Honesty-Humility Interacts With Context Perception in Predicting Task Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Wendler, Kathrin; Liu, Jie; Zettler, Ingo

Published in:
Journal of Personnel Psychology

DOI:
[10.1027/1866-5888/a000203](https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000203)

Publication date:
2018

Document version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (APA):
Wendler, K., Liu, J., & Zettler, I. (2018). Honesty-Humility Interacts With Context Perception in Predicting Task Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 17(4), 161-171.
<https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000203>

This work is scheduled to appear in
Journal of Personnel Psychology

© 2018 Hogrefe Publishing

This manuscript may not exactly replicate the final version published in the journal. It is not the copy of record.

Reference:

Wendler, K., Liu, J., & Zettler, I. (2018). Honesty-Humility interacts with context perception in predicting task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 17, 161–171. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000203>

Honesty-Humility Interacts with Context Perception in Predicting Task Performance and
Organizational Citizenship

Abstract

In this study, we investigated the interaction effects between honesty-humility and two contextual perception variables, perceptions of organizational politics and perceptions of interactional justice, on two dimensions of job performance, task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. In a multiple rater design, we dissociated the assessments of the contextual perception variables (rated by target employees), personality traits (rated by colleagues), and job performance (rated by supervisors) from each other. We expected employees lower in honesty-humility to adapt their behavior according to the perceived context, whereas employees higher in honesty-humility were expected to perform equally well rather irrespective of the perceived environment. Results supported the hypothesized interactions in general.

Keywords: honesty-humility; task performance; organizational citizenship behavior; interactional justice; organizational politics

Honesty-Humility Interacts with Context Perception in Predicting Task Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Personality traits have been used successfully to predict job performance. Corresponding research has mostly been conducted using the Big Five, indicating links between these traits and several job performance dimensions (e.g., Berry, Ones, & Sackett, 2007; Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, & Gardner, 2011). Recently, studies on personality structure have suggested a sixth basic trait, honesty-humility (Ashton & Lee, 2007). In line with theoretical notions, this trait has been linked to cooperative, ethical, and prosocial behavior. Concerning work and organizational psychology, honesty-humility has been found to be related to counterproductive work behavior (Marcus, Lee, & Ashton, 2007), organizational citizenship behavior (Cohen, Panter, Turan, Morse, & Kim, 2014), and general job performance (Johnson, Rowatt, & Petrini, 2011).

Besides main effects of honesty-humility on several outcomes, both theorizing and empirical results have suggested a specific interaction pattern between honesty-humility and context factors in predicting criteria. More precisely, it has been suggested that individuals who are relatively higher in honesty-humility show similar levels of cooperative behavior rather irrespective of contexts, whereas people who are relatively lower in honesty-humility adapt their behavior according to situational cues (Zettler & Hilbig, 2015). This interaction pattern has been found in both basic experimental (e.g., Zettler, Hilbig, & Heydasch, 2013) and applied settings (e.g., Wiltshire, Bourdage, & Lee, 2014).

Herein, we extend previous work on interaction effects of honesty-humility in the workplace by considering the job performance dimensions of task performance and organizational citizenship behavior as a criterion and by considering perceptions of interactional justice and organizational politics as predictors. Additionally, in contrast to

previous studies, we assessed honesty-humility, context perceptions, and the job performance dimensions from three different sources.

Honesty-Humility

Recent lexical studies have suggested that people's basic personality structure might best be described via six traits, summarized in the HEXACO Model of Personality (Lee & Ashton, 2008). While three of the HEXACO traits (extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience) virtually mirror their Big Five counterparts and two (agreeableness and emotionality) reflect adaptations of them, honesty-humility has no exact equivalent in the Big Five (Ashton & Lee, 2007). Honesty-Humility comprises characteristics such as being honest, loyal, and sincere versus being boastful, hypocritical, and pretentious.

Regarding organizational outcomes, most research has focused on the link between honesty-humility and counterproductive work behavior (CWB). Across different samples (e.g., Chirumbolo, 2015; Cohen et al., 2014; Marcus et al., 2007), honesty-humility has been found to correlate negatively with CWB. Likewise, honesty-humility has been found to be positively related to ethical leadership (De Vries, 2012) and negatively related to unethical business decisions (Ogunfowora, Bourdage, & Nguyen, 2013).

Some studies have also indicated a link between honesty-humility and positive aspects of employees' job performance. For instance, Johnson et al. (2011) found that honesty-humility was positively linked to overall job performance in a care setting. Likewise, both Cohen et al. (2014) and Oh et al. (2014) reported positive associations between honesty-humility and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; for more details, see Bourdage, Lee, Lee, & Shin, 2012). These associations are typically explained by the cooperative and sincere manner of those high in honesty-humility, with their willingness to support others without expecting additional rewards. Notably, such behaviors seem to not only target other people (e.g., helping colleagues), but also to target one's organization (e.g., following the

organizational norms). While the reported correlations between honesty-humility and CWB are typically ranging from medium to strong, the relationship between honesty-humility and overall job performance or OCB seems to be weaker.

