

Running head: CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AT WORK

A Multilevel Analysis of the Effects of Positive Personal Traits, Positive Experienced States, and
Their Interactions on Intraindividual Patterns of Citizenship Behavior at Work

Remus Ilies

Department of Management

Eli Broad Graduate School of Management

Michigan State University

Brent A. Scott and Timothy A. Judge

Department of Management

Warrington College of Business Administration

University of Florida

-- The paper is under review – please do not cite without permission --

Author Notes

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Remus Ilies, Department of Management, Eli Broad Graduate School of Management, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824. Electronic mail may be sent to ilies@msu.edu.

Abstract

This paper presents a multilevel investigation of the dynamic process through which positive personal traits and positive states experienced at work influence intraindividual patterns of organizational citizenship behavior across time. The results of an experience-sampling study generally supported the hypotheses. First, within individuals, experience-sampled positive affect and job satisfaction predicted experience-sampled reports of organizational citizenship behaviors across time. Second, between individuals, agreeableness had a direct effect on organizational citizenship behavior and this effect was mediated by average positive affect. Finally, the results supported the hypothesized cross-level interaction between agreeableness and positive affect in predicting organizational citizenship behavior across time, showing that not only did agreeable employees report that they engage more often in organizational citizenship behavior, but these individuals also reported more consistent patterns of such behavior in that the extent to which they engage in these behaviors was less dependent on their momentary positive affect.

A Multilevel Analysis of the Effects of Positive Personal Traits, Positive Experienced States, and Their Interactions on Intraindividual Patterns of Citizenship Behavior at Work

Over the past quarter-century, organizational scholars have been paying increased attention to “work behavior that is in some way beyond the reach of traditional measures of job performance but holds promise for long-term organizational success” (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994, p. 765; see also Koys, 2001, and Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997). Such behavior, described by various authors with terms such as *organizational citizenship behavior* (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983; Organ, 1988; Organ & Ryan, 1995), *prosocial behavior at work* (George, 1991), *organizational spontaneity* (George & Brief, 1992), *extra-role behavior* (Van Dyne & Lepine, 1998), and *contextual performance* (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994), is thought to be influenced by personal traits (e.g., Organ & Lingl, 1995), job attitudes (e.g., Van Dyne et al., 1994), and affective states (e.g., George & Brief, 1992). Furthermore, citizenship behavior can be considered a manifestation of employee ‘positive deviance’ thus falling within the scope of the domain of *positive organizational scholarship* (Cameron & Caza, 2004; Cameron, Dutton & Quinn, 2003). Positive organizational scholarship is a broad field of scientific inquiry “concerned primarily with the study of especially positive outcomes, processes, and attributes of organizations and their members” (Cameron et al., 2003, p. 4) or, in other terms, it is an organizational field focusing “on positive deviance” (Cameron & Caza, 2003, p. 2).

Positive organizational scholarship aims at understanding positive deviance by focusing both on individuals’ traits, states, and experiences, and on organizational systems and dynamics that enable positive outcomes (Cameron et al., 2003). With respect to individuals, drawing from the emergent *positive psychology* movement (e.g., Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), positive organizational scholarship is especially concerned with studying the effects of positive traits and

positive states on positive deviance outcomes (e.g., Cameron et al., 2003; see also Luthans, 2002). Positioning the study presented herein as an empirical endeavor within the positive organizational scholarship field, we examine the dynamic process in which positive personal traits (agreeableness and conscientiousness) and positive states experienced at work (positive affect and job satisfaction) produce positive deviance in the form of organizational citizenship behavior.

Following Mischel and Shoda's (1995; 1998) recommendations for studying individual differences and processing dynamics theories of human personality and functioning in an integrated framework, we study the dynamic process in which positive traits, positive states, and their interactions influence citizenship behavior at work. That is, we examine individuals' patterns of organizational citizenship behavior across time, the influence of time-sampled positive states experienced at work on these intraindividual patterns of behavior, and the link between positive personal traits and intraindividual processing parameters (e.g., individuals' average citizenship behaviors and the magnitudes of the states-behavior intraindividual associations).

Conceptually, employees' citizenship behaviors at work can be distinguished according to the target of the behavior. That is, organizational scholars typically distinguish citizenship behavior targeted at coworkers (e.g., helping, prosocial behavior) from citizenship behavior targeted at the organization (e.g., generalized compliance, Smith et al., 1983) (Lee & Allen, 2002, Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Moreover, perhaps the most widely used conceptualization of organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988) includes five dimensions: Helping (Altruism), Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, Courtesy, and Civic Virtue. However, operationally, the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior are often highly intercorrelated (LePine, Erez,

& Johnson, 2002). In their review and meta-analysis, LePine et al. (2002) concluded, “on the basis of the meta-analyses reported in this article, it appears that the relationships among the dimensions of OCB are generally as high as reliability estimates and that there are no meaningful differences in relationships with predictors across dimensions” (p. 62) and suggested that researchers should define organizational citizenship behavior as a latent construct (and consider the sub-dimensions as imperfect indicators). In this study, we followed their recommendation by conceptualizing organizational citizenship behavior as a latent construct that causes behaviors targeted at both individuals in the organization and at the organization. Furthermore, we examined patterns of organizational citizenship performance across time, which is consistent with the theory of task and contextual performance proposed by Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmit (1997) who define performance as episodic behavior:

From one perspective, work behavior is a continuous stream that flows on seamlessly as people spend time at work [...] Thus, streams of work behavior are punctuated by occasions when people do something that does make a difference in relation to organizational goals and these are the behavioral episodes that make up the domain of job performance. (p. 73)

Positive States and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

In the spirit of the emerging positive organizational scholarship movement, in this study we focused on two positive states experienced by employees at work – positive affect and job satisfaction – as intraindividual predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Such positive affective states have been specifically linked to citizenship behavior in previous theoretical models of voluntary behavior at work. George and Brief (1992), for example, proposed a model of organizational spontaneity in which positive mood at work has a central role in that it

mediates the effects of both individual factors and contextual characteristics on the criterion. Similarly, in a more recent model of voluntary behaviors, Spector and Fox (2002) specifically predict that positive emotions should have a central role in predicting citizenship behavior because emotional responses determine action tendencies.

