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Abstract

This study draws on trait activation theory to examine the effects of frontline hospitality employees’ prosocial motivation on their taking charge and job performance and how job autonomy moderates these effects. We collected data in two stages from 185 pairs of front-line hospitality employees and their direct supervisors, and we found a positive relationship between employees’ prosocial motivation and their taking charge. In addition, job autonomy strengthened this positive relationship, and taking charge mediated the interactive effect of prosocial motivation and job autonomy on job performance. These results suggest that when front-line hospitality employees perceive their level of job autonomy to be high enough to activate their expression of prosocial motivation, they will be more likely to engage in taking charge, which should lead to a higher evaluation of their job performance. Theoretical and practical implications for hospitality industry were discussed at the end of the paper.
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1. Introduction

In response to the pressures of decentralized organizational structures, rapid economic change, and environmental uncertainty, organizations are now increasingly encouraging employees to engage in extra-role behavior—that is, actions or habits that go beyond an employee’s formal job description (Van Dick, van Knippenberg, Kerschreiter, Hertel & Wieseke, 2008; Zhang & Xie, 2017). It is especially important for frontline hospitality employees to satisfy customers’ diverse demands in their daily work (Beck, Cha, Kim & Knutson, 2014; Chen, Lyu, Li, Zhou & Li, 2017).

Taking charge is defined as the “voluntary and constructive efforts, by individual employees, to effect organizationally functional change with respect to how work is executed within the contexts of their jobs, work units, or organizations” (Morrison & Phelps, 1999; p. 403). In response to the observation that employees’ taking charge is beneficial to an organization, researchers identify several of its antecedents, including general self-efficacy, top management openness, felt responsibility (Morrison & Phelps, 1999), leadership styles (Li, Chiaburu, Kirkman & Xie, 2013; Li, Zhang & Tian, 2016), and psychological empowerment (Kim, Liu & Diefendorff, 2015). However, some researchers suggest that taking charge is of value only when it contributes to job performance (Kim et al., 2015; Kim & Liu, 2017). It is therefore important to understand both the antecedents to and consequences of taking charge.

One of the research streams on the antecedents of taking charge focuses on individual differences (Parker, Williams & Turner, 2006; Moon, Kamdar, Mayer & Takeuchi, 2008). Moon et al. (2008) find that taking charge tends to flourish in
individuals whose other-centered traits outweigh their self-centered traits. By separating these two facets of personality, they find that dutiful employees who demonstrate feelings of responsibility for the well-being of the organization (the other-centered facet) are more likely to take charge. In contrast, employees striving toward strong personal achievement who focus more on their own work performance and less on the needs and well-being of others (the self-centered facet) are less likely to take charge.

Researchers also find that certain situational factors can stimulate taking charge. For example, Moon et al. (2008) find that the perception of procedural justice can positively enhance an employee’s propensity toward taking charge, but that of distributive justice cannot. Researchers also find that different leadership styles such as transformational leadership (Li et al., 2013) and empowering leadership (Li, Chiaburu & Kirkman, 2017) have positive effects on taking charge, while abusive supervision is negatively related to it (Ouyang, Lam & Wang, 2015). Among these situational factors, job autonomy is one of the most commonly studied situational factors in predicting taking charge (Parker et al., 2006; Parker, Bindl & Strauss, 2010).

It is defined as a general workplace situation in which employees can do their jobs with independence and freedom (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Job autonomy is recognized as a predictor of taking charge in that it can enhance role-orientation (Parker et al., 2006) and role breadth self-efficacy (Parker, 1998).

To date, these two streams of research on the predictors of taking charge have developed independently, which makes it difficult to understand how personal factors
and situational factors interact to affect an employee’s taking charge. To address this
research gap, we use trait activation theory (Haaland & Christiansen, 2002), which
provides a theoretical foundation for examining the interaction between personal and
situational factors. Trait activation theory posits that the extent to which a situation is
trait-relevant will strengthen or weaken the influence that personal traits exert on
behavior (Tett & Guterman, 2000), and this is particularly the case in predicting
taking charge. In the original model of taking charge, Morrison and Phelps (1999)
point out two judgments: an assessment of likely success and an assessment of likely
consequences, which taken together will tend to affect an employee’s propensity to
take charge. Morrison and Phelps argue that these judgments “vary from one taking
charge opportunity to another” (p. 406); that is, any attempt to predict taking charge
must take into account the specifics of the situation. Although they study both the
individual and contextual factors that affect taking charge, they do not comment on
what interactional effect these two factors might have on each other. Due to this
situation-specific nature of taking charge, some contextual factors are more likely
than others to signal whether the expression of a personal trait is appropriate in certain
situations. Thus, context will strengthen or weaken the effects of personal traits on
taking charge. It is therefore reasonable to integrate the two research streams given
the expectation that certain personal and situational factors can operate together to
predict taking charge.

