ISSN No. 2349-7165

"Correlates Of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Implication With Educational Institutions"

Ms. Tapati Roy Yadav
Research Scholar, Discipline of Psychology, SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi, India
Contact details-tapatiroy2011@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study explores few exceptional consequences of organizational citizenship behavior. It makes an attempt to draw implications for educational institute to its benefit. In past few decades the profile of educator has become complex. Job description of a teacher includes so many factors that many of them cannot be penned down. Teaching is an art and skill that requires certain innate qualities to give better results. The study aims to critically examine the well and ill effect of Organizational citizenship behavior. This is a narrative review of literature on the consequences of Organizational citizenship behavior and not a Meta analytic representation. Negative consequences are not found to be very significant and number of studies conducted is very less. The present study neither challenges the construct of organizational citizenship behavior nor advocates reduction of engagement with the same. This paper is an effort to bring the possible losses in knowledge of management and human resource practitioner of educational institutes. The study aims to broaden our understanding towards positive work values, positive job values and positive lifestyle. This is also an initiative to guide the academicians to behave in a manner that help them inculcate Similar attributes in their students who would need to project healthy organizational citizenship behavior to be successful in later stage. The paper also indicates that there is much more to unveil with respect to organizational citizenship behavior.

INTRODUCTION

In present scenario of multiple challenges faced by educational institutions, the only way to stay ahead is to bank upon belongingness and performance of academic and non academic staff. The contributing factors to organizational citizenship behavior should be identified and promoted. Organizational citizenship behavior can be classified as set of behaviors which are neither evidently observed in performance nor distinctly mentioned in manuals. Such behaviors are neither rewarded nor punished by the management (Dipaola, 2001). Institutes would prefer research orientated proactive employees who are innovative, expressive, vigilant and motivated and can contribute in the structural development, handhold the coworker and instill values in students.

As identified by katz (1964) there are three basic type of behavior required for any organization to function properly and they are, remaining with the system, carrying out well defined roles and spontaneity to go beyond role description. Organizational citizenship behavior was originally coined by Smith, Near, Bateman & Organ (1983).

Later in (1990) Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman and Fetter proposed the contextual framework of organizational citizenship behavior with five dimensions, namely conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, helping behavior and civic virtue. Although it was brought into attention that organizational citizenship behavior may have some negative consequences as well (Bolino and Turnley, 2005), it was greatly ignored.

The research in academic setup with relation to organizational citizenship behavior started much later where in a positive relationship was established between school climate and organizational citizenship behavior (Dipaola an Tschannen-Moran, 2001).The aim of this review is to reflect on nature of organizational

citizenship behavior, its effect on academic institute, its positive and negative impact on present life and future generation.

Organ (1988) defined organizational citizenship behavior as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization."Van Dyne (1995) observes the researchers and researches focused more upon establishing relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with other constructs than working into its definition. Some studies at later stage suggests that organizational citizenship behavior is not perceived purely as behavior that is beyond formal job requirement (Fischer and smith, 2006; Morrison, 1994).To overcome this uncertainty it was suggested that if a behavior creates positive effects on social, psychological, organizational and political context, than on technical context, it can be defined as organizational citizenship behavior by focusing on result (Farh, 2004).

Katz lay the foundation of organizational citizenship behavior by proposing dimensions of innovativeness and spontaneous behavior, which included cooperating with others, protecting the organization, volunteering constructive ideas, self training and maintaining a favorable attitude towards the organization (Katz,1964).

Smith ,Organ and Near conducted factor analysis taking 16 item measure of organizational citizenship behavior which resulted into two factors Altruism and Conscientiousness (Smith , Organ and Near,1983). Organ developed a five factor model by destruction which was composed of five dimensions altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue (Organ, 1983).