Positive affect at work should lead to organizational citizenship behavior because (a) individuals in a positive mood perceive things in a more positive light and thus are more likely to feel positively towards co-workers and help them when the opportunity is present (George & Brief, 1992), (b) positive mood facilitates creativity (Isen, Daubman, & Novicki, 1987) and thus people are more likely to propose innovative solutions at work when they experience positive affect (George & Brief, 2002), (c) positive affect influences empathy through its arousal component (Nezlek, Feist, Wilson, & Plesko, 2001) and employees are more likely to help others at work when they feel empathetic towards them. Thus, though it is yet to be shown, we predict that intraindividual variation in positive affect will predict intraindividual variation in citizenship behavior.

That increased job satisfaction causes organizational citizenship behavior has been proposed since the behavioral construct was explicitly introduced to the organizational behavior literature (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988; Smith et al., 1983). In fact, organizational citizenship behavior, as an aspect of job performance, was thought to reflect the job satisfaction-job performance relationship that had eluded researchers until the start of the 21st century (see Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001) because voluntary behavior is less likely to be constrained by nonattitudinal factors (e.g., skill, resources) than task performance (Organ & Lingl, 1995).

Since the first empirical studies on the antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983), empirical evidence for the between-individual effects of both positive affect and job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior manifestations has been rapidly accumulating (e.g., George, 1991; Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Lee & Allen 2002; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Organ & Lingl, 1995; Rioux & Penner, 2001; see Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001 and Organ & Ryan, 1995). Though we are not aware of intraindividual research on experienced states and organizational citizenship behaviors across time, in line with the episodic behavior conceptualization of contextual performance (Motowidlo, et al., 1997), we believe that not only do individuals who generally experience more positive states of work engage more frequently in organizational citizenship behavior, but momentary states also influence episodic behavior within individuals:

H-1: Within individuals, individuals' daily (a) positive affect and (b) job satisfaction will be positively related to their daily organizational citizenship behavior, across time.

The intraindividual functioning model positing positive relationships between positive states experienced at work and episodic citizenship behavior across time is similar to the intraindividual processing component of the cognitive-affective personality system proposed by Mischel and Shoda (1995; 1998) in that it specifies situational-influenced effects (through momentary positive affect and job satisfaction) on behavior across time. These authors also suggest that traditional trait conceptualizations of personality should be integrated with intraindividual processing by examining the links between traits and parameters of intraindividual processing. We followed this suggestion by examining (a) the relationships between personality traits and average organizational citizenship behavior, (b) the mediating role

of positive states in the trait-behavior relationships (between individuals), and (c) the associations between personality traits and the magnitudes of the intraindividual positive affect-organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction–organizational citizenship behavior relationships. We formulate our expectations for these effects below.

Positive Traits and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Two positive personality traits have been consistently linked to organizational citizenship behavior in past conceptual treatments of individual differences in citizenship behavior: agreeableness and conscientiousness (e.g., Motowidlo et al., 1997; Organ & Lingl, 1995; Organ & Ryan, 1995), though these links were not always supported empirically (e.g., Konovsky & Organ, 1996). Agreeableness, which composes dimensions such as trust, altruism, and compliance (Costa & McCrae, 1992), should naturally predict citizenship behaviors, especially those targeted at other employees (Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Organ & Lingl, 1995). More generally, Graziano and Eisenberg (1997, p. 816) argue that “prosocial behavior can be conceptualized as a form of agreeableness.” Similarly, Costa and McCrae (1992) note, “The agreeable person is fundamentally altruistic. He or she is sympathetic to others and eager to help them...” (p. 15). Meta-analytic investigations of the agreeableness-citizenship behavior link point to a significant relationship between the two constructs, though the magnitude of the estimated relationship is not large (Borman et al., 2001; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Conscientiousness, defined as a reflection of individual differences in behavioral tendencies that express qualities such as competence, order, and dutifulness (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1992), has been proposed to influence mostly the generalized compliance (Smith et al., 1983) aspect of citizenship behavior (e.g., Konovsky & Organ, 1996). It follows that, to the

extent to which generalized compliance is an indicator of the broader organizational citizenship behavior construct (LePine et al., 2002), conscientiousness should predict citizenship behaviors.

In addition, because dutifulness is a marker of conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992), employees who score high on conscientiousness are more likely to fulfill their obligations at work. Furthermore, conscientious individuals have high aspirations and work hard to accomplish their goals; to the extent that organizational goals are aligned with personal goals, those individuals are likely to support organizational goals and objectives. In Borman and Motowidlo's (1993) model of citizenship performance, fulfilling work obligations (following organizational rules and procedures) and supporting organizational objectives are important components, or indicators (LePine et al., 2002), of citizenship behavior (see also Smith et al., 1983).