In this study, we aim to advance the research on taking charge and hospitality
research in four ways. First, scholarly attention has increasingly been given to how to
motivate hospitality employees’ organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). For example, researchers have identified several antecedents and consequences of hospitality employees’ OCB (Chiang & Hsieh, 2012; Chen et al., 2017; Zhu, Lyu, Deng & Ye, 2017). However, the hospitality literature has largely neglected the effects of employees’ taking charge, which is another form of OCB. One exception is the study by Beck et al. (2014), which investigates lodging revenue managers’ taking charge. The lack of research in this area is significant because both hospitality organizations and frontline employees can benefit from taking charge. The service quality of hospitality organizations and individual employees largely relies on the interaction between frontline employees and customers. Therefore, to meet diverse and changing customer demands, it is essential for frontline hospitality employees to challenge the present state of operations and bring constructive changes. To our knowledge, this is the first empirical study to test the effect of frontline employees’ taking charge. It contributes to the hospitality literature by testing a new form of extra-role behavior by frontline hospitality employees. The findings can advance our knowledge on the antecedents and consequences of taking charge and its boundary conditions in the hospitality industry.

Second, we suggest that prosocial motivation can be an antecedent of taking charge. Prosocial motivation is a type of other-centered motivation that is normally expressed as a desire to benefit others (Grant, 2008a). Due to the discretionary change-oriented nature of taking charge (Morrison & Phelps, 1999), prosocial motivation may enhance taking charge because prosocial workers demonstrate
genuine concern for others, often by challenging the status quo to improve the general welfare of the organization. Taking a different angle from that of Moon et al. (2008), who propose that the other-centered facet of personality is an antecedent of taking charge, this study extends their research by identifying a more proximal and other-centered motivational factor. Within the literature on personality and motivation, there is agreement that personality affects work behaviors only if it affects motivational states (Barrick, 2005; Ng, Ang & Chan, 2008). Thus, given the importance of motivational processes in predicting work behavior, testing whether prosocial motivation can be an antecedent to taking charge is a clear contribution to the literature.

Third, the current literature on the antecedents of taking charge (e.g. Kim et al., 2015; Moon et al., 2008) neglects the interactional effect of personal and situational factors. Failing to consider relevant situational cues may lead to underestimating or overestimating the effects of personal traits and motives on taking charge. Drawing on trait activation theory (Haaland & Christiansen, 2002), we propose that job autonomy may serve as a situational cue that activates the expression of prosocial motivation and stimulates prosocial workers to engage in taking charge. By introducing job autonomy, a typical factor in job design, as a boundary condition in the relationship between individual differences and taking charge, this study extends our understanding of how the perception of situational factors may enhance the effect of prosocial motivation on an employee’s propensity for taking charge.

Lastly, this study integrates the antecedents and consequences of taking charge
and suggests that taking charge is one way in which the interaction of individual differences and situational factors relates to job performance. We propose a mediated moderation model and argue that when the work environment provides the relevant situational cue (i.e. job autonomy), employees with prosocial motivation will be more willing to adopt taking charge, which should contribute to higher evaluations of job performance. Figure 1 shows the conceptual model of this study.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses

As noted above, taking charge is defined as voluntary and constructive individual behavior to improve the work environment of teams and organizations (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). It is a form of extra-role behavior that consists of discretionary actions taken by an employee to improve the organization’s effectiveness (Kim & Liu, 2017). Examples of taking charge in the hospitality industry may include frontline employees’ 1) introduction of new technologies or approaches for better service performance; 2) elimination of redundant or unnecessary procedures to enhance service and organizational effectiveness; 3) efforts to change how their jobs are performed to be more effective.

