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EDITORIAL FOREWORD

This is the twenty-seventh volume of the International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (IRIOP) and the eighth volume to have appeared under our editorship. As in previous years we have assembled a collection of scholarly reviews covering major developments across a wide spectrum of topics at the forefront of the field. Each chapter offers a comprehensive and critical survey of the chosen topic, and each is supported by a valuable bibliography.

The opening chapter entitled: “The Self-Concept in Organizational Psychology: Clarifying and Differentiating the Constructs” by John Schaubroeck, You Jin Kim, and Ann Chunyan Peng provides a useful overview of a series of closely related yet distinct constructs pertaining to the self-concept notions that have evolved in a rather disparate fashion across various of the social science disciplines and which have been brought to bear on the analysis of behavior in organizations. Organizational researchers have adopted different terms and defined self-concept constructs in different ways that have the potential to hinder knowledge sharing and knowledge accumulation. Focusing on three of the most researched self-constructs: self-efficacy, self-esteem, and self-construal (i.e., identity and identification), the authors clarify the terms in use and survey the major developments that have occurred over the past six years of research conducted by organizational psychologists and management researchers.

In keeping with the series tradition the majority of the chapters in the present volume offer new insights into topics covered previously in the series. Gary Latham and Edwin Locke’s chapter, “The Effect of Subconscious Goals on Organizational Behavior” is one such chapter, which explores the well-established question of how goals influence organizational behavior. However, by drawing on state-of-the-art advances in social and cognitive psychology pertaining to the nature and role of the subconscious the authors develop a highly original contribution that not only breaks new ground in I/O Psychology but also challenges the underlying assumptions of the foundational work upon which they base their arguments, thereby providing stimulus for a new wave of research at the interfaces of all three subfields. The chapters by Nathan Bowling, Terry Beehr, and Simone Grebner (“Combating Stress in Organizations”), Robert Ployhart (“Personnel Selection and the Competitive Advantage of Firms”), Stephen Zaccaro and Gia DiRosa (“The Processes of Team Staffing: A Review of Relevant Studies”), and David Lepak, Kaifeng Jiang, Jia Hu, Kyongji Han, and William Castellano (“Strategic HRM Moving Forward: What Can We Learn from Micro Perspectives?”) similarly advance new perspectives on topics that have long occupied the attention of I/O psychologists. Like the
chapter by Latham and Locke, in each case they do so by drawing on material that lays beyond the conventional boundaries of the core I/O Psychology literature in order to pose new questions and expand the frontiers of knowledge.

The remaining chapters, by Desiree Van Dun and Celeste Wilderom (“Human Dynamics and Enablers of Effective Lean Team Cultures and Climates”) and Kenneth Brown, Steven Charlier, and Abigail Pierotti (“e-Learning at Work: Contributions of Past Research and Suggestions for the Future”), address topics that have yet to attract significant scholarly attention from the I/O Psychology research community, notwithstanding their obvious importance as issues of pressing concern within the world of practice. In both cases the authors highlight significant opportunities for psychologists to bring theoretical insights and methodological rigor to bear in an arena where they have much to offer to colleagues from other disciplines that lack the requisite expertise pertaining to human behavior at work.

Finally, we have an important announcement to make regarding the future of IRIOP. In view of the growing number of outlets seeking to solicit high quality reviews from the world’s leading scholars on topics that fall within its thematic purview, the time has come to revisit the modus operandi of the series. Many changes have occurred in the world of scholarly publishing over the 28 years that have passed since the series was commissioned – not least the growing emphasis by our paymasters on the value of peer reviewed journal articles in internationally regarded outlets, evidenced by citation metrics in globally recognized databases such as the Thomson Reuters Web of KnowledgeSM. Accordingly, following a major strategic review of the series, we are delighted to announce that from 2013 onwards IRIOP will be incorporated as an annual review issue within the Journal of Organizational Behavior (JOB). The rationale and mission of the IRIOP annual review issue remains unchanged: to attract and publish the highest possible quality scholarly review articles that survey leading-edge developments across the full spectrum of topics that fall within the domain of industrial and organizational psychology/organizational behavior.

In future, all manuscripts will undergo formal peer review through a two-stage double-blind process. First, potential authors will submit a proposal document in the form of an extended abstract. Incorporating a clear statement of the intended contribution of the proposed article, together with an indicative bibliography, the most promising proposals will be sent out to anonymous expert reviewers for independent scrutiny, in order to identify which ones should go forward to the next stage of being developed into full length articles. Manuscripts thus developed will then be returned to the same team of independent reviewers for further scrutiny, prior to a firm editorial decision as to whether they are to be accepted for publication, conditionally accepted (following further rounds of revisions with or without further review) or rejected outright. Guidelines for intending contributors and further details of the editorial process will be announced shortly in a formal call for proposals that will appear on the JOB website and in future issues of the journal.
The changes we are introducing are designed to strengthen the position of IRIOP against growing competition from a variety of rival publications, each of which are seeking to provide state-of-the-art overviews and commentary on major developments at the forefront of the field. Going forward, IRIOP will remain the most authoritative and current guide to new developments and established knowledge in the fields of organizational behavior and industrial and organizational psychology.

