps (1999) found that top managements' openness to change was positively related with employees' willingness to engage in taking-charge behaviors. Similarly, in a qualitative research, Dutton et al. (1997) found that top managements' willingness to listen was positively related to employees' perception, and that it was favorable to engage in issue selling.

Not only leadership style but also the quality

of exchange relationship between leader and employee can also affect proactive behavior. This is because employees in a higher leader-member exchange relationship are more likely to commit to bring a positive change in the organizations and have more resources from their supervisors to enact change. Empirically, higher leader-member exchange (LMX) has been positively related to individual innovation (Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004; Scott & Bruce, 1994), voice (Burris, Detert, & Chiaburu, 2008), and change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors (Bettencourt, 2004). A more in-depth review on the relationship between leadership and proactive behavior can be found in Parker and Wu (in press).

Supportive organizational climate.

Past studies showed that an organizational climate that denotes a supportive and psychologically safe environment is helpful to foster proactive behaviors. For example, individuals who report being satisfied with or supported by others (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007; Kanfer et al., 2001; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998) are more likely to engage in proactive behaviors. Similarly, Axtell et al. (2000) also found climate constructs at team level, such as participative safety, support for innovation, management support, and perception of capability in influencing team and the organization, were generally positive to suggestion and implementation of ideas. Scott and Bruce (1994) reported that employees who perceived higher levels of support for innovation in organizations are more likely to exhibit innovative behaviors. In a longitudinal study, Axtell, Holman, and Wall (2006) further reported that change in management support was positively related to change in suggestions, and change in team support for innovation was positively related to change in implementing innovation. Focusing on the supportive organizational practices, Dorenbosch, van Engen, and Verhagen, (2005) further suggested that commitment-based human resource management, characterized by (1) employee participation, (2) wages, (3) training and development, (4) information sharing, and (5) supervisor support, can

form a strong employee psychological link (i.e., commitment) to organizations, which makes employees more willing to take responsibility and engage in proactive behavior. Finally, Parker et al. (2006) showed that employees' trust in their colleagues predicted proactive problem solving and idea implementation via individuals' flexible role orientation (reason to). Collectively, these findings reveal that have a positive and safe environment is important for an individual to be willing to challenge status quo and effect change.

Interaction between individual and situational antecedents.

Individual and situational forces are not independent; they can work together to influence an individual's proactive behavior. First, some studies indicate that positive situational characteristics can be conceptualized as conditions that allow individuals to exhibit their dispositional tendency in being proactive. For example, McAllister, Kamdar, Morrison, and Turban (2007) found that higher procedural justice enhanced the association between perceived role breadth and taking charge. Griffin, Parker, and Mason (2010) found that leader vision enhanced the association between role breadth self-efficacy and proactive behavior when assessed one year later. Both procedural justice and leader vision can thus be considered as facilitating conditions that enhance the likelihood that employees with certain attributes will be proactive.

However, there are also studies suggesting that some situational characteristics spur an individual to enact proactive behavior if they lack dispositional tendencies, implying a compensating positive role of the environment. For example, Speier and Frese (1997) found that job control has a stronger effect on personal initiative among people with lower self-efficacy than among those with higher self-efficacy. LePine and Van Dyne (1998) showed that individuals with low self-esteem were more receptive to favorable situational characteristics promoting voice (e.g., high levels of overall group autonomy), than were individuals with high levels of self-esteem. Similarly, Rank, Nelson, Allen, and Xu (2009) found that transformational leadership

was more strongly and positively related with individual innovation for individuals with lower levels of organization-based self-esteem. In the same vein, Bettencourt (2004) found that contingent reward leadership had a negative relationship with change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors among people high in performance goal orientation because contingent reward leadership focuses on in-role task responsibilities. People high in performance goal orientation tend to focus on in-role tasks to achieve their competence at work, rather than extra-role, change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. However, when people high in performance goal orientation encounter transformational leaders, they are likely to engage in change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors because in this case, transformational leaders focus on broader organizational values and goals. People high in performance goal orientation are more likely to be attuned to this cue and enacting proactive behavior in order to achieve their competence at work. All these findings suggested that situational characteristics can spur individuals with less conducive attributes to behave more proactively.

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

Some situations can also decrease an

individual's tendency to be proactive. For example, Gupta and Bhawe (2007) found that the negative impact of stereotype threat on entrepreneurship intention was stronger among women with higher proactive personality because entrepreneurship is related to a masculine stereotype and women, who are negatively stereotyped in entrepreneurship, tend to show a decrement in aspirations to be entrepreneurs when they are aware of the stereotype, and believe that they are judged based on the stereotype. Thus, their findings suggest that an individual's tendency to be proactive can also be constrained in certain situations.

Finally, it is also possible that dispositional factors can compensate for situational factors in proactive behavior. Grant and Sumanth (2009) found that those individuals who were high in dispositional trust propensity and were also pro-socially motivated showed high levels of job-related initiative, even if they indicated their managers were not trustworthy. VandeWalle, Ganesan, Challagalla, and Brown (2000) indicated that individuals' learning goal orientation becomes more important for perceiving higher value and lower cost in feedback seeking when individuals work with inconsiderate supervisors. These findings in general imply that dispositional factors (trust propensity or learning goal orientation) can compensate for situational factors (manager trustworthiness or inconsiderate supervisors) to lead proactive behavior.

In summary, the interaction effects between individual and situational antecedents are complex, and further investigation is needed to develop integrative frameworks that synthesize the findings.

Consequences of proactive behavior

We now focus on the outcomes of proactive behavior, including job performance, career success, and subjective satisfaction.

Job performance.

Proactive behavior has been linked to superior performance, particularly because in uncertain and interdependent contexts, being proactive is helpful

for generating creative ideas (Binnewies, Ohly, & Sonnentag, 2007) that facilitate dealing with changing environments (Griffin et al., 2007). For example, specific proactive behaviors have been found to be positively related to individuals' performance rated by supervisors or themselves, including voice, issue selling and taking charge (Grant, Parker, & Collins, 2009; Van Dyne & Le Pine, 1998), network building and taking charge (Thompson, 2005), personal initiative (Bledow & Frese, 2009), proactive information seeking (Morrison, 1993a, 1993b), building relationships with boss and positive framing (Ashford & Black, 1996; Ashforth et al., 2007), and championing behavior in innovation (Howell & Shea, 2001).