Besides exploring the main effects of honesty-humility, several studies have investigated its interaction effects with contextual factors. In line with the definition of honesty-humility, “the tendency to be fair and cooperative toward others, *even when* [emphasis added] one might exploit them without suffering retaliation” (Ashton & Lee, 2007, p. 156), people higher in honesty-humility should act in a more cooperative manner rather irrespective of contexts, while people lower in honesty-humility should regulate their behavior according to situational cues, i.e., cooperating if the contexts suggest doing so.

Empirical support for this interaction pattern has been found in both experimental and applied settings (for an overview, see Zettler & Hilbig, 2015). For instance, Wiltshire et al. (2014) replicated a finding by Zettler and Hilbig (2010) of an interaction between honesty-humility and organizational politics regarding CWB. Similarly, Chirumbolo (2015) examined the interaction between honesty-humility and job insecurity in predicting CWB. Interestingly, De Vries and Van Gelder (2015) recently failed to observe an interaction between honesty-humility and two contextual variables, ethical culture and employee surveillance, when predicting workplace delinquency.

Honesty-Humility and Factors of Context Perception

Herein, we examine interaction effects between honesty-humility and context perception factors in predicting task performance and OCB, relying on trait activation theory (Tett & Burnett, 2003). This theory relates to situational specificity and suggests that trait-related behavior is only observed when situational cues indicate that such behavior is relevant, i.e., when trait and situation are thematically connected. Judge and Zapata (2015)

recently found that trait activation theory can help predicting specific interaction patterns between personality traits and job performance.

Based on trait activation theory, individual differences in honesty-humility should come into effect in situations where cooperative and sincere behavior is at stake. Herein, we consider perceptions of organizational politics and perceptions of interactional justice as variables reflecting differences in such situations in the work environment (see Rosen, Harris, & Kacmar, 2011). Note that both variables refer to an employee's perception, but are typically treated as context factors based on the view "that situations should be assessed in terms of how they are perceived" (Hochwarter, Witt, & Kacmar, 2000, p. 473). We investigate potential interaction effects between honesty-humility and both situational perceptions on task performance and OCB. Specifically, we assume that employees lower in honesty-humility are relatively responsive toward opportunities to exhibit selfish, self-promoting behavior, whereas their counterparts higher in honesty-humility are expected to behave equally cooperatively, irrespective of their context perceptions.

Perception of organizational politics describes the extent to which a work environment is perceived to be crossed by political, self-centered activities in ambiguous settings. Environments perceived as highly political are competitive, evoking self-advancing behavior (Silvester, 2008). In other words, at high levels of perceptions of organizational politics, self-serving behavior is triggered—or, at least, less sanctioned. Perception of interactional justice is one aspect of organizational justice and refers to the extent to which employees consider their organizations as fair regarding the treatment by the authorities involved in determining outcomes and regarding whether individuals have access to all relevant information in the process of outcome determination (e.g., Colquitt et al., 2013; Greenberg, 2011).

Perceptions of both organizational politics and interactional justice constitute situational perceptions relevant to honesty-humility, affecting employee performance in different ways. Environments perceived as fair motivate hard-working and cooperation, and result in positive work outcomes. Meta-analytic findings by Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng (2001) indicated moderate positive relations between interpersonal and informational justice with individual-directed OCB ($\rho = .29$ and $.26$, respectively). Informational justice was weakly related to organization-directed OCB and performance ($\rho = .18$ and $.13$, respectively). By contrast, environments perceived as highly political encourage self-promoting and less cooperative behavior, resulting in negative work outcomes. In their meta-analysis, Bedi and Schat (2013) reported negative relations between perceptions of organizational politics and job performance (self-rated: $\rho = -.11$, supervisor-rated: $\rho = -.16$) and OCB ($\rho = -.23$), but positive relations to CWB ($\rho = .42$).

Using the framework of trait activation theory, we expect employees lower in honesty-humility to be quite responsive towards opportunities to promote themselves in perceived unjust and/or highly political environments, even at the expense of others, resulting in a reduction in OCB. Employees higher in honesty-humility, by contrast, should be equally motivated to cooperate regardless of the contexts, which is why we do not suppose a decline in OCB in perceived unjust and/or highly political environments. While this rationale seems reasonable with regard to the prediction of OCB, the mechanism for task performance might be a different one. Compared to OCB, which is based on voluntary actions, task performance refers to the completion of tasks formally required in a specific job description. Since selfish behavior, which is motivated in politicized or unjust environments, constitutes the “natural” way of conduct for those who are lower in honesty-humility, they might have a higher motivation to perform well under such circumstances compared to those higher in honesty-humility with respect to task performance. On the other hand, employees higher in honesty-

humility should be generally motivated to do their best. Because we can only speculate how these dispositions might influence each other, we investigate interactive effects on task performance from an exploratory manner only.

To sum up, we expect the following pattern of interactions: Employees higher in honesty-humility should have higher levels of OCB irrespective of the levels of the context perception factors. By contrast, employees lower in honesty-humility should have lower levels of OCB when perceptions of organizational politics are high and perceptions of interactional justice are low, but higher levels of OCB when perceptions of organizational politics are low and perceptions of interactional justice are high. Interaction effects between honesty-humility and the context perception factors on task performance are examined from an exploratory manner.

Overall, this study extends research on person-situation interactions in the organizational context by implementing three novel features: First, we explore interaction effects between honesty-humility and context perceptions regarding task performance and OCB. Second, next to organizational politics, we consider interactional justice as a relevant factor of organizational context perception interacting with honesty-humility. Finally, we assess honesty-humility, context perceptions, and the two performance dimensions from three different sources.

