

# **PROACTIVE PERSONALITY, JOB PERFORMANCE, AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE. CASE OF EXPRESS PETROLEUM COMPANY LEBANON**

**Ali TAKACH**  
University of Balamand  
(Lebanon)  
University of Jean Moulin Lyon 3  
(France)

## **ABSTRACT:**

The present study aims to prove the usefulness of using the socioeconomic approach (SEAM) to management as a research methodology for an investigation into the ways in which an oil and gas private company could improve its overall organizational performance by enhancing employee proactivity. The research intends to identify the existent dysfunctions in the company alongside their root causes and the associated hidden costs particularly related to the ways in which employees are allowed to act in a proactive manner that would enhance their job performance and drive overall organizational performance. The research methodology is based on the SEAM approach to data collection and involves a series of interviews in an integral way. The present study will not only provide valuable recommendations for the management of the oil and gas company, but also demonstrate the effectiveness of using the socio-economic approach to management in projects of organizational change.

**Keywords:** Proactive personality, job performance, organizational performance, SEAM.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Nowadays, oil and gas industry in Lebanon is facing uncertainty because of the poor economic situation. This industry is very important for all Lebanese people because they are using diesel and diesel oil on a daily basis. The Lebanese government is facing problems in this industry because of the high volatility in the exchange rate of LBP to US dollar which led to a large increase in prices. As a result, a large number of small companies went bankrupt within a year because of the low strategic implementations. An intervention research process has been negotiated in the case of oil and gas company in Lebanon located in Beirut, i.e., Express Petroleum.

The proactive personality is characteristic for people who always have the initiative, who anticipate events, who assume responsibilities as their own

without expecting others to tell them so, and take a quick turn in search of the solution to the problems presented. These are people who are always willing to make the most favorable decisions in any circumstance and at any time and who are also capable of reacting to any event in an organized and safe manner.

The first investigations on proactive personality were conducted at the end of the last century by authors such as Ashford and Cummings (1985), Bateman and Crant (1993), and Frese et al. (1997). However, only recently has the issue been given real relevance in the field of organizational behavior studies since in business management a relevant role is nowadays given to proactive workers, who are being considered a fundamental part of organizations as drivers of change and transformations, not only as a result of their professionalism, but also of their willingness to change their circumstances and to better themselves in order to help their organizations grow.

Scientific studies consistently show that having employees who are motivated, committed and willing to transcend the limits of their role constitutes a strategic asset for all organizations (DuBrin, 2014). In other words, an inescapable condition to achieve success in a context in which change and complexity are the norm seems to be related to the ability of organizations to identify employees that are able to anticipate future developments and are willing to take matters into their own hands in order to bring about a better future not only for themselves but also for the organization as a whole. According to Spitzmuller (2015), the renewed interest that exists today in proactive personality is perhaps due to the recognition that, in addition to becoming a source of greater satisfaction and commitment, proactive behavior can contribute to organizational competitiveness. All this leads us to think that organizations today are more aware of their actions, since they consider proactive behavior as a way of enhancing organizational performance, since these behaviors are oriented towards the assertiveness, responsibility, creativity, self-control and dynamism of organizations.

**The objectives** of the study are as follows:

- O1: To perform a critical analysis of the available literature on proactive personality, job performance and organizational performance.
- O2: To collect data from the chosen company using the socio-economic approach to management methodology.
- O3: To evaluate the relationships between proactive personality, job performance, and organizational performance in the chosen company.
- O4: To make a set of recommendations based on the findings to help the chosen company improve the employees' performance.

The research project is based on the hypothesis that a proactive personality has an effect on overall job performance, which in turn influences organizational performance.

-Descriptive hypothesis: There is a general lack of strategic implementation and strategic orientation and a lack of strategic skills among the employees at Express Petroleum.

-Explicative hypothesis: The lack of strategic skills at Express Petroleum is generated by a lack of awareness of the hidden costs and a lack of trainings on strategic management.