Career success.

Proactive behaviors can also lead to higher career success, such as when individuals build networks that can help their performance, actively secure mentoring relationships, or negotiate roles that better fit with individual abilities. As reported by Frese et al. (1997), people who are high in personal initiative have a clear career plan, a higher level of execution of the plan, and higher employability. Proactive behavior for shaping interpersonal relationships with supervisor or senior colleagues can also contribute to an individual's career development. For example, Ashford and Black (1996) found that newcomers who proactively build relationships with supervisors in the first six months have higher self-rated performance at the end of a year. Building relationships with senior colleagues or mentors can facilitate achieving favorable career outcomes such as higher income and higher-level positions in the hierarchy (Blickle, Witzki, & Schneider, 2009). Similarly, Eby, Butts and Lockwood (2003) reported that experience with a mentor, breadth of within-organization networks, and breadth of external networks were positively related to perceived career success and internal and external marketability.

Subjective satisfaction.

Proactive behavior is also related to higher

satisfaction with their jobs, careers, or lives because its achievement to bring about change will lead an individual to be more satisfied with their conditions. For example, career initiative and individual innovation can predict increases in career satisfaction and promotions at work in two years (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001). Information seeking, feedback seeking, relationship building, and positive framing were also generally linked to higher levels of job satisfaction and lower levels of intention to leave (Morrison, 1993b; Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000). Ashforth et al. (2007) further reported that proactive behavior (information seeking, feedback seeking, job-change negotiation, socializing, building a relationship with boss, and networking) contributes to higher role innovation, lower intentions to quit, and higher newcomer learning, which in turn, lead to higher job performance, organization identification, and job satisfaction.

Summary of Literature Review

Actively trying to take charge of one's self or the environment to bring about a different future — or being proactive — is an increasingly vital way of behaving in today's work places. We have shown how the concept of proactivity can be considered from dispositional, behavioral, and goal process perspectives. Focusing particularly on the behavioral perspective, we reviewed three motivational mechanisms to promote proactive behavior: the belief that one is able to be proactive (can do), that one wants to be proactive (reason to), and the experience of activated positive affect (energized to). Individual and situational antecedents of proactive behavior were also reviewed with the findings showing that both individual and situational factors operate separately and jointly to shape proactive behavior. Finally, the current evidence suggests that proactive behavior can lead to positive outcomes, such as higher career success and better job performance, albeit with some evidence that these positive outcomes depend on individual attributes such as situational judgment (Chan, 2006) or pro-social motivation (Grant et al., 2009).

Recent Studies on Dispositional Influences on Proactive Behavior

In this section, we provide a specific review on our recent work that focuses mainly on the role of dispositional factors in shaping proactive behavior. Overall, there are four main characteristics of our approach. First, we highlight cognitive and relational aspects of proactivity that have less often been examined, even though they are important to describe the nature of proactivity. Second, we adopt an individual differences perspective to consider these cognitive and relational aspects of proactivity. Past studies have paid more attention to situational rather than disposition impacts on proactive behavior. Yet proactivity is self-initiated, so it is reasonable to consider why some people but not others will initiate behavior to bring about change. Third, we investigate interactions between dispositional and situational factors in shaping proactive behavior. In so doing, we identify boundary conditions of dispositions and situations, and thereby provide useful managerial implications to promote proactive behavior. Theoretically, delineating interaction effects between dispositional and situational factors helps us to understand the potential mechanisms in leading proactive behavior. Fourth, we address dispositional influences on proactive behavior at both inter- and intra-individual level as they represent different psychological mechanisms (Borsboom, Mellenbergh, & van Heerden, 2003). Considering both levels is valuable because it addresses both the structure and process views of personality (Fleeson, 2001) and provides a more comprehensive understanding for dispositional factors to operate.

Cognitive Nature of Proactivity: The Role of Need for Cognition and Contingent Effects of Job Characteristics

As discussed above, scholars have suggested that proactivity is a goal-oriented process that involves cognitive and behavioral elements including goal envisioning, planning, enacting, and

reflecting (Bindl et al., 2012; Frese & Fay, 2001; Grant & Ashford, 2008). From this perspective, being proactive involves not only doing, but also thinking, such as imagining how things might be different and generating new ideas or alternative ways to do jobs (Frese & Fay, 2001). As such, it is important to consider thinking-oriented dispositions over and above action-oriented ones like proactive personality.

We (Wu et al., in press) suggest that the need for cognition, a dispositional tendency to engage in and enjoy thinking (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982), *can positively contribute to* proactive behavior. Individuals who are high in the need for cognition “tend to have active, exploring minds, and, through their senses and intellect, they reach and draw out information from their environment; accordingly, they are more likely to expend effort on information acquisition, reasoning, and problem solving to cope with a wide variety of predicaments in their world” (Cacioppo, Petty, Feinstein, & Jarvis, 1996, p.245). People high in the need for cognition are thus expected to be comfortable initiating change that deviates from the status quo. They are also likely to process more information in any given situation, and therefore are better able to predict the future and come up with plans to deal with the anticipated situation.

Research has identified several ways in which the need for cognition can facilitate the thinking involved in proactivity. First, people high in the need for cognition are more likely to engage in and enjoy situations marked by novelty, complexity, and uncertainty (Cacioppo et al., 1996), which is typically when proactivity is called for, as indicated by Griffin et al. (2007, p.329): “proactivity is important whenever a work context involves uncertainty and some aspects of work roles that cannot be formalized.” Second, people high in the need for cognition have a higher ability to link new knowledge into previous knowledge in the pursuit of comprehension, and can flexibly change learning strategies to acquire new information (Evans, Kirby, & Fabrigar, 2003). As such, they can process information deeply and quickly, which is helpful for proactivity because in order to set and achieve a proactive goal, an individual must determine what

type of information is valuable in that situation and then make appropriate plans to bring about change in the future. Third, individuals high in the need for cognition tend to form a strong attitude toward the objects after cognitive elaboration (Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992), which then sustains behavior that is consistent with their attitude (Cacioppo, Petty, Kao, & Rodriguez, 1986). We would thus expect individuals who are high in the need for cognition to be more likely to persist in the pursuit of a proactive goal because they develop ownership of the idea once they have spent time thinking it through.