For these reasons, conscientiousness should predict organizational citizenship behavior. Indeed, meta-analytical reviews of the literature have found that conscientiousness was a robust correlate of citizenship behavior (Borman et al., 2001; Organ & Ryan, 1995). In sum, given the conceptual arguments and the empirical support reviewed above, we expect that the two positive traits will positively influence the average levels of episodic citizenship behaviors reported by employees.

H-2: The personality traits of (a) agreeableness and (b) conscientiousness will be positively related to individuals' average experience-sampled ratings of organizational citizenship behavior.

Positive States as Mediators of the Effects of Positive Traits on Behavior

Organ and Ryan (1995) concluded their review of dispositional influences on citizenship behaviors with the suggestion that dispositional variables influence such behaviors only to the

extent that they affect thoughts and feelings about one's job. In George and Brief's (1992) model, positive mood mediates the effects of both individual factors and contextual characteristics on organizational spontaneity (mood is influenced by both personal characteristics and situational factors, e.g., Watson, 2000). (Conceptually, both agreeableness and conscientiousness are related to positive affect and job satisfaction – agreeableness leads to pleasant and satisfying relationships with others at work, and conscientiousness leads to involvement and rewards [e.g., Organ & Lingl, 1995].)

Within the research design employed in our study, it follows that average positive affect should mediate the effects of the positive personal traits on organizational citizenship behavior. Similarly, momentary job satisfaction, as an attitudinal state, is subject to both dispositional and situational influences (Ilies & Judge, 2002), and job satisfaction has been specifically linked, conceptually, to voluntary behavior at work (e.g., Organ & Ryan, 1995), though empirical evidence on the mediating role of *average state satisfaction* has yet to be published in the literature. However, the vast literature on global job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior at work (e.g., Organ & Lingl, 1995; Organ & Ryan, 1995) does suggest that the average level of job satisfaction experienced at work is indeed a mediating mechanism explaining the effects of positive traits on citizenship behavior. In sum, we expect that,

- H-3: Between individuals, average levels of experienced states (positive affect and job satisfaction) will mediate the effects of individuals' (a) agreeableness and (b) conscientiousness on their average organizational citizenship behavior ratings.

State-Trait Interactions and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

In their article presenting a conceptual model of voluntary behavior at work, Spector and Fox (2002) note that "...emotion only induces a readiness to engage in behavior or an intention

to act; other factors must also be present” (p. 275), and further suggest that individual differences are important in this process. Though we are not aware of empirical evidence on this point, theoretical models of the positive traits considered here suggest that agreeableness and conscientiousness should moderate the intraindividual effects of positive states on episodic organizational citizenship behavior.

As noted, we expect that agreeable individuals exhibit, on average, more organizational citizenship behaviors than those scoring low on agreeableness (H-2). The extent to which individuals who score high on agreeableness engage in helpful behaviors should depend less on their momentary affect and satisfaction experiences, compared to those scoring low on agreeableness. First, suggestive of such an effect is the assertion of Costa and McCrae (1992) that those who score low on compliance (a facet of agreeableness) have no reluctance in expressing negative emotions. To the extent that negative emotions are associated with low positive affect, it follows that individuals who score low on agreeableness will more easily cease to engage in helpful behaviors when they experience low positive affect, compared to those who score higher on agreeableness.

Second, we believe that agreeable individuals help others, in part, because they “have a disposition to believe that others are honest and well-intentioned” (i.e., they trust others; Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 17). Momentary feelings influence cognitive evaluations through an affect infusion effect (e.g., Forgas, 1995) that leads to affect-congruent judgments when mood overrides the influences leading to the 'standard' judgment. It follows that those who are not very agreeable and are generally more skeptical of others' intentions will likely engage in more helpful behaviors when they are in a highly positive mood because their mood will cause them to see others in a more positive light. For highly agreeable people, according to the affect infusion

model, this influence will be minimal because they already highly trust others' intentions and honesty (their trust in others is perhaps less situation-dependent, compared to low-agreeableness individuals).

H-4: Individuals' agreeableness will moderate the magnitude of (a) the intraindividual relationship between their daily positive affect and their daily reports of organizational citizenship behavior and (b) the intraindividual relationship between their daily job satisfaction and their daily reports of citizenship behavior such that for those who score high on agreeableness, their organizational citizenship behavior level will depend less on the level of experienced positive states, as compared to those who score lower on agreeableness.

Conscientiousness should also moderate the intraindividual relationships between positive states and organizational citizenship behavior. Because dependability, reliability, and discipline are hallmarks of conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992), those who score high on conscientiousness should consistently engage in organizational citizenship behaviors irrespective of their momentary affect and satisfaction. In contrast, those scoring low on conscientiousness not only engage less often in organizational citizenship behaviors (as specified in H-2), but their lack of self-discipline (Costa & McCrae, 1992) makes them more easily distracted when performing tasks and they "are easily discouraged and eager to quit" (Costa & McCrae, 1992, p. 18). Following this argument, low job satisfaction and low positive affect would give low-conscientiousness individuals reasons to quit engaging in citizenship behaviors. In addition, the closely related personality trait of *prudence* from the Hogan Personality Inventory (Hogan & Hogan, 1992) reflects individual differences in *spontaneity* and *impulse control* (among other sub-dimensions; Hogan & Hogan, 1992), which again suggests that the behaviors of those who

score high on conscientiousness (prudence) will be less influenced by their momentary affect and satisfaction, compared to those who score lower on the trait. On this point, Watson, Clark, and Harkness (1994, p. 27) note that “Conscientious individuals are less swayed by the immediate sensations of the moment and are controlled more strongly by the broader, longer term implications of their behavior.” In consequence, we expect that,

H-5: Individuals’ conscientiousness will moderate the magnitude of (a) the intraindividual relationship between their daily positive affect and their daily reports of organizational citizenship behavior and (b) the intraindividual relationship between their daily job satisfaction and their daily reports of organizational citizenship behavior such that for those who score high on conscientiousness, their organizational citizenship behavior level will depend less on the level of experienced positive states, as compared to those who score lower on conscientiousness.

