

The Power of Negative Disposition: An Examination of Trait and State Negative Affect with
OCBI and OCBO

Mark Geiger ^{a,*}
Duquesne University

Jeong-Yeon Lee ^b
Seoul National University

Mingang K. Geiger ^c
West Virginia University

Cite as:

Geiger, M., Lee, J. Y., & Geiger, M. K. (2019). The power of negative disposition: An examination of trait and state negative affect with OCBI and OCBO. *Group & Organization Management*, 44(6), 1136-1172.

Published version available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601118819893>

^a Duquesne University, Palumbo-Donahue School of Business, 600 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA, 15282, United States.

^b Seoul National University, Business School, 1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul, 08826, South Korea.

^c West Virginia University, John Chambers College of Business and Economics, 1601 University Avenue, PO Box 6025, Morgantown, WV, 26506, United States.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: geigerm1@duq.edu

E-mail addresses: geigerm1@duq.edu (M. Geiger), jaytalks@snu.ac.kr (J. Lee), mg0081@mix.wvu.edu (M. K. Geiger).

The Power of Negative Disposition: An Examination of Trait and State Negative Affect with
OCBI and OCBO

Abstract

The authors developed and tested a two-by-two framework that identifies the strength of relationships between facets of negative affect (trait and state) and facets of organizational citizenship behavior (OCBI and OCBO). The framework is based on a stream of research concerned with dispositional- and situational-based predictors of OCB and is complemented with the phenomenon of social exchange spillover. Hypotheses were developed and tested using meta-analytic data to provide an authoritative perspective on the relationships of interest. The results largely support the proposed framework and suggest the strongest relationships are those between trait negative affect and OCBO, whereas the weakest relationships are those between state negative affect and OCBI. The authors discuss implications for research and practice concerning relationships between negative affect and OCB.

Keywords: negative affect, organizational citizenship behavior, meta-analysis

There has been a surge in empirical examinations of affect-behavior relationships in the organizational literature. Over the past couple of decades researchers have examined the influence of affective constructs (i.e., a person's emotions, moods, or feelings) on work-related outcomes such as performance (e.g., Rothbard & Wilk, 2011), creativity (e.g., Amabile, Barsade, Mueller, & Staw, 2005), and citizenship behavior (e.g., Dalal, Lam, Weiss, Welch, & Hulin, 2009), to name a few. Upon what has been called an affective revolution (Barsade, Brief, & Spantaro, 2003) has been a growing interest in the relationship between affect and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; e.g., Dalal, Baysinger, Brummel, & LeBreton, 2012; Lee & Allen, 2002; Rodell & Judge, 2009; Spence, Brown, Keeping, & Lian, 2014; Spence, Ferris, Brown, & Heller, 2011). While literature has enlightened our understanding of some relationships between affect and OCB (e.g., PA and OCB)¹, relationships concerning negative affect and OCB are still not well understood.

In fact, several empirical reviews showed mixed results when examining relationships between negative affect and OCB (e.g., Kaplan, Bradley, Luchman, & Haynes, 2009; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Shockley, Ispas, Rossi, & Levine, 2012). For example, the results of an early meta-analysis including affect and OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995) suggested that trait negative affect has a significant negative relationship with OCB directed at the organization (i.e., compliance), but a non-significant relationship with OCB directed at individuals (i.e., altruism). More recently, Kaplan et al. (2009) showed meta-analytic support for a significant negative relationship between trait negative affect and OCB as a composite construct. Extending these findings, Shockley and colleagues' (2012) research suggested a distinction between trait and state affect may determine the relationship between negative affect and OCB. Their results displayed a

¹ A strong positive relationship between positive affect (PA) and OCB has largely been supported across literature (Kaplan et al., 2009; Shockley et al., 2012).

significant negative relationship between trait negative affect and OCB as a composite construct, and a non-significant relationship between state negative affect and OCB as a composite construct.

The mixed findings across studies concerning negative affect and individual behavior are not new. Echoing a statement by George and Brief (1992) concerning such relationships, “The influence of negative moods on behaviors like these is much less clear-cut. Generally, these relationships have either been nonexistent, inconsistent across studies, or uninterpretable” (p. 317). Since the most recent meta-analyses including negative affect and OCB (e.g., Shockley et al., 2012), examinations of negative affect with individual behaviors have continued to show mixed results. For example, some studies have found negative relationships between negative affect and OCB (e.g., Dalal et al., 2012; Greenridge & Coyne, 2014), whereas others have found non-significant (e.g., Koopman, Lanaj, & Scott, 2016) or inverse relationships (e.g., Tenhiala & Lount, 2013) between negative affect and OCB. As such, the thoughts of George and Brief (1992) are still relevant.

In our research, we continue the conversation concerning the relationship between negative affect and OCB by presenting one possible framework that may help provide a clearer picture on this relationship. To help explain how relationships might differ with respect to different types of negative affect and OCB, we follow logic rooted in dispositional versus situational predictors of OCB (McNeely & Meglino, 1994). Further, we follow research on spillover effects of social exchange (Lavelle, Rupp, & Brockner, 2007), which suggests predictors of employee behavior may show different relationships depending on the target of the behavior. Moreover, we examine the predicted relationships using meta-analytic methodology.

In general, our goal in this research is to provide theoretical and empirical support for different relationships between negative affect and OCB. Specifically, we hypothesize and examine relationships between two facets of negative affect (trait and state) and two facets of OCB (OCBI and OCBO). By providing predictions grounded in theory and testing these predictions using meta-analytic data, this research may provide new insight and an authoritative perspective (Bosco, Uggerslev, & Steel, 2017; Cooper & Hedges, 2009) on the relationship between negative affect and OCB. In the forthcoming sections, we review key literature and provide a theoretical rationale to predict relationships between negative affect and OCB. We then provide a meta-analytic examination to test hypotheses and conclude with a discussion of the findings and implications.

Constructs

Negative Affect

Negative affect is a term for negative feelings that include negative emotions, moods, and affectivity (George & Brief, 1996; Lee & Allen, 2002; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). The consensus when defining negative affect is that it is comprised of unpleasant feelings (Kaplan et al., 2009; Russell & Carroll, 1999; Watson & Tellegen, 1985). Research suggests that conceptualizing affect in terms of valence (i.e., unpleasantness) may yield important insights into the nature and strength of affect's relationship with behavior (Côté, 1999; Cropanzano & Wright, 2001; Kaplan et al., 2009; Watson & Clark, 1984). In this study, we focus on individuals' feelings that are identified as negative (unpleasant) as described by prominent frameworks of affect (Russell & Carroll, 1999; Watson & Tellegen, 1985). Furthermore, we differentiate between trait and state negative affect. Individuals with high trait negative affect have a general tendency to experience negative feelings across time and situations. This form of negative affect

is a partially inheritable and relatively stable individual trait (Kaplan et al., 2009; Watson & Walker, 1996). In contrast to trait negative affect, which manifests itself regardless of time and situation, state negative affect refers to feelings that are time and/or situation dependent (Watson & Clark, 1984).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) has traditionally been defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Employee discretionary behaviors such as helping (or altruism), sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiatives, civic virtue, and self-development have largely been considered sub-constructs of OCB (see Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000 for a thorough review). Given many kinds of OCB, researchers have often conceptualized OCB based on the object to which the discretionary behavior is exercised, such as individuals (e.g., coworkers) and the organization. Following this conceptualization, Williams and Anderson (1991) distinguished two distinct types of OCB: OCBO and OCBI. OCBO includes “behaviors that benefit the organization in general (e.g., gives advance notice when unable to come to work, adheres to informal rules devised to maintain order),” whereas OCBI includes “behaviors that immediately benefit specific individuals . . . (e.g., helps others who have been absent, takes a personal interest in other employees)” (p. 601-602).

Among other work behaviors, OCB should be a special concern for organizations. This is because employees can exert their discretion at a greater level for OCB compared to other types of work behaviors. For example, counterproductive work behaviors (CWB) include abusive and nasty treatment of others such as damaging property, theft, and unauthorized withdrawal

(Spector et al., 2006). In general, reducing OCB may not be caught as easily, but engaging in CWB involves a greater risk to be caught by other members of the organization. Furthermore, the adverse consequence against employees who engage in CWB is greater than for those who reduce OCB. Likewise, when employees reduce in-role performance, they may receive lower scores during the performance appraisal process. Thus, in general, reduction of OCB is a relatively easier option for employees than engaging in CWB or reducing in-role performance. However, the consequence of lowered OCB can still be detrimental to organizations (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). Thus, focusing on the relationship between negative affect and OCB is meaningful both theoretically and practically.