In support of our prediction, Steinhart and Wyer (2009) found that people who are high in the need for cognition have a stronger approach motivation seeking to gain the expected positive consequences than people with a lower need for cognition. Yet, when potential threats are observed, people who are high in the need for cognition tend to heighten their avoidance motivation in order to avoid the expected negative consequences, which helps them to cope effectively with setbacks. This latter finding is consistent with an experimental study concerning fear appeals to prevent breast cancer by Ruiters, Verplanken, De Cremer, and Kok (2004). These scholars showed that when participants were confronted with a higher threat message, only people with a higher need for cognition exhibited adaptive coping (e.g., higher intention to carry out monthly self-examinations), suggesting that individuals who are higher in the need for cognition have a strong tendency to analyze the problem and accept recommended actions. On this basis, we expect that the need for cognition helps individuals to respond adaptively to setbacks or obstacles that are commonly associated with proactivity.

Therefore, we suggest that, compared to individuals with low need for cognition, employees with higher need for cognition are more likely to engage in proactive work behavior because they enjoy novel situations. They are better able to learn from information in a situation, are likely to be strongly committed to goals, and are more able to cope adaptively with obstacles that are commonly encountered with proactive action. Supporting our hypothesis, in a sample of 179 employees working

in a research and consultancy organization in the Netherlands, we found need for cognition positively predicted individual innovation behavior, a form of proactive work behavior (Parker & Collins, 2010) while controlling effects of proactive personality and openness to experience, two personality factors that have previously been shown to predict proactivity.

Nevertheless, in the same sample, we also found that need for cognition is more important for shaping individual innovation behavior when job autonomy and time pressure are lower, but less important when job autonomy and time pressure are higher. We suggest this situation occurs because higher job autonomy encourages — and time pressure pushes — an individual to be more innovative, regardless of an employee's dispositional tendency to prefer thinking. When job autonomy and time pressure is lower, there is no situational force driving the individual to be innovative, and thus employees' dispositional tendency in thinking (i.e., need for cognition) becomes important for shaping individual innovation behavior.

More specifically, we suggest that job autonomy enables and triggers similar functions, such as the need for cognition when it comes to proactive work behavior. First, high autonomy means the work context is less defined and restricted by formal rules and procedures (Meyer, Dalal, & Hermida, 2010), resulting in a more cognitively demanding situation in which individuals are required to engage in cognitive activities — regardless of whether they particularly enjoy novel situations. Second, high autonomy gives individuals better opportunities to link new knowledge with previous knowledge, and learn new information (Daniels, Boocock, Glover, Hartley, & Holland, 2009; Leach, Wall, & Jackson, 2003; Parker & Axtell, 2001). As such, in high autonomy situations, individuals' dispositional motivation to think and cognitively explore situations will matter less. Moreover, high autonomy results in individuals feeling more responsibility for, and in ownership of, their work (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Parker, Wall, & Jackson, 1997). When individuals form stronger attitudes towards the issues at work, this motivates

them to persist with change-related goals and again reduces the influence of need for cognition. Altogether, when autonomy becomes higher, individuals are more likely to engage in proactive work behavior irrespective of their need for cognition because the autonomy in the context motivates and enables this behavior. However, when individuals lack job autonomy, the benefit of the need for cognition for proactive work behavior will be more prominent because the situation does not provide a favorable environment to motivate individuals to take more responsibility, widen their perspectives, and deepen their knowledge.

In contrast, time pressure represents a challenge stressor that can impose a force on individuals to seek proactive ways to accomplish work on time (Wu & Parker, 2011). Drawing on activation theory (Gardner, 1986), Ohly and Fritz (2010) proposed that time pressure will lead to higher activation and, under this condition, individuals will be stimulated and are more likely to try different things from routine. Drawing on control theory (Carver & Scheier, 1982), Fay and Sonnentag (2002, p.224) proposed that time pressure can be regarded as a signal “indicating that a process, procedure, or design is below an optimal level.” From this perspective, higher time pressure indicates a suboptimal condition that requires more effort to achieve the expected goal, and thus can increase initiative taking. As such, high time pressure is likely to prompt individuals to engage in novel situations, or deviate from the status quo, because they need to solve their problems in new ways in order to gain time. At the same time, high time pressure also makes it important for individuals to process information quickly because they need to finish a certain amount of work within a relative short time period, which is line with Hockey’s (1993) idea that stress can increase effort and concentration to deal with tasks at hand. Accordingly, when time pressure becomes higher, individuals are more likely to engage in proactive work behavior irrespective of their need for cognition because the situation prompts this type of behavior. When time pressure is low, the situation does not create a strong force for proactivity, so the need for cognition plays a more powerful role.

In summary, our study contributes to proactivity literature by identifying the need for cognition as a dispositional antecedent of proactive work behavior. In addition, we showed that the need for cognition is most important when levels of job autonomy or time pressure are relatively low. Our findings provide several implications. First, we show that proactive behavior is not only about doing, but also about thinking. Dispositions in both thinking (i.e., need for cognition) and doing (i.e., proactive personality) are positively and uniquely able to predict behavior. Second, we show that both positive (i.e., job autonomy) and negative (i.e., time pressure) job characteristics can facilitate proactive behavior, which is consistent with previous findings that we have reviewed. Third, we show a compensation effect between need for cognition and job autonomy/time pressure in shaping proactive behavior. In line with job design theory, it would be good to increase job autonomy to structurally empower employees (e.g., Biron & Bamberger, 2010; Spreitzer, 1996; Thorlakson & Murray, 1996; Wall, Cordery, & Clegg, 2002), and to cultivate their proactive behavior regardless their dispositions. Nevertheless, there are some jobs where it is very difficult to increase autonomy, yet proactivity is still important. For example, jobs in safety critical industries often have highly standardized work procedures with very low method autonomy, and yet employee proactivity in improving the work systems is vital in the prevention of latent errors or injuries (e.g., Grote, 2007; Mark et al., 2007). Recruiting individuals with a high need for cognition might be a way of achieving proactivity within such highly constrained environments in which it is highly challenging to increase job autonomy.