Method

Procedure and Participants

We tested our expectations in a field study comprising three different rating sources, using the indirect 'snowball' technique (Wheeler, Shanine, Leon, & Whitman, 2014). Study materials were distributed among (German) employees via several students. The employees were asked to provide ratings of the context perception variables themselves and to pass on one envelope containing a questionnaire to a colleague and another envelope containing a

questionnaire to their supervisor. Colleagues assessed target employee's personality and supervisors assessed target employee's task performance and OCB. As we are interested in the effects of situational *perceptions*, target employees provided ratings on how their working environments are perceived by themselves (i.e., we relied on self-reports for assessing organizational politics and interactional justice). Concerning the assessment of personality traits, we relied on observer reports for two reasons. First, research indicates substantial correlations between self- and observer reports regarding the HEXACO personality traits (De Vries, Zettler, & Hilbig, 2014), allowing us to dissociate the assessments of the personality variables from the assessments of the context perception factors. Second, the use of observer ratings of personality traits has been shown to outperform self-ratings in the prediction of different performance behaviors (e.g., Connelly & Ones, 2010; Connelly & Hülshager, 2012). To the best of our knowledge, we are here the first researchers to link observer ratings of honesty-humility to task performance.

Each questionnaire was returned separately via an enclosed stamped and return-addressed envelope. Returned questionnaires referring to the same target employee were matched anonymously via a random code. Questionnaires returned with the same random code were checked for anomalies (e.g., similar handwriting, inconsistencies in information provided across the questionnaires such as about time working with the target employee). Participants joined the study voluntarily and without compensation.

In total, we obtained 223 complete sets of questionnaires (i.e., self-report, colleague report, and supervisor report) out of 400 approached employees. Reasons for this relatively high response rate for an organization triad-design might be that the final data set was used in the teaching and that students received partial course credit for collecting data.

For the final analyses, we included those sets with information on all variables of interest and in which target employees had been working in their organization for a minimum

of six months, resulting in $N = 201$ triads. The mean age of target employees (53% female) was 38 ($SD = 12$) years, and they had been working on average for 10 ($SD = 9$) years in their organization. The mean age of the colleague raters (55% female) was 38 ($SD = 11$) years, and the mean age of the supervisor raters (33% female) was 47 ($SD = 9$) years. Target employees worked in different occupations such as craftsman, engineer, or nurse. Colleagues and supervisors had been working on average for 62 ($SD = 64$) months and 90 ($SD = 86$) months, respectively, with the target employees.

Measures

Honesty-Humility. Target employees' levels of honesty-humility were assessed by colleagues via the corresponding scale of the observer report form of the German version (Moshagen, Hilbig, & Zettler, 2014) of the HEXACO-60 (Ashton & Lee, 2009). The HEXACO-60 assesses each HEXACO trait via ten items, using a Likert response scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). A sample item for honesty-humility is "He/she wants people to know that he/she is an important person of high status" (reverse-coded).

Perception of Organizational Politics. Target employees assessed the levels of organizational politics perception via the German version (Zettler & Hilbig, 2010) of Kacmar and Carlson's (1997) Perceptions of Politics Scale. The scale comprises 15 items, rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). A sample item is "People in this organization attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down". We used the composite score of all items.

Perception of Interactional Justice. Target employees assessed the levels of interactional justice perception via the German version (Maier, Streicher, Jonas, & Woschée, 2007) of Colquitt's (2001) organizational justice questionnaire. The scale consists of 20 items, nine of which measure interactional justice. These items refer to the authority figure who enacted the procedure participants referred to; herein, the last decision-making process

they were involved in, e.g., performance appraisals, promotion decisions. Sample items are “To what extent has he/she treated you with respect?” or “To what extent were his/her explanations regarding the procedures reasonable?”. We used the same response scale as for organizational politics, and we used the composite score of all nine items.

Task Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. The target employee’s job performance dimensions were assessed by their immediate supervisor. We assessed task performance and OCB via the corresponding scales of the German version (Zettler, Kramer, Thoemmes, Nagy, & Trautwein, 2013) of the Role-Based Performance Scale (Welbourne, Johnson, & Erez, 1998). Specifically, task performance was assessed via the job role, and OCB was assessed via the organization role, the team role, and the innovator role subscales. We used a composite score of the latter three to measure OCB. All scales consist of four items, introduced by “The person who gave you this questionnaire...”. Sample items are “has high quality in her/his work” for task performance, and “does things to promote the company”, “responds to the needs of others in her/his work group” or “finds improved ways to do things” for OCB. Again, we administered a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) as the response format.

We also collected other variables not pertinent to the current investigation.

Analyses

To test our expectations, we used multiple hierarchical regression analyses with mean-centered independent variables. We tested potential interaction effects between honesty-humility and each context perception factor separately. In all analyses, we controlled for employee tenure (see Ng & Feldman, 2010).¹ Significant interactions were plotted one SD below and above the mean of the contextual variables.

¹ Following recent recommendations on statistical control by Becker et al. (2015), results of analyses not including control variables are provided in the Appendix for comparison.