Theory and Hypotheses

State Negative Affect and OCB

Research has been interested in situational predictors of OCB (George, 1991; Lee & Allen, 2002; McNeely & Meglino, 1994). These situational predictors have mostly been conceptualized as job cognitions, such as job satisfaction and fairness perceptions, among others. In our research, however, we suggest that affective states may serve as situational predictors of OCB. Supporting this idea, Forgas and George (2001) suggested that affective states (or moods) are essential components of social interaction and behavior in organizations and are important for employee behavior because they influence both what employees think and how employees think.

Important for the present study, Forgas and George (2001) suggested that negative affect states prompt vigilant information processing (Bless, 2000; Fiedler, 2000; Forgas & George, 2001). In other words, state negative affect's influence on employee behavior may be less explained by the direct influence of negative affect itself, and more by the situation from which it

results. For example, Brown, Westbrook, and Challagalla, (2005) claimed that negative emotion “prompts intensive analysis of details of the situation to explore their implications for one’s goals, well-being, and behavior responses” (p. 793). As such, different situations may result in different behavioral outcomes. For example, some situations may spur negative emotions that lead employees to dwell on a negative event and their negative feelings about it, and, in turn, they may respond by reducing OCB (Brown et al., 2005). Alternatively, employees may have reasons for maintaining the status quo of social interaction, or may perform OCB for self-serving reasons such as impression management. As such, employees may choose to maintain, or even raise, levels of OCB as the result of a negative affect state (Bolino, 1999; Wayne & Green, 1993). In general, because state negative affect prompts vigilant analysis of a situation (Bless, 2000; Brown et al., 2005; Fiedler, 2000; Forgas & George, 2001), employees might reflect on their motives for performing OCB before deciding to change their OCB performance.

Trait Negative Affect and OCB

Unlike state negative affect, trait negative affect is more likely to have a stronger direct influence on employee behavior. This is because, compared to state negative affect, behavioral outcomes of trait negative affect rely less on appraisals of a situation and occur as a direct response to one’s disposition. As discussed above, trait negative affect is a partially inheritable and relatively stable disposition. Compared to state negative affect, trait negative affect is more likely to manifest itself as behavioral inhibition (Gray, 1987). Explained by Carver and White (1994), individuals with a high disposition to experience negative affect are inherently over-aroused and attempt to avoid stimulation. These employees have a tendency to perceive the work environment in a threatening way (Deifendorff & Mehta, 2007). As such, employees high on

negative affect as a disposition will likely see extra-role behaviors in a threatening way and will avoid them if possible.

In general, key insights can be made concerning the relationships of dispositional (trait) negative affect and situational (state) negative affect with OCB. That is, individuals high on dispositional negative affect are likely to carry the burden of negative feelings across all times and situations. Employees high on this trait will bring their negative dispositions with them to the workplace and may naturally avoid OCB from the start of their employment. As such, regardless of workplace situations, employees high on trait negative affect (compared to those high on state negative affect) will have lower levels of OCB. On the other hand, employees experiencing high state negative affect are more likely to consider situations prior to deciding whether to reduce OCB. In all, we suggest that state negative affect will have less of a negative influence on OCB than trait negative affect. Based on this logic, we provide the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Employee negative affect is negatively related to organizational citizenship behavior.

Hypothesis 2: The negative relationship between trait negative affect and OCB is stronger than the negative relationship between state negative affect and OCB.

Negative Affect and OCBO vs. OCBI

In addition to the influence of trait versus state negative affect on employee behavior, research on target-specific OCB suggests that employees may direct their OCB differently with respect to individuals and organizations (Lavelle et al., 2007). In a review of research on social exchange and citizenship behavior, Lavelle and colleagues (2007) presented the “target similarity” model. In their review of the literature on target-specific social exchange, Lavelle et al. (2007) pointed to the empirical findings of a study conducted by Rupp and Cropanzano (2002). What they found, and what Lavelle and colleagues argued, was that cross-level targets or

‘spillover’ of OCB may move up the organizational hierarchy. For example, Rupp and Cropanzano (2002) found that supervisor social exchange had a significant influence on OCB directed at the organization. In contrast, organization social exchange did not influence OCB directed at supervisors. However, more surprisingly, supervisor social exchange predicted OCB directed at the organization beyond organization social exchange.

What the cross-foci model (Lavelle et al., 2007) and empirical results (Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002) might suggest, is that outcomes of social exchange will have spillover effects towards the authority that oversees the source of the social exchange. In line with our research, employees may interpret the organization as the unit that oversees within-organization social exchange. As such, any negative feelings associated with individuals will result in behaviors directed at individuals and the organization. In contrast, negative feelings associated with the organization will only result in behaviors directed at the organization. Given the logic that negative feelings will have overall stronger relationships with behaviors directed at the organization than at individuals, we provide the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: The negative relationship between negative affect and OCB is stronger for OCBO than OCBI.

Strength of Relationships between Negative Affect and OCB

Hypothesis 2 suggests that trait negative affect will have a stronger negative relationship with OCB than state negative affect. Hypothesis 3 suggests that negative affect will have a stronger relationship with OCBO than OCBI. As depicted in Figure 1, we consider the combined relative strength of trait negative affect and OCBO, and the combined relative weakness of state negative affect and OCBI. Considering these combined effects, we provide the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4(a): The negative relationship between trait negative affect and OCBO is the strongest relationship.

Hypothesis 4(b): The negative relationship between state negative affect and OCBI is the weakest relationship.

 Insert Figure 1 about here.

Method

Data Collection and Coding

For this research, we collected published and unpublished studies concerning the relationship between affect and OCB. To identify relevant studies, we searched electronic databases (*e.g.*, *PsychINFO*; *Business Source Complete*; *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses*; *Google Scholar*) and carried out manual searches in prominent management journals (*e.g.*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Personnel Psychology*). Keywords associated with affect (*emotion*, *affect*, *mood*, *affectivity*) were combined with keywords associated with OCB (*OCB*, *OCB-individual*, *OCB-organization*, *organizational citizenship behavior*, *contextual performance*, *altruism*, *compliance*, *civic virtue*, *courtesy*, *helping*, *loyalty*, *organizational support*, *individual support*). Searches were conducted from 1983 to the present year; 1983 was the year that the original conception of organizational citizenship behavior was introduced (*e.g.*, Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). In addition, we searched metaBUS (see Bosco et al., 2017 for a thorough review) and reference sections of quantitative reviews (Dalal, 2005; Kaplan et al., 2009; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Shockley et al., 2012). Additionally, we sent a request for unpublished papers and data via the Academy of Management OB ListServ.

Empirical studies were included in the present investigation if they fit several criteria. First, only empirical studies that investigated the relationship between negative affect (negative emotion, mood, or affectivity) and OCB were included in the analysis. Second, only studies that used participants in an employment setting were included. Finally, if studies had an overlap in authorship, we reviewed their methods and sample demographics to determine if the same sample was used more than once (Wood, 2008). If multiple studies were identified as using the same sample, results from only one of the studies were included in the analyses. The Appendix reports the studies that were considered but excluded.

Two authors coded negative affect and OCB by following relatively objective protocols. Our protocol for coding negative affect was to first review the measure used. We coded negative affect that was assessed with no reference to a time or situation as trait. If negative affect was measured with respect to a specific time or situation, it was coded as state. When information was not provided in the methods with respect to these criteria, we defaulted to the conceptualization used by the authors. The negative affect protocol resulted in an interrater agreement kappa (κ) of 0.82 ($p < .001$). The protocol for coding OCB was to follow the work of Williams and Anderson (1991). We reviewed their research concerning descriptions of OCBs that immediately benefit individuals (e.g., helping coworkers) versus those that benefit the organization in general (e.g., adhering to informal rules). Studies assessing OCB that immediately benefit individuals were coded as OCBI, those assessing OCB that benefit the organization in general were coded as OCBO. Studies that provided only composites of OCB (i.e., did not differentiate between OCBI and OCBO), were coded as OCB-composite. The OCB coding protocol resulted in an interrater agreement kappa (κ) of 0.91 ($p < .001$).