One limitation of our study is that we did not examine the “thinking” mechanisms that we theorized explain the relationship between the need for cognition and proactive behavior, and the moderating roles of job autonomy and time pressure. We assumed that job autonomy and time pressure moderate the need for cognition because these work characteristics can motivate thinking and opportunity identification in a similar way to the need for cognition, but this assumption has not been

tested. Future studies are thus encouraged to unpack the underlying cognitive mechanisms.

Relational Nature of Proactivity: The Role of Attachment Style and Contingent Effects of Leader Secure-Base Support

We propose that an individual characteristic reflecting how an individual relates with others — attachment style — is important for shaping proactive behavior. Proactivity can feel personally risky because individuals' initiating change can often encounter resistance from others (Parker et al., 2010) and their self-image as perceived by others can be damaged (Ashford, Blatt, & VandeWalle, 2003; Morrison & Bies, 1991). Bringing about change successfully also often requires that an individual has social capital to support the resources they need for change (Thompson, 2005). Because of the inherent social nature of many forms of proactivity, we propose that individuals with an orientation to relate positively to others will be more motivated to behave proactively.

More specifically, we suggest that an individual's attachment style will shape proactive behavior. Attachment theory suggests that the quality of a child's interactions with his/her primary caregiver influences that child's sense of relational security, reflected in their attachment style, and hence their exploration of novel and unfamiliar environments (Bowlby, 1969/1982). Over time, this early attachment style gradually becomes a relatively stable, though changeable, individual characteristic (Fraley, 2002; Fraley, Vicary, Brumbaugh, & Roisman, 2011), and thereby can influence one's exploration in adulthood, such as a greater degree of willingness to explore and process novel information (Green & Campbell, 2000; Mikulincer, 1997), a higher degree of achievement motivation in academic settings (Elliot & Reis, 2003), and engaging in a range of exploration experiences, such as thrill-seeking behavior, novelty seeking, and impulsivity (Carnelley & Ruscher, 2000; Johnston, 1999).

Based on the attachment-exploration association, we suggest that attachment style will predict proactive behavior because proactive

behavior can be regarded as a form of exploration involving seeking information to reduce the knowledge gap between what one knows and what one wants to know in facing novelty, complexity, uncertainty, and conflict (Berlyne, 1960; Griffin et al., 2007; Loewenstein, 1994), and is driven by a motivation to master the environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993; White, 1959). Supporting our ideas, in a student sample, we (Wu & Parker, 2012b) found that attachment style is significantly related to proactive career behavior. Specifically, based on the two dimensions of adult attachment style (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998), we found that attachment anxiety (which reflects the extent to which an individual is anxious or fearful about abandonment or being unloved) was negatively related to proactive career behavior because of lower self-efficacy, whereas attachment avoidance (which reflects the extent to which an individual is uncomfortable with closeness and dependence on others) was negatively related to proactive career behavior because of lower autonomous motivation and positive affect. We replicated the same finding in an employee sample with the focus on proactive work behavior rated by supervisors. These findings suggest that people with different relational orientations had different motivations for engaging in proactive behavior, such that people with higher attachment anxiety have lower "can do" motivation, whereas people with higher attachment avoidance have lower "reason to" and "energized to" motivation, with the net consequence being lower proactivity.

In the employee sample, we further tested whether supervisors can provide a secure base to help employees with higher attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance to feel more efficacious (can do), more autonomously motivated (reason to), and to experience higher positive affective (energized to) and thus to engage in more proactive work behavior (Wu & Parker, 2012b). We examined the moderating effect of leader secure-base support on the relationship between attachment anxiety and self-efficacy, and the relationship between attachment avoidance and autonomous motivation or positive affect. We incorporated into our measurement of leadership the three elements of

secure-base support (i.e., availability, encouragement, and non-interference) identified by Feeney and Thrush (2010). Thus, employees rated their leaders' perceived support in terms of whether the leader was available during difficult situations, encouraged them, and delegated tasks without interference. Results of moderated regression analyses indicated that leader secure-base support mitigated the negative relationship between attachment anxiety and self-efficacy, the negative relationship between attachment avoidance and autonomous motivation, and the negative relationship between attachment avoidance and positive affect. These findings show that supportive supervisors can play a role as a secure base that provides confidence, encourages autonomous motivation, and enhances positive affect for employees, especially those who are lacking attachment security, to lead to greater employee proactivity.

In summary, this study (Wu & Parker, 2012b) contributes to the proactivity literature by identifying the attachment style as a dispositional antecedent of proactive behavior for a relational perspective. Attachment styles had a unique and significant effect on the three motivational states of proactive behavior even when controlling for the effect of proactive personality. This finding supports the idea that proactive behavior is grounded within the interpersonal context. In addition, we showed that the leader secure-base support could mitigate the negative impact of attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance on the motivational states of proactive behavior. This finding is consistent with the compensation hypothesis (Granqvist & Kirkpatrick, 2008) suggested in attachment theory that individuals who cannot obtain attachment security from their primary caregivers will try to seek figures who can provide attachment security and provide an important managerial implication that supervisors' support for exploration is a key factor to cultivate employees' proactive behavior.

Relational Nature of Proactivity: The Role of Attachment Style in Shaping Proactive Behavior at Inter-Individual Level

Attachment style not only influences proactive

behavior at the inter-individual level as we reported above, but also influences proactive behavior at the intra-individual level (Wu & Parker, 2012a), as we elaborate next.

It is reasonable to expect that an individual does not always exhibit proactive behavior in all situations, even though s/he is high in proactive personality. This is because, at the intra-individual level, individuals experience different states, they operate within different situations, and they are subject to varying motivational forces that influence their proactive behavior at a particular point. Based on the states and relevant cues in a particular situation, an individual will decide whether to behave proactively or not (Sonnentag, 2003; Sonnentag & Niessen, 2008). In other words, people vary in their thresholds for being proactive in response to relevant states or cues such that some individuals are more likely to engage in proactive behavior than others are, even though they are in the same situation. Drawing on the cognitive-affective personality system (CAPS) model of personality (Mischel & Shoda, 1995, 1998), the associations between relevant states or cues and behavior likely reflect one's personality. That is, people can chronically differ in the associations between relevant states or cues and their behavior. We propose people with different attachment styles chronically differ in these associations.