To test the effects hypothesized herein, we conducted a field study using experience-sampling methodology. For this study, we asked participants to provide daily reports of their positive affect and job satisfaction (i.e., the positive states), as well as daily ratings of organizational citizenship behavior (i.e., episodic behavior). In addition, we measured participants’ agreeableness and conscientiousness (i.e., the positive traits). We describe this study below.

Method

Participants

Participants were 67 full-time employees sampled from a variety of occupations, including education, information technology, and administration. The average age of the

individuals in this sample was 36 years ($SD = 9.2$ years); 72% of the respondents were female. These individuals were recruited through an e-mail letter soliciting participation and through word of mouth. Participation in the study was completely voluntary and was rewarded with a small honorarium.

Procedure

The data collection process involved two different phases. For the first phase, we used interval-contingent experience-sampling methodology (see Hormuth, 1986; Ilies & Judge, 2002; Wheeler & Reiss, 1991), having the employees report their positive affect, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors daily from work, for a period of three weeks (15 working days). The experience-sampled data were collected through an Internet interface. Two participants consistently rated their organizational citizenship behavior using the highest end of the scale for each item, thus we did not include the data provided by these employees in the analyses (they showed zero variability in their behavioral ratings across time). In the second phase, participants completed measures of personality traits. Of the 65 participants who provided valid experience-sampling ratings, 62 also completed the personality survey – these individuals comprised the final sample used in all analyses presented. For those in the final sample, we obtained 824 (out of a maximum of 930) sets of experience-sampled ratings of positive affect, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior, which is equivalent to an overall response rate across individuals and time periods of 88.4%.

Measures

Positive states. We measured momentary positive affect using the *Positive and Negative Affect Schedule* (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The PANAS measures PA with 10 adjectives, which individuals rate on a 1 = *Very Slightly or Not At All* to 5 = *Very Much* scale.

Sample adjectives included “interested,” “excited,” and “enthusiastic.” The average (across days) coefficient alpha for this scale was $\bar{\alpha} = .93$. Momentary job satisfaction was measured with the five-item version of the Brayfield and Rothe (1951) measure that has been successfully used in experience-sampling research (e.g., Ilies & Judge, 2002). On each working day, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with five statements about their job, using a five-point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*). Sample items included “At this very moment, I am enthusiastic about my work,” “Right now, I feel fairly satisfied with my present job,” and “At this moment, I am finding real enjoyment in my work.” The average (across days) internal consistency of the job satisfaction scores was $\bar{\alpha} = .89$.

Agreeableness and conscientiousness. We measured agreeableness and conscientiousness using the *Big Five Inventory* (BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). In the BFI, agreeableness (“I am kind to almost everyone” and “I am generally trusting”) and conscientiousness (“I make plans and follow through” and “I do things efficiently”) are measured with nine items each. Individuals used a 1=*Strongly Disagree* to 5=*Strongly Agree* response scale in completing the items. The internal consistencies of the scores were .77 and .81 for agreeableness and conscientiousness, respectively.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. We assessed organizational citizenship behavior using 11 items from the scale described by Lee and Allen (2002). It was important to keep the survey brief because participants completed the daily survey during work hours. Thus, we eliminated items that would be less likely to vary on a daily basis during a short period of time. For the 11 included items, individuals were instructed to “*indicate how often you engaged in the behavior today*” using a five-point scale (1 = *Never* to 5 = *Often*). Sample items include “Assisted others with their duties,” “Willingly gave your time to help others who had work-

related problems,” and “Expressed loyalty toward the organization.” As noted, we modeled effects on the latent construct of organizational citizenship behavior (LePine, et al., 2002); thus, we did not distinguish among individual- and organizational-targeted dimensions of citizenship behavior, and we computed an organizational citizenship dimension score by averaging respondents’ scores for the 11 items. The average (across days) internal consistency of the organizational citizenship behavior scores was $\bar{\alpha} = .93$.

Analyses

To test the intraindividual hypothesis (H-1) and the cross-level moderating hypotheses (H-4 and H-5), we used a hierarchical linear modeling (HLM; Byrk & Raudenbush, 1992) framework in which we modeled the intraindividual effects of positive affect and job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior by regressing daily criterion scores on the daily predictor scores at the first level (across days). At second level we modeled the interactive effects of agreeableness and conscientiousness on the magnitudes of the intraindividual effects of the positive states on organizational citizenship behavior (across individuals). More specifically, at the second level, we regressed individuals’ intraindividual slopes and intercepts for predicting organizational citizenship behaviors with positive affect and job satisfaction across time on their scores on the two personality traits.