In 1991 itself Williams and Anderson categorized organizational citizenship behavior construct in two dimension organizational citizenship behavior –organization(OCB-O) and organizational citizenship behavior-individual(OCB-I).OCBI included behavior towards self and peers, whereas OCBO studied behavior directly relate to the organization.(Williams and Anderson,1991).In 1994 three dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior were introduced by Van Dyne, namely obedience, loyalty and participation.(Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch,1994). In later stage seven common themes of organizational citizenship behavior were proposed by Podsakoff (2000) which were labeled as helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue and self development.

Organizational citizenship behavior is believed to be a significant contributor in effectiveness and efficiency of any organization (Organ and Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff and Mackenzie, 1997). It is worthwhile to note that in later stage empirical researches found contradictory relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational outcomes. Employee dissatisfaction, Burnout at individual level, and stress at workplace are some of the negative output of organizational citizenship behavior which causes adverse effect both at organizational and individual level (Williams, 1989). Organizational citizenship behavior shares attributes with impression management behavior in such overlapping manner that it can be mistaken for each other easily (Bolino, 1999; Eastman, 1994).

Organizational citizenship behavior in educational Institution

Educational institutions play a significant role in shaping generations. The higher education learning centers are the feeder institutes for the industry. Every single factor that contributes towards organizational growth is learned in the institute .The innate attributes are shaped appropriately or shaped under supervision of academic and non academic staff of the institute. Unfortunately not much has been done in field of academics with relation to organizational citizenship behavior.

A very prominent reason for this ignorance could be the fact that performance, productivity, commitment, extra role behavior are rather difficult to assess in such set up, where goals and duties remain in ambiguity

(Leveille, 2006).Measuring effectiveness in educational institutes is challenging (Cameron, 1980; O'Neil, 1999).To achieve the optimum in organizations by organizational standards it is mandatory to focus more on exemplary leadership in academic institutions. Ambiguity and substandard leadership will produce disoriented youth (Astin and Astin, 2000; Shriberg, 2005).Higher education learning centers are constantly challenged to perform dual function of creation of knowledge and sharing of knowledge simultaneously (Pienaar and Bester, 2006).

Since the educational institutes are torch bearer in field of knowledge and propagator of values, it is only sensible to include academic and non academic staff in studies of organizational citizenship behavior, in order to identify needs, improve existing conditions and encourage higher level of performance (Serife, Zihni, Eyupoglu, 2015).It is believed that an employee may selectively display organizational citizenship behavior (LePine et.al.,2002).Effort should be made to research the gap in existing literature with relation to organizational citizenship behavior and educational institutions, because it is a proven fact that organizations becomes more successful where more employees are engaged in organizational citizenship behavior(Yen and Neihoff,2004).This can be achieved with trained work force and the results will be better if people receive training in younger stage while they are still pursuing formal education.

Unconventional Determinants of organizational citizenship behavior

Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation

Blau in 1964 hypothesized that employees who are intrinsically motivated and self directed are more engaged in organizational citizenship behavior and reciprocative. Most of the time educational institutes fail to design activities in an interesting way so as to keep the profile of educator challenging and interesting that they remain intrinsically motivated to accomplish goals. However such tasks can be associated with appropriate incentives to keep them motivated extrinsically (Ryan and Deci, 2000).As word of caution, overemphasis on extrinsic motivation lead to negative effects (Kelsey, 2010).It is important to practice the value of organizational citizenship behavior amongst teachers who are extrinsically motivated to increase their performance (Tan Yew Huei, Nur Naha Abu Mansor, Huam Hon Tat, 2014).

Sometimes tasks that undermines individual employees' caliber may also contribute to higher indulgence in organizational citizenship behavior. People may get disinterested in the meager activities and exhibit more pro social behavior (Bolino, 2004).Educational institutes should have clear demarcation of group activities and individual responsibilities. Overindulgence in organizational citizenship behavior sometimes lead the employee to overlook routine tasks that disinterests them, may be of lesser importance, to be a part of assignment that may entice them. Moreover such behavior can be assessed better by the supervisor considering the unique nature of organizational citizenship behavior, and core work of the institute may suffer (DeNisi, Cafferty, and Meglino, 1984).