-Prescriptive hypothesis: Building an internal and external strategic plan as well as a proactive and strategic culture through the implementation of trainings will improve the organizational performance at Express Petroleum.

### **Literature Review:**

The term proactivity refers to a broad and diverse set of self-motivated and change-oriented behaviors that seek to influence the environment to achieve certain individual, group or organizational goals (Belschak & Den Hartog, 2017; Fatimah, Ferris & Frese, 2016; Grant & Ashford, 2008). From the perspective of what was pointed out by the aforementioned authors, it can be inferred that the proactive personality is marked by the responsibility and motivation to do things so that they happen in a certain time, the willingness to make decisions without waiting for external motivation, and the ability to choose the most effective and efficient manner for handling current circumstances.

At present there is an abundance of studies that deal with the topic of proactive personality, how workers influence their work environment, carrying out the redesign of their tasks, forming their internal locus of control, modifying their behavior if it affects society, being always focused on work without being disturbed by anything or anyone and without their daily work being hampered. From this perspective, it is necessary to point out that a new line of research has emerged on the bases of the rhetoric in social processes, job structures and organizational change, collected in the literature under the name of "proactividad" (Fatimah, Ferris, & Frese, 2016; Grant and Ashford, 2008). Therefore, talking about proactivity is synonymous with a broad construct that cannot be enclosed in a single type of behavior. Instead, the concept indicates that depending on their motivation, each individual intends to influence the achievement of business objectives leaving their own mark on the result of collective actions.

In this sense, the study of proactivity has been developed in two main stages. Initially, research was conducted in isolation, focusing on behaviors such as taking control (Morrison & Phelps, 1999), personal initiative (Frese et al., 1997), seeking feedback (Ashford & Cummings, 1985) and proactive personality (Bateman & Crant, 1993). In this context, it is striking that since the end of the last century, research on isolated features of proactive personality was already heading towards the search for means to strengthen proactivity within companies, all of which has given birth to a new strand of research in the literature.

### **Proactive Personality Characteristics:**

The proactive personality presents a series of individual characteristics that allow it to establish itself as a priority within organizations. Among them are mentioned the knowledge that the final choice of any decision depends on the individual, because they always know when something affects them. In addition, proactive individuals quickly modify the problems they observe and transform them into solutions while knowing how to recognize when there are events that are not under their control.

In this same sense, López (2010) highlights that within the analysis of the different studies on business proactivity, six main characteristics stand out: (a) looking for opportunities, which means always being alert to detect

circumstances that favor the company; (b) creating opportunities, which translates into making circumstances a good opportunity that others hardly highlight; (c) taking the initiative, a notion related to acting driven by self-motivation, to proposing ideas and actions to be carried out; (d) being a promoter of new circumstances, to generate ideas and actions different from the traditional ones and new ways of operating in the different areas for the company; (e) anticipating problems, which means anticipating difficult situations that may arise such as the economic situation, competition, customers, shortage of raw materials etc.; and (f) displaying an attitude of control, which is the way of acting where the desire to direct, command and organize stands out. In this sense, proactivity comes from the capacities, abilities, skills, attitudes and aptitudes that, individually, each employee applies when faced with the difficulties that arise in the organization in order to modify them for the benefit of the organization.

In summary, the above research reveals that proactivity is driven by six main characteristics that define it as a fundamental pattern for improving business performance. This is because the achievement of the objectives set in the organizations is key for their strengthening in the short, medium and long term within a global economic context that achieves the acquisition of knowledge that goes beyond the basic needs of the company, employers and workers, but without neglecting indicators such as efficiency, productivity, values, labor and financial markets, among others. Proactivity is not just about taking decisions or initiatives, it also about taking responsibility and turning objectives into reality, deciding at all times what to do. Therefore, it is necessary to promote proactive behavior within companies to ensure that these companies can compete in various markets. It is through proactivity that entrepreneurs can respond to the deficiencies of the environment, represented by the way in which they perceive various situations, make decisions, and design strategies (Frese, Brantjes & Hoorn, 2002).