The major difference between taking charge and other types of extra-role or organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) is its inherently change-oriented nature and its goal of improvement (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). Research identifies two
forms of citizenship behaviors (Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995). The first form is affiliative OCB, which is defined as “interpersonal, cooperative and noncontroversial” promotive and supportive behaviors that are directed toward maintaining the status quo (Grant & Mayer, 2009). Affiliative OCB includes helping and showing courtesy to others in the workplace. The second form is challenging OCB, which is defined as actions to improve work procedures by changing the status quo (Grant & Mayer, 2009, Van Dyne et al., 1995). Typical forms of challenging OCB include taking charge, voice and issue selling. Despite their change-oriented nature, taking charge differs from other forms of challenging OCB. For example, taking charge goes beyond voice because it involves active efforts to initiate and implement constructive change (Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Withey & Cooper, 1989). Issue selling may also enhance organizational effectiveness by bringing performance-related key trends, developments, and events to an organization’s attention (Ashford et al., 1998). A major difference between issue selling and taking charge is that taking charge focuses more on individuals’ constructive behaviors for accomplishing organizational goals, while issue selling calls attention to problems or opportunities. Offering suggestions and implementing solutions are not the focus of issue selling (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). Although researchers have examined the role of prosocial motivation on some forms of OCB, such as voice and personal initiative (Grant & Mayer, 2009; Kim, Van Dyne, Kamdar & Johnson, 2013), there is little exploration of the role that prosocial motivation plays in predicting taking charge.

In this study, we examine the relationship between an employee’s prosocial
motivation and the propensity to take charge. Prosocial motivation, which is defined as a desire to benefit others (Grant, 2008a), may affect taking charge through two mechanisms. First, employees with prosocial motivation are more willing to act on behalf of their colleagues and the organization in general than are their non-prosocial peers (Grant, 2008a; Grant & Mayer, 2009). Therefore, they are more likely than their peers to initiate constructive change at work. Second, research on motivated information processing shows that employees motivated by other-orientation tend to search and process more on other-related information cues, causing their actions to be informed to a greater degree by a consideration of the community’s best interests. (De Dreu & Nauta, 2009; De Dreu, Nijstad & van Knippenberg, 2008). For these reasons, we hypothesize that prosocial motivation will enhance an employee’s propensity to taking charge.

H1: Prosocial motivation has a positive relationship with taking charge.

Trait activation theory is frequently used to explain how situational factors interact with personal traits in predicting work behavior (Tett & Burnett, 2003). Building upon more traditional ways of thinking about the relationship between personality traits and performance, this theory supposes that personality traits can be activated by trait-relevant situational cues (Tett & Guterman, 2000). Since it was introduced by Tett and Guterman (2000), trait activation theory has been widely used to examine the interactional effect of personal traits and situational cues on work
behavior and job performance (see Tett, Simonet, Walser & Brown, 2013 for a
review). We draw upon this theory to argue that the activation of prosocial motivation
in the workplace will be more likely to occur when the employee perceives a degree
of job autonomy.

We hypothesize in this paper that job autonomy enhances the positive
relationship between prosocial motivation and taking charge. Job autonomy refers to
the opportunity for employees to do their jobs with independence and freedom
(Hackman & Oldham, 1976). According to trait activation theory, both trait relevance
and trait strength are essential qualitative features of situations that may reasonably
affect the expression of an individual’s traits (Tett & Burnett, 2003). First, regarding
the relevance of job autonomy as a situational factor, research indicates that a
situation is relevant if it can be “expected to provoke the trait in the form of a
behavioral response” (Tett & Guterman, 2000, p. 502). We argue that employees who
enjoy job autonomy can act in ways that are consistent with their prosocial motivation
due to the independence and freedom that allows them to make their own decisions in
the workplace. More specifically, greater job autonomy gives an employee greater
freedom to consider the welfare of colleagues or the wider organization and to devote
more attention to searching for and processing information on other-related cues. It
follows, then, that job autonomy will strengthen the positive relationship between an
employee’s prosocial motivation and taking charge. Second, research on situational
strength, or the degree to which the environment constrains an individual’s choices,
suggests that various job characteristics can restrict the expression of individual
differences (Meyer, Dalal & Hermida, 2010). When a situation provides greater job
autonomy, there are fewer constraints on an employee’s behavior, and individual
differences are more likely to be expressed (Mischel, 1977; Ng et al., 2008). This
finding corroborates the conclusions of similar studies. Gellatly and Irving (2001) find
that job autonomy strengthens the effect of extroversion and agreeableness on
contextual performance. Similarly, Ng et al. (2008) find that job autonomy
strengthens the relationship between a supervisor’s personality (e.g. emotional
stability, extroversion and conscientiousness) and leader effectiveness. Following the
same logic, we expect that job autonomy will strengthen the positive relationship
between an employee’s prosocial motivation and propensity to take charge.