Procedural Justice

Educational institutes are also advised to design and implement a reward system free of bias and defined in very clear terminologies with each task being operationally defined to keep the morale of teachers high, and to ensure continuous engagement with organizational citizenship behavior. Procedural justice strengthens organizational citizenship behavior (Tyler and Blader, 2003), commitment and trust (Korsgaard, Schweiger, Sapienza, 1995) and work performance(Lavalle, Brockner, Konovsky, Price, Henley,Taneja and Vinekar (2009).A positive relationship was found in organizational citizenship behavior and organizational justice, amongst primary school teachers(Kursad Yilmaz,Murat Tastan,2009).Employees adapt fair strategy ,and do more when they believe organizational procedure had been fair towards them, because they attribute this to be organizations willingness to be fair to them (Shore and Shore ,1995).

Employee engagement

Employee engagement is a positive, fulfilling work related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli,2002).Engaged employees appears to show more discretionary behaviors to improve the organization as well as to fulfill their role ,and are effectively(Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004).In the case of disengagement employee withdraw from role performance and try to defend themselves cognitively, physically, or emotionally(Kahn,1990).In educational institutions opportunities of skill development for career advancement should not be compensated with monetary reinforcement as it only adds to frustration and disengagement(Cartwright and Holmes,2006). Since different profession have their own specifics, management should focus more on emotional exhaustion and stress during engagement building process of teaching staff. Resource allocation should be free of prejudice or criticism. Employees evaluate resources and support provided to them and decides whether or not to engage in relation to the resources received (Maryana Sakovska, 2012).

Individual factor

Organizational citizenship behavior may not be always a positive indicator of job satisfaction, employee engagement or commitment. Research shows that sometimes individual who are otherwise dissatisfied may also show positive signs and high relevance to organizational citizenship behavior(Spector and Fox ,2010;Joireman et.al.,2006;Bolino,2004;Haworth and Levy,2001).People sometimes indulge heavily in organizational responsibilities to cope with personal failure at some other front or dissatisfaction with family life (Rioux and Penner ,2001).

Management in educational institutions should provide counseling services to both academic and non academic staff, along with students to help them overcome conflicts. Educational premises should be fostering grounds for creative and constructive output instead of becoming a place to sulk and escape from other important responsibilities of life.

Noteworthy Negative Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Few studies have thrown light on the undesired output of organizational citizenship behavior which otherwise remains unnoticed or paid very less attention in today's world. It has been found that Organizational citizenship behavior while bringing all the happiness for organization may cause unhappiness to personal life.

Organizational citizenship behavior sometimes demands the employee to put in extra effort in organizational tasks and family gets neglected, The employee spends less time with family which stimulates work-family conflict (Pezji,2010; Bolino and Turnley,2005).Though in educational institutes staying late is rare practice it happens once in a while owing to some cultural event or inspections. Teachers should be given ample free time during work hours to focus on research. Cultural event should be followed by calendar strictly and preparation for the same should take place in regular schedule. Though there is lack of evidence it has been observed that in some institutions turnover rate is high because of after hour meetings with the management. Sometimes the need to project organizational citizenship behavior is so strong that the employee feels pressured to act in certain way (Perlow and Weeks, 2002)

Sportsman ship is one of the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior which is defined as willingness of employees to tolerate less than ideal organizational situation without complaining or sacrificing one's own personal interest. It has been observed that eventually maintaining silence over matters that matter would bring low quality of work for the organization (Bagheri, Zarei and Aaeen (2012).Through Silence organizational members hold down fears about problematic personnel and organizational issues including awkwardness, absence of ethical responsibility, decreased chance for raising voice (Joinson,1996).Educational institutes should designate someone as management representative who would

interact with academic and non academic staff as well as students, collect feedback and help the institute remain conducive of positive energy. Employee silence is extremely detrimental to the organization, causing an escalating level of dissatisfaction (Colquitt and Greenberg, 2014)