For testing the main effects of traits on organizational citizenship (H-2) behavior, we used correlation and linear regression analysis. Support for the mediating role of averaged experience-sampled positive affect and job satisfaction in explaining the relationships between the positive traits and citizenship behavior at work (H-3) was sought by means of hierarchical regression analysis.

Results

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations (computed both within and between individuals for the experience-sampled variables), and between-individual intercorrelations among trait scores and average experience-sampled scores for all study variables.

Before conducting multilevel analyses, we examined whether organizational citizenship behavior varied substantially within, as well as between, people. Results of a null model, where we partitioned the total variance into within- and between-individual variance, revealed that 29% of the total variance was within individuals and that between-individual differences in average scores were meaningful ($p < .01$).

Intraindividual Results

Parameter estimates of the multilevel models are presented in Table 2. First, the main intraindividual effects model, in which we regressed daily organizational citizenship behavior scores on daily positive affect and daily job satisfaction scores within individuals (the predictor scores were centered relative to individuals' means to remove between individual variance in these scores; see Hofmann, Griffin, & Gavin, 2000), showed support for both H-1a (positive affect had a significant intraindividual effect on organizational citizenship behavior; standardized $\beta_1 = .20$, $p < .01$) and H-1b (job satisfaction was a significant intraindividual predictor of organizational citizenship behavior; standardized $\beta_2 = .13$, $p < .01$). Jointly, positive affect and job satisfaction explained 14.8% of the intraindividual variance in citizenship behavior.

Interindividual Results

The regression results of the direct effects model (Table 3) show that across employees, agreeableness was a positive predictor of average organizational citizenship behavior ($\beta = .37$, $p < .01$), which provides support for H-2a. In contrast, conscientiousness did not predict

organizational citizenship behavior in the between-individual regression, ($\beta = -.03$, ns); thus H-2b was not supported. (Conscientiousness was only weakly correlated with average organizational citizenship behavior [$r = .07$, ns].)

The mediation test, supported H-3a in showing that average levels of positive affect and job satisfaction reported by individuals did mediate the effect of agreeableness on average organizational citizenship behavior (upon introducing positive affect and job satisfaction in the regression predicting organizational citizenship behavior with agreeableness and conscientiousness, the standardized effect of agreeableness decreased from .37 to .17 and became non-significant; see Table 3). However, the results presented in Table 3 show that H-3b (the mediating effect of positive states on the conscientiousness-organizational citizenship behavior relationship) was not supported (actually, there was no direct effect to mediate). The regression results also show that experienced-sampled positive states not only mediated the effects of positive traits on organizational citizenship behavior, but also explained additional variance in the criterion ($\Delta R^2 = .28$, $p < .01$), which suggests that states may also mediate contextual influences on citizenship behavior, in addition to mediating dispositional effects on such behavior.

Cross-Level Results

Before testing the cross-level moderator effects, we examined whether there was significant variance in the intraindividual slopes for predicting organizational citizenship behavior with the positive states across time. To do so, we estimated a model that regressed the criterion scores on the two positive states scores (centered relative to individuals' means) at the first level, and estimated the pooled intraindividual parameters at the second level (it included no second level predictors). The results of this model showed that there was significant variability in

the intraindividual slopes for predicting organizational citizenship behavior with positive affect ($p < .01$), but the chi square test for the variance in the intraindividual slope for predicting citizenship behavior with job satisfaction only approached significance ($p < .09$).

The moderated effects model results (see Table 2) showed support for the interactive effect of agreeableness and positive affect on organizational citizenship behavior across time (H-4a) in that, at the second level, agreeableness significantly predicted the first level regression coefficient of positive affect. Examining the residual variance in the first level parameters revealed that agreeableness explained 23.04% of the between-individual variance in the intraindividual slope for predicting reports of citizenship behavior with momentary positive affect. In contrast, conscientiousness did not show a significant moderating effect on the positive affect-organizational citizenship behavior relationship, which lends no support to the second moderating hypothesis (H-4b). The final hypothesis (H-5) also was not supported, in that neither agreeableness nor conscientiousness had a cross-level moderating effect on the intraindividual job satisfaction-organizational citizenship behavior relationship (which was to be expected given that there was not much variance in the corresponding intraindividual regression coefficient, as noted).

Figure 1 shows the cross-level moderating effect of agreeableness on the intraindividual relationship between individuals' daily positive affect and their daily reports of organizational citizenship behavior. This interaction indicates that not only do employees who score high on agreeableness report that they engage more often in organizational citizenship behaviors (as predicted by H-2a) but that these individuals also report a more consistent pattern of citizenship behaviors across time in that the extent to which they engage in these behaviors is less dependent

on their momentary positive affect, as compared to those who score lower on agreeableness (as predicted by H-4a).

Discussion

Although research on organizational citizenship behavior has prospered since the introduction of the behavioral construct, to our knowledge, empirical investigations aimed at predicting citizenship behavior have concentrated exclusively on modeling between-individual relationships among citizenship behavior and its antecedents. Following Motowidlo et al.'s (1997) episodic behavior conceptualization of contextual performance, we addressed a gap in the literature by examining citizenship behavior at the intraindividual level. The results revealed that a substantial portion of the variance in citizenship behavior was intraindividual, and that positive states (i.e., positive affect and job satisfaction) significantly predicted the within-individual variance in citizenship behavior. In addition, we found that agreeableness was positively related to average citizenship behavior. Furthermore, consistent with George and Brief's (1992) model of organizational spontaneity, average positive states mediated the effect of agreeableness on average citizenship behavior. Finally, as hypothesized, results indicated that agreeableness had a cross-level moderating influence on the within-individual relationship between positive affect and citizenship behavior.