Additionally, two authors collected study sample size, construct reliabilities, and effect size estimates. Any discrepancies were discussed and resolved. Most effect sizes were reported as correlations; effect sizes not reported as correlations were transformed into correlations (Knight & Eisenkraft, 2015; Peterson & Brown, 2005). Composite correlations were created for studies reporting multiple effect sizes for the same construct (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990)². Table 1 displays the studies used and the coding of the studies. In all, 214 effect sizes across 58 articles and 70 independent samples ($k = 70$) that included 15,843 individuals ($n = 15,843$) were used for the meta-analysis.

 Insert Table 1 about here.

Analysis

Following meta-analytic procedures (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990), we estimated sample size weighted mean effect sizes (r) and sample size weighted mean effect sizes corrected for measurement error (r_c). To test direct relationships, we calculated 95% confidence intervals around the error-corrected effect sizes. Effect sizes with confidence intervals that do not include zero are significant. To test hypotheses concerning the comparison of effect sizes we utilized bivariate subgroup analysis (Geyskens, Krishnan, Steenkamp, & Cunha, 2009) and calculated Z-scores to test for significant differences in effect sizes. For this meta-analysis, we utilized the R package *metafor* (Viechtbauer, 2010). The metafor package is a validated tool that allows for the computation of meta-analysis effect sizes in R and is particularly useful for moderator analyses (Viechtbauer, 2010).

² The number of composite correlations used in the analyses ranged from 5 (the relationships of 4.1 and 4.3 in Table 2) to 43 (the relationship of 1.1 in Table 2).

Self-report bias tests. We tested the effects of OCB that was self-report and OCB that was other-report. The purpose for these tests was to examine the extent to which the results may be influenced by self-report bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). The idea is that self-report constructs inflate the magnitude of relationships due to spurious covariance (Organ & Ryan, 1995); and with affect being largely self-report, common method bias (i.e., self-report OCB) should be of concern to literature investigating the relationship between affect and OCB. To examine this, we used subgroup analysis to test for a significant difference in relationships based on whether OCB was self-report or other-report. As displayed in Table 2, the results of these tests were not significant. Therefore, there is little evidence that self-report bias influenced the results of this study.

Insert Table 2 about here.

Publication bias tests. We tested for the influence of publication bias. Also known as the “file-drawer problem” (Rosenthal, 1979), publication bias refers to the idea that null or unsupportive results are less likely to be published (Kepes, Banks, McDaniel, & Whetzel, 2012). As a result, research using meta-analytic methods should include tests examining the extent to which publication bias may be present. To assess the potential influence of publication bias on the results of this study we utilized two approaches suggested by Kepes et al. (2012).

First, we conducted subgroup analysis to test for a significant difference in relationships based on whether the effect sizes were published or unpublished. This is a traditional method (Kepes et al., 2012) to test for publication bias that is commonly used across meta-analyses. As displayed in Table 2, none of these tests were significant. Second, we implemented trim and fill analysis (Duval & Tweedie, 2000a; 2000b) using Egger’s Linear Regression method (Egger,

Smith, Schneider, & Minder, 1997). This is an advanced method (Kepes et al., 2012) to examine publication bias which uses an iterative process to impute missing effect sizes. As displayed in Table 2, the pattern of results of the trim and fill analyses were similar to that of both uncorrected (r) and corrected (r_c) effect sizes.

Primary Results

Table 2 reports the meta-analytic results of all hypothesis tests. Hypothesis 1 states that employee negative affect is negatively related to OCB. As displayed, the relationship between negative affect and OCB was negative ($r_c = -.13$) and the 95% confidence interval did not include zero (95% CI = $-.17, -.09$). Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported. Hypothesis 2 states that the negative relationship between trait negative affect and OCB is stronger than the negative relationship between state negative affect and OCB. As displayed in Table 2, the relationship between trait negative affect and OCB was negative ($r_c = -.18$) and the 95% confidence interval did not include zero (95% CI = $-.24, -.13$). Also, the relationship between state negative affect and OCB was negative ($r_c = -.10$) and the 95% confidence interval did not include zero (95% CI = $-.15, -.06$). Furthermore, the relationship between trait negative affect and OCB was stronger than the relationship between state negative affect and OCB (Z-score = -2.30 , $p < .05$). Thus, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Hypothesis 3 states that the negative relationship between negative affect and OCBO is stronger than the negative relationship between negative affect and OCBI. As displayed in Table 2, the relationship between negative affect and OCBO was negative ($r_c = -.20$) and the 95% confidence interval did not include zero (95% CI = $-.26, -.13$). Also, the relationship between negative affect and OCBI was negative ($r_c = -.09$) and the 95% confidence interval did not include zero (95% CI = $-.13, -.05$). Furthermore, the relationship between negative affect and

OCBO was stronger than the relationship between negative affect and OCBI (Z -score = -2.89, $p < .01$). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported.

Hypothesis 4(a) states that the negative relationship between trait negative affect and OCBO is stronger than other relationships between negative affect and OCB. Hypothesis 4(b) states that the negative relationship between state negative affect and OCBI is weaker than other relationships between negative affect and OCB. As displayed in Table 2, the results showed that the relationships between trait negative affect and OCBO ($r_c = -.33$; 95% CI = -.44, -.23), state negative affect and OCBO ($r_c = -.12$; 95% CI = -.17, -.07), trait negative affect and OCBI ($r_c = -.19$; 95% CI = -.27, -.10), and state negative affect and OCBI ($r_c = -.06$; 95% CI = -.10, -.02) were negative and significant.

To directly test Hypothesis 4(a), direct comparisons were made between the strength of the effect size for the relationship between trait negative affect and OCBO with all other relationships between negative affect and OCB. As displayed in Table 2, the results showed that the relationship between trait negative affect and OCBO was significantly stronger than the relationship between state negative affect and OCBO (Z -score = -4.01, $p < .01$), trait negative affect and OCBI (Z -score = -2.10, $p < .05$), and state negative affect and OCBI (Z -score = -6.12, $p < .01$). Thus, Hypothesis 4(a) was supported.

To directly test Hypothesis 4(b), direct comparisons were made between the strength of the effect size for the relationship between state negative affect and OCBI with all other relationships between negative affect and OCB. As displayed in Table 2, the results showed that the relationship between state negative affect and OCBI was significantly weaker than the relationship between trait negative affect and OCBI (Z -score = 2.99, $p < .01$) and trait negative affect and OCBO (Z -score = 6.12, $p < .01$). However, it was only marginally weaker than the

relationship between state negative affect and OCBO (Z -score = 1.85, $p < .10$). Considering these results, we concluded partial support for Hypothesis 4(b).

Discussion

We found evidence supporting our hypotheses that suggest trait negative affect has a stronger relationship with OCB than state negative affect, and that negative affect has a stronger relationship with OCBO than OCBI. Collectively, as displayed in Figure 1, the results suggest that the strongest relationship is between trait negative affect and OCBO, whereas the weakest relationship is between state negative affect and OCBI. This is consistent with our dispositional versus situational argument that employees high on trait negative affect may inherently engage in less OCB, whereas employees high on state negative affect will likely consider situational factors before deciding to change their levels of OCB. Moreover, the results support research that suggests employee behavior may be stronger when directed at the organization than at individuals (Lavelle et al., 2007; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002). In all, the results of our investigation may provide one explanation for why relationships between negative affect and OCB are different across studies.

Implications for Research and Theory

There may be several contributions of this study for research and theory. For example, our results support previous research showing that trait negative affect is negatively related to OCB (Kaplan et al., 2009; Shockley et al., 2012) and we extend these findings by showing that this relationship is consistent for both OCBO and OCBI. Moreover, whereas previous research suggests that state negative affect may not have a relationship with OCB (Shockley et al., 2012), we found significant negative relationships between state negative affect and each of the OCBs examined (i.e., OCBO, OCBI, and OCB-composite).

To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first meta-analysis that differentiates relationships between negative affect and OCB based on whether OCB is directed at the organization or individuals. We believe this is because until recently, the number of empirical studies examining affect and distinct types of OCB (i.e., OCBO and OCBI) may not have been sufficient for a meta-analysis. This is apparent given that approximately two-thirds of the studies used to examine OCBO and OCBI as presented in this manuscript are from the past decade. Moreover, much of the research concerning the relationship between affect and OCB (exceptions include those used in this study) conceptualized OCB as a composite construct. Although not formally hypothesized, the results included in this study (see relationships 3.1, 3.2, & 3.3 in Table 2) suggest that negative affect's relationship with OCBO and OCBI may be different than with OCB-composite.