Results

Means, standard deviations, Cronbach's Alphas, and correlations between all variables are shown in Table 1. Honesty-Humility ($.19 \leq r \leq .26$, all $p < .05$), perceptions of organizational politics ($-.24 \geq r \geq -.32$, all $p < .05$), and perceptions of interactional justice ($.28 \leq r \leq .30$, all $p < .05$) were associated with task performance and OCB. The correlation between both job performance dimensions was $.78$, $p < .05$, and the correlation between both context perception variables was $-.57$, $p < .05$.

Bifactor Analyses

Both context perception variables and both job performance variables were associated quite strongly with each other, suggesting potential overlapping. Thus, we used bifactor modelling (see Reise, 2012) to build one general context perception factor (from perceptions of interactional justice as well as perceptions of organizational politics) and one general job performance factor (from task performance and OCB). The bifactor model fit the data considerably better ($\chi^2 = 1849$, $df = 734$, $CFI = .86$, $RMSEA = .07$) than the model with four correlated factors ($\chi^2 = 1227$, $df = 689$, $CFI = .70$, $RMSEA = .09$).

Based on the bifactor analysis, we first ran a regression model using the general context perception factor, honesty-humility, and their interaction to predict the general job performance factor, and we found a significant interaction effect ($\beta = -.23$, $p < .05$). The results supported our (OCB-) expectations, indicating that employees lower in honesty-humility regulate their performance according to the perceived contexts, whereas those higher in honesty-humility are less affected by the context, showing less performance overall.

Hypothesis Tests

We continued with running the originally planned analyses. The results of predicting task performance and OCB from honesty-humility, perceptions of interactional justice and their interaction are presented in the left of Table 2. The interaction was significant for both

task performance ($\beta = -.15, p < .05$) and OCB ($\beta = -.14, p < .05$). Significant negative slopes were observed for values of honesty-humility below 3.96 (0.81 SD above mean) in predicting task performance, and for values below 4.05 (0.94 SD above mean) in predicting OCB.

Figures 1 and 2 show the interaction plots, indicating employees higher in honesty-humility had high ratings of task performance and OCB rather irrespective of the level of perceived interactional justice, whereas employees lower in honesty-humility showed better task performance and OCB at high levels of perceived interactional justice, but showed worse task performance and OCB at low levels of perceived interactional justice. The results concerning interaction effects between honesty-humility and perceptions of organizational politics are shown in the right of Table 2. The interaction was significant for both task performance ($\beta = .15, p < .05$) and OCB ($\beta = .23, p < .05$). Significant positive slopes were observed for values of honesty-humility below 3.68 (0.39 SD above mean) in predicting task performance, and for values below 3.76 (0.51 SD above mean) in predicting OCB. Figures 3 and 4 show the interaction plots, indicating that employees higher in honesty-humility scored high on task performance and OCB rather irrespective of the levels of perceived organizational politics, whereas employees lower in honesty-humility performed better when organizational politics was perceived as low, but performed worse when organizational politics was perceived as high.

Dawson (2014) recommends a joint analysis of interaction effects of multiple predictors. Hence, we incorporated honesty-humility, both context perception factors, and their interactions with honesty-humility in one regression model. The results are presented in Table 3. While we did not observe significant interactions between honesty-humility and perceptions of interactional justice, we found that honesty-humility interacted significantly with perceptions of organizational politics in predicting OCB ($\beta = .20, p < .05$), but not in

predicting task performance. The interaction pointed in the same direction as in the separate analyses.

Across all analyses, the results supported our (OCB-) expectations, indicating that employees lower in honesty-humility regulate their performance according to the perceived contexts, whereas those higher in honesty-humility are less affected by them. Note that results were very similar when tenure was not controlled for (Appendices 1 and 2).²

Supplementary Analyses

Additionally, we examined the unique effects of both context perception factors on the general performance factor from the bifactor model. Specifically, we conducted two separate regression models, one with the factor scores of interactional justice, honesty-humility, and their interaction predicting general job performance, and one with the factor scores of organizational politics, honesty-humility, and their interaction predicting general job performance. In line with our previous results, the interaction between honesty-humility and perceptions of organizational politics was significant ($\beta = .21, p < .05$), whereas the interaction between honesty-humility and perceptions of interactional justice was not ($\beta = .05, ns$; Table 4). Again, we obtained similar results when tenure was not controlled for (Appendix 3).

Discussion

Although honesty-humility has been introduced as a basic personality trait rather recently, it has already been found to be important for work and organizational psychology. For instance, associations of honesty-humility with CWB or OCB have been reported (Cohen

²Following recommendations by Dawson (2014), analyses were also conducted controlling for curvilinear effects of the predictors and the moderator. We obtained the same results for all analyses when additionally controlling for curvilinear effects, i.e., the interactions described above remained significant.

et al., 2014; Marcus et al., 2007). Replicating and extending previous findings, we herein found honesty-humility to have direct positive effects on task performance and OCB.

Moreover, both experimental and applied research have supported the notion that individuals higher in honesty-humility show similar levels of cooperative behavior rather irrespective of the (perception of the) situation, whereas those lower in honesty-humility tend to exhibit positively connoted behavior only under circumstances that encourage these behaviors (e.g., Chirumbolo, 2015; Wiltshire et al., 2014; Zettler & Hilbig, 2010). We tested this idea by looking at the interplay between honesty-humility and perceptions of both organizational politics and interactional justice in predicting task performance and OCB.