Gerard P. Hodgkinson
J. Kevin Ford

December 2011
Chapter 1

THE SELF-CONCEPT IN ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY: CLARIFYING AND DIFFERENTIATING THE CONSTRUCTS

John Schaubroeck
Department of Psychology and Eli Broad Graduate School of Management, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824

You Jin Kim and Ann Chunyan Peng
Eli Broad Graduate School of Management, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824

Organizational psychologists and scholars representing other organizational disciplines have in recent years become increasingly interested in self-concept constructs. Scholars have applied the root constructs of self-efficacy, self-esteem, and identity to a wide range of topics. Research examining these constructs has also spawned other organizational research examining cognate constructs such as self-uncertainty (Thau, Aquino, & Wittek, 2007), self-concept clarity (Bechtoldt, De Dreu, Nijstad et al., 2010), and self-complexity (Hannah, Woolfolk, & Lord, 2009). These add to the suite of constructs which researchers must come to understand if they seek to extend the literature concerning the influence of self-concept on how people interact with their work environments.

Self-concept variables have significant motivational implications because they may predict effort and performance in ways that are unaccounted for by established motivation models (e.g., expectancy theory, equity theory) (Leonard, Beauvais, & Scholl, 1999). The self-concept is also an “interpersonal being” (Baumeister, 1998) that arises from and influences one’s social interactions (Gecas, 1982). How one views oneself affects one’s interpretations, attitudes, and behavior toward others (Fiske & Taylor, 1991).
Despite its importance to behavior in organizations, research is rather scattered and it is often unclear how work with one concept (e.g., self-efficacy) relates to another (e.g., self-esteem). Organizational researchers have borrowed constructs or perspectives on the self from the broader psychology or sociology literatures which have different foci and terminologies. For example, the term “self-concept” has been used interchangeably with self-esteem in much of the educational or developmental psychology research (e.g., Marsh, Trautwein, Lüdtke, Köller, & Baumert, 2006; Rosenberg, 1979), whereas sociologists and social psychologists have emphasized the role-dependent nature of the self, as within social identity perspectives (Hogg & Hains, 1996; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Therefore, organizational researchers have come to define self-concept constructs differently and adopt different terms (e.g., self-construal vs. self-identity). These differences can lead to confusion and hinder knowledge sharing. In this chapter we provide a fairly comprehensive overview of research conducted by organizational psychologists and management researchers relating to the self-concept, with special attention to the differences in self-concept domains under investigation.

We introduce the theories and perspectives on self-concept, followed by a categorization of the various types of self-concept variables. We then review studies that focused on self-concept variables in the literature of organizational behavior/psychology since 2004. In particular, we focus on three of the most researched self-constructs: self-efficacy, self-esteem, and self-construal (i.e., identity and identification). The review for each self-construct is further organized by cognate constructs (e.g., global self-esteem vs. organization-based self-esteem), with conclusions and suggestions for future research at the end of each section.

**SELF-CONCEPT RESEARCH**

The self-concept refers to the organized knowledge system one has about oneself as “a physical, social, and spiritual or moral being” (Gecas, 1982, p. 3). It is the “totality of an individual’s thoughts and feelings having reference to himself as an object” (Rosenberg, 1979, p. 7). The self-concept is viewed as a dynamic system arising from one’s interactions with the world which guides behavior (Epstein, 1973).

There have been attempts in the literature to categorize different types of self-concepts. One useful distinction is between self-conceptions and self-evaluations (Gecas, 1982). Self-conceptions concern the content and the frame of self-image (e.g., role-based identities), whereas self-evaluations involve the evaluative and emotional aspects of self (e.g., self-esteem, self-efficacy). We examine self-concept constructs concerning one’s personal attributes (e.g., competency beliefs) and one’s opinions of his or her social relationships as content-related self-constructs. Among these content-related self-beliefs, some
are evaluative and others are non-evaluative in nature. Evaluative self-beliefs are judgments of valence that range from very negative to very positive. One example would be self-esteem, the overall evaluation of oneself as competent, likable, and worthy of respect (Rosenberg, 1979). Other examples include self-efficacy, physical attractiveness, and integrity. In contrast, non-evaluative self-constructs concern self-beliefs that are not necessarily good or bad. Examples include levels of identity (or self-construal), and gender role identity.