### **Dimensionality of the Proactive Personality:**

Based on what has been described in previous research, the proactive personality can be disaggregated into two dimensions: the first comprises the point of view of mental capacity and consciousness; and the second includes conscientiousness and kindness. The first dimension is directed towards the performance of the task, while the second is directed towards the performance within the company. Both dimensions define effective and efficient business proactivity. In fact, these dimensions of proactive personality also offer predictive validity in specific work settings and outcomes (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

In this same context, Spitzmuller et al. (2015) points out that the studies carried out have shown that proactive personality explains the unique variation in the overall job performance, specifically with the performance of tasks. These findings show that there is a significant relationship between proactive personality and job performance in its dimension of task performance. This finding is of great importance since it lays the foundation for the present research.

**Job Performance:**

At present, organizations are no longer seen from a linear perspective in which only competitiveness and obtaining benefits prevail, with a base of horizontal segmentation of work and vertical decisions, where there is an individual at the top who makes decisions that seemed most appropriate and passed them on to the employees, who received a salary for performing them as ordered. Today the perspective has changed because organizations are no longer seen as isolated structures, but as the whole resulting from various processes. From this perspective, organizations are a system of relationships between individuals through which employees, guided by managers, are oriented towards the achievement of common goals, which are obtained through the product of planning and management processes and decision making, where objectives are created based on the learning capacity of the employees and knowing that organizations will gain relevance by taking advantage of the enthusiasm and learning capacity of the employees.

In this context, job performance can be conceptualized as a set of concrete actions aimed at the fulfillment of functions, which is determined by factors associated with the employees and their environment. Studies suggest that job performance is mediated by the expectations that the employees have about the roles they play within the organization, about their way of taking into account achievements and their wishes for harmony. In this sense, it is pertinent to point out that job performance is directly proportional to abilities and skills which allow the employees to work towards the achievement of the objectives set within the company.

In this regard, Ghiselly (1998) points out that job performance is influenced by five factors: motivation, skills, personal traits, clarity, and acceptance of the role and opportunities to perform. These factors underlie a harmonious relationship with efficient work, where motivation means providing an impulse or reason for a person to behave in a certain way, therefore referring to the awakening interest and enthusiasm towards something, starting from their own motives or needs, thus awakening interest, enthusiasm and personal satisfaction. Likewise, these factors go hand in hand with the attitudes and skills possessed by the employees based on the objectives and goals set, followed by the policies and standards, vision and mission of the organization.

However, despite the fact that job performance plays an important role in almost all human resources processes, starting with decisionmaking, after several decades of studies there is still no consensus among academics on a comprehensive theory of job performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Motowidlo, 2003). Probably the reason for this situation is the constant difficulty of discernment in terms of achieving a single approach to dimensionality and measures that allow researchers to conduct a validation against the operational evaluation of job performance (Binning & Barrett, 1989). There are studies that regard job performance as a measure of organizational effectiveness (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004), as well as studies which consider a combination of measures of task performance and contextual performance, where the number of measures for each dimension varies.

It is estimated that job performance is an action or attitude observed in employees linked to their characteristics which results from the manner in which their qualities, needs and abilities interact with the nature of the role they play

and with the organization. Therefore, when an employee reaches an execution level, achieving the goals in a predetermined time within the organization, he obtains the necessary efficiency for the organization and experiences a higher job satisfaction.

In line with this, Katz and Kahn (1978) presented three types of critical behaviors for obtaining an effective and efficient organization: (a) joining and staying in the organization; (b) exceedance of performance standards in an innovative and spontaneous way to go beyond the prescribed roles; and (c) cooperation with and protection of other members of the organization, undertaking self-development, and representing the organization favorably to the public (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Organ (1988) also suggested an expanded domain of work behavior and suggested that this construct could be considered as a part of overall job performance. In this way, for the creation of excellence within organizations it is necessary to have a sense of belonging to the organization as well as to the role that is carried out, providing great performance, which implies anticipating expectations and going beyond what is suggested by role responsibility.