Because of the limited theoretical distinction between OCBO and OCBI in past research, literature may be missing an important aspect of how affective constructs are related to OCB. For example, research suggests that employees may direct work behaviors differently with respect to individuals and organizations (Lavelle et al., 2007). One possible explanation is that when employees experience affect related to social contexts, there is likely to be considerable affective spillover toward the organization. That is, in social settings, interpersonal perceptions may be strongly associated with the authority that oversees interpersonal exchanges. From this perspective, affect influencing OCB directed at coworkers (i.e., individuals) will also influence OCB directed at the organization (i.e., authority overseeing the individuals). In contrast, affect influencing OCB directed at the organization will not spillover toward coworkers, because coworkers do not have authority over the organization.

An additional contribution may be the use of a situational perspective to explain the relationship between state negative affect and OCB. Historically, the influence of state negative affect on employee behaviors has been ambiguous (George & Brief, 1992). For example, George and Brief (1992) pointed out that the influence of negative states on behaviors is largely inconsistent across studies. We acknowledged similar patterns across meta-analyses (Kaplan et al., 2009; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Shockley et al., 2012) and recent primary studies (e.g., Dalal & colleagues, 2012; Greenridge & Coyne, 2014; Koopman et al., 2016; Tenhiala & Lount, 2013). In general, by providing meta-analytic results on the relationship between negative affect and OCB, our research provides a promising step forward for theory and research concerning this relationship.

Practical Implications

Beyond the implications for research and theory, the results of this study suggest that organizations may want to reduce negative affect in the workplace. One option for organizations may be to test individuals' susceptibility to negative affect before hiring decisions. With the idea that individuals high on trait negative affect inherently have lower levels of OCB at the outset of their employment, employers may want to implement selection processes to place these employees in appropriate positions. For example, research on emotional contagion suggests, "people are 'walking mood inductors,' continuously influencing the moods and then the judgments and behaviors of others" (Barsade, 2002, pg. 667). As such, in theory, individuals' negative affect will also influence the OCB of their coworkers through emotional contagion processes. Thus, to maintain overall levels of group and organizational level OCB, employees' who are primed to experience and display negative affect may be better suited for positions that require a greater amount of individual and/or isolated work (e.g., work from home).

Another option for organizations could be the implementation of training programs or interventions to help employees cope with negative affect. For example, drawing from emotional labor and work recovery literatures, Trougakos, Beal, Green, and Weiss (2008) found that during work breaks, employees who engaged in more respite activities (e.g., relaxing), rather than chore activities (e.g., running errands), experienced less negative emotions. Furthermore, interventions aimed at leadership may be implemented in ways to reduce the negative affect of subordinates (Johnson, 2008). Work conditions can also reduce employees' negative affect. For example, noise reduction, temperature control, and better illumination could all be related to less negative affect among employees (Wright, Cropanzano, & Meyer, 2004).

While we suggest that organizations can implement procedures based on selection and training to deal with employee negative affect, it may not always be this straightforward. For example, it may not be convenient, or the right thing to do, to filter employees out of certain positions, or, out of the organization altogether. For many organizations, finding talented employees can be a challenge (Schramm, 2016), and ruling out otherwise qualified applicants based on negative affect could be a cost many organizations cannot afford. Furthermore, selecting employees based on traits, which may or may not be related to potential in-role performance, could be seen as unfair. For example, once a potential employee is labeled with negative affect, employers may form stereotypes about their behaviors and ability to perform their job. Even if hired, preconceived attributes of a *negative affect individual* by employers may result in those individuals being placed in less desirable positions. Thus, while measures can be taken with respect to hiring and training processes, they must be approached with caution concerning costs incurred by the organization and their impact on individuals.

In light of our suggestions and precautions, organizations should be aware of what research on OCB suggests for organizations. For example, research has shown that OCB can have implications for organizational effectiveness (Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2007; Podsakoff et al., 2009). Empirical results show that more employee OCB results in less absenteeism, turnover intentions, and actual turnover (Podsakoff et al., 2009). At an organizational level, empirical results show that more OCB results in greater productivity, efficiency, profitability, and customer satisfaction (Podsakoff et al., 2009). In general, the results of this study suggest that negative affect is important for employee OCB. Through selection processes, work designs, and training, organizations can mitigate the impact that negative affect has on OCB, and as a result, experience greater organizational effectiveness.

Limitations and Future Directions

Despite the contributions of this study, limitations and future directions should be discussed. First, the studies included in this meta-analysis constitute a mix of independent samples that may differ in substantive ways. For example, different work contexts may display various levels of negative affect and OCB, which may influence the strength of the relationships. An interesting future direction for research might be to compare work contexts that require frequent interaction with customers, such as customer service, with those consisting of limited interaction with customers, such as manufacturing. Because front-line service employees might regulate their emotions and behaviors differently than employees that work behind closed doors, there may be meaningful differences concerning negative affect and OCB across these contexts.

Second, future research may want to delve deeper into the measures of affect and OCB. For example, the PANAS scale (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) is the prevalent assessment tool for affective constructs when examining the relationship between affect and OCB. However,

there are other popular scales (e.g., JAWS; Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, & Kelloway, 2000) and newly developed scales (Levine et al., 2011) being used to examine these relationships.

Moreover, while we recognized that much of the OCB measures cited can be traced back to early research on OCB (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 1990; Smith et al., 1983; Williams & Anderson, 1991), the actual work that was cited when reporting OCB measures varied. In general, it may be insightful for future research to theorize and empirically examine the influence that different measures have with respect to negative affect and OCB.

Further limitations of this research reside in the conventional nature of meta-analyses. That is, the effect sizes for this study were mostly correlational relationships, thus limiting causal inferences. Future research may want to examine the proposed framework using a study design that can examine these relationships longitudinally and provide a clearer picture of causality. In a similar vein, the samples used in this meta-analysis consisted of self- and other-report OCB. This may have resulted in method bias effects among some samples given that affect was all self-report. However, we did consider this possibility and tested for the presence of bias based on self- and other-report OCB. As the results suggested, there was little evidence of method bias due to self-report OCB.

We should also note that we did not include positive affect in our research. While previous research shows mostly strong positive relationships between positive affect and OCB across studies (Kaplan et al., 2009; Shockley et al., 2012), there may still be interesting theory development and research to pursue on these relationships. Lastly, as with any meta-analysis, there may be research with useful effect sizes that are not included in this study. However, we conducted a thorough search using traditional methods complemented with a search in metaBUS

(Bosco, 2017). Furthermore, we conducted traditional and advanced publication bias tests (Kepes et al., 2012), which showed no marked influence of publication bias.

Conclusion

Our meta-analysis shows that relationships between different facets of negative affect (i.e., trait and state) and different facets of OCB (i.e., OCBO and OCBI) are significantly different. We encourage future research to distinguish different facets of negative affect and OCB when they measure these constructs. Furthermore, we suggest that future research utilize theory that explains the unique mechanisms through which negative affect relates to employee behavior (George & Brief, 1996). From a practitioner's perspective, a better understanding of these relationships may help managers attenuate the effects of negative affect on OCB, ultimately improving organizational effectiveness (Hoffman et al., 2007; Podsakoff et al., 2009). In general, this paper contributes to research interested in the relationship between negative affect and OCB.

References

- Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., & Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 367-403.
- *Arshad, R., & Sparrow, P. (2010). Downsizing and survivor reactions in Malaysia: Modelling antecedents and outcomes of psychological contract violation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(11), 1793-1815.
- *Ball, G. A., Trevino, L. K., & Sims Jr, H. P. (1994). Just and unjust punishment: Influences on subordinate performance and citizenship. *Academy of Management journal*, 37(2), 299-322.
- *Barclay, L. J., & Kiefer, T. (2014). Approach or avoid? Exploring overall justice and the differential effects of positive and negative emotions. *Journal of Management*, 40(7), 1857-1898.
- Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(4), 644-675.
- Barsade, S., Brief, A. P., & Spataro, S. E. (2003). The affective revolution in organizational behavior: The emergence of a paradigm. In J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science* (pp. 3-52). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- 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(4), 587-595.
- *Binnewies, C., Sonnentag, S., & Mojza, E. J. (2010). Recovery during the weekend and

- fluctuations in weekly job performance: A week-level study examining intra-individual relationships. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(2), 419-441.
- *Binnewies, C., Sonnentag, S., & Mojza, E. J. (2009). Feeling recovered and thinking about the good sides of one's work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(3), 243-256.
- Bless, H. (2000). Moods and general knowledge structures: Happy moods and their impact on information processing. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Feeling and thinking: The role of affect in social cognition* (pp. 201-222). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors?. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 82-98.
- *Bolino, M. C., Hsiung, H. H., Harvey, J., & LePine, J. A. (2015). "Well, I'm tired of trying'!" Organizational citizenship behavior and citizenship fatigue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 56-74.
- *Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., Gilstrap, J. B., & Suazo, M. M. (2010). Citizenship under pressure: What's a "good soldier" to do?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(6), 835-855.
- Bosco, F. A., Uggerslev, K. L., & Steel, P. (2017). MetaBUS as a vehicle for facilitating meta-analysis. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(1), 237-254.
- *Brennan, A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2004). Personality and perceived justice as predictors of survivors' reactions following downsizing. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(6), 1306-1328.
- Brown, S. P., Westbrook, R. A., & Challagalla, G. (2005). Good cope, bad cope: adaptive and maladaptive coping strategies following a critical negative work event. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 792-798.

- Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(2), 319-333.
- Côté, S. (1999). Affect and performance in organizational settings. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(2), 65-68.
- *Crede, M., Chernyshenko, O. S., Stark, S., Dalal, R. S., & Bashshur, M. (2007). Job satisfaction as mediator: An assessment of job satisfaction's position within the nomological network. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80(3), 515-538.
- Cooper, H., & Hedges, L. V. (2009). Research synthesis as a scientific process. In F. Cooper, & L. Hedges (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis* (pp. 3-17). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cropanzano, R., & Wright, T. A. (2001). When a "happy" worker is really a "productive" worker: A review and further refinement of the happy-productive worker thesis. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 53(3), 182-199.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255.
- *Dalal, R. S., Baysinger, M., Brummel, B. J., & LeBreton, J. M. (2012). The relative importance of employee engagement, other job attitudes, and trait affect as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(1), 295-325.
- *Dalal, R. S., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. W., & Hulin, C. L. (2009). A within-person approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship

- counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5), 1051-1066.
- *De Lara, P. Z. M. (2008). Should faith and hope be included in the employees' agenda?: Linking PO fit and citizenship behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(1), 73-88.
- Diefendorff, J. M., & Mehta, K. (2007). The relations of motivational traits with workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 967-977.
- *Donovan, M. A. (1999). *Cognitive, affective, and satisfaction variables as predictors of organizational behaviors: A structural equation modeling examination of alternative models*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Egger, M., Smith, G. D., Schneider, M., & Minder, C. (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *British Medical Journal*, 315, 629-634.
- *Feys, M., Anseel, F., & Wille, B. (2013). Responses to co-workers receiving recognition at work. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(5), 492-510.
- Fiedler, K. (2000). Towards an integrative account of affect and cognition phenomena. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Feeling and thinking: The role of affect in social cognition* (pp. 223-252). New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- *Findley, H. M., Giles, W. F., & Mossholder, K. W. (2000). Performance appraisal process and system facets: Relationships with contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 634-640.
- Forgas, J. P., & George, J. M. (2001). Affective influences on judgments and behavior in organizations: An information processing perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(1), 3-34.

- *Fortunato, V. J. (2004). A comparison of the construct validity of three measures of negative affectivity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64(2), 271-289.
- *Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. R. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85(1), 199-220.
- Frijda, N. H. (1987). Emotion, cognitive structure, and action tendency. *Cognition and Emotion*, 1(2), 115-143.
- George, J. M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(2), 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(2), 310-329.
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1996). Motivational agendas in the workplace: The effects of feelings on focus of attention and work motivation. In Staw, Barry M. & Cummings, L. L. (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews* 18: (pp. 75-109). New York: Elsevier Science.
- Geyskens, I., Krishnan, R., Steenkamp, J. B. E., & Cunha, P. V. (2009). A review and evaluation of meta-analysis practices in management research. *Journal of Management*, 35(2), 393-419.
- *Glomb, T. M., Bhawe, D. P., Miner, A. G., & Wall, M. (2011). Doing good, feeling good: Examining the role of organizational citizenship behaviors in changing mood. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 191-223.

- *Gotlib, T. (2011). *Multifoci organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior and Counterproductive work behavior. The mediating effects of emotions*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida Institute of Technology.
- Gray, J. A. (1987). Perspectives on anxiety and impulsivity: A commentary. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 21(4), 493-509.
- *Greenidge, D., & Coyne, I. (2014). Job stressors and voluntary work behaviours: Mediating effect of emotion and moderating roles of personality and emotional intelligence. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(4), 479-495.
- *Halbesleben, J. R., Harvey, J., & Bolino, M. C. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources view of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(6), 1452-1465.
- *Hall, A. T., & Ferris, G. R. (2011). Accountability and extra-role behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 23(2), 131-144.
- *Hochwarter, W. A., Meurs, J. A., Perrewé, P. L., Todd Royle, M., & Matherly, T. A. (2007). The interactive effect of attention control and the perceptions of others' entitlement behavior on job and health outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(5), 506-528.
- Hoffman, B. J., Blair, C. A., Meriac, J. P., & Woehr, D. J. (2007). Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 555-566.
- *Holtom, B. C., Burton, J. P., & Crossley, C. D. (2012). How negative affectivity moderates the relationship between shocks, embeddedness and worker behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 434-443.
- *Hoon, F. L., & Ansari, M. A. (2005). Affect and organizational citizenship behavior: The

- impact of leader-member exchange. *Unpublished Manuscript Presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Los Angeles, California.
- *Hui, C., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. (1999). A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader-member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 77(1), 3-21.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (1990). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- *Jacobs, G., Belschak, F. D., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2014). (Un)ethical behavior and performance appraisal: The role of affect, support, and organizational justice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 121(1), 63-76.
- *Jain, A. K., Malhotra, N. K., & Guan, C. (2012). Positive and negative affectivity as mediators of volunteerism and service-oriented citizenship behavior and customer loyalty. *Psychology & Marketing*, 29(12), 1004-1017.
- *Janssen, O., Lam, C. K., & Huang, X. (2010). Emotional exhaustion and job performance: The moderating roles of distributive justice and positive affect. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(6), 787-809.
- *Jensen, J. M., & Raver, J. L. (2012). When self-management and surveillance collide: Consequences for employees' organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behaviors. *Group & Organization Management*, 37(3), 308-346.
- *Johnson, S. K. (2008). I second that emotion: Effects of emotional contagion and affect at work on leader and follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(1), 1-19.
- *Johnson, J. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2003). The effects of psychological contract breach

- and organizational cynicism: Not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(5), 627-647.
- *Johnson, R. E., Tolentino, A. L., Rodopman, O. B., & Cho, E. (2010). We (sometimes) know not how we feel: Predicting job performance with an implicit measure of trait affectivity. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(1), 197-219.
- Kaplan, S., Bradley, J. C., Luchman, J. N., & Haynes, D. (2009). On the role of positive and negative affectivity in job performance: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 162-176.
- Kepes, S., Banks, G. C., McDaniel, M., & Whetzel, D. L. (2012). Publication bias in the organizational sciences. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15(4), 624-662.
- *Kluemper, D. H., Little, L. M., & DeGroot, T. (2009). State or trait: effects of state optimism on job-related outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(2), 209-231.
- Knight, A. P., & Eisenkraft, N. (2015). Positive is usually good, negative is not always bad: The effects of group affect on social integration and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(4), 1214-1227.
- *Kohan, A., & Mazmanian, D. (2003). Police work, burnout, and pro-organizational behavior: A consideration of daily work experiences. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30(5), 559-583.
- *Koopman, J., Lanaj, K., & Scott, B. A. (2016). Integrating the bright and dark sides of OCB: A daily investigation of the benefits and costs of helping others. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(2), 414-435.
- Lavelle, J. J., Rupp, D. E., & Brockner, J. (2007). Taking a multifoci approach to the study of justice, social exchange, and citizenship behavior: The target similarity model. *Journal of Management*, 33(6), 841-866.