How self-beliefs are organized also denotes an important set of self-concept characteristics. Individuals differ in how strongly their self-beliefs are interrelated (self-complexity), how different self-beliefs are from each other (self-differentiation), how clearly people understand themselves (self-concept clarity) and how resistant to change domain self-beliefs are over specified periods (self-concept stability). These constructs commonly emphasize the organization of self-beliefs in the self-concept system, and therefore we label them as structural self-constructs. To date, little research has examined the role of these structure-related self-constructs in the organizational context. The most significant distinction we make in our review is among the content constructs in terms of whether they are clearly self-evaluative (e.g., self-esteem) or merely descriptive (e.g., identity).

**SELF-EFFICACY AND RELATED CONSTRUCTS**

Self-efficacy refers to the belief that one can effectively utilize one’s resources to achieve certain outcomes (Bandura, 1997). Since Bandura introduced this concept in his social learning theory (Bandura, 1986), self-efficacy has been one of the most extensively researched constructs in organizational studies. A keyword search with self-efficacy or collective efficacy in PsycINFO shows that over 7,000 studies incorporating one or both of these constructs have been published from 2005 through 2011. As there are so many studies, even within the narrower organizational psychology literature, we focus on efficacy studies that constitute thematic areas of interest to many researchers.

Whereas self-efficacy was viewed as being task-specific in its original conceptualization (Bandura, 1986, 1997), researchers have expanded the construct space by developing efficacy constructs which concern a broader set of activities or roles, as well as constructs referring to the shared beliefs in a group (i.e., collective self-efficacy). At the individual level, self-efficacy constructs differ in levels of generality, ranging from the global construct of general self-efficacy (GSE) to self-efficacy pertaining to a specific task. Self-efficacy is more state-like as the scope is more task-specific (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). At the other end of this continuum of generality, GSE refers to an individual’s belief in his/her capabilities to mobilize the physical, intellectual, and emotional resources needed to have control over the events in one’s life (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997). Compared to self-esteem, GSE is narrower in terms of the
domains that the individual evaluates. As noted by Chen, Gully, and Eden (2004), self-esteem is a more affective evaluation of oneself whereas GSE emphasizes the motivational components associated with one’s competency beliefs. Task-specific self-efficacy constructs refer to one's beliefs about accomplishing specific tasks (e.g., typing); yet the scope of activities contained by a task can be narrower or broader, and therefore task-specific self-efficacy still varies in its generality. For example, computer self-efficacy defined as perceptions of ability to use computers to accomplish a task (Compeau & Higgins, 1995) is more general than efficacy in typing.

We apply the label role-specific self-efficacy to constructs that refer to one's capabilities to conduct a set of tasks within a particular role. One example would be job self-efficacy, which is defined in terms of one's confidence in performing one's job effectively (Tierney & Farmer, 2002). Similarly, Abele and Spurk (2009) developed a similar concept pertaining to the occupational level. There are also narrower role-specific efficacy constructs that refer to a specific type of job (e.g., teacher self-efficacy, counselor self-efficacy), or job position (e.g., leader self-efficacy, or managerial self-efficacy).

Task-specific Self-efficacy

One area in which self-efficacy has been particularly prominent concerns the connection between efficacy and goal setting. Although the vast majority of studies support positive influences of self-efficacy on task performance (Judge, Jackson, Shaw, Scott, & Rich, 2007; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998), Vancouver and his colleagues (Vancouver & Kendall, 2006; Vancouver, Thompson, & Williams, 2001) have demonstrated that very high self-efficacy can under some circumstances have a debilitating effect on performance. Their earlier experimental studies were criticized for arbitrarily raising the subjects’ self-efficacy without any enactive experiences (Bandura & Locke, 2003). They subsequently conducted field studies that provided further support for a negative within-person correlation between efficacy and performance (Vancouver & Kendall, 2006). More recently, Goncalo, Polman, and Maslach (2010) found that the negative efficacy-performance relationship can be generalized to the group level. The findings of their first study indicated that collective self-efficacy at the beginning of a project was negatively related to final performance assessed at the end of the project. In the subsequent study, they surveyed the teams in another class project at five different observation points and replicated the findings of the first study. Process conflict during the project explained this negative effect of collective self-efficacy on team performance. Conversely, in a stock market simulation conducted across 20 days of trials, Seo and Ilies (2009) found a positive within-person correlation between self-efficacy and performance. Goal level partially mediated this positive efficacy-performance relationship.
A few recent studies examined interventions to alter self-efficacy beliefs. For example, Ellis, Ganzach, Castle, and Sekely (2010) showed that participation in an after-event review raised participants’ self-efficacy, leading to higher subsequent performance. In a field experiment, McNatt and Judge (2008) implemented an intervention to improve newcomer’s self-efficacy. Results showed that, compared to the control group, newcomers in the intervention condition had significantly higher job self-efficacy and a lower turnover rate five months later.