### **Dimensionality of Job Performance:**

In this literature review, job performance is considered to be a two-dimensional construct formed of task performance and contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Maroofi & Navidinya, 2011), which are conceptualized as follows:

#### **Task Performance**

Task performance is an enveloping factor that is intrinsically part of the initiative of each employee, since it includes one of the requirements established by the organization to achieve the goals and objectives set in the short, medium and long term. Therefore, to keep up with these demands, it is necessary to promote a whole set of strategies that maintain acceptable decision rates. This initiative depends on the integration of efforts in the development of the agreed objectives, as elements of professional growth. These behaviors can be distinguished by their effectiveness, which is the impact that behaviors have on the results that are valued by the organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). This distinction emphasizes that the performance of tasks is defined by the behavior itself, while effectiveness is the consequence of that behavior (Griffin, Neal & Neale, 2000). Therefore, the performance of the task is a principal factor in organizational security, since it is capable of transforming the raw material of the company into an event that allows the development of the product, distinguishing its finished products, thus providing important planning, as well as coordination, supervision and personnel functions. Similarly, Motowidlo (2003) argued that the performance of tasks contributes to organizational effectiveness by supporting the organization within the context in which the technical core should function. From this it follows that the general growth of the organization requires consensus between people and the work they do it in, since it allows greater efficiency in the development of processes that revolve around defined objectives.

Maroof and Navidinya (2011) proposed a four-item measure to capture task performance: job knowledge, problem-solving skills, skills to operate equipment

and use tools, and protection and care of available resources. For their part, Williams and Anderson (1991) developed a measure of seven items, which are: "adequately completes the assigned tasks", "meets the responsibilities specified in the job description", "performs the tasks expected of he/she", "meets formal job performance requirements", "engages in activities that will directly affect performance evaluation", "neglects aspects of work that are required to be performed" and "does not fulfill essential duties".

### **Contextual performance**

Organizations must be focused not only on the work responsibilities that each employee has, but also on the holistic understanding of the employees as persons with particular roles to perform, which allows them to create a distinctive organizational profile within the company (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). For this reason, job performance considers a second dimension that focuses on the person, and is known as contextual performance, which comprises citizenship behaviors, both organizational and interpersonal, and job dedication.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behaviors**

It is defined as the mutual benefit that the organization obtains through the input of employees in regard to the improvement of productivity, which occurs through the focus on acting empathically towards the employees and improving job satisfaction as a result of the fact that the employees positively evaluate the environment of their job. Therefore, organizational citizenship behavior (OCBO) can be conceptualized as an individualized procedure recognized by the formal reward system which promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization.

Organizational citizenship behavior is a concept which appeared in the field of industrial or organizational psychology, in which the impact of the behaviors of individuals, groups and the structure of organizations is analyzed. These behaviors are defined as open, discretionary and unrelated behaviors by the formal system of the organization, but they are necessary, since as a whole they promote the efficient and effective functioning of the organization (Organ 1988, 2006).

For his part, Puffer (1987) postulated a distinction between positive and negative prosocial organizational behavior. In contrast to the definition given earlier, negative organizational citizenship is represented by those discretionary behaviors that are dysfunctional for the organization, that is, those defined as non-compliant behaviors, for example, making unrealistic promises to clients, such as promising early delivery which produces situations that affect the credibility of organizations and lead customer distrust.

Given this variety of conceptualizations, Schnake (1991) suggested that there is a need for an exhaustive review aimed at the exploration of the overlap of the terms used to describe prosocial organizational behaviors, extra-role behavior and OCB-O, since they are used interchangeably to describe the same or very similar behaviors. Therefore, it is necessary to use the dimensions and measures of each of these terms separately. Schnake (1991) states that although these terms may seem interchangeable, the one that explains the broadest collection of behaviors appears to be prosocial organizational behavior. Additionally, he also suggested excluding voluntary behaviors that are detrimental to the organization,

because better explanatory power is obtained when they are not included. Later, these deliberate harmful behaviors evolved into a new construct called counterproductive behaviors at work (CWB).