In order to test this idea, we identified three relevant states that can trigger proactive behavior in a given occasion at the intra-individual level: curiosity, core self-evaluations, and future orientation. Frese and Fay's (2001) proactive process model has implied a positive link between curiosity and proactive behavior at the intra-individual level because being curious is required when a proactive intention is formed. Thus, when one's curiosity level is increased, his/her level of proactive behavior will also become higher at the same time. In line with this view, Kashdan and Steger (2007) showed that daily curiosity is beneficial to generating more daily proactive social behaviors and goal-directed efforts. Likewise, each time an individual forms a intention to take proactive actions, he/she will initiate a proactive goal with intrinsic reasons (Parker et al., 2010) and

gauge his/her ability to face challenges elicited from that action (Morrison & Phelps, 1999), both of which are associated with one's core self-evaluations in that situation. Thus, when one's core self-evaluations are increased, his/her level of proactive behavior is more likely to become higher. Likewise in regard to future orientation, Grant and Ashford (2008) defined the three phases of the proactivity process as anticipation, planning and action directed toward future impact. All three phases have a strong future orientation, which leads a person to think ahead, plan in advance, and take actions for the future. Thus when one's future orientation is high, the tendency to go through the process of anticipation, planning, and action to complete a proactive action should also be high. General evidence therefore suggests intra-individual experiences in curiosity, core self-evaluations, and future orientation influence intra-individual proactive behavior. Supporting our hypothesis, in a sample with 58 participants in a repeated measures study, we found that monthly measures of curiosity, core self-evaluations, and future orientation positively predicted a monthly measure of proactive behavior at the intra-individual level.

We further examined cross-level interaction effects of attachment styles to see whether attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance at inter-individual will moderate the relationship between monthly curiosity, core self-evaluations, and future orientation and monthly proactive behavior at the intra-individual level. Only attachment anxiety had significant cross-level interaction effects. Specifically, attachment anxiety had a negative cross-level interaction effect with monthly core self-evaluations in predicting monthly proactive behavior, showing that core self-evaluations have a weaker association with proactive behavior among people high in attachment anxiety. However, attachment anxiety also had a positive cross-level interaction effect with monthly future orientation in predicting monthly proactive behavior, showing that future goal orientation had a stronger predictive effect on proactive personality among people high in attachment anxiety. Overall, these findings show that anxiously attached individuals tend to rely less on their perceived sense

of worth, but more on their future orientation, for behaving proactively within a particular occasion. This might reflect the ambivalent attitude towards external worlds characterized by people high in attachment anxiety. That is, although they are eager to master their external environment, they also experience a fear of loss at the same time (Bowlby, 1969; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). In other words, as reported by Mikulincer (1997), people high in attachment anxiety appreciate feelings of mastery during exploration, but at the same time, they do not perceive themselves as having enough capability to sustain this exploration or cope with potential distress (Wei, Heppner, & Mallinckrodt, 2003). For individuals high in attachment anxiety, behaving proactively might be a good way of experiencing mastery in the face of a strong focus on future goals, but the fragility of their self-concept means that positive core self-evaluations do not necessarily translate into proactive action. Proactive personality did not have any cross-level moderating effects on the intra-individual links between states and proactivity in this study.

Consistent with the idea that providing a supportive social environment can help to promote proactive behavior, one potential strategy for boosting anxiously attached individuals' proactivity at a given occasion is through cultivating a positive social environment. This is because higher quality of social relationships can help them to reduce their relationship anxiety (Bowlby, 1969/1982) while also strengthening their self-evaluations, such that having positive and reliable social relationships with others will alleviate their worries about loss and positive feedback or personal care from mentors or colleagues can help to strengthen their self-evaluations (Srivastava & Beer, 2005). Thus, for those people, a positive social environment might help both to reduce relationship anxiety and to enhance CSE, thereby increasing the impact of CSE on proactive behavior at any given moment and ultimately fostering proactive behavior.

Conclusion

In this article, we provide reviews on (1) conceptualizations of proactivity, (2) mechanisms,

(3) antecedents, and (4) consequence of proactive behavior. Being proactive involves self-initiated, future-focused, and change-orientated behaviors (Frese & Fay, 2001; Parker et al., 2006), such as designing and implementing new work methods or actively seeking feedback from a supervisor. Such proactivity has been recognized as positive behavior that can lead to the increased performance and effectiveness of individuals and organizations, especially when employees are required to respond to changing conditions and demands (Griffin et al., 2007). Because of its well-documented benefits, the antecedents and mechanisms of proactive behavior have been widely examined in an effort to identify how to promote such behavior in organizations (Fay & Frese, 2001; Parker et al., 2006). As we reviewed, according to Parker, Bindl and Straus (2010), individuals are more likely to engage in proactive action if they have a strong autonomous motivation for bringing about the change ('reason to' pathway); have the self-efficacy to behave proactively and deal with any consequences ('can do' pathway); and if they experience activated positive effects, such as feelings of enthusiasm ('energized to' pathway). Both dispositional (e.g., knowledge/ability, personality) and situational antecedents (e.g., job characteristics, leadership, and organizational climate) and their interactions can shape these motivational state and/or proactive behavior.

We also provide a specific review of our research studies focusing on the dispositional impact on proactive behavior. We highlighted the cognitive and relational aspects of proactive behavior, identified dispositional factors (i.e., need for cognition and attachment styles) relating to these two aspects, and examined contingent effects of situational factors (i.e., job characteristics and leaders' support) to gauge dispositional impact of proactive behavior. We also brought a multilevel perspective to investigate how dispositional factors (attachment styles in particular) shape proactive behavior at inter- and intra-individual level, as reported in different studies.

From our perspective, we suggest it is valuable to strengthen the research on the link between personality and proactive behavior as studies in the past have almost exclusively focused

on proactive personality (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Fuller & Marler, 2009). Our recent studies highlight that proactive personality is not sufficient to explain why some people, but not others, will engage in proactive behavior. It also does not explain why an individual engages in proactive behavior on one occasion but not others (Wu & Parker, 2012a). Thus, we encourage future studies that focus on dispositional factors beyond proactive personality, including studies that delineate the mechanisms by which personality has its effects, and that consider interaction effects with situational factors. We also recommend bringing a multilevel perspective to consider how dispositional factors will influence proactive behavior at inter- and intra-individual context.