*Job search self-efficacy/Reemployment self-efficacy*: Wanberg, Glomb, Song, and Sorenson (2005) defined job search self-efficacy as “an individual’s belief that he or she can successfully perform job-search behaviors” (p. 412). They surveyed unemployment insurance recipients over an 18-week period, yielding ten waves of observations with a two-week separation between waves. Job-search efficacy was positively related to job-search intention and job-search intensity, and job-search intensity was positively related to reemployment. Wanberg, Zhu, and Van Hooft (2010) coined the term *reemployment efficacy* to refer to individuals’ confidence in finding an acceptable job. They found that perceived progress in job searching was related to positive affect and reemployment efficacy, which in turn led to increased job search effort the next day.

*Creative self-efficacy*: Tierney and Farmer (2002) introduced the construct of creative self-efficacy and developed a 13-item creative self-efficacy scale. In a more recent study, Gong, Huang, and Farh (2009) examined both the antecedents and consequences of creative self-efficacy. They found that creative self-efficacy mediated the positive effects of employee learning orientation and transformational leadership on employee creativity as rated by his/her supervisor. Carmeli and Schaubroeck (2007) found creative self-efficacy moderated the relationship between employees’ expectations of their creativity at work and their degree of involvement in creative activities.

**General Self-efficacy**

Although more studies have focused on task-specific self-efficacy, a good deal of research has examined GSE as an antecedent of work-related performance (see Judge & Bono, 2001, for a review). A study reported by DeRue and Morgeson (2007) is an exception in that they examined general self-efficacy as moderating the relationship between employee task performance evaluated by the supervisor and employee perceived person-role fit (i.e., the perceived match between one’s own attributes/capabilities and job demands). The positive effect of performance on person-role fit was observed only among employees with high general self-efficacy.

Other studies have examined the antecedents of general self-efficacy. For example, Steele-Johnson, Narayan, Delgado, and Cole (2010) found that performance approach and mastery approach goal orientations were both positively related to GSE, but that mastery avoidance goal orientation was negatively
related to GSE. Nielsen and Munir (2009) argued that GSE is malleable, such that transformational leadership influences follower GSE. Across separate cross-sectional and longitudinal designed studies, they found that subordinate's GSE mediated the positive effect of transformational leadership on employee well-being.

**Role-specific Self-efficacy**

*Job self-efficacy/Occupational self-efficacy:* Job self-efficacy (JSE) has been frequently examined as a predictor of job performance (Judge *et al.*, 2007) or as a personal resource that buffers the stress-strain relationship (see Sonnentag & Frese, 2003, for a review). In addition, research has examined JSE as mediating the influences of other variables on performance. For example, Tsai, Chen, and Liu (2007) demonstrated that JSE partially mediated the effect of positive mood on employee task performance among insurance agents in Taiwan. Walumbwa, Avolio, and Zhu (2008) surveyed employees in the banking industry and found that transformational leadership was positively related to JSE, which in turn predicted job performance. Similarly, Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke (2010) found that JSE mediated a cross-level main effect of servant leadership (group-level) on employee organizational citizenship behavior as rated by the supervisor.

Schyns and Sczesny (2009) defined occupational self-efficacy as “the conviction of a person that he/she can execute behaviors relevant to their own work” (p. 79). This is very similar to JSE. In their study, leader task-oriented attributes, but not people-oriented attributes, were found to be positively related to follower occupational self-efficacy. Abele and Spurk (2009) examined the longitudinal effect of occupational self-efficacy on subjective and objective career advancement. They found that graduating college students’ occupational self-efficacy was positively related to salary and career status three years after graduation, as well as to changes in salary and status seven years after graduation. Occupational self-efficacy was also positively related to career satisfaction measured seven years after graduation.

Studies have also contextualized JSE in relation to specific job types, such as teacher self-efficacy (e.g., Klassen & Chiu, 2010) and counselor self-efficacy (e.g., Lent, Hill, & Hoffman, 2003). The majority of these studies have been published in professional area journals that are not widely cited in the organizational literature. In an exception, Mellor, Barclay, Bulger, and Kath (2006) found that gender similarity with the union steward strengthened the positive effect of verbal persuasion on women’s union self-efficacy (i.e., expectancies of successfully serving as a union steward).