In recent researches it was found that when employee spends a lot of time in helping co workers they could be overlooking the core task assigned to them, which sometimes results into bad quality work. (Bolino, 2004).In educational institute this may cause more harm than manifested. Most of the time the teacher is concerned with conducting researches, writing book, preparing notes etc. Poor quality of output will multiply itself with the number of people who directly or indirectly access the material. Frequently extended help will also arouse resentment in receiver (Fisher, Nadler, Whitcher-Alagna, 1982; Van Dyne and Ellis 2004). The receiver of help may feel incompetent. Sometimes the one who extends help could also be insufficiently trained or not competent enough (Beehr, 2010). Sometimes the receiver of help may not be in need of any help and consider the extended help as encroachment. This will cause more harm to the institute than any help. It is better to assign new joinees to senior teacher as attaché.

Evidences suggest positive relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and role overload (Pezil, 2010).Role overload is defined as the degree to which role expectations exceed the amount of time and resources offered for their accomplishment (Bolino and Turnley, 2005). Role overload induces stress in the individual. Employee under stress will be disinterested in work. There will be marked drop in productivity and the employee shall abstain from work. There will be increased incidences of conflict with superior and increased chances of accidents (Van Dyne and Ellis,2004).A research conducted on teachers revealed organizational citizenship behavior ,work-family conflict , stress, and burn out effect are positively associated (Hannam and Jimmieson,2002;Oplatka,2009).Teachers in present era are also burdened with huge amount clerical tasks. Management should make provision to provide them with assistance, so that their intellectual capital can be put to more effective and valuable use in a constructive manner.

It was found that more time spent on organizational citizen behavior lead to less increase in salary, lower promotional prospects and slower career advancements (Bergeron, Shipp, Rosen and Furst, 2013).It is advisable that educational institutes periodically conduct training programs to train both academic and non academic staff in organizational citizenship behavior. The institute can also impart a customized training module on students to equip future mangers in organizational citizenship behavior. As it is assumed that relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational effectiveness is likely to be negative where employees are not trained to perform specific organizational citizenship behavior (Bolino, 2004).

There is a positive relationship between social loafing and organizational citizenship behavior (Mulvey and Klein,1998).More organizational citizenship behavior displayed by an employee towards his/her co worker will result in more social loafing by the coworker(Hogg and Voughan,2005).In long run excessive importance placed on organizational citizenship behavior may cause much trouble by increase in social loafing in educational institute .In educational institute it is difficult to evaluate every employees performance in precise terms, especially when they get involved in group assignment. In such case the institute may fall prey to basic human tendency of copying the observable behavior and learning by modeling. The management should device an assessment chart based on in-role behavior, that measurable with observable evaluation system a, so as to help the supervisor to keep record of individual contribution (Harun, Semith, and Ebru, 2014)

Limitation of the study

Organizational citizenship behavior is always considered as major contributor towards organizational success. Most of the researcher focused only on the positive aspect of organizational citizenship behavior. As

a matter of fact, no concept or construct can only be positive with any hindrances, the present study is an effort to investigate the negative consequences of organizational citizenship behavior. Since very researcher worked on negative results of organizational citizenship behavior there is dearth of relevant literature. Though the present study aims to alert educational institutions, not many empirical evidences are available pertaining educational sector.

Implications of the study

The study concerns with few unusual consequences of organizational citizenship behavior. Though the findings were not from educational sector nevertheless it would help in framing strategies that would help the institute grow in a positive manner and gain optimum result from organizational citizenship behavior of employees. Management should be able to reduce the negative impact of organizational citizenship behavior as work –family conflict, role overload, counterproductive behaviors, stress and social loafing. Positive consequences of less explored determinants of organizational citizenship behavior would help manager to frame and implement policies that strengthens organizational citizenship behavior.

Scope for future research

This paper is based on findings of previous researches .As it is evident from the findings a lot of scope lies unexplored in field of organizational citizenship behavior. Each finding that is been quoted in this study can be replicated and verified with respect to field of education choosing a different sample from academics.

Another variable with respect to organizational citizenship behavior is gender. A very different outcome can be expected from conducting similar kind of studies with respect to gender.