First, we conducted a bifactor analysis to examine the effects of a general context perception factor (the overlap between perceptions of interactional justice and organizational politics), honesty-humility, and their interaction on a general job performance factor (the overlap between task performance and OCB). General context perception affected performance of people low in honesty-humility in particular, but had virtually no impact on those high in honesty-humility. Then, we examined the effects of honesty-humility, each context perception, and their interactions with honesty-humility on both performance dimensions. Concerning perceptions of organizational politics, we found that employees lower in honesty-humility showed lower levels of task performance and OCB when higher levels of organizational politics were perceived, while employees higher in honesty-humility showed relatively equally high job performance irrespective of perceived organizational politics levels. Analyses considering perceptions of interactional justice pointed in the same direction, i.e., those lower in honesty-humility performed better in environments perceived as fair, while those higher in honesty-humility performed consistently well regardless of perceived interactional justice levels.

When both context perceptions were examined in joint analyses, only the interaction effect between honesty-humility and perceptions of organizational politics regarding OCB remained significant. In subsequent analyses looking at the unique effects of context perceptions, only the interaction between honesty-humility and the unique effect of perceptions of organizational politics remained, mirroring the results of the joint analyses.

Strengths and Potential Limitations

Our results and interpretations should be regarded in light of several strengths and potential limitations. Concerning strengths, we strictly dissociated the assessment of honesty-humility, context perception factors, and job performance dimensions from each other to reduce common method bias. Further, assessing personality by observers (such as colleagues) has been considered beneficial regarding work and organizational psychology (Connelly & Hülshager, 2012). Nevertheless, the correlation between the supervisor ratings of task performance and OCB was rather strong, which could possibly reflect common source bias. We addressed this possibility by running a bifactor analysis, accounting for the overlap between the performance dimensions. Also, the use of well-known measures for each construct, as well as our controlling for tenure, can be considered as strengths.

There are, however, also several potential limitations concerning the sampling methods. Employees were asked to pass on the questionnaires to colleagues and supervisors themselves, which might be a source of some selection biases. However, this approach is quite common in and—within some circumstances (Wheeler et al., 2014)—useful for work and organizational research. Moreover, our findings concerning the simple correlations were quite in line with previous research, further substantiating the general validity of our interpretations.

Although the use of colleague reports to assess personality traits is considered beneficial in work and organizational psychology in general, results reported by Bourdage,

Wiltshire, and Lee (2015) suggest that colleagues might not be the most accurate sources to assess honesty-humility in the workplace. Additionally, Lee et al. (2009) found that people tend to evaluate levels of honesty-humility of well-acquainted people as similar to their own (termed 'assumed similarity'), typically overestimating actual similarity. Applied to our study, colleagues might assume the target employees to have similar levels of honesty-humility as themselves, thus providing a biased assessment for the target employees' honesty-humility. Also, high levels of perceived organizational politics might drive colleagues to perceive the target employees as having lower levels of honesty-humility than they actually possess, as we found a negative relation between (self-rated) perceptions of organizational politics and (observer rated) honesty-humility.

Due to our cross-sectional design, it is difficult to clearly distinguish cause and effect. Alternative interpretations of our results might, for instance, treat the perception of higher levels of organizational politics and/or lower levels of interactional justice as a consequence of lower performance. This way, employees might cope with the perception of reduced performance by externally attributing this reduction to their working environment, which they perceive to be highly political and/or unjust, so that possible cognitive dissonances may be resolved (Festinger, 1957; Greenberg, 2011).

Summary and Outlook

The present study contributes to our understanding of the processes shaping employee behavior at work by investigating person-situation interactions. While interaction effects between honesty-humility and situational variables at work have been applied to predicting CWB in particular (Chirumbolo, 2015; Wiltshire et al., 2014), we extended this research direction to the positive aspects of job performance in forms of task performance and OCB. This is particularly important in the light of recent discussions on replicability in psychology research (e.g., Makel, Plucker, & Hegarty, 2012). In this regard, the fact that specific

assumptions in the definition of honesty-humility (Ashton & Lee, 2007) have been supported conceptually equivalent in various settings in both basic experimental and applied research yields strong support for the general validity of these assumptions.

Regarding work and organizational psychology, the importance of honesty-humility is further substantiated. This trait seems not only to be linked to various job performance dimensions, but also to interact with employees' perception of their work environment in predicting one's job performance. In other words, (high) honesty-humility does not only seem to have direct effects on job performance, but can also be considered as a variable buffering against detrimental effects of perceived high organizational politics and low interactional justice on work outcomes. Organizations might thus aim to find employees with higher levels in honesty-humility or to train those lower in honesty-humility to behave more cooperatively. What is more, organizations might generally aim to create environments encouraging prosocial behaviors, e.g., by providing clear and transparent rules for decision-making processes.