References

- Ashford, S. J., & Black, J. S. (1996). Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(2), 199–214.
- Ashford, S. J., Blatt, R., & VandeWalle, D. (2003). Reflections on the looking glass: A review of research on feedback-seeking behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management, 29*(6), 773–799.
- Ashforth, B. E., Sluss, D. M., & Saks, A. M. (2007). Socialization tactics, proactive behavior, and newcomer learning: Integrating socialization models. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 70*, 447–462.
- Axtell, C. M., Holman, D. J., Unsworth, K. L., Wall, T. D., Waterson, P. E., & Harrington, E. (2000). Shopfloor innovation: Facilitating the suggestion and implementation of ideas. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*, 265–285.
- Axtell, C. M., Holman, D. J., & Wall, T. D. (2006). Promoting innovation: A change study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 79*, 509–516.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachandra (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behaviour* (Vol. 4, pp. 71–81). New York: Academic Press.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*(2), 103–118.
- Belschak, F. D., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2010). Pro-self, prosocial, and pro-organizational foci of proactive behaviour: Differential antecedents and consequences.

- Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83, 475–498.
- Berlyne, D. E. (1960). *Conflict, arousal, and curiosity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bettencourt, L. A. (2004). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors: The direct and moderating influence of goal orientation. *Journal of Retailing*, 80, 165–180.
- Bindl, U. K., & Parker, S. K. (2010). Proactive work behavior: Forward-thinking and change-oriented action in organizations. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bindl, U. K., Parker, S. K., Totterdell, P., & Hagger-Johnson, G. (2012). Fuel of the self-starter: How mood relates to proactive goal regulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 134–150.
- Binnewies, C., Ohly, S., & Sonnentag, S. (2007). Taking personal initiative and communicating about ideas: What is important for the creative process and for idea creativity? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16, 432–455.
- Binnewies, C., Sonnentag, S., & Mojza, E. J. (2009). Daily performance at work: Feeling recovered in the morning as a predictor of day-level job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 67–93.
- Biron, M., & Bamberger, P. (2010). The impact of structural empowerment on individual well-being and performance: Taking agent preferences, self-efficacy and operational constraints into account. *Human Relations*, 63, 163–191.
- Bledow, R., & Frese, M. (2009). A situational judgment test of personal initiative and its relationship to performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 62, 229–258.
- Blickle, G., Witzki, A., & Schneider, P. B. (2009). Self-initiated mentoring and career success: A predictive field study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 94–101.
- Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G. J., & van Heerden, J. (2003). The theoretical status of latent variables. *Psychological Review*, 110, 203–219.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss. Vol. 1: Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss. Vol. 1: Attachment*. London: Pimlico.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46–76). New York: Guilford Press.
- 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.
- Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2008). Quitting before leaving: The mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 912–922.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. (1982). The need for cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 116–131.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., Feinstein, J. A., & Jarvis, W. B. G. (1996). Dispositional differences in cognitive motivation: The life and times of individuals varying in need for cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 197–253.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., Kao, C. F., & Rodriguez, R. (1986). Central and peripheral routes to persuasion: An individual difference perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1032–1043.
- Carless, S. A., & Bernath, L. (2007). Antecedents of intent to change careers among psychologists. *Journal of Career Development*, 33, 183–200.
- Carnelley, K. B., & Ruscher, J. B. (2000). Adult attachment and exploratory behaviour in leisure. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 15, 153–165.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1982). Control theory: A useful conceptual framework for personality-social, clinical, and health psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92(1), 111–135.
- 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.
- Chen, G., & Kanfer, R. (2006). Toward a systems theory of motivated behavior in work teams. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 27, 223–267.
- Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 435–462.
- Daniels, K., Boocock, G., Glover, J., Hartley, R., & Holland, J. (2009). An experience sampling study of learning, affect, and the demands control support model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 1003–1017.
- De Vos, A., De Clippeleer, I., & Dewilde, T. (2009). Proactive career behaviours and career success during the early career. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 761–777.
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2007). Personal initiative, commitment and affect at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80, 601–622.
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). When does transformational leadership enhance employee proactive behavior? The role of autonomy and role breadth

- self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 194–202.
- Dorenbosch, L., van Engen, M. L., & Verhagen, M. (2005). On-the-job Innovation: The impact of job design and human resource management through production ownership. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14, 129–141.
- Dutton, J. E., Ashford, S. J., O'Neill, R. M., Hayes, E., & Wierba, E. E. (1997). Reading the wind: How middle managers assess the context for selling issues to top managers. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(5), 407–425.
- Eby, L. T., Butts, M., & Lockwood, A. (2003). Predictors of success in the era of the boundaryless career. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 689–708.
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 109–132.
- Elliot, A. J., & Reis, H. T. (2003). Attachment and exploration in adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 317–331.
- Evans, C. J., Kirby, J. R., & Fabrigar, L. R. (2003). Approaches to learning, need for cognition, and strategic flexibility among university students. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73, 507–528.
- Fay, D., & Frese, M. (2001). The concept of personal initiative: An overview of validity studies. *Human Performance*, 14(1), 97–124.
- Fay, D., & Sonnentag, S. (2002). Rethinking the effects of stressors: A longitudinal study on personal initiative. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7(3), 221–234.
- Feeney, B. C., & Thrush, R. L. (2010). Relationship influences on exploration in adulthood: The characteristics and function of a secure base. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 57–76.
- Fleeson, W. (2001). Toward a structure-and process-integrated view of personality: Traits as density distributions of states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 1011–1027.
- Ford, M. E. (1992). *Motivating humans: Goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fraley, R. C. (2002). Attachment stability from infancy to adulthood: Meta-analysis and dynamic modeling of developmental mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 123–151.
- Fraley, R. C., Vicary, A. M., Brumbaugh, C. C., & Roisman, G. I. (2011). Patterns of stability in adult attachment: An empirical test of two models of continuity and change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 974–992.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions?. *Review of General Psychology*, 2(3), 300–319.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218–226.
- Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative (PI): An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. In B. M. Staw & R. M. Sutton (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 23, pp. 133–187). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- 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.
- Frese, M., Garst, H., & Fay, D. (2007). Making things happen: Reciprocal relationships between work characteristics and personal initiative in a four-wave longitudinal structural equation model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1084–1102.
- 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.
- Fritz, C., & Sonnentag, S. (2009). Antecedents of day-level proactive behavior: A look at job stressors and positive affect during the workday. *Journal of Management*, 35, 94–111.
- Fuller, J. B., & Marler, L. E. (2009). Change driven by nature: A meta-analytic review of the proactive personality literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 75, 329–345.
- Fuller, J. B., Marler, L. E., & Hester, K. (2006). Promoting felt responsibility for constructive change and proactive behavior: Exploring aspects of an elaborated model of work design. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 1089–1120.
- Gardner, D. G. (1986). Activation theory and task design: An empirical test of several new predictions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 411–418.
- Granqvist, P., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2008). Attachment and religious representations and behavior. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd ed., pp. 906–933). New York: Guilford.
- Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 3–34.
- Grant, A. M., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Good soldiers and