H2: Job autonomy moderates the positive relationship between prosocial motivation
and taking charge. This relationship will be stronger when job autonomy is higher and
weaker when job autonomy is lower.

We argue that taking charge will positively relate to the evaluation of an
employee’s job performance. As mentioned above, taking charge involves
change-oriented behavior for the benefit of the organization (Li et al., 2013).
Employees who take charge in the workplace will thus tend to make greater efforts
not only toward other-centered information searching and processing but also toward
constructive change in the organization (Kim & Liu, 2017). Such efforts influence
how frontline employees conduct their in-role job behaviors and thus improve their
own effectiveness in the organization. This hypothesis is in line with findings by other researchers on the relationship between taking charge and job performance (Grant, Parker & Collins, 2009; Kim et al., 2015; Kim & Liu, 2017).

H3: Taking charge is positively related to the evaluation of employees’ job performance.

The fourth hypothesis integrates the first three (H1–H3) into a single mediated moderation model. We argue that when there is greater job autonomy, employees with prosocial motivation will be more likely to engage in taking charge, which will lead to a better evaluation of their job performance. Because taking charge involves constructive changes aimed at increasing the welfare of others or the organization (Morrison & Phelps, 1999), we propose that taking charge should be understood as a mechanism by which the interaction of prosocial motivation and job autonomy relates to the evaluation of an employee’s job performance.

H4: Taking charge mediates the interactive effect of prosocial motivation and job autonomy on job performance such that the indirect effect becomes significant when job autonomy is high.

3. Method

Participants and procedures
We collected data from a five-star hotel belonging to one of the largest hotel groups in China. Before the data collection, we interviewed the human resource director, who acknowledged that the extra-role behaviors of frontline hotel employees were important to the hotel’s performance. With the help of the human resource director, we randomly selected 280 frontline employees and their direct supervisors to conduct our research.

To avoid common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003), we collected survey data from frontline employees and their direct supervisors in two stages, 3 months apart. With the help of two research assistants, the questionnaires were distributed to the respondents during the workday, and the respondents returned them directly to our research assistants. In Stage 1, 280 questionnaires were distributed to frontline employees in several departments, including food and beverage, housekeeping, front desk, concierge, and club services. We received 224 of the questionnaires back, a response rate of 80%. In Stage 2, questionnaires were sent to the 224 employees who returned their questionnaires during Stage 1, and we invited 45 direct supervisors of these employees to complete a questionnaire about their employees’ job performance. Ultimately, questionnaires from 198 employees (a response rate of 88%) and 42 direct supervisors (a response rate of 93%) were returned. After removing the questionnaires with large percentages of missing data on the key variables, 185 paired questionnaires from 185 employees and 42 direct supervisors were included in the further analysis, a response rate of 66% from the frontline employees after two waves of data collection. Of the useable samples, 60.5%
of the subordinates were female, the average age was 26.3 years old (SD=7.12), and 65.4% of frontline employees had an education level of high school or below.

Measures

We adopted translation and back-translation on the measurement items. All of the questionnaires were presented in Chinese. Different variables were measured in the two stages: frontline employees rated prosocial motivation and job autonomy during Stage 1 and taking charge during Stage 2. Employees’ direct supervisors rated job performance during Stage 2. Except for job autonomy, all of the variables were rated using a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). We adopted well-established measurements for all of the variables in our model (see Appendix 1 for the measurement items used in the study).

Prosocial motivation was measured using a 4-item scale adapted from Grant (2008a). Items in this model include “I want to help others through my work” and “It is important to me to do good for others through my work” (Cronbach’s alpha = .75).

Job autonomy was measured using a 9-item scale from Parker et al. (2006). Respondents were asked about the extent to which they were involved in making decisions at work. The response scale ranged from 1 (not at all) to 7 (a great deal). Items in this model include “allocate jobs among team members” (Cronbach’s alpha = .91). The results of an ANOVA test showed no significant difference across different jobs in terms of frontline employees’ perceptions of job autonomy (F=1.91, p>.05).