- *Lee, K. (2000). *Job affect as a predictor of organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Western Ontario.
- *Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131-142.
- *Levine, E. L., Xu, X., Yang, L. Q., Ispas, D., Pitariu, H. D., Bian, R., Ding, R. C., Che, H., & Musat, S. (2011). Cross-national explorations of the impact of affect at work using the state-trait emotion measure: a coordinated series of studies in the United States, China, and Romania. *Human Performance*, 24(5), 405-442.
- Lord, R. G., Diefendorff, J. M., Schmidt, A. M., & Hall, R. J. (2010). Self-regulation at work. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 543-568.
- *Loughlin, C., & Murray, R. (2013). Employment status congruence and job quality. *Human Relations*, 66(4), 529-553.
- McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(6), 836-844.
- *Meyer, J. P., Stanley, L. J., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2012). Employee commitment in context: The nature and implication of commitment profiles. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1), 1-16.
- *Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10(1-2), 51-57.
- *Molitor, D. D. (1998). *An examination of the effects of personality and job satisfaction on*

- multiple non-work role organizational behaviors*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Iowa State University.
- *Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 759-776.
- *Munson, L. J. (2000). *Assessing the influence of personality, affectivity, and mood on job satisfaction and job behaviors: A test of alternative models*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- *Munyon, T. P., Hochwarter, W. A., Perrewé, P. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2010). Optimism and the nonlinear citizenship behavior - Job satisfaction relationship in three studies. *Journal of Management*, 36(6), 1505-1528.
- *O'Brien, K. E. (2008). *A Stressor-strain model of organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- *Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 157-164.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-802.
- Peterson, R. A., & Brown, S. P. (2005). On the use of beta coefficients in meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 175-181.
- Piaget, J. (1981). Intelligence and affectivity: Their relationship during child development.

- (Trans & Ed T. A. Brown & C. E. Kaegi). Oxford, England: Annual Reviews.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Podsakoff, N., Whiting, S., Podsakoff, P., & Blume, B. (2009). Individual-and organizational level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122-122.
- *Richards, D. A., & Schat, A. C. (2011). Attachment at (not to) work: Applying attachment theory to explain individual behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 169-182.
- *Rodell, J. B., & Judge, T. A. (2009). Can “good” stressors spark “bad” behaviors? The mediating role of emotions in links of challenge and hindrance stressors with citizenship and counterproductive behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(6), 1438-1451.
- Rosenthal, R. (1979). The file drawer problem and tolerance for null results. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(3), 638-641.
- Rothbard, N. P., & Wilk, S. L. (2011). Waking up on the right or wrong side of the bed: Start-of workday mood, work events, employee affect, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 959-980.
- Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in

- predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 925-946.
- Russell, J. A., & Carroll, J. M. (1999). On the bipolarity of positive and negative affect. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(1), 3-30.
- Schramm, J. S. (2016). *Survey: Qualified Workers Are Harder to Find*. Society for Human Resource Management. Retrieved from: <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/news/hr-magazine/0616/pages/0616-hr-recruiting-difficulties-rise.aspx>
- Shockley, K. M., Ispas, D., Rossi, M. E., & Levine, E. L. (2012). A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between state affect, discrete emotions, and job performance. *Human Performance*, 25(5), 377-411.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.
- *Sommer, K. L., & Kulkarni, M. (2012). Does constructive performance feedback improve citizenship intentions and job satisfaction? The roles of perceived opportunities for advancement, respect, and mood. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 23(2), 177-201.
- 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(2), 269-292.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68(3), 446-460.
- Spence, J. R., Brown, D. J., Keeping, L. M., & Lian, H. (2014). Helpful today, but not

- tomorrow? Feeling grateful as a predictor of daily organizational citizenship behaviors. *Personnel Psychology*, 67(3), 705-738.
- *Spence, J. R., Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., & Heller, D. (2011). Understanding daily citizenship behaviors: A social comparison perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(4), 547-571.
- *Tenhiälä, A., & Lount, R. B. (2013). Affective reactions to a pay system reform and their impact on employee behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86(1), 100-118.
- Trougakos, J. P., Beal, D. J., Green, S. G., & Weiss, H. M. (2008). Making the break count: An episodic examination of recovery activities, emotional experiences, and positive affective displays. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(1), 131-146.
- Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 219.
- Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 36(3), 1-48.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96(3), 465-490.
- 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(6), 1063.
- Watson, D., & Tellegen, A. (1985). Toward a consensual structure of mood. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98(2), 219-235.

- Watson, D., & Walker, L. M. (1996). The long-term stability and predictive validity of trait measures of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 567–577.
- Wayne, S. J., & Green, S. A. (1993). The effects of leader-member exchange on employee citizenship and impression management behavior. *Human Relations*, 46(12), 1431-1440.
- *Webster, J. R., Beehr, T. A., & Christiansen, N. D. (2010). Toward a better understanding of the effects of hindrance and challenge stressors on work behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(1), 68-77.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In Staw, B. M., & Cummings, L. L. (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews* 18: (pp. 1-74). New York: Elsevier Science.
- *Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.
- *Williams, S., & Shiaw, W. T. (1999). Mood and organizational citizenship behavior: The effects of positive affect on employee organizational citizenship behavior intentions. *The Journal of Psychology*, 133(6), 656-668.
- Wood, J. A. (2008). Methodology for dealing with duplicate study effects in a meta-analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(1), 79-95.
- Wright, T. A., Cropanzano, R., & Meyer, D. G. (2004). State and trait correlates of job performance: A tale of two perspectives. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(3), 365-383.

- *Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(6), 1068-1076.
- *Ziegler, R., Schlett, C., Casel, K., & Diehl, M. (2012). The role of job satisfaction, job ambivalence, and emotions at work in predicting organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 11*(4), 176-190.

Table 1

Summary of Studies and Samples Included in the Meta-Analysis.

Article	Published	Sample Size	Effect Size	Negative Affect	OCB	OCB Report
Arshad & Sparrow (2010)	Yes	281	-.18	Trait (.78)	OCBcomp (.88)	Self
Ball et al. (1994)	Yes	89	-.01	Trait (.71)	OCBcomp (.90)	Other
Barclay & Kiefer (2014)	Yes	136	.17	State (.91)	OCBi (.91)	Other
		136	.05	State (.91)	OCBo (.91)	Other
		136	-.08	State (.74)	OCBi (.91)	Other
		136	-.12	State (.74)	OCBo (.91)	Other
		451	-.05	State (.97)	OCBi (.81)	Self
		451	.02	State (.97)	OCBo (.84)	Self
		451	-.09	State (.97)	OCBi (.81)	Self
		451	-.05	State (.97)	OCBo (.84)	Self
		451	-.17	Trait (.79)	OCBi (.81)	Self
		451	-.25	Trait (.79)	OCBo (.84)	Self
		451	-.10	Trait (.79)	OCBi (.81)	Self
		451	-.18	Trait (.79)	OCBo (.84)	Self
Binnewies et al. (2009)	Yes	358	-.08	State (.85)	OCBi (.74)	Self
		358	-.06	State (.85)	OCBi (.73)	Self
Binnewies et al. (2010)	Yes	133	.09	Trait (.84)	OCBi (.72)	Self
		133	-.02	Trait (.84)	OCBi (.64)	Self
Bolino et al. (2015)	Yes	260	-.01	Trait (.90)	OCBcomp (.96)	Other
		260	-.02	Trait (.90)	OCBcomp (.96)	Other
Bolino et al. (2010)	Yes	245	-.04	Trait (.88)	OCBcomp (.93)	Self
Brennan & Skarlicki (2004)	Yes	93	-.17	Trait (.79)	OCBi (.81)	Other
		93	-.09	Trait (.79)	OCBo (.86)	Other
Crede et al. (2007)	Yes	959	-.14	Trait (.89)	OCBcomp (.84)	Self
Dalal et al. (2009)	Yes	67	-.01	State (n/a)	OCBi (n/a)	Self
		67	-.01	State (n/a)	OCBo (n/a)	Self
		67	-.01	State (n/a)	OCBi (n/a)	Self
		67	.02	State (n/a)	OCBo (n/a)	Self
Dalal et al. (2012)	Yes	191	-.18	Trait (.86)	OCBcomp (.84)	Self
De Lara (2007)	Yes	84	-.19	Trait (.83)	OCBi (.83)	Self
		84	-.44	Trait (.83)	OCBo (.86)	Self
Donovan (1999)	No	188	-.10	State (.91)	OCBcomp (.87)	Self
		188	.03	State (.85)	OCBcomp (.87)	Self
		188	.00	State (.86)	OCBcomp (.87)	Self
		188	-.11	State (.86)	OCBcomp (.87)	Self
		188	-.03	Trait (.82)	OCBcomp (.87)	Self
		144	-.15	State (.93)	OCBcomp (.88)	Self
		144	.06	State (.89)	OCBcomp (.88)	Self
		144	.01	State (.89)	OCBcomp (.88)	Self
		144	-.19	State (.88)	OCBcomp (.88)	Self
Feys et al. (2013)	Yes	246	.01	State (.87)	OCBi (.87)	Self
Findley et al. (2000)	Yes	199	-.07	Trait (.87)	OCBcomp (.94)	Other
		199	-.10	Trait (.87)	OCBo (.92)	Other
		199	-.04	Trait (.87)	OCBi (.92)	Other
		199	-.04	Trait (.87)	OCBi (.87)	Other