Schnake (1991) also suggested that for future research to accurately operationalize organizational citizenship as a construct, a broader variety of behaviors must be identified and the dimensionality of the construct must be evaluated. Therefore, it is necessary to have all the variables, dimensions and measures to obtain a clear and precise study of the performance domain within the citizen structure, using different analysis methodologies that allow the complete identification of a clear domain structure.

To respond in part to these concerns, Williams and Anderson (1991) developed a six-item measure to capture OCB-O in the following terms: "attendance at work is above the norm", "give early warning when not can go to work", "take undeserved breaks from work", "spending a lot of time in personal phone conversations", "complain about insignificant things at work", "adhere to informal rules designed to maintain order".

### **Interpersonal Citizenship Behaviors**

Interpersonal citizenship behaviors (OCB-I) refer to the human relationships that form between members of the organization as they attempt to respond to the difficulties presented through mutual consensus. Along these lines, Anderson and Williams (1996) affirm that interpersonal citizenship can be the result of "opportunity structures" created by the work flow and the social system of the organization. The main cause of these situations is due to the fact that there are people with sufficient abilities and skills to give more assistance than others. In this context, Organ (1988) has found that people help more frequently because they are an integral part of the workflow, they have the necessary experience or because they are simply more available in a physical or temporal sense. What the author points out could give way to an intrinsic link between the quality of the relationship with individuals and interpersonal citizenship, centered on the person and the task.

Over time, various authors (Organ, 1988; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983; Williams & Anderson, 1991; Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994) have pointed out that interpersonal citizenship arises from helping co-workers, always offering collaboration, which implies collaborative assistance for people in need. Underlining their importance to organizations, these behaviors have been associated with the quantity and quality of work group performance and various other indicators of the organization's financial efficiency and customer service and performance. Therefore, the evidence suggests that interpersonal citizenship is more related to the work team and organizational performance than to other forms of citizenship.

Williams and Anderson (1991) proposed a measure for capturing the OCB-I, with a scale of five items, which are: "accepts added responsibility when you are absent", "helps you when you have a heavy work load", "assists you with your work (when not asked)", "takes a personal interest in you", and "passes along work-related information to you".



### **Dedication to work**

Dedication to work constitutes the investment of time and hours used by employees to deal with specific tasks within an organization. This dedication is measured through the contribution of each employee to the achievement of organizational goals based on the characteristics, methods, activities and strategies that allow the consolidation of the proposed tasks in the search and consolation of the goals and objectives set for the achievement of the proposed goals. In this sense, it is pertinent to point out that dedication to work implies a unique relationship with the other workers of the company for teamwork within the expression of citizenship.

To capture dedication to work, Maroofi and Navidinya (2001) propose the following scale of items: "attention to important details", "creativity to problem solving", "engaging in self-development" and "planning and organization work".

### **Organizational Performance**

In this review, organizational performance (OP) is understood as a management process where organizational elements are integrated in order to lead to the achievement of the goals and objectives set by the organization, among which human talent, structure, and environment elements are the most important since mixed together they produce a significant impact on the expected results.

Kaplan and Norton (2004) point out that it is necessary to focus on the tangible and intangible of organizational performance. Therefore, they conducted a comparative study of the financial and non-financial results, and contributed the idea of focusing on the social aspects, emphasizing the importance of organizational learning. This is why they advocate the creation of value in organizations by comprehensively managing tangible and intangible assets. This interest in creating value from intangible assets is motivated by the fact that focusing only on tangible assets can mislead decision-makers, since organizational aspects are bound to change over time.

According to the arguments presented above, organizations must be aware of all of their resources including intangible resources that result from the way in which employees interact with each other and from their attachment to the organization since the omission of these resources can lead the organization into chaos. For this reason, it can be considered that organizational performance should be evaluated from two perspectives: financial and nonfinancial aspects (Kaplan & Norton, 2004).