*Leadership self-efficacy* is generally defined as one’s perceived capabilities to perform leadership roles (e.g., Ng, Ang, & Chan, 2008). Paglis and Green (2002) provided a more descriptive definition whereby leadership self-efficacy refers to “a person’s judgment that he or she can successfully exert leadership of other people by: setting a direction for the work group; building
relationships with followers in order to gain their commitment to change goals; and working with them to overcome obstacles to change” (p. 217). There have been two approaches toward measuring leadership self-efficacy. One is to measure an individual’s confidence in conducting very general leadership tasks (e.g., influencing the group, leading the group to accomplish the task; Murphy, 1992). The other approach uses a list of specific leader role activities (e.g., formal presentation, business knowledge, retaining staff; Anderson, Krajewski, Goffin, & Jackson, 2008). Although the latter approach seems more sophisticated, it is possible that these specific role activities may not generalize well to other contexts.

Leadership self-efficacy has been shown to be positively related to managerial job performance (Semadar, Robins, & Ferris, 2006). Ng, Ang, and Chan (2008) found that leadership self-efficacy mediated the effects of three Big Five personality variables (i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness) on leader effectiveness. Hannah, Avolio, Luthans, and Harms (2008) reviewed the leader self-efficacy literature and advanced propositions about factors mediating and moderating the relationship between leader efficacy and performance. They also argued for a more complex multi-level framework of leadership efficacy that incorporates leader, follower, and collective efficacy dimensions.

Collective Efficacy/Group Potency

Collective efficacy is “a group’s shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainment” (Bandura, 1997, p. 447). Parallel to the distinction made between task-specific self-efficacy and general self-efficacy, group potency is viewed as a general form of collective efficacy. It refers to “the generalized beliefs about the capabilities of the group across tasks and contexts” (Gully, Beaubien, Incalcaterra, & Joshi, 2002, p. 820). Although these constructs are not aspects of self-evaluation, they can be seen as related to social identity, a domain we examine later in this chapter.

Stajkovic, Lee, and Nyberg (2009) reported on a meta-analysis of the relationship between collective efficacy and group performance. They noted that the number of studies had increased by 60% since an earlier meta-analysis by Gully et al. (2002). Consistent with the earlier meta-analysis, Stajkovic et al. (2009) found a mean correlation of .35 between collective efficacy and group performance, and .29 between group potency and group performance. Collective efficacy fully mediated the positive effect of group potency on group performance. In addition, they found that collective efficacy was more strongly related to group performance under conditions of high task interdependence. DeRue, Hollenbeck, Ilsen, and Feltz (2010) proposed a compositional approach whereby the different distributions of member’s team efficacy perceptions are seen as having distinct implications for performance.
Although a theoretical distinction has been made between collective efficacy and group potency, this distinction is less evident in the field studies. Some authors have used the term of collective efficacy when in fact group potency was measured (e.g., Wu, Tsui, & Kinicki, 2010). Therefore the distinction between these constructs can be misleading, particularly in reviewing field studies.

Collective efficacy has been extensively examined in leadership research. In particular, transformational leadership style has been linked to group potency (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007; Wu et al., 2010). Schaubroeck and colleagues (2007) investigated financial service teams in the Hong Kong and US branches of a multinational bank. They found that group potency mediated the effect of transformational leadership on team performance. In addition, the mean of each unit’s collectivism and power distance moderated the effect of transformational leadership on group potency. Wu et al. (2010) examined how group-based transformational leadership (i.e., idealized influence and inspiration), as opposed to differentiated transformational leadership (e.g., individualized consideration), related to collective efficacy. They found that group-based transformational leadership was positively associated with collective efficacy as mediated by group identification. Collective efficacy also predicted group effectiveness measured later in time.

Srivastava, Bartol, and Locke (2006) examined collective efficacy among employees of hotel properties. Collective efficacy was measured by aggregating team members’ perceptions of the capability of the team to reach the room occupancy goal. They found that empowering leadership was positively related to collective efficacy, which was in turn positively associated with team performance as indicated by average room occupancy rates.

ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES CONCERNING SELF-EFFICACY

One trend in the literature of self-efficacy is toward examining within-person change in self-efficacy. A within-person approach emphasizes that self-efficacy can be dynamic and is influenced by episodic events. Studies suggest that the experience of success increases self-efficacy whereas the experience of failure decreases self-efficacy. These effects are more evident when the individual has an internal attribution style (e.g., Tay, Ang, & Van Dyne, 2006; Tolli & Schmidt, 2008). For example, Tolli and Schmidt (2008) showed that positive feedback increased self-efficacy only when the participants attributed positive feedback to their capabilities, as opposed to their good luck. Conversely, negative feedback decreased self-efficacy to a greater degree when the participants had an internal attribution style.