Our results have several implications for positive organizational scholarship (Cameron et al., 2003). From a positive organizational scholarship perspective, organizational citizenship behavior, as a form of 'positive deviance' (Cameron & Caza, 2004), can best be understood by focusing on individual states, traits, and experiences, as well as on supportive organizational contexts. The current study provides direct as well as indirect support for this contention. That is, positive traits and average positive states had positive effects on the average reported citizenship

behavior, and organizational context and events likely influenced citizenship behavior across time through the positive states (the positive states, which are influenced by work events and context, had additional predictive power, over and above positive traits, in predicting citizenship behavior). The present results also demonstrate the complex nature of the effects of states and traits on citizenship behavior; positive affect exerted a direct effect on behavior, acted as a mediator of the agreeableness-citizenship behavior link, and interacted with agreeableness in predicting behavior. Thus, our results imply that positive organizational scholarship researchers should adopt research designs that enable them to incorporate these complexities when predicting outcomes. Such research would provide a richer understanding of how states and traits affect organizationally relevant positive outcomes such as the behavior examined herein, as well as outcomes highly relevant for individual employees, such as job satisfaction and psychological well-being.

Implications for Theory

The current results also have implications for theory on organizational citizenship behavior. According to Rioux and Penner (2001), three motives underlie citizenship behavior: prosocial values, organizational concern, and impression management. Of these, prosocial values are associated with higher levels of the altruism aspect of citizenship behavior, whereas organizational concern is associated with higher levels of the conscientiousness aspect of citizenship behavior. Rioux and Penner (2001) stress a functional approach to citizenship behavior, whereby individuals engage in citizenship behavior because it allows them to fulfill certain needs. Applying this framework to the current study, the results for agreeableness indicate that individuals high in agreeableness may engage in citizenship behavior because it fulfills a motive to be altruistic. Moreover, the significant interaction between agreeableness and

positive affect suggests that individuals high in agreeableness attempt to meet their altruistic needs by engaging in citizenship behavior regardless of their transitory moods. In contrast, individuals low in agreeableness have weaker motives to act altruistically and thus appear to increase their citizenship behaviors only when they are in a positive mood.

In addition to the implications for theory on motives for engaging in organizational citizenship behavior, the current study also suggests that theories on other positive outcomes could be enriched by considering the influence of positive states and their interactions with positive traits. Positive affect influences outcomes such as creativity (Isen, Daubman, & Nowicki, 1987) and expectancy motivation (Erez & Isen, 2002). Furthermore, Frederickson's (1998, 2001) *broaden-and-build theory* posits that positive emotions *broaden* the relationship between thought and action, leading to increased novelty and exploration of ideas on the part of employees experiencing such positive emotions. On the basis of the results of the present study, we recommend that theoretical models of positive outcomes such as those described above should incorporate multilevel predictions similar to those hypothesized in this paper. More generally, we believe that theories in the domain of positive organizational scholarship would be more complete by integrating the effects of positive states and their interactions with a diverse array antecedents on work outcomes.

Finally, this study has implications for Mischel and Shoda's (1995) cognitive-affective system. In the current study, both traits and states influenced citizenship behavior. To the extent that the experienced states reflect contextual influences, these results show that citizenship behavior is subject to both dispositional and contextual influences. Consistent with this argument, average positive affect and job satisfaction not only mediated the trait-behavior

relationship but also had substantial incremental power (in addition to the traits) in predicting average citizenship behavior across individuals.

Furthermore, a central aspect of Mischel and Shoda's theory is that individuals differ in how they focus on and encode specific situational features. Importantly, these differences will be expressed as different patterns of information processing across a variety of different situations. Although behavioral personality traits do reflect relatively stable behavior patterns, variance in behavior over time always exists because the situational context changes. To the extent that individuals differ in their characteristic responses to the situational cues, traits should predict parameters of intraindividual processing and behavior.

Related to the current study, the interaction between agreeableness and positive affect in predicting citizenship behavior suggests that momentary affect can be thought of as a "situation" (it is influenced by situations) that influences the degree to which individuals engage in citizenship behavior, and that agreeableness influences individuals' characteristic responses to the situational stimuli. Those low in agreeableness tended to engage in citizenship behavior when their mood was positive, whereas individuals high in agreeableness were less attuned to the "situation" and engaged in citizenship behavior regardless of their momentary mood. Like organizational citizenship behavior, we believe that other organizational criteria may best be understood using designs that capture both person- and situation-effects, and could productively be studied with experience-sampling designs.

Implications for Practice and Future Research

A fundamental implication taken from the results is that organizational decision makers should strive to provide an organizational context that enables the experiences of positive affect for employees. Providing such context may be as simple as treating employees with courtesy,

respect, and dignity. Organizations that provide such enabling contexts stand to benefit from increased citizenship behavior, and the benefit of positive affect should be more prominent for individuals who score low on agreeableness. It appears that, for these individuals, citizenship behavior may be manifested only during experiences of positive mood. In contrast, individuals high in agreeableness will tend to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors regardless of their momentary mood. Thus, organizations for which citizenship behaviors are important may maximize the occurrence of these behaviors by selecting employees based on agreeableness, but also by taking actions that foster the experience of positive affect.