Conclusion

Every concept has dual aspects. Mangers should weigh the consequences before implementation of certain schemes or before expecting certain set of behavior. Any behavior that is considered as fetching may end up causing loss if adequate attention is not paid. Sometimes the whole system gets carried away in a one direction that the faulty aspect is overlooked. Organizational citizenship behavior has got many positive results in the organizational world. The Researchers have now started analyzing the negative aspect of organizational citizenship behavior too.

Intrinsic motivation, procedural judgment and employee engagement can influence organizational citizenship behavior strongly if played wisely. It is moral responsibility of the organization to ensure that employee should not use work place as an excuse to escape responsibilities of family. Work should be divided between individual and group in such manner that by all means there is a personal accountability of the task accomplished. Social loafing should be discouraged by all means in any degree. The present paper opens up ample of opportunity to conduct empirical studies related to organizational citizenship behavior and its negative consequences.

Reference

1. Abdul Rauf, F.H.,(2014). Two Sides of the Same Coin: Harmful Or Helpful□A Critical Review of The Consequences Of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. International Journal of Business management Review.(4)

2. Bagheri G., Zarei R., and Aeen M.N.,(2012).Organizational Concepts And Its Developmental Factors. Ideal Type of Management (1)

3. Bakker, A. B, Demerouti, E., and Verbeke, W.(2004).Using The Job Demands: Resources Model To Predict Burnout And Performance. Human Resource Management(43)

4. Beehr, T. A., Bowling, N.A., & Bennet, M.M.(2010).Occupational Stress and failures of social support: When helping hurts. Journal of occupational Health psychology.(15)

5. Bolino, M.C., & Turnley, W.H.(2005).The Personal Costs Of Citizenship Behavior: The Relationship Between Individual Initiative And Role Overload, Job Stress, And Work –Family Conflict. Journal of Applied Psychology.(90)

6. Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W.H., & Niehoff, B.P. (2004).The Other Side Of The Story: Reexamining Prevailing Assumptions About Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Human Resource Management Review(14)

7. Cameron, K.S.(1980).Critical Questions In Assessing Organizational Effectiveness. Organizational Dynamics.(4)

8. Cartwright, S., and Holmes, N., (2006).The Meaning of Work: The Challenge of Regaining Employee Engagement and Reducing Cynicism. Human resource Management Review (16).

9. Colquitt, J.A., Greenberg, J., and Phelan, C.P.,(2005). What is organizational justice□a historical overview. Handbook of Organizational Justice.(1)

10. DeNisi, A .S., Cafferty, T.P., & Meglino, B.M.,(1984).A Cognitive View Of The Performance Appraisal Process: A Model And Research Propositions. Organizational behavior and Human Performance(33)

11. Dipaola, M.F. & Tschannen-Moran, M(2001).Organizational Citizenship Behavior In Schools And Its Relationship To School Climate. Journal of School leadership (11)

12. Eastman , K.K.(1994).In The Eyes Of Beholder: An Attribution Approach To Integration And Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Academy of Management Journal(37)

13. Farh, J., Zhong, C.,& Organ D.W.,(2004)Organizational Citizenship Behavior In The People's Republic Of China. Organization Science(15)

14. Fischer, R., & Smith, P.B. (2006).Who Cares about Justice□The moderating effect of value on the link between organizational justice and work behavior. Applied psychology: An international Review (55).

15. Fisher ,J.D., Nadler,A. & Whitcher –Alagna,S.(1982).Recipient reactions to aid. Psychological Bulletin.(91)

16. Graham, J.W.,(1991)An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. Employee responsibilities and Rights journal(4)

17. Hannam, R.L., & Jimmieson, N.L.,(2002).The Relationship Between Extra-Role Behaviors And Job Burnout For Primary School Teachers: A Preliminary Model And Development Of An Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale. Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research(1-17).

18. Haworth, C.L. and Levy, P.E.(2001) The importance of instrumentality beliefs in the prediction of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of vocational behavior(59)

19. Kahn,W.A.,(1990).Psychological Conditions Of Personal Engagement And Disengagement At Work. Academy of Management Journal(33).