Although self-efficacy can be augmented by certain interventions (e.g., Ellis, Ganzach, Castle, & Sekely, 2010; McNatt & Judge, 2008), neither the duration
nor the consequences of an increase in self-efficacy are well understood. How long does this enhancement last? To what extent do participants who receive an efficacy enhancing intervention internalize this information into their chronic self-views? What are the potential influences of an externally-driven enhancement of self-efficacy on an individual's subsequent behavior? Knowledge regarding these questions can be widely applied to many organizational research areas such as leadership, training, and selection. For example, researchers might examine when (the conditions) and how (the mechanisms) a leader's positive feedback might enhance follower efficacy beliefs and whether this influence is long-lasting.

The degree of malleability in self-efficacy itself may also be a meaningful index of some underlying personality trait. Lang, Featherman, and Nesselroade (1997) found in a sample of older persons that social self-efficacy variability had meaningful outcomes related to personal relationships and adjustment that were distinct from level of social self-efficacy. Variability in one's self-efficacy beliefs over time may reflect self-uncertainty, a disposition that is associated with lowering one's self-evaluation in response to negative external feedback (Kernis, Lakey, & Heppner, 2008). The within-person variability in self-efficacy beliefs needs to be examined more fully in future studies, much as self-esteem variability has been examined in the broader psychology literature.

Together with meta-analysis findings indicating that task complexity attenuates the efficacy-performance relationship (Judge et al., 2007; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998), recent research suggests scope for a potentially more complex efficacy-performance relationship (e.g., Vancouver & Kendall, 2006). Future studies need to understand the multiple mechanisms that connect self-efficacy to performance (e.g., affect, resource allocation), as well as the boundary conditions for these processes. For example, self-efficacy may be more strongly related to maximum performance than typical performance.

**SELF-ESTEEM AND RELATED CONSTRUCTS**

Self-esteem refers to an individual's global evaluation of his or her worth and value as a human being (Baumeister, 1998). High self-esteem is generally acknowledged to be associated with positive outcomes such as physical and psychological well-being (Leary & Tangney, 2003). However, some researchers have questioned whether high self-esteem is universally salutary to individuals’ well-being, performance, and interactions with others. For example, persons with high self-esteem have been found to limit the impact of negative feedback on their self-evaluations by exaggerating their positive standing on dimensions that are irrelevant to the feedback (Baumeister, 1982; Greenberg & Pyszczynski, 1985). Consistent with predictions based on this compensatory self-inflation process, self-affirmation theory argues that persons with high self-esteem are better able to extract feedback-irrelevant positive information.
about themselves in the face of failure or negative feedback than are persons with low self-esteem (Spencer, Josephs, & Steele, 1993).

Among more recent findings, Sivanathan, Molden, Galinsky, and Ku (2008) found that self-esteem, posited as a general measure of affirmational resources, was negatively related to escalating commitment to a failing course of action. However, they also found that affirming oneself on a dimension related to the decision increased escalation behavior. Unzueta, Lowery, and Knowles (2008) reported that white males’ beliefs about the influence of affirmative action policies were positively related to their competency beliefs, and these beliefs in turn influenced their self-esteem. Self-affirmation has also been applied to studying self-efficacy and performance. Vancouver and Tischner (2005) found that when subjects were given an opportunity to affirm their self-concepts by listing previous achievements and awards they had achieved, both positive and negative performance feedback had a weaker influence on their subsequent performance.

Rosenberg, Schooler, Schoenbach, and Rosenberg (1995) distinguished between global self-esteem and specific self-esteem. They suggest that global self-esteem refers to the extent to which one feels positively about oneself, whereas specific self-esteem refers to the extent to which one feels positively about oneself within a specific domain, such as member of a particular organization. Among constructs in the latter category within the organizational literature, organization-based self esteem (OBSE; Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1989) is most prominent. OBSE is conceptualized as the degree to which an organizational member perceives he or she has high status among other members and is seen as a person who is competent across a range of important tasks. It reflects the extent to which individuals see themselves as valued organization members (Pierce, Gardner, Dunham, & Cummings, 1993). Global self-esteem is seen to be influenced by external factors such as others’ opinions, attitudes, and approval, even though it is less malleable and less affected by organizational variables than is OBSE (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Our review focuses on global and organization-based self-esteem in organizational settings. It must be noted, however, that there is a great deal more research on self-esteem in the broader psychological literature. Given our focus on the most recent research, we refer the interested reader to the excellent review provided by Pierce and Gardner (2004) for a summary of the relevant organizational literature prior to 2004.