References

- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*, 150-166. doi: 10.1177/1088868306294907
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*, 340-345. doi: 10.1080/00223890902935878
- Becker, T. E., Atinc, G., Breugh, J. A., Carlson, K. D., Edwards, J. R., & Spector, P. E. (2015). Statistical control in correlational studies: 10 recommendations for organizational researchers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Advanced online publication. doi: 10.1003/job.2053
- Bedi, A., & Schat, A. C. H. (2013). Perceptions of organizational politics: A meta-analysis of its attitudinal, health, and behavioural consequences. *Canadian Psychology, 54*, 246-259. doi: 10.1037/a0034549
- Berry, C. M., Ones, D. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2007). Interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and their common correlates: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 410-424. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.410
- Bourdage, J. S., Lee, K., Lee, J-H., & Shin, K-H. (2012). Motives for organizational citizenship behavior: Personality correlates and coworker ratings of OCB. *Human Performance, 25*, 179-200. doi: 10.1080/08959285.2012.683904
- Bourdage, J. S., Wiltshire, J., & Lee, K. (2015). Personality and workplace impression management: Correlates and implications. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*, 537-546. doi: 10.1037/a0037942

- Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I.-S., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2011). The five-factor model of personality traits and organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 1140-1166. doi: 10.1037/a0024004
- Chirumbolo, A. (2015). The impact of job insecurity on counterproductive work behaviors: The moderating role of Honesty–Humility personality trait. *The Journal of Psychology, 149*, 554-569. doi: 10.1080/00223980.2015.916250
- Cohen, T. R., Panter, A. T., Turan, N., Morse, L., & Kim, Y. (2014). Moral character in the workplace. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 107*, 943-963. doi: 10.1037/a0037245
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 386-400. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.386
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 425-445. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millenium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*, 199-236. doi: 10.1037/a0031757.
- Connelly, B. S., & Hülshager, U. R. (2012). A narrower or a clearer lens for personality? Examining sources of observers' advantages over self-reports for predicting performance. *Journal of Personality, 80*, 603-631. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00744.x

- Connelly, B. S., & Ones, D. S. (2010). An other perspective on personality: Meta-analytic integration of observers' accuracy and predictive validity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 1092-1122. doi: 10.1037/a0021212
- Dawson, J. F. (2014). Moderation in management research: What, why, when, and how. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29, 1-19. doi: 10.1007/s10869-013-9308-7
- De Vries, R. E. (2012). Personality predictors of leadership styles and the self-other agreement problem. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 809-821. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.03.002
- De Vries, R.E., & van Gelder, J.-L. (2015). Explaining workplace delinquency: The role of Honesty-Humility, ethical culture, and employee surveillance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 86, 112-116. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2015.06.008
- De Vries, R. E., Zettler, I., & Hilbig, B. E. (2014). Rethinking trait conceptions of social desirability scales: Impression management as an expression of honesty-humility. *Assessment*, 21, 286-299. doi: 10.1177/1073191113504619
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Greenberg, J. (2011). Organizational justice: The dynamics of fairness in the workplace. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 271-327). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hochwarter, W. A., Witt, L. A., & Kacmar, K. M. (2000). Perceptions of organizational politics as a moderator of the relationship between conscientiousness and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 472-478. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.85.3.472

- Johnson, M. K., Rowatt, W. C., & Petrini, L. (2011). A new trait on the market: Honesty-Humility as a unique predictor of job performance ratings. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*, 857-862. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2011.01.011
- Judge, T. A., & Zapata, C. P. (2015). The person-situation debate revisited: Effect of situation strength and trait activation on the validity of the big five personality traits in predicting job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 58*, 1149-1179. doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.0837
- Kacmar, K. M., & Carlson, D. S. (1997). Further validation of the Perceptions of Politics Scale (POPS): A multiple sample investigation. *Journal of Management, 23*, 627-658. doi: 10.1177/014920639702300502
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2008). The HEXACO personality factors in the indigenous personality lexicons of English and 11 other languages. *Journal of Personality, 76*, 1001-1054. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00512.x.
- Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., Pozzebon, J. A., Visser, B., Bourdage, J. S., & Ogunfowora, B. (2009). Similarity and assumed similarity in personality reports of well-acquainted persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 460-472. doi: 10.1037/a0014059
- Maier, G. W., Streicher, B., Jonas, E., & Woschée, R. (2007). Gerechtigkeitseinschätzungen in Organisationen - Die Validität einer deutschsprachigen Fassung des Fragebogens von Colquitt (2001) [Assessment of justice in organizations: The validity of a German version of the questionnaire by Colquitt (2001)]. *Diagnostica, 53*, 97-108. doi: 10.1026/0012-1924.53.2.97
- Makel, M. C., Plucker, J. A., & Hegarty, B. (2012). Replications in psychology research: How often do they really occur? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*, 537-542. doi: 10.1177/1745691612460688