### **Synthesis**

The literature review conducted to support the future research proposal suggests that proactive personality, work performance, and organizational performance are related in various ways. For the purpose of the present study, it is important to note that there is a clear indication that proactive personality could have a significant influence on organizational performance through the mediation of job performance.

### **Research Field**

This research will take place in an oil and Gas company (Express Petroleum) in Lebanon.

## **Methodology**

The present study is based on the socio-economic approach to management (SEAM) which has been proven highly successful when dealing with organizational change both in public and in private organizations.

According to Savall (2003, p. 33), SEAM “can be considered a ‘machine for negotiating’ innovative solutions, with the underlying goal of reducing the dysfunctions experienced in the enterprise”. SEAM was first introduced by Henri Savall in 1974 and since then it has become one of the most popular methods for interventions in organizations interested in long-term change, alongside others such as Emery’s or Davis and Weisbord’ methods (Boje and Rosile, 2003). The SEAM process starts with a diagnostics stage during which the consultants gather information from the top management and other areas of the organization in order to, first, gain the support of top leadership for the desired change, and, second, help top leadership understand which are the dysfunction of their organization that have to be addressed. Then, consultants proceed with vertical diagnosis which implies gathering information from work groups that are formed out of all important stakeholders involved in the change process. Subsequently, the consultants help managers implement plans to address the dysfunctions identified, plans which include several important principles including: a) generic consistency – the idea that although all organizations have unique features, there are certain commonalities between them which allow researchers to predict the most likely dysfunctions; b) cognitive interactivity – the idea that knowledge is created through exchanges between the members of the organizations and the researchers; and c) contradictory intersubjectivity – the idea that every actor perceives reality in a different manner and that there is no objective truth to which all have to adhere (Conbere & Heorhiadi, 2017).

SEAM is based on a non-traditional approach to management since it relies on the combination of qualitative data gathered through interviews with quantitative data gathered through the collection of data on financial performance, employee performance and other relevant data. In line with this, SEAM refutes the idea that employees should be regarded simply as human capital, and instead proposes a perspective where employees are human beings who react to the way in which they are being managed, thus linking poor employee performance to bad approaches to management (Conbere & Heorhiadi, 2011). As a result of this belief, one particular aspect which makes SEAM stand out from other intervention methods is its reliance on using the metaphor of the theatre in order to understand how organizational members make sense of what is happening inside the organization. According to SEAM, there is a wealth of scripts which exist within the same organization and the purpose is to critically evaluate all of the scripts offered by managers and often marginalized voices (i.e., non-managerial members) in order to extract the metascript which often contains “a multiplicity of contending and fragmented scripts” (Boje and Rosile, 2003, p. 23). After the metascript is documented through extensive interviews with multiple internal stakeholders, the purpose of the consultants/researchers is to investigate the points where the metascript reveals implicit or hidden conflicts (e.g., conflicts of values, purpose, methods etc.), the topics which are often not discussed for reasons of them being taboo and any underlying dysfunctions which affect the performance of the organization (Boje and Rosile, 2003). Thus,

in comparison to other intervention methods, SEAM places emphasis on the fact that all members from an organization should be given a voice and on the fact that there is no ultimate narrative or script which can be all encompassing and fully adhered to by all members of the organization.

In addition, SEAM is also focused on the identification of hidden costs which affect the performance of the organization in a negative manner. These costs are called hidden because they are not explicitly presented in the financial reports of the organization and usually are left out of conversations regarding the aspects that need to be improved. However, hidden costs have a great impact on employee productivity and are regarded by SEAM one of the most important aspects which need to be identified in order to lead organizations on a path of positive change. According to Conbere and Heorhiadi (2017) hidden costs usually refer to employee absenteeism, problems with health and security that lead to occupational injuries and work-related incidents, low product or service quality, and gaps in productivity which result from poor process design and bottlenecks. Combined, these hidden costs together with a poor understanding of the way in which members of the organizations desire to be managed lead to organizational dysfunctions which can be identified, evaluated and solved through collaboration involving all of the internal stakeholders of the organization as part of the SEAM process. According to Goffnett et al. (2016, p. 82) the dysfunctions which are most likely to affect organizations fall into one of the following six categories:

“communication/coordination/conciliation problems, time management, lack of integrated training, and strategy implementation along with organization-specific issues”.