- good actors: Prosocial and impression management motives as interactive predictors of affiliative citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 900–912.
- Grant, A. M., Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2009). Getting credit for proactive behavior: Supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(1), 31–55.
- Grant, A. M., & Sumanth, J. J. (2009). Mission possible? The performance of prosocially motivated employees depends on manager trustworthiness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 927–944.
- Green, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2000). Attachment and exploration in adults: Chronic and contextual accessibility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 452–461.
- 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(2), 327–347.
- Griffin, M. A., Parker, S. K., & Mason, C. M. (2010). Leader vision and the development of adaptive and proactive performance: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 174–182.
- Grote, G. (2007). Understanding and assessing safety culture through the lens of organizational management of uncertainty. *Safety Science*, 45, 637–652.
- Gruman, J. A., Saks, A. M., & Zweig, D. I. (2006). Organizational socialization tactics and newcomer proactive behaviors: An integrative study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 90–104.
- Gupta, V. K., & Bhawe, N. M. (2007). The influence of proactive personality and stereotype threat on women's entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13, 73–85.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250–279.
- Haugtvedt, C., & Petty, R. E. (1992). Personality and persuasion: Need for cognition moderates the persistence and resistance of attitude change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 308–319.
- Hockey, G. R. J. (1993). Cognitive-energetic control mechanisms in the management of work demands and psychological health. In A. D. Baddeley & L. Weiskrantz (Eds.), *Attention: Selection, awareness, and control: A tribute to Donald Broadbent* (pp. 328–345). New York, NY: Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press.
- Howell, J. M., & Shea, C. M. (2001). Individual differences, environmental scanning, innovation framing, and champion behavior: Key predictors of project performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 18, 15–27.
- Ilies, R., & Judge, T. A. (2005). Goal regulation across time: The effects of feedback and affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 453–467.
- Isen, A. M. (1999). On the relationship between affect and creative problem solving. In S. Russ (Ed.), *Affect, creative experience, and psychological adjustment* (pp. 3–17). Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis.
- Janssen, O., & Van Yperen, N. W. (2004). Employees' goal orientations, the quality of leader-member exchange, and the outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 368–384.
- Johnston, M. A. (1999). Influences of adult attachment in exploration. *Psychological Reports*, 84, 31–34.
- Kanfer, R., Wanberg, C. R., & Kantrowitz, T. M. (2001). Job search and employment: A personality-motivational analysis and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 837–855.
- Kashdan, T. B., & Steger, M. F. (2007). Curiosity and pathways to well-being and meaning in life: Traits, states, and everyday behaviors. *Motivation and Emotion*, 31, 159–173.
- Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 485–516.
- Leach, D. J., Wall, T. D., & Jackson, P. R. (2003). The effect of empowerment on job knowledge: An empirical test involving operators of complex technology. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76, 27–52.
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6), 853–868.
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(2), 326–336.
- Loewenstein, G. (1994). The psychology of curiosity: A review and reinterpretation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 75–98.
- Madjar, N., Oldham, G. R., & Pratt, M. G. (2002). There's no place like home? The contributions of work and non-work creativity to support employee's creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 757–767.
- Major, D. A., Turner, J. E., & Fletcher, T. D. (2006). Linking proactive personality and the Big Five to motivation to learn and development activity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 927–935.
- Mark, B. A., Hughes, L. C., Belyea, M., Chang, Y., Hofmann, D., Jones, C. B., & Bacon, C. T. (2007). Does safety

- climate moderate the influence of staffing adequacy and work conditions on nurse injuries? *Journal of Safety Research*, 38, 431–446.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible Selves. *American Psychologist*, 41(9), 954–969.
- McAllister, D. J., Kamdar, D., Morrison, E. W., & Turban, D. B. (2007). Disentangling role perceptions: How perceived role breadth, discretion, instrumentality, and efficacy relate to helping and taking charge. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1200–1211.
- Meyer, R. D., Dalal, R. S., & Hermida, R. (2010). A review and synthesis of situational strength in the organizational sciences. *Journal of Management*, 36, 121–140.
- Mikulincer, M. (1997). Adult attachment style and information processing: Individual differences in curiosity and cognitive closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 1217–1230.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system theory of personality: Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. *Psychological Review*, 102(2), 246–268.
- Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1998). Reconciling processing dynamics and personality dispositions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 229–258.
- Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2003). Work design. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 423–452). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Morrison, E. W. (1993a). Longitudinal study of the effects of information seeking on newcomer socialization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), 173–183.
- Morrison, E. W. (1993b). Newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 557–589.
- Morrison, E. W., & Bies, R. J. (1991). Impression management in the feedback-seeking process: A literature review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(3), 522–541.
- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 403–419.
- Ohly, S., & Fritz, C. (2007). Challenging the status quo: What motivates proactive behavior? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80, 623–629.
- Ohly, S., & Fritz, C. (2010). Work characteristics, challenge appraisal, creativity, and proactive behavior: A multi-level study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 543–565.
- Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., & Pluntke, F. (2006). Routinization, work characteristics and their relationships with creative and proactive behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 257–279.
- Parker, S. K. (1998). Enhancing role breadth self-efficacy: The roles of job enrichment and other organizational interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6), 835–852.
- Parker, S. K. (2007). *How positive affect can facilitate proactive behavior in the work place*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Conference, Philadelphia, USA.
- Parker, S. K., & Axtell, C. M. (2001). Seeing another view point: Antecedents and outcomes of employee perspective-taking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 1085–1100.
- Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K., & Strauss, K. (2010). Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. *Journal of Management*, 36, 827–856.
- Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 36, 633–662.
- Parker, S. K., & Ohly, S. (2008). Designing motivating work. In R. Kanfer, G. Chen, & R. Pritchard (Eds.), *Work motivation: Past, present, and future*: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 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(4), 899–929.
- Parker, S. K., Williams, H. M., & Turner, N. (2006). Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 636–652.
- Parker, S. K., & Wu, C. -H. (in press). Leading for proactivity: How leaders cultivate staff who make things happen. In D. V. Day (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Raabe, B., Frese, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2007). Action regulation theory and career self-management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70, 297–311.
- Rank, J., Carsten, J. M., Unger, J. M., & Spector, P. E. (2007). Proactive customer service performance: Relationships with individual, task, and leadership variables. *Human Performance*, 20(4), 363–390.
- Rank, J., Nelson, N. E., Allen, T. D., & Xu, X. (2009). Leadership predictors of innovation and task performance: Subordinates’ self-esteem and self-presentation as moderators. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 465–489.