20. Katz, D.(1964).The motivational basis of organizational behavior. Behavioral Science (9)

21. Kelsey, J.(2010).The negative impact of rewards and ineffective praise on student motivation. ESSAI(8)

22. Konovsky, M.A.& Pugh ,S.D.(1994).Citizenship Behavior And Social Exchange. Academy of Management Journal.(37)

23. Lavalle J. J., Brockner J., Konovsky M.A., Price K.H., Henley A.B., Taneja A., Vinekar V.,(2009).Commitment, Procedural Fairness, And Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Multifold Analysis. Journal of organizational Behavior(30)

24. Lepine, J. A., Erez, A.,& Johnson D.E.,(2002).The Nature And Dimensionality Of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Critical Review And Meta –Analysis. Journal and Applied Psychology(87)

25. Leveille, D.(2006)Accountability In Higher Education: A Public Agenda For Trust And Cultural Change. Centre For Studies In Higher Education.(30)

26. Maryana Sakovska (2012) Importance of employee engagement in business environment: Measuring the engagement level of administrative personnel in VUC Aarhus and detecting factors requiring improvement .School of Business and Social Sciences

27. Mulvey W. P., and Howard J. Klein (1998). The impact of perceived loafing and collective Efficacy on group Goal processes and group performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes(74)

28. Pienaar, C., Bester, C.,(2008).Retention of Academics in the early career phase. Journal of Human Resource Management(6)

29. Pezij, A.M.,(2010)when helping others is harmful to yourself: Moderating effects of motives on the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and negative outcomes. Master Thesis work and organizational Psychology.

30. Perlow, L., and Weeks J., (2002) who is helping whom□Lyers of culture and workplace behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior.(23)

31. Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S. B. Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational Leader Behaviors And Their Effects On Followers' Trust In Leader, Satisfaction, And Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. Leadership Quarterly(1)

32. Oplatka, I.(2009).Organizational behavior in teaching: The consequences for teachers, pupils, and the school. International Journal of Educational management (23).

33. Organ D.W.,& Konovsky, M.(1989).Cognitive Vs Affective Determinants Of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Journal of Applied psychology(74)

34. Ryan, R.M.,& Deci ,E.L.(2000)Self –Determination Theory And The Facilitation Of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, And Well Being. American Psychologist (55)

35. Sax, L. J., Astin, A.W., Arredondo, M., Korn, W.S.(1996).The American Colege Teacher: National Norms For The 1995-1996 HERI Faculty Survey. Higher Education Research Institute, Graduate School Education and Information.

36. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzale-Roma,V.,& Bakker, A.B.(2002).The Measurement Of Engagement And Burnout: A Confirmative Analytic Approach. Journal of happiness studies(3)

37. Shore, L., M., & Shore, T.H.,(1995).Perceived Organizational Support And Organizational Justice In R.S. Cropanzano & K. M. Kacmar (Eds). Managing the social climate of the work place.

38. Smith, C. A., Organ, D.W., & Near, J.P (1983).Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature And Antecedents. Journal of Applied psychology (68)

39. Tyler, T.R., & Blader S.L.,(2009)Testing And Extending The Group Engagement Model: Linkages Between Social Identity, Procedural Justice , Economic Outcomes ,And Extra Role Behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology(2009)

40. Van Dyne, L., & Ellis, J.B.(2004).Job Creep: A Reactance Theory Perspective On Organizational Citizenship Behavior As Over Fulfillment Of Obligations. J.A.M. Coyle.

41. Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L.L., & McLean Parks, J.(1995).Extra- Role Behaviors: In Pursuit Of Construct And Definition Clarity. Research in Organizational Behavior.(17)

42. Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W.,& Dienesch, R.M.(1994).Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Construct Redefinition, Measurement And Validation. Academy of Management Journal(37)

43. Williams L.J., Anderson S.E., (1991).Job Satisfaction And Organizational Commitment As Predictors Of Organizational Citizenship And In Role Behaviors. Journal of Management (17)