- Marcus, B., Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2007). Personality dimensions explaining relationships between integrity tests and counterproductive behavior: Big five, or one in addition? *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 1-34. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00063.x
- Moshagen, M., Hilbig, B. E., & Zettler, I. (2014). Faktorstruktur, psychometrische Eigenschaften und Messinvarianz der deutschen Version des 60-Item HEXACO Persönlichkeitsinventars [Factor structure, psychometric properties, and measurement invariance of the German language version of the 60-item HEXACO personality inventory]. *Diagnostica*, 60, 86-97. doi: 10.1026/0012-1924/a000112
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). Organizational tenure and job performance. *Journal of Management*, 36, 1220-1250. doi: 10.1177/0149206309359809
- Ogunfowora, B., Bourdage, J. S., & Nguyen, B. (2013). An exploration of the dishonest side of self-monitoring: Links to moral disengagement and unethical business decision making. *European Journal of Personality*, 27, 532-544. doi: 10.1002/per.1931
- Oh, I.-S., Le, H., Whitman, D., Kim, K., Yoo, T.-Y., Hwang, J.-O., & Kim, C.-S. (2014). The incremental validity of Honesty-Humility over cognitive ability and the Big Five personality traits. *Human Performance*, 27, 206-224. doi: 10.1090/08959285.2014.913594
- Reise, S. P. (2012). The rediscovery of bifactor measurement models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 47, 667-696. doi: 10.1080/00273171.2012.715555
- Rosen, C. C., Harris, K. J., & Kacmar, K. M. (2011). LMX, context perceptions, and performance: An uncertainty management perspective. *Journal of Management*, 37, 819-838. doi: 10.1177/0149206310365727
- Silvester, J. (2008). The good, the bad and the ugly: Politics and politicians at work. In G. P. Hodgkinson, & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and*

- Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 107-148). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Tett, R. P., & Burnett D., D. (2003). A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 500-517. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.500
- Welbourne, T. M., Johnson, D. E., & Erez, A. (1998). The Role-Based Performance Scale: Validity analysis of a theory-based measure. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 540-555. doi: 10.2307/256941
- Wheeler, A. R., Shanine, K. K., Leon, M. R., & Whitman, M. V. (2014). Student-recruited samples in organizational research: A review, analysis, and guidelines for future research. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87, 1-26. doi: 10.1111/joop.12042
- Wiltshire, J., Bourdage, J. S., & Lee, K. (2014). Honesty-Humility and perceptions of organizational politics in predicting workplace outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29, 235-251. doi: 10.1007/s10869-013-9310-0
- Zettler, I., & Hilbig, B.E. (2010). Honesty-Humility and a person-situation-interaction at work. *European Journal of Personality*, 24, 569-582. doi: 10.1002/per.757
- Zettler, I., & Hilbig, B. E. (2015). Honesty and Humility. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.), Vol. 11 (pp. 169-174). Oxford: Elsevier. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.20568-X
- Zettler, I., Hilbig, B. E., & Heydasch, T. (2013). Two sides of one coin: Honesty-Humility and situational factors mutually shape social dilemma decision making. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47, 286-295. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2013.01.012
- Zettler, I., Kramer, J., Thoemmes, F., Nagy, G., & Trautwein, U. (2013). Welchen Einfluss hat der Besuch unterschiedlicher Hochschultypen auf den frühen beruflichen Erfolg?

Eine explorative Untersuchung [Different types of universities and early career success: An exploratory investigation]. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogische Psychologie*, 27, 51-62. doi: 10.1024/1010-0652/a000088

Figure 1. Prediction of task performance from perceptions of interactional justice (centered on mean), depending on honesty-humility. HH = honesty-humility.

Figure 2. Prediction of organizational citizenship behavior from perceptions of interactional justice (centered on mean), depending on honesty-humility. HH = honesty-humility.

Figure 3. Prediction of task performance from perceptions of organizational politics (centered on mean), depending on honesty-humility. HH = honesty-humility.

Figure 4. Prediction of organizational citizenship behavior from perceptions of organizational politics (centered on mean), depending on honesty-humility. HH = honesty-humility.

HONESTY-HUMILITY, CONTEXT PERCEPTION, AND PERFORMANCE

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics, Cronbach's Alphas, and Intercorrelations

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. Tenure (in months)	114.33	111.51	-					
2. Honesty-Humility (C)	3.42	0.67	.08	(.79)				
3. Perceptions of Interactional Justice (E)	3.67	0.64	-.06	.04	(.87)			
4. Perceptions of Organizational Politics (E)	2.48	0.55	.07	-.19*	-.57*	(.80)		
5. Task Performance (S)	3.97	0.65	-.10	.19*	.28*	-.24*	(.82)	
6. Organizational Citizenship Behavior (S)	3.80	0.65	-.08	.26*	.30*	-.32*	.78*	(.90)

Note. *N* = 201 triads. Cronbach's alpha in parentheses. (C) = colleague rating, (E) = target employee rating, (S) = supervisor rating.

* $p < .05$.

HONESTY-HUMILITY, CONTEXT PERCEPTION, AND PERFORMANCE

Table 2

Results of Separate Moderation Analyses

Predictors	Task Performance			OCB				Task Performance			OCB		
	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2		<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2
Step 1 tenure	0.00 (0.00)	-.10	.01	0.00 (0.00)	-.08	.01	Step 1 tenure	0.00 (0.00)	-.10	.01*	0.00 (0.00)	-.08	.01
Step 2 HH	0.19 (0.07)	.19*	.11*	0.25 (0.06)	.25*	.15*	Step 2 HH	0.16 (0.07)	.16*	.08*	0.21 (0.07)	.21*	.14*
IJ	0.29 (0.07)	.27*		0.29 (0.07)	.29*		OP	-0.26 (0.09)	-.21*		-0.32 (0.08)	-.27*	
Step 3 HH*IJ	-0.24 (0.11)	-.15*	.02*	-0.22 (0.10)	-.14*	.02*	Step 3 HH*OP	0.30 (0.13)	.15*	.02*	0.42 (0.12)	.23*	.05*

Note. *N* = 201 triads. OCB = organizational citizenship behavior, HH = honesty-humility, IJ = perceptions of interactional justice, OP = perceptions

of organizational politics.