Managers who are able to facilitate positive affect and, consequently, increased citizenship behaviors, may enhance overall organizational functioning. One mechanism through which citizenship behavior may increase organizational functioning is through social capital. According to Bolino, Turnley, and Bloodgood (2002), citizenship behavior plays an important role in the development of structural, relational, and cognitive aspects of social capital. That is, citizenship behaviors increase resources such as network ties, trust, and shared language. As a result, organizational performance is increased. To the extent that employees are treated in a manner that increases their positive affect, increased citizenship behaviors as well as increased organizational effectiveness may result. In addition, as posited by Frederickson's (1998, 2001) *broaden-and-build theory*, through experiencing positive emotions, individuals *build* their intellectual and social skills by exploring novel ideas. Future theory-building endeavors should integrate Frederickson's theory with the theory on the formation of social capital, perhaps focusing on the transferences of positive emotions among employees working together (e.g., Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994).

This study also has important implications for future research. First, future research should address the moderating role of personality on affect infusion effects on judgments and evaluations that influence choice and behavior. As stated previously, affect-congruent judgments occur when affect overrides influences leading to the 'standard' judgment. It is likely that affect influences judgments to a greater degree when there is not a strong dispositional force influencing the judgment. Although we examined the moderating role of positive traits on the relationships between positive states and behavior, future research could employ the opposite scenario to examine the affect-infusion hypothesis. For example, one could examine whether individuals high in neuroticism engage in deviant behaviors regardless of their momentary negative moods. In this case, individuals low in neuroticism may only engage in counterproductive behaviors when they experience negative states.

Future research could also examine outcomes other than citizenship behavior using dynamic designs such as the one used in this study. A repeated measures design integrating both intraindividual variations and interindividual differences can shed new light on constructs that have been examined at length within the organizational behavior literature. Given that almost a third of the variance in citizenship behavior was found to be within individuals, future research could determine whether substantial within-individual variance exists in other outcomes such as organizational commitment and counterproductive behavior. If a significant amount of intraindividual variance exists in some outcomes more than others, an important theoretical topic would be to specify why such differences exist. To date, researchers have tended to focus on between-individual differences; however, dynamic models explaining within-individual differences in behavior have the potential to add richness and complexity to both theoretical and empirical research.

Limitations

This study is not without limitations. First, the sample size is small, compared to other studies on organizational citizenship behavior. In addition, although the sample is diverse, it is likely not representative of the work population. Thus, the degree to which the current results are generalizable to other settings may be questioned. Given the demanding nature of the data collection process, large sample sizes are difficult to obtain. From a relative standpoint, however, the sample size of this study is one of the largest to date among experience-sampling studies of employees. For example, a recent experience-sampling study by Fuller et al. (2003) obtained a useable sample size of 14. In addition, the experience-sampling study by Ilies and Judge (2002) reported a sample size of 27.

Second, all the constructs examined in this study were assessed with self-report measures. Thus, another limitation is that the results may be inflated due to same-source bias. However, the fact that individual differences in positive affect and job satisfaction were assessed with average scores of momentary self reports mitigates this concern with respect to the cross sectional results (compared to between-individual differences in traits, individual differences in states were assessed with a different method and at different times). (The fact that conscientiousness, though it was measured reliably [$\bar{\alpha} = .81$], correlated only .07 and .08 with the average reported behavior and average job satisfaction indeed suggests that same-source bias cannot explain the between-individual results.)

With respect to the intraindividual analyses, one typical source of common method variance – response tendencies that stem from personal characteristics and experiences – has been eliminated by centering the positive state scores relative to the individuals' mean scores, which removed all the between-individual variance in these scores. Though same source bias

remains a concern when interpreting intraindividual results, considering the nature of our design, it seems likely that participants would be best able to assess their citizenship behavior, positive affect, and job satisfaction on a daily basis. Sufficient intraindividual variance may not exist if supervisors are asked to rate participant's citizenship behaviors on a daily basis because of reduced observational opportunities, unless supervisors were in close contact with their subordinates throughout the majority of each day. Future research that is able to overcome these obstacles may provide a more accurate assessment of the relationships of interest. However, we believe that the current study makes a significant contribution despite these limitations.

Conclusion

Positive organizational scholarship is important for both researchers and practitioners in understanding the ways in which positive states, positive traits, and enabling organizational contexts relate to organizational outcomes. Despite the importance of intraindividual processing and of intraindividual variations in affect and behavior, research investigating within-individual processes is lacking. This study takes an important first step in examining how positive states and positive traits influence organizational citizenship behavior. Dynamic models such as the one employed in the current study allow researchers to clearly delineate both intraindividual and interindividual effects and, consequently, have much to offer to organizational behavior in general, and to positive organizational scholarship in particular. Of special importance is the ability to examine cross-level moderation with hierarchical data. Specifically, we believe that the study of moderating effects of personal traits on intraindividual functioning at work, such as the effect of agreeableness on the intraindividual relationship between positive affect and citizenship behavior documented here, will likely be a fruitful avenue to integrate trait theories of personality with conceptual models of situational influences on organizational behavior.

References

- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587–595.
- Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 505-522.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt and W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 52-69.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 307-311.
- Byrk, A. S., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1992). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cameron, K. S., & Caza, A. (2004). Introduction: Contributions to the discipline of positive organizational scholarship. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47, 1-9.
- Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (2003). An introduction to Positive Organizational Scholarship. In K. S. Cameron, J. E., Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.) *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 3-13). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor (NEO-FFI) Inventory professional manual*. Odessa, FL: PAR.