Taking charge was measured using a 10-item scale from Morrison and Phelps
Items in this model include “I often try to bring about improved procedures for the work unit or department” and “I often try to correct a faulty procedure or practice” (Cronbach’s alpha = .89).

Job performance was measured using a 5-item scale from Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1989). Items in this model include “This subordinate always completes the duties specified in his/her job description” and “This subordinate meets all the formal performance requirements of the job” (Cronbach’s alpha = .82).

In this study, we controlled for four demographic variables: subordinates’ age, gender, organizational tenure, and educational level. Researchers indicate that these demographic variables can influence individual proactive behaviors (for a review, see Bindl & Parker, 2010). Research also demonstrates that these demographic variables are significantly correlated with taking charge and job performance (Fritz & Sonnentag, 2009; Zhang et al., 2014; Dysvik et al., 2016). To rule out the potential influence of these demographic variables on the key constructs of the current study (Bernerth & Aguinis, 2016), we used a set of control variables that is consistent with the literature (Kim et al., 2015; Li et al., 2015).

4. Results

We analyzed whether significant non-response bias existed in our study. Specifically, we compared employee participants who responded only to the first wave of the survey with participants who responded to both waves. The results of the independent sample t-test analysis showed that these two groups of participants did
not differ significantly in terms of prosocial motivation (t = -.96, n.s.), job autonomy (t = -.65, n.s.), age (t = 1.26, n.s.), tenure (t = -.33, n.s.), gender (t = 1.60, n.s.), or educational level (t = .74, n.s.). These results indicated that non-response bias was not significant in our study.

We then conducted confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) to evaluate convergent validity and discriminant validity. We examined the baseline model that included all four key variables (i.e., prosocial motivation, job autonomy, taking charge, and job performance) and found that the four-factor model had an acceptable fit ($\chi^2 = 701.67$, $df = 344$, $p \leq .01$; RMSEA = 0.075, CFI = 0.94, TLI = 0.94). Additionally, all of the factor loadings were significant, indicating convergent validity. We also compared different alternative factor models by randomly combining two subordinate-rated variables. The results suggested that the four-factor model fit the data considerably better than any of the alternative models did (see Table 1). The results of further analyses supported the discriminant validity of the constructs, and all four constructs were applied.

Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations, and zero-order Pearson correlations for all of the variables. The results showed that consistent with our hypotheses, prosocial motivation was positively correlated with taking charge ($r = .22$, $p \leq .01$), and taking charge was positively correlated with job performance ($r = .26$, $p \leq .01$).
Hypothesis Testing

Because the supervisors may have provided job performance ratings for more
than one of the surveyed subordinates, one-way analysis of variance and the intraclass
correlation coefficient were used to test whether the data contained nested effects. The
results supported the non-independent structure of the data ($F=5.057, p<.01$, ICC (1)
=.48, ICC (2) =.80 for job performance). We therefore used hierarchical linear
modeling (HLM) to analyze the data, as it allowed us to test each hypothesis
individually while simultaneously controlling for the non-independence inherent to
nested data.

Hypotheses 1 and 3 both postulate that prosocial motivation is positively related
to taking charge and that taking charge is positively related to the evaluation of job
performance. To test these two hypotheses, we regressed subordinates’ prosocial
motivation on taking charge and taking charge on job performance together with the
control variables. As shown in Table 3, prosocial motivation related positively to
taking charge ($\gamma = .18, p < .05$), and taking charge related positively to job
performance ($\gamma = .21, p < .01$). Therefore, Hypotheses 1 and 3 were supported.
between prosocial motivation and taking charge. We thus regressed the grand
mean-centered prosocial motivation, job autonomy, and the interaction term on taking
charge. As shown in Table 3, the interaction term positively related to taking charge (γ
= .15, p < .05), supporting Hypothesis 2. Figure 2 shows the pattern of this interaction.
The results of the simple slope test indicated that the relationship between prosocial
motivation and taking charge was significantly positive (b = .25, p < .05) when job
autonomy was high (1 standard deviation above the mean), but it was not significant
(b = -.11, n.s.) when job autonomy was low (1 standard deviation below the mean).
Hence, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Hypothesis 4 posits that taking charge mediates the interactive effect of prosocial
motivation and job autonomy on job performance. To test the conditional indirect
effect, we conducted a bootstrapping analysis by the PROCESS macro and estimated
the bias-corrected confidence intervals using 2,000 bootstrap re-samples (Hayes,
2012). The results showed that the indirect effect between prosocial motivation and
job performance was significant when job autonomy was high (effect = .08,
bias-corrected confidence intervals = .003; .253) but not significant when job
autonomy was low (effect = -.02, bias-corrected confidence intervals = -.211; .027) at
95% confidence intervals. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was supported.
5. Discussion