SEAM is an appropriate research method for study on the ways in which employee proactivity can be enhanced in order to drive organizational performance since it meant to be a type of intervention that directly impacts the psychological factors which related to the development of proactivity. On the one hand, through the emphasis that it places on enabling all relevant internal stakeholders to express their views on what is not properly working in the organization, SEAM is meant to foster the ability of the stakeholders to act in more proactive manners by focusing on identifying the dysfunctions as well as on actions that could be taken to solve these dysfunctions. On the other hand, SEAM also works through mirror-effects which allow internal stakeholders to realize the importance of proactivity at all organizational levels and thus can help internal stakeholders realize the fact that not acting in a proactive manner can be a hidden cost that has a tremendously negative effect on organizational performance. Finally, it is also worth mentioning that SEAM works with a conceptualization of motivation that focuses not only on addressing the needs of the internal stakeholders but also on enabling the internal stakeholders to understand their contribution to the overall organizational performance. This conceptualization of motivation is clearly linked with the factors that are known to enable the development of proactivity at the employee level.

### **Research Architecture**

Express Petroleum is a private company in the oil and Gas sector in Lebanon, we agreed with them to do the integral way on interviews, after reviewing the organization chart, we concluded that we have to do interviews with all the

managers and supervisors and to group the technicians and drivers (12 employees) into 3 interview group, each group consist of 4 employees.

The present study will use the SEAM approach in order to collect data from the chosen company which has approximately 25 employees and is active in the field of oil and gas through unstructured interviews. More exactly, the interviewees will be asked only a specific question, i.e., “What are the dysfunctions in the company?” and then they will be allowed to provide their own answers without any guidance or interference from the interviewer. Since this is a SEAM-based research project, it is important to include among the interviewees members of the organization that hold different positions (i.e., both managers and non-managers) because this would allow a comprehensive understanding of the metascript. The interviews will be conducted after obtaining the informed consent of the participants. In order to obtain their informed consent, the participants will be given a letter of invitation containing information regarding the objectives of the study, their responsibilities and their rights. In particular, they will be informed of the right to remain anonymous and the right to refuse participation in case they feel that any risks could threaten their position within the company.

The analysis will be focused on identifying the main themes in relation to the dysfunctions/hidden costs in the company as identified by the researchers based on their previous knowledge (i.e., absenteeism, productivity gaps, low quality, safety hazards, and employee turnover) and on how these are related to employee proactivity, and organizational and individual performance.

### **Work in Progress**

Up till now, I did a training for all the employees in the company and I introduced them to SEAM. In addition, I finished all the interviews and I am currently working on the analysis of the interviews.

**Gantt Chart**  
**Proactive Personality, Job Performance, and Organizational Performance:**

|   | Activity   | Jan till<br>June<br>2021 | Jul till<br>Dec<br>2021 | Jan till<br>June<br>2022 | Jul till<br>Dec<br>2022 | Jan till<br>June<br>2023 |
|---|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Interviews   |                          |                         |                          |                         |                          |
| 2 | Qualitative<br>Analysis (Mirror<br>effect/Expert<br>Opinion) |                          |                         |                          |                         |                          |
| 3 | Vertical Intervention  |                          |                         |                          |                         |                          |
| 4 | Qualitative<br>Analysis (Mirror<br>effect/Expert<br>Opinion) |                          |                         |                          |                         |                          |
| 5 | Interviews For<br>Calculating Hidden<br>Costs                |                          |                         |                          |                         |                          |
| 6 | Implementing<br>projects                                     |                          |                         |                          |                         |                          |
| 7 | Evaluating   |                          |                         |                          |                         |                          |
| 8 | Data<br>Formalization and<br>analysis                        |                          |                         |                          |                         |                          |
| 9 | Finalization of the<br>thesis                                |                          |                         |                          |                         |                          |