(Table 1 continues)

Table 1 (*continued*)

Article	Published	Sample Size	Effect Size	Negative Affect	OCB	OCB Report
Fortunato (2004)	Yes	309	-.09	Trait (.89)	OCBcomp (.77)	Self
Fox et al. (2012)	Yes	169	.23	State (.88)	OCBcomp (.89)	Self
		136	.06	State (.88)	OCBcomp (.94)	Other
		515	-.22	State (.90)	OCBcomp (.93)	Self
		515	.18	State (.90)	OCBcomp (.94)	Other
		515	.18	State (.90)	OCBcomp (.94)	Other
Glomb et al. (2011)	Yes	68	.09	State (n/a)	OCBi (n/a)	Self
		68	.00	State (n/a)	OCBi (n/a)	Self
		68	.35	State (n/a)	OCBi (n/a)	Self
		68	.41	State (n/a)	OCBi (n/a)	Self
Gotlib (2011)	No	185	-.27	Trait (.88)	OCBo (.90)	Self
		185	-.08	Trait (.88)	OCBi (.85)	Self
		185	-.35	State (.91)	OCBo (.90)	Self
		185	-.04	State (.91)	OCBi (.85)	Self
Greenridge & Coyne (2014)	Yes	202	-.33	State (.93)	OCBo (.94)	Other
		202	-.27	State (.93)	OCBi (.92)	Other
		202	-.29	State (.93)	OCBi (.91)	Other
Halbesleben et al. (2009)	Yes	80	-.08	State (.91)	OCBi (.91)	Other
		513	-.10	State (.83)	OCBi (.85)	Other
Hall & Ferris (2011)	Yes	215	-.30	Trait (n/a)	OCBcomp (.83)	Self
		84	-.15	Trait (n/a)	OCBcomp (.94)	Other
Hochwarter et al. (2007)	Yes	309	-.37	State (.82)	OCBcomp (.84)	Self
		584	-.27	State (.91)	OCBcomp (.75)	Self
Holtom et al. (2012)	Yes	279	-.10	Trait (.89)	OCBcomp (.84)	Self
Hoon & Ansari (2005)	No	140	.06	State (.83)	OCBi (.93)	Other
		140	.10	State (.83)	OCBo (.88)	Other
		140	-.08	State (.83)	OCBo (.82)	Other
		140	-.04	State (.83)	OCBi (.65)	Other
		140	-.03	State (.83)	OCBo (.69)	Other
Hui et al. (1999)	Yes	347	-.13	Trait (.72)	OCBcomp (.75)	Other
Jacobs et al. (2014)	Yes	332	-.12	State (.85)	OCBo (.95)	Other
Jain et al. (2012)	Yes	125	-.62	Trait (.69)	OCBo (.71)	Other
		125	-.67	Trait (.69)	OCBo (.68)	Other
		125	-.54	Trait (.69)	OCBo (.71)	Other
		125	-.74	Trait (.69)	OCBo (.57)	Other
Janssen et al. (2010)	Yes	241	-.14	State (n/a)	OCBo (.89)	Other
		241	-.08	State (n/a)	OCBi (.93)	Other
Jensen & Raver (2012)	Yes	212	-.13	Trait (.95)	OCBo (.94)	Self
Johnson et al. (2010)	Yes	120	-.37	Trait (.89)	OCBi (.86)	Other
		120	-.39	Trait (.88)	OCBo (.81)	Other
		120	-.07	Trait (.89)	OCBi (.86)	Other
		120	-.20	Trait (.88)	OCBo (.81)	Other
Johnson (2008)	Yes	126	-.23	State (.87)	OCBcomp (.90)	Self
		126	-.16	Trait (.92)	OCBcomp (.90)	Self
Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly (2003)	Yes	103	-.09	State (.75)	OCBi (n/a)	Other
Kluemper et al. (2009)	Yes	133	-.03	State (.91)	OCBcomp (.96)	Other
		118	.03	State (.89)	OCBcomp (.96)	Other

(Table 1 continues)

Table 1 (*continued*)

Article	Published	Sample Size	Effect Size	Negative Affect	OCB	OCB Report
Kohan & Mazmanian (2003)	Yes	199	-.24	Trait (.88)	OCBo (.75)	Self
		199	-.27	Trait (.88)	OCBo (.80)	Self
		199	-.17	Trait (.88)	OCBo (.78)	Self
Koopman et al. (2016)	Yes	82	-.01	State (.79)	OCBi (.83)	Self
Lee & Allen (2002)	Yes	155	.10	State (.85)	OCBi (.83)	Other
		155	-.07	State (.87)	OCBi (.83)	Other
		155	-.08	State (.77)	OCBi (.83)	Other
		155	.00	State (.83)	OCBi (.83)	Other
		155	-.01	State (.85)	OCBo (.88)	Other
		155	-.08	State (.87)	OCBo (.88)	Other
		155	-.05	State (.77)	OCBo (.88)	Other
		155	-.03	State (.83)	OCBo (.88)	Other
		155	-.03	State (.83)	OCBo (.88)	Other
		155	-.03	State (.83)	OCBo (.88)	Other
Lee (2000)	No	215	-.11	State (.85)	OCBi (.78)	Self
		215	-.02	State (.87)	OCBi (.78)	Self
		215	-.14	State (.77)	OCBi (.78)	Self
		215	.00	State (.83)	OCBi (.78)	Self
		215	-.16	State (.85)	OCBo (.87)	Self
		215	-.19	State (.87)	OCBo (.87)	Self
		215	-.20	State (.77)	OCBo (.87)	Self
		215	-.15	State (.83)	OCBo (.87)	Self
Levine et al. (2011)	Yes	142	-.20	State (.65)	OCB (.90)	Self
		142	-.21	State (.65)	OCBi (.83)	Self
		142	-.07	State (.65)	OCBo (.93)	Self
		142	-.20	State (.63)	OCB (.90)	Self
		142	-.17	State (.63)	OCBi (.83)	Self
		142	-.13	State (.63)	OCBo (.93)	Self
		345	-.02	State (.70)	OCB (.93)	Self
		345	.00	State (.70)	OCBi (.89)	Self
		345	-.01	State (.70)	OCBo (.86)	Self
		345	-.01	State (.68)	OCB (.93)	Self
		345	-.02	State (.68)	OCBi (.89)	Self
		345	.01	State (.68)	OCBo (.86)	Self
		108	.05	State (.66)	OCBi (.85)	Self
		108	.03	State (.66)	OCBo (.81)	Self
		108	.01	State (.70)	OCBi (.85)	Self
		108	.03	State (.70)	OCBo (.81)	Self
		105	-.09	State (.83)	OCBi (.83)	Self
		105	-.09	State (.83)	OCBo (.88)	Self
		105	-.05	State (.85)	OCBi (.83)	Self
		105	-.06	State (.85)	OCBo (.88)	Self
Loughlin & Murray (2013)	Yes	171	-.11	State (.89)	OCBi (.76)	Self
		172	-.15	State (.92)	OCBi (.81)	Self
		132	-.07	State (.90)	OCBi (.80)	Self
Meyer et al. (2012)	Yes	180	-.10	State (.89)	OCBi (.91)	Other
		180	-.19	State (.89)	OCBo (.92)	Other
Miles et al. (2002)	Yes	203	.12	State (.92)	OCBcomp (.90)	Self

(Table 1 continues)

Table 1 (*continued*)