- Erez, A., & Isen, A. M. (2002). The influence of positive affect on the components of expectancy motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 1055-1067.
- Forgas, J. P. (1995). Mood and judgment: The affect infusion model (AIM). *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 39-66.
- Frederickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology, 2*, 300-319.
- Fuller, J. A., Stanton, J. M., Fisher, G. G., Spitzmuller, C., Russell, S. S., & Smith, P. C. (2003). A lengthy look at the daily grind: Time series analysis of events, mood, stress, and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 1019-1033.
- Frederickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*, 218-226.
- George, J. M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 299-307.
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good -- doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work--organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 310-329.
- Graziano, W. G., & Eisenberg, N. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 767—793). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. L. (1994). *Emotional contagion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Hofmann, D. A., Griffin, M. A., & Gavin, M. B. (2000). The application of hierarchical linear modeling to organizational research. In K. Klein and S. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel Theory, Research, and Methods in Organizations: Foundations, Extensions, and New Directions* (pp. 467-511). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1992). *Hogan Personality Inventory Manual.*, Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.
- Hormuth, S. E. (1986). The sampling of experiences in situ. *Journal of Personality*, *54*, 262-293.
- Ilies, R., & Judge, T.A. (2002). Understanding the dynamic relationship between personality, mood, and job satisfaction: A field experience-sampling study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *89*, 1119-1139.
- Isen, A. M., Daubman, K. A. & Novicki, G. P. (1987). Positive affect facilitates creative problem solving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 1122-1131.
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory - Versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*, 376-407.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *17*, 253-266.

- Koys, D. J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 101-114.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 131-142.
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 52-65.
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 695-702.
- Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system of personality: reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. *Psychological Review, 102*, 246-268.
- Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1998). Reconciling processing dynamics and personality dispositions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 229-258.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance, 10*, 71-84.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & van Scooter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 475-480.
- Nezlek, J. B., Feist, G. J., Wilson, F. C., & Plesko, R. M. (2001). Day-to-day variability in empathy as a function of daily events and mood. *Journal of Research in Personality, 35*, 401-423.

- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*.
Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of
organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 157-164.
- Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship
behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*, 339-350.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional
predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775-802.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on
organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human
Performance, 10*, 133-151.
- Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A
motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1306-1314.
- Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction.
American Psychologist, 55, 5-14.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature
and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 653-663.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some
parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship
behavior. *Human Resource Management Review, 12*, 269-292.
- Van Dyne, L., & Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior:
Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal,*
47, 765-802

- Van Dyne, L., & Lepine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*, 765-802.
- Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and temperament*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Harkness, A. R. (1994). Structures of personality and their relevance to psychopathology. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *103*, 18-31.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 1063-1070.
- Wheeler, L., & Reis, H. T. (1991). Self-recording of everyday life events: Origins, types, and uses. *Journal of Personality*, *59*, 339-354.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Interindividual Correlations for All Study Variables

	M	SD-w	SD-b	1	2	3	4	5
1. Agreeableness	3.91	--	.53	1.00				
2. Conscientiousness	4.11	--	.53	.27*	1.00			
3. Positive Affect	3.21	.60	.87	.41**	.29*	1.00		
4. Job Satisfaction	3.60	.52	.75	.22	.08	.75**	1.00	
5. Organizational Citizenship Behavior	3.11	.52	.87	.36**	.07	.61**	.52**	1.00

Notes. Correlations were computed between individuals, using each participant's mean scores for the experience-sampled variables. M = mean, SD-w = standard deviation computed within individuals, SD-b = standard deviation computed between individuals.

N = 62 * $p < .05$ (two-tailed). ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed).

Table 2

HLM Results Testing the Cross-Level Interaction Effects on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Model/Predictor	Regression Coefficient	T - Value
<u>Main Effects Model</u>		
Intercept (baseline β_0)	3.11	30.61**
Positive Affect (baseline β_1)	.19	3.90**
Job Satisfaction (baseline β_2)	.14	3.04**
<u>Moderated Effects Model</u>		
Agreeableness effect on:		
β_0	.60	2.64**
β_1	-.27	-2.67**
β_2	.11	1.50
Conscientiousness effect on:		
β_0	.12	.59
β_1	-.01	-.13
β_2	-.08	-1.01

Notes. All level 1 predictor scores were centered at the individuals' means to eliminate between-individual variance. β = unstandardized first level regression coefficients. In the main effects model agreeableness and conscientiousness were held at their means. Moderating effects of agreeableness and conscientiousness were estimated with separate models. ** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$.

Table 3

Regression of Averaged Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scores on Trait Scores and Averaged State Scores

Model/Predictor	Regression Coefficients			Regression Model		
	Point Estimate	T-Value	Significance	R ²	F-value	Significance
<u>Direct Effects Model</u>				.13	4.51	p < .015
Agreeableness	.37	2.94	p < .005			
Conscientiousness	-.03	-.22	p < .827			
<u>Mediated Model</u>				.41	10.23	p < .001
Agreeableness	.17	1.52	p < .134			
Conscientiousness	-.12	-1.09	p < .280			
Positive Affect	.46	2.73	p < .008			
Job Satisfaction	.15	.94	p < .350			

Notes. N = 62. Tests are two tailed.

Figure Caption

Figure 1. The moderating effect of agreeableness on the intraindividual effect of positive affect on organizational citizenship behaviors at work.