The results supported all of the hypotheses that we proposed in this study. Specifically, employees with higher prosocial motivation were more likely to engage in taking charge, and this relationship could be strengthened when employees perceived greater job autonomy. The findings also indicated that when job autonomy was high, the indirect effect between prosocial motivation and job performance via taking charge was significant. The theoretical contributions and practical implications of these findings are discussed below.

Theoretical contributions

This study makes three important theoretical contributions to the current literature on taking charge and prosocial motivation. First, its findings contribute to the literature on taking charge by demonstrating that prosocial motivation can be a motivational antecedent. Previous research focuses solely on personality features, such as conscientiousness and the propensity to be proactive in the workplace (Moon et al., 2008; Parker et al., 2006), as the individual traits important to predicting taking charge. Some researchers argue that motivation is a proximal factor that can explain how personality affects an employee’s work behavior (Barrick, Stewart & Piotrowski, 2002; Judge & Ilies, 2002; Latham & Pinder, 2005), and the results of this study indeed showed that prosocial motivation can predict taking charge. This finding was consistent with the literature linking prosocial motivation to various types of extra-role behavior, such as voice, personal initiative (Grant & Mayer, 2009),
organizational citizenship behavior (Mayfield & Taber, 2010), and mentoring (Allen, 2003). Our findings suggest that prosocial motivation can also be an antecedent to taking charge in its expression as a specific type of extra-role behavior (Morrison & Phelps, 1999).

Second, the study’s outcome adds to the current understanding of how personal and situational factors can be predictors of taking charge. Previous research focuses on personal factors independently of situational factors as predictors of taking charge (Moon et al., 2008; Parker et al., 2006), and they do not address the question of how the interaction of these two sets of factors affects taking charge. Drawing on trait activation theory (Tett & Burnett, 2003), we found that job autonomy can enhance the effect of prosocial motivation on taking charge. This study thus contributes to the literature on taking charge by integrating personal and situational factors and demonstrating that job autonomy (i.e. the situational factor) can strengthen the positive effect of prosocial motivation (i.e. the personal factor) on taking charge. This finding is also consistent with trait activation theory in that it shows that the effect of personal factors can be strengthened or weakened by situational factors (Kacmar, Collins, Harris & Judge, 2009; Kim et al., 2013). Neglecting situational factors in assessing the relationship between traits and behavior may result in overestimating or underestimating the effects of personal factors.

Third, the findings of this study extend our knowledge about the relationship between an employee’s prosocial motivation and the supervisor’s evaluation of that employee’s job performance by showing that job autonomy may be identified as a
moderator between the two. This study examined both the antecedents and consequences of taking charge and proposed the mediated moderation model, by which the interactive effect of prosocial motivation and job autonomy affects taking charge, which further influences supervisor-rated job performance. The results supported our hypotheses. We contribute to the literature on taking charge by demonstrating that taking charge is a mechanism by which employees with prosocial motivation can achieve higher job performance when they perceive higher job autonomy. In addition to the mediated moderation effect, the results weakly supported \( (p = .057) \) the observation that job autonomy moderates the relationship between prosocial motivation and job performance. This is consistent with the research on the relationship between prosocial motivation and performance. For example, some researchers find no significant relationship between prosocial motivation and job performance (Alonso & Lewis, 2001). Grant (2008a) extends their research and finds that intrinsic motivation strengthens the relationship between prosocial motivation and job performance, which suggests the importance of boundary conditions in the link between prosocial motivation and job performance.

Practical implications

The outcome of our study has two implications for best practices in hospitality management. First, managers may wish to encourage frontline employees to engage in more extra-role behavior (e.g. taking charge). This is borne out by the findings that employees with prosocial motivation tend to take charge more and that taking charge
can lead to higher evaluation of job performance. Considering that the long-term organizational performance of a hospitality company largely relies on the extra-role and proactive behaviors of its members (Chen, 2011; Cha, Kim, Beck & Knutson, 2017), managers may wish to emphasize employees’ prosocial motivation during the recruitment and training process to promote their taking charge behavior. In addition, scholars have demonstrated that satisfying personal psychological needs can lead to employees’ taking charge (Li, Zhang, & Tian, 2016). Hence, we suggest that managers should pay more attention to frontline employees’ psychological needs. Fulfilling frontline employees’ needs for achievement, competence, and affiliation can increase their intrinsic prosocial motivation, which increases taking charge. In addition, managers may consider increasing their perceived prosocial impact by creating a culture that makes employees aware of how they contribute to customer satisfaction and overall organizational effectiveness.