- Ruiter, R. A. C., Verplanken, B., Cremer, D. D., & Kok, G. (2004). Danger control and fear control in response to fear appeals: The role of need for cognition. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 26*, 13–24.
- Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1999). Effects of individual differences and job search behaviors on the employment status of recent university graduates. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 335–349.
- Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behaviour. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19*(1), 116–131.
- 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*(3), 580–607.
- 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*(2), 845–874.
- Sonnetag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between nonwork and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(3), 518–528.
- Sonnetag, S., & Niessen, C. (2008). Staying vigorous until work is over: The role of trait vigour, day-specific work experiences and recovery. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 81*, 435–458.
- Speier, C., & Frese, M. (1997). Generalized self-efficacy as a mediator and moderator between control and complexity at work and personal initiative: A longitudinal field study in East Germany. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 171–192.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1996). Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*, 483–504.
- Srivastava, S., & Beer, J. S. (2005). How self-evaluations relate to being liked by others: Integrating sociometer and attachment perspectives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 966–977.
- Steinhart, Y., & Wyer, R. S. (2009). Motivational correlates of need for cognition. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*, 608–621.
- Strauss, K., Griffin, M. A., & Parker, S. K. (2012). Future work selves: How salient hoped-for identities motivate proactive career behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*, 580–598.
- Strauss, K., Griffin, M. A., & Rafferty, A. E. (2009). Proactivity directed toward the team and organization: The role of leadership, commitment, and role-breadth self-efficacy. *British Journal of Management, 20*, 279–291.
- Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2008). Exploring nonlinearity in employee voice: The effects of personal control and organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal, 51*, 1189–1203.
- Thomas, J. P., Whitman, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (2010). Employee proactivity in organizations: A comparative meta-analysis of emergent proactive constructs. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*, 275–300.
- Thompson, J. A. (2005). Proactive personality and job performance: A social capital perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 1011–1017.
- Thorlakson, A. J. H., & Murray, R. P. (1996). An empirical study of empowerment in the workplace. *Group & Organization Management, 21*, 67–83.
- Tidwell, M., & Sias, P. (2005). Personality and information seeking: Understanding how traits influence information-seeking behaviors. *Journal of Business Communication, 42*, 51–77.
- Tuckey, M., Brewer, N., & Williamson, P. (2002). The influence of motives and goal orientation on feedback seeking. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75*, 195–216.
- Van Dyne, L., & Le Pine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(1), 108–119.
- VandeWalle, D., Ganesan, S., Challagalla, G. N., & Brown, S. P. (2000). An integrated model of feedback-seeking behavior: Disposition, context, and cognition. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(6), 996–1003.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley.
- Wall, T. D., Cordery, J. L., & Clegg, C. W. (2002). Empowerment, performance, and operational Uncertainty: A theoretical integration. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 51*, 146–169.
- Wanberg, C. R., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of proactivity in the socialization process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 373–385.
- Wei, M., Heppner, P. P., & Mallinckrodt, B. (2003). Perceived coping as a mediator between attachment and psychological distress: A structural equation modeling approach. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*, 438–447.
- White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review, 66*, 297–333.
- Wu, C. -H., & Parker, S. K. (2011). Proactivity in the work

- place: Looking back and looking forward. In K. Cameron & G. Spreitzer (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wu, C. -H., & Parker, S. K. (2012a). The role of attachment styles in shaping proactive behaviour: An intra-individual analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85, 523–530.
- Wu, C. -H., & Parker, S. K. (2012b). *A secure base for proactivity: How supportive leaders compensate for individuals' insecure attachment styles* Unpublished manuscript.
- Wu, C. -H., Parker, S. K., & de Jong, J. P. J. (in press). Need for cognition as an antecedent of individual innovation behavior. *Journal of Management*, doi: 10.1177/0149206311429862

深谋远虑：前瞻行为研究的回顾与展望

吴佳辉 Sharon K. Parker

(西澳大学商学院, 澳大利亚)

摘要 前瞻行为是一个自我发起、未来导向以及试图改变现状的积极行为,能够为个人与组织带来正面的影响。本文旨在回顾前瞻行为的本质、前导因素、动机历程以及结果效应,也特别回顾笔者近期针对前瞻行为所进行的研究。首先,关于前瞻一词可以从不同的角度进行理解,包括个别差异观点、行为观点与历程观点。由于过去文献多从行为观点进行研究,本文的回顾亦以行为观点为主轴。其次,本文逐一回顾目前文献所提出的三个关于促进前瞻行为的动机历程:能力、缘由与情绪。再者,笔者讨论各种能够促发前瞻行为的前导因素,包括个人因素、环境因素,以及两者间的交互作用如何影响前瞻行为的展现。笔者也基于过去的研究发现,总结前瞻行为所能导致的结果,包括工作态度与绩效。最后,在近期研究的介绍中,笔者介绍了三个根据个别差异的观点所进行的研究。此研究路线旨在了解人格特质对前瞻行为的影响,并且勾勒情境所扮演的调节效应。全文最终总结前瞻行为的研究现状,以及提出未来可能探索的研究方向。

关键词 前瞻行为;人格特质;组织行为

分类号 B849:C93