There are several theoretical streams that can be used to explain the effects of self-esteem on organizationally relevant attitudes and behaviors. First, self-enhancement theory notes that people strive to maintain a positive self-view by actively seeking information which conforms to a favorable view of themselves (Tesser, 1988). Thus, high OBSE may motivate people to perform better to maintain their current high self-esteem, and low OBSE could encourage people to withhold their best effort in order to justify low performance (see Korman, 2001).
Self-consistency theory (Swann, Griffin, Predmore, & Gaines, 1987) argues that people deal with uncertainty in their views of themselves by creating, seeking, and endorsing information that is consistent with their prevailing self-image and by diverting and rejecting information that is inconsistent with their self-conceptions. Extending this perspective to the predictions made by adherents of uncertainty management theory (Thau, Bennett, Mitchell, & Marrs, 2009), individuals with high self-esteem may tend to report favorable work attitudes and behaviors because such thoughts and actions are consistent with their decision to maintain employment in an organization (Pierce et al., 1989).

Brockner (1988) argues that self-esteem influences the degree to which individuals attend and react to external cues. His behavioral plasticity theory proposes that as a result of a lack of confidence in their own thoughts and feelings, low self-esteem individuals depend on information from outside sources to evaluate themselves. Conversely, high self-esteem individuals are more confident in their competence and consequently attend to external cues with lower intensity (Brockner, 1988). Thus, low self-esteem individuals tend to be more malleable (or “behaviorally plastic”) than high self-esteem individuals in that they react with greater intensity to certain characteristics of their work environment.

A less commonly researched model is the threat-immunity perspective (Gilbert, Pinel, Wilson, Blumberg, & Wheatley, 1998). This model argues that people enhance or maintain their positive self-image by believing that they are relatively immune from egocentric biases associated with social comparison, and that as a result they assume that others are more psychologically threatened by them than they are by others. In a series of studies Menon and Thompson (2007) found that persons who maintained self-enhancing threat appraisals, such as believing that others envied them, enacted situations that led to less favorable relationships with coworkers.

GLOBAL SELF-ESTEEM

Based on both self-enhancement and self-consistency theories, employees with low self-esteem are believed to often withhold their effort and perform worse in order to align their level of contributions with their negative self-concept. However, a recent review of the literature by Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger, and Vohs (2003) concluded that, contrary to self-enhancement and self-consistency theory predictions, findings are mixed as to whether self-esteem level is positively correlated with better performance. A meta-analysis by Judge and Bono (2001) found a positive correlation between self-esteem and job performance, but effect sizes were highly variable, with the 80% credibility interval including zero.
Such inconclusive findings have encouraged researchers to investigate boundary conditions of the self-esteem–job performance relationship. Ferris, Lian, Brown, Pang, and Keeping (2010) demonstrated the moderating role of the importance of performance to self-esteem, which can be thought of as a type of contingent self-esteem. They found that the self-consistency theory prediction that individuals with low self-esteem should tend to be poor performers is applicable only when workplace performance is not important to the individual’s self-esteem level. In addition, although behavioral plasticity theory argues that individuals with low self-esteem should be more strongly influenced by role stressors than are high self-esteem persons (Brockner, 1988), Ferris et al. supported a three-way interaction (role stress x self-esteem x importance of performance to self-esteem) in which the moderating effect of self-esteem on the relationship between role stress and performance was observed only among individuals for whom performance was of little importance to their self-esteem.

Ferris, Brown, Lian, and Keeping (2009) found that workplace contingent self-esteem moderated the relationship between self-esteem and organizational deviance behavior. Workers whose self-worth was contingent upon being competent at work were found to avoid work behaviors that could demonstrate incompetence. As with their later study predicting job performance (Ferris et al., 2010), this study also supported a three-way interaction between contingent self-worth (in this case “workplace-contingent self-esteem”), self-esteem level, and role conflict in predicting workplace deviance.

Brockner (1988) argued that external cues that threaten one’s positive self-image – referred to as “esteem-threatening situations” – “somewhat paradoxically, may have a greater impact on individuals whose self-esteem is high rather than low” (p. 88). Perceiving that one is being socially undermined by one or more coworkers can be regarded as an esteem-threatening situation. Duffy, Shaw, Scott, and Tepper (2006) examined the moderating effect of self-esteem on reactions to perceiving one as the victim of social undermining behaviors. Among neurotic individuals with high self-esteem, group undermining behaviors were more strongly related to engaging in behaviors to undermine others. Similarly, Garcia, Song, and Tesser (2010) examined how effort to protect one’s self-esteem leads people doing gatekeeping tasks, such as writing a recommendation letter, to make weak representations for persons who exceed them on their most personally relevant dimensions of social comparison.