Second, managers may be able to encourage proactive extra-role behavior by creating a more autonomous working environment, which will enhance employees’ taking charge and job performance both directly and indirectly. This follows from our finding that job autonomy not only directly affected taking charge but also strengthened the positive relationship between prosocial motivation and taking charge. In addition, the significant mediated moderation model between prosocial motivation and job performance via taking charge implies that job autonomy is a key factor that can activate the expression of prosocial motivation. We therefore suggest that managers provide more opportunities for job autonomy to their frontline employees.
For example, a more flexible environment for frontline employees can strengthen their sense of ownership and create more opportunities for them to take charge. We also suggest that managers consider displaying more empowering leadership to increase frontline employees’ psychological empowerment. Scholars demonstrate that empowering leadership can increase employees’ perception of job autonomy (Bennis and Townsend, 1997).

Limitations and future research

Although this study makes the aforementioned theoretical and practical contributions, it also has limitations. First, our measurements of prosocial motivation, job autonomy, and taking charge were based solely on the perspective of frontline employees. This may lead to the problem of common method variance, which we have attempted to mitigate by collecting data in two stages (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Future research may benefit by measuring employees’ motivation and behavior from two different sources (e.g., from both the frontline employees and their direct supervisors). Second, we collected data from just one hotel, which may have resulted in limited generalizability. It is possible that our findings cannot be generalized to other service settings. However, given that some of our findings were consistent with those of previous studies in other settings, they may be generalized to a broad range of service settings in the hospitality area. Nevertheless, we do not assert that our findings have perfect generalizability. Future research may consider replicating this study in other service settings. Future research may also profitably extend this study to other
industries, although we believe that companies in the hospitality industry have a particular need for their employees to adopt more extra-role behavior due to the constantly changing needs and requirements of service industry customers (Chiang & Hsieh, 2012; Raub, 2008). Third, we used subjective rating of a situational variable (i.e. job autonomy), although it is consistent with the treatment of previous research (Parker et al., 2006). Future research may consider to either use experiment or team design (for example, make variables such as job autonomy as a level 2 variable) to investigate the objective effect of situational variables. Lastly, this study only examined the role of taking charge, leaving unanswered the question of how prosocial motivation interacts with job autonomy to predict other types of extra-role behavior, such as helping, voice, and organizational citizenship behavior. Future research may consider whether these extra-role behaviors act as mediators between prosocial motivation and job performance.

Despite its limitations, this study sets a foundation upon which future researchers may consider other motivational and job design factors in predicting taking charge. A particularly promising direction for future research on predicting taking charge would be to examine the interactional effects of other types of motivational factors. Although there is as yet a lack of empirical studies of such effects, the findings from studies of other types of extra-role behavior may provide some guidance to future research. For example, Rioux and Penner (2001) identified three motives (i.e. prosocial motives, impression management motives, and organizational concern motives) for organizational citizenship behavior, which is a specific form of extra-role behavior.
Extending the research of Rioux and Penner (2001), Grant and Mayer (2009) find that impression management motivation strengthens the positive effect of prosocial motivation on forms of affiliative citizenship behavior, including personal initiative, helping, and courtesy. Kim et al. (2013) extended this research by demonstrating that prosocial and impression management motivations can interact with coworker and organizational support to predict helping and voice. Testing the effects of more motivational and job design factors on taking charge can advance our knowledge on how to motivate hospitality employees to engage in more taking charge. Taken together, these studies provide a foundation for future work on motivational and organizational contexts.

Second, while our aim was to integrate the literature on motivation and job design, future research could consider other types of job design factors. One direction would be to consider the potential of relational job design. Grant (2007) proposes a model of relational job design aimed at increasing employees’ motivation to make a prosocial difference. He asserted that employees tend to engage in prosocial behavior when they perceive great impacts on the beneficiaries of their work (Grant, 2007, 2008b). Following this research stream, future research could consider the perception of job impact as a predictor of taking charge and how it affects hospitality employees’ decisions to take charge.