* $p < .05$.

HONESTY-HUMILITY, CONTEXT PERCEPTION, AND PERFORMANCE

Table 3

Results of Joint Moderation Analyses

Predictors	Task Performance			OCB		
	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2
Step 1			.01			.01
tenure	0.00 (0.00)	-.10		0.00 (0.00)	-.08	
Step 2			.12*			.17*
HH	0.18 (0.07)	.18*		0.22 (0.07)	.23*	
IJ	0.25 (0.09)	.23*		0.21 (0.08)	.21*	
OP	-0.09 (0.10)	-.07		-0.18 (0.10)	-.15	
Step 3			.02			.04*
HH*IJ	-0.16 (0.13)	-.10		-0.04 (0.14)	-.02	
HH*OP	0.15 (0.16)	.08		0.36 (0.14)	.20*	

Note. *N* = 201 triads. OCB = organizational citizenship behavior, HH = honesty-humility, IJ = perceptions of interactional justice, OP = perceptions

of organizational politics.

* $p < .05$.

HONESTY-HUMILITY, CONTEXT PERCEPTION, AND PERFORMANCE

Table 4

Results of Separate Moderation Analyses Based on Factor Scores

Predictors	Overall Performance(fs) (<i>N</i> = 195)				Overall Performance(fs) (<i>N</i> = 183)		
	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2		<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2
Step 1				Step 1			
tenure	0.00 (0.00)	-.11	.01	tenure	0.00 (0.00)	-.11	.01*
Step 2				Step 2			
HH	0.17 (0.06)	.20*	.09*	HH	0.16 (0.06)	.19*	.15*
IJ(fs)	0.34 (0.14)	.17*		OP(fs)	-0.26 (0.06)	-.30*	
Step 3				Step 3			
HH*IJ(fs)	0.14 (0.19)	.05	.00	HH*OP(fs)	0.29 (0.10)	.21*	.04*

Note. HH = honesty-humility, IJ(fs) = perceptions of interactional justice (factor scores), OP(fs) = perceptions of organizational politics (factor scores).

Listwise deletion of cases with missing values.

* $p < .05$.

HONESTY-HUMILITY, CONTEXT PERCEPTION, AND PERFORMANCE

Appendix 1

Results of Separate Moderation Analyses without Control Variables

Predictors	Task Performance			OCB				Task Performance			OCB		
	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2		<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2
Step 1			.11*			.15*	Step 1			.08*			.14*
HH	0.18 (0.07)	.18*		0.24 (0.06)	.25*		HH	0.15 (0.07)	.15*		0.20 (0.07)	.21*	
IJ	0.30 (0.07)	.28*		0.30 (0.07)	.29*		OP	-0.27 (0.09)	-.22*		-0.33 (0.08)	-.28*	
Step 2			.03*			.02*	Step 2			.03*			.05*
HH*IJ	-0.25 (0.11)	-.16*		-0.23 (0.10)	-.15*		HH*OP	0.32 (0.13)	.16*		0.43 (0.12)	.23*	

Note. $N = 201$ triads. OCB = organizational citizenship behavior, HH = honesty-humility, IJ = perceptions of interactional justice, OP = perceptions

of organizational politics.

* $p < .05$.

HONESTY-HUMILITY, CONTEXT PERCEPTION, AND PERFORMANCE

Appendix 2

Results of Joint Moderation Analyses without Control Variables

Predictors	Task Performance			OCB		
	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2
Step 2			.12*			.17*
HH	0.17 (0.07)	.16*		0.21 (0.06)	.22*	
IJ	0.25 (0.09)	.23*		0.21 (0.08)	.21*	
OP	-0.10 (0.10)	-.08		-0.18 (0.10)	-.16	
Step 3			.0*			.05*
HH*IJ	-0.17 (0.13)	-.11		-0.04 (0.12)	-.03	
HH*OP	0.16 (0.16)	.09		0.37 (0.14)	.20*	

Note. *N* = 201 triads. OCB = organizational citizenship behavior, HH = honesty-humility, IJ = perceptions of interactional justice, OP = perceptions of organizational politics.

* $p < .05$.

HONESTY-HUMILITY, CONTEXT PERCEPTION, AND PERFORMANCE

Appendix 3

Results of Separate Moderation Analyses Based on Factor Scores without Control Variables

Predictors	Overall Performance(fs) (<i>N</i> = 195)				Overall Performance(fs) (<i>N</i> = 183)		
	<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2		<i>B</i> (SE)	β	ΔR^2
Step 2			.08*	Step 2			.15*
HH	0.16 (0.06)	.19*		HH	0.16 (0.06)	.18*	
IJ(fs)	0.33 (0.14)	.17*		OP(fs)	-0.27 (0.06)	-.31*	
Step 3			.00	Step 3			.05*
HH*IJ(fs)	0.13 (0.19)	.05		HH*OP(fs)	0.31 (0.10)	.22*	

Note. HH = honesty-humility, IJ(fs) = perceptions of interactional justice (factor scores), OP(fs) = perceptions of organizational politics (factor scores).

Listwise deletion of cases with missing values.

* $p < .05$.