Self-esteem also has implications for goal setting. Heimpel, Elliot, and Wood (2006) examined how self-esteem influences the self-setting of avoidance goals (goals oriented toward avoiding a negative outcome or end state) and approach goals (goals oriented toward approaching a positive outcome or end state). They observed a negative relationship between self-esteem and individuals’ self-selection of avoidance goals, relative to approach goals, after controlling for social desirability. Self-esteem also mediated the relationship between neuroticism and a preference for setting avoidance goals.
Blader and Chen (2010) investigated the interactive effect of procedural justice, self-esteem, and outcome favorability in predicting trust in and liking of one's leader. The interaction of outcome favorability and justice was stronger among people with low self-esteem than among people with high self-esteem. These results are consistent with behavioral plasticity theory. De Cremer, van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, Mullenders, and Stinglhamber (2005) examined the interactive effect of fairness and a rewarding leadership style on self-esteem. They found that the effect of procedural fairness on self-esteem was stronger when the leader more frequently rewarded his or her followers. There was a positive relationship between procedural fairness and self-esteem when outcomes were favorable but not when they were unfavorable. Working with a leader who compliments followers and encourages them to reward themselves for a job well done can be experienced as creating opportunities for greater outcome favorability. This may explain why the effects of procedural fairness on self-esteem are stronger when the leader has a rewarding style.

ORGANIZATION-BASED SELF-ESTEEM

Even though organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) is highly correlated with domain-level measures of self-efficacy such as job self-efficacy, OBSE is distinct in that it denotes an individual's self-perceived favorable status within an organization. Self-efficacy reflects a belief in one's actual competence on a task or, in the case of JSE, in performing one's job as a whole. Nevertheless a work-related self-efficacy construct can potentially be regarded as a predictor of OBSE. A meta-analysis conducted by Bowling, Eschleman, Wang, Kirkendall, and Alarcon (2010) found that there is a reliable positive relationship between OBSE and both GSE and general self-esteem. In addition, OBSE was reliably related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment (continuance and affective), in-role performance, OCB, and indexes of well-being.

Individuals with high OBSE are more likely to exhibit better job performance. This linkage may partially explain why persons with high OBSE receive higher extrinsic rewards (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Gardner, Van Dyne, and Pierce (2004) found that after controlling for organization tenure and previous pay change, pay level influenced OBSE, which in turn influenced employee performance. Scott, Shaw, and Duffy (2008) tested the interaction between merit pay and pay for performance perceptions predicting OBSE. The merit raise level had a positive effect on OBSE only when it was tied to a belief that pay raises are actually determined by performance.

Ferris, Brown, and Heller (2009) found that OBSE mediated the relationship between the two constructs of perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange (LMX) on organizational deviant behavior. Their findings are consistent with belongingness theory (Baumeister & Leary, 1995),
which proposes that humans are intrinsically driven to belong to groups and to form strong positive interpersonal relationships. Thus, self-esteem levels appear to fluctuate in accordance with one’s perceived acceptance or rejection by a group (Williams, 2007). When OBSE levels decrease, belongingness needs are likely to be undermet (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Brockner, 1988). Perceived threats to social attachments are seen to thwart self-regulatory ability by diminishing self-esteem (Baumeister, Dewall, Ciarocco, & Twenge, 2005), which in turn may precipitate deviant behavior. In a study with similar grounding in belongingness theory, OBSE was found to mediate the effects of negative affect, procedural justice, and LMX quality on complaining behavior (Heck, Bedeian, & Day, 2005).

OBSE has also been found to influence leader–follower relationships. Transformational leadership was more strongly related to innovative behavior among subordinates with low OBSE in a study by Rank, Nelson, Allen, and Xu (2009). The authors based this prediction on behavioral plasticity theory. Consistent with previous findings, Heck et al. (2005) reported positive relationships between OBSE and the outcomes of LMX and procedural justice. Other studies have examined OBSE as a dependent variable and found that perceived care from the organization enhances OBSE (see McAllister & Bigley, 2002). For example, Ferris et al. (2010) reported a positive relationship between LMX and OBSE. Sekiguchi, Burton, and Sablonski (2008) examined OBSE as a moderator of the effects of LMX and job embeddedness on task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors.

A number of studies have investigated commitment implications of OBSE. Hughes and Palmer (2007) found that OBSE only partially mediated the relationship between perceptions of a relational psychological contract and organizational value commitment. Along the same lines, Lee and Peccei (2007) found that OBSE mediated the relationship between perceived organizational support and affective commitment. Naus, Van Iterson, and Roe (2007) found that OBSE only partially mediated the effects of two constructs, namely (1) the level of incongruence between personal values and perceived organizational values, and (2) job autonomy, on organizational cynicism.

**ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES CONCERNING SELF-ESTEEM**

Although OBSE has been conceptualized as a dynamic construct, to this point studies have not examined variability in OBSE. As we noted in the previous section concerning self-efficacy, interest in the variability of self-concept variables may derive from a literature on how individuals differ in state self-esteem and the implications of this variability for individual behavior and well-being (e.g., Kernis, Cornell, Sun, Berry, & Harlow, 1993). It seems plausible that