6. Conclusion

An organization cannot achieve optimal effectiveness without employees who
continuously challenge the status quo and proactively improve the procedures that
they follow. This study integrates the research literature on motivation and job design
by showing that prosocial motivation can interact with job autonomy to predict taking
charge, which is a specific form of extra-role behavior, in the hospitality industry. In
addition, taking charge can further increase a frontline employee’s job performance.
We call for future research on other antecedents of taking charge, particularly from the
perspectives of motivational cues and relational job design. Such efforts would
undoubtedly extend our understanding in this emerging area of extra-role behavior in
the hospitality industry.
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Appendix 1. Measurement items used in the paper

**Prosocial motivation (from Grant 2008a)**
I care about benefiting others through my work;
I want to help others through my work;
I want to have positive impact on others;
It is important to me to do good for others through my work.

**Job autonomy (from Parker et al., 2006)**
Help to decide how much work your team will do
Help to allocate jobs among team members
Get involved in the selection of new team members
Arrange cover for people
Get involved in improvement teams
Help to monitor your team’s overall performance
Train other people
Get involved in the discipline of other team members
Help to manage the budget for your team

**Taking charge (Adapted from Morrison & Phelps, 1999)**
I often try to adopt improved procedures for doing my job.
I often try to change how my job is executed in order to be more effective.
I often try to bring about improved procedures for the work unit or department.
I often try to institute new work methods that are more effective for the hotel.
I often try to change organizational rules or policies that are nonproductive or counterproductive.
I often make constructive suggestions for improving how things operate within the hotel.
I often try to correct a faulty procedure or practice.
I often try to eliminate redundant or unnecessary procedures.
I often try to implement solutions to pressing organizational problems.
I often try to introduce new structures, technologies, or approaches to improve efficiency.

**Job performance (Adapted from Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1989, used by Janssen, 2001)**
This employee always completes the duties specified in his/her job description.
This employee fulfills all responsibilities required by his/her job.
This employee often fails to perform essential duties. (Reversed item)
This employee never neglects aspects of the job that he/she is obligated to perform.
This employee meets all the formal performance requirements of the job.
Figure 1. The Conceptual Model
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Figure 2. The moderating effect of job autonomy
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Table 1. Confirmatory factor analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four-factor model</td>
<td>701.67</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-factor models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial motivation and taking charge combined</td>
<td>915.49</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>213.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial motivation and job autonomy combined</td>
<td>832.53</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>130.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job autonomy and taking charge combined</td>
<td>1832.88</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1131.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor Model</td>
<td>2718.56</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2016.89**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$. TLI is the Tucker-Lewis Index, CFI is the comparative fit index, and RMSEA is the root-mean-square error of approximation.
Table 2. Means, standard deviations, and correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tenure</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prosocial motivation</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job autonomy</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Taking charge</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job performance</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01. N = 185 (individual-level) and 42 (group-level). Age was measured in number of years and tenure was measured in number of months. Gender was measured as 0 (male) and 1 (Female). Education was measured as 1 (secondary school), 2 (high school), 3 (college level) and 4 (university degree or above).
Table 3. Results of hierarchical linear modeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Taking charge</th>
<th>Job performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.78**(.38)</td>
<td>5.14**(.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01(.01)</td>
<td>.01(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.05(.13)</td>
<td>-.02(.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.04**(.01)</td>
<td>.02(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.04(.07)</td>
<td>.04(.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial motivation</td>
<td>.18*(.08)</td>
<td>.07(.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job autonomy</td>
<td>.25**(.05)</td>
<td>.12*(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial motivation ×job autonomy</td>
<td>.15*(.06)</td>
<td>.10*(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking charge</td>
<td>.21**(.06)</td>
<td>.16*(.07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pseudo-$R^2$                  | .08           | .23             | .05     | .06     | .07     |

Note: $^+ p < .06; ^* p < .05; ^{**} p < .01$. N = 185 (individual-level) and 42 (group-level). Age was measured in number of years and tenure was measured in number of months. Gender was measured as 0 (male) and 1 (Female). Education was measured as 1 (secondary school), 2 (high school), 3 (college level) and 4 (university degree or above). The numbers in brackets are standard errors. Pseudo-$R^2$ refers to the percentage of within-person variance accounted for by the model.