Article	Published	Sample Size	Effect Size	Negative Affect	OCB	OCB Report
Molitor (1998)	No	313	.01	State (.83)	OCBcomp (.83)	Self
Moorman (1993)	Yes	225	-.03	State (.77)	OCBi (.81)	Other
		225	-.14	State (.77)	OCBi (.87)	Other
		225	-.13	State (.77)	OCBo (.87)	Other
		225	-.08	State (.77)	OCBo (.83)	Other
		225	-.04	State (.77)	OCBo (.77)	Other
		225	-.04	State (.77)	OCBo (.77)	Other
Munson (2000)	No	453	-.25	State (.90)	OCBcomp (.83)	Self
		453	-.19	Trait (.89)	OCBcomp (.83)	Self
		453	-.19	Trait (.87)	OCBcomp (.83)	Self
		364	-.28	State (.90)	OCBcomp (.75)	Self
		364	-.23	Trait (.87)	OCBcomp (.75)	Self
		364	-.23	Trait (.87)	OCBcomp (.75)	Self
Munyun et al. (2010)	Yes	165	.06	Trait (.82)	OCBcomp (.90)	Self
		219	.03	Trait (.81)	OCBcomp (.91)	Self
		642	-.17	Trait (.85)	OCBcomp (.84)	Self
O'Brien (2008)	No	205	-.27	Trait (.90)	OCBi (.91)	Self
		205	-.25	Trait (.90)	OCBo (.87)	Self
		205	-.28	Trait (.90)	OCBcomp (.91)	Self
		205	-.17	Trait (.90)	OCBi (.91)	Self
		205	-.26	Trait (.90)	OCBo (.87)	Self
		205	-.23	Trait (.90)	OCBcomp (.91)	Self
		205	-.28	Trait (.93)	OCBi (.92)	Self
		205	-.35	Trait (.93)	OCBo (.90)	Self
		205	-.34	Trait (.93)	OCBcomp (.93)	Self
		205	-.28	Trait (.93)	OCBi (.92)	Self
		205	-.34	Trait (.93)	OCBo (.90)	Self
		205	-.34	Trait (.93)	OCBcomp (.93)	Self
		205	-.27	Trait (.90)	OCBi (.92)	Self
		205	-.33	Trait (.90)	OCBo (.90)	Self
		205	-.32	Trait (.90)	OCBcomp (.93)	Self
		205	-.26	Trait (.90)	OCBi (.92)	Self
		205	-.31	Trait (.90)	OCBo (.90)	Self
		205	-.31	Trait (.90)	OCBcomp (.93)	Self
		205	-.28	Trait (.93)	OCBi (.91)	Self
		205	-.28	Trait (.93)	OCBo (.87)	Self
		205	-.30	Trait (.93)	OCBcomp (.91)	Self
		205	-.23	Trait (.93)	OCBi (.91)	Self
		205	-.31	Trait (.93)	OCBo (.87)	Self
		205	-.29	Trait (.93)	OCBcomp (.91)	Self
		205	-.34	Trait (.90)	OCBi (.96)	Other
		205	-.35	Trait (.90)	OCBo (.94)	Other
		205	-.36	Trait (.90)	OCBcomp (.93)	Other
		205	-.23	Trait (.90)	OCBi (.96)	Other
		205	-.23	Trait (.90)	OCBo (.94)	Other
		205	-.24	Trait (.90)	OCBcomp (.93)	Other
		205	-.37	Trait (.93)	OCBi (.96)	Other

(Table 1 continues)

Table 1 (*continued*)

Article	Published	Sample Size	Effect Size	Negative Affect	OCB	OCB Report
		205	-.38	Trait (.93)	OCBo (.94)	Other
		205	-.39	Trait (.93)	OCBcomp (.93)	Other
		205	-.27	Trait (.93)	OCBi (.96)	Other
		205	-.27	Trait (.93)	OCBo (.94)	Other
		205	-.27	Trait (.93)	OCBcomp (.93)	Other
Organ & Konovsky (1989)	Yes	369	-.04	State (.84)	OCBi (.89)	Other
		369	-.11	State (.84)	OCBo (.81)	Other
Richards & Schat (2011)	Yes	147	-.39	Trait (.94)	OCBi (.95)	Other
		147	-.49	Trait (.94)	OCBo (.79)	Other
Rodell & Judge (2009)	Yes	100	.08	State (.83)	OCBcomp (.91)	Self
		100	-.02	State (.85)	OCBcomp (.91)	Self
		100	.20	State (.83)	OCBcomp (.91)	Self
		100	.06	State (.85)	OCBcomp (.91)	Self
Sommer & Kulkarni (2012)	Yes	128	-.40	State (.91)	OCBcomp (.77)	Self
Spence et al. (2011)	Yes	99	-.01	State (.87)	OCBi (.89)	Self
		99	.05	State (.87)	OCBi (.89)	Self
Tenhiala & Lount (2013)	Yes	267	.00	State (.86)	OCBi (.80)	Self
		267	.22	State (.91)	OCBi (.80)	Self
Webster et al. (2010)	Yes	143	.10	State (.72)	OCBi (.88)	Other
		143	-.04	State (.72)	OCBo (.83)	Other
Williams & Anderson (1991)	Yes	127	-.09	State (.78)	OCBi (.88)	Other
		127	-.10	State (.78)	OCBo (.75)	Other
Williams & Shiaw (1999)	Yes	139	-.12	Trait (.84)	OCBcomp (.83)	Self
		139	-.08	Trait (.84)	OCBcomp (.62)	Self
Zellers (2002)	Yes	373	-.13	Trait (.88)	OCBcomp (.91)	Other
Ziegler et al. (2012)	Yes	92	-.24	State (.85)	OCBcomp (.83)	Other
		92	-.29	State (.85)	OCBcomp (.80)	Self
		92	-.19	State (.85)	OCBcomp (.80)	Self
		92	-.05	Trait (.83)	OCBcomp (.83)	Other
		92	-.24	Trait (.83)	OCBcomp (.80)	Self
		92	-.22	Trait (.83)	OCBcomp (.80)	Self

Note. Trait = trait affect; State = state affect; OCBcomp = OCB composite; OCBi = OCB directed at individuals; OCBO = OCB directed at the organization; Other = other report OCB; Self = self-report OCB. () = reliability. n/a = reliability not available; mean reliability of all negative affect assessments used for negative affect n/a; mean reliability of all OCB assessments used for OCB n/a.

Table 2
Meta-Analytic Results of Negative Affect with OCB.

Relationship	Bias analyses			k	n	r	r _c	95% CI	95%CV	Q	Compare ES ^d
	Self-report OCB ^a	Publication test ^b	Trim & fill ^c								
H1. Overall:											
1.1 Negative affect <i>with</i> OCB ^{\$}	.79 ^{ns}	.78 ^{ns}	-.19**	70	15843	-.11	-.13	-.17, -.09	-.41, .15	418.67**	
H2. Trait vs. state:											
2.1 Trait negative affect <i>with</i> OCB ^{\$}	1.42 ^{ns}	.53 ^{ns}	-.24**	32	8089	-.16	-.18	-.24, -.13	-.45, .09	177.29**	
2.2 State negative affect <i>with</i> OCB ^{\$}	-.24 ^{ns}	.96 ^{ns}	-.15**	44	9651	-.09	-.10	-.15, -.06	-.38, .17	264.65**	-2.30*, e
H3. OCBO vs. OCBI:											
3.1 Negative affect <i>with</i> OCB-O ^{\$}	.69 ^{ns}	.38 ^{ns}	-.23**	27	5067	-.17	-.20	-.26, -.13	-.52, .13	198.51**	
3.2 Negative affect <i>with</i> OCB-I ^{\$}	1.61 ^{ns}	.57 ^{ns}	-.13**	36	6623	-.08	-.09	-.13, -.05	-.29, .12	102.64**	-2.89**, f
3.3 Negative affect <i>with</i> OCB-composite ^{\$}	-1.08 ^{ns}	.89 ^{ns}	-.18**	33	9058	-.11	-.14	-.19, -.08	-.41, .14	208.78**	
H4(a)&(b). Trait & state <i>with</i> OCBO & OCBI											
4.1 Trait negative affect <i>with</i> OCBO ^{\$}	.65 ^{ns}	-.13 ^{ns}	-.38**	11	2020	-.30	-.33	-.44, -.23	-.67, -.00	83.41**	6.12**, l
4.2 State negative affect <i>with</i> OCBO ^{\$}	.89 ^{ns}	1.33 ^{ns}	-.16**	18	3683	-.11	-.12	-.17, -.07	-.31, .07	51.99**	-4.01**, g 1.85 [†] , k
4.3 Trait negative affect <i>with</i> OCBI ^{\$}	1.42 ^{ns}	.14 ^{ns}	-.19**	9	1617	-.16	-.19	-.27, -.10	-.41, .04	27.21**	-2.10*, h 2.99**, j
4.4 State negative affect <i>with</i> OCBI ^{\$}	1.01 ^{ns}	-.53 ^{ns}	-.09*	29	5642	-.05	-.06	-.10, -.02	-.21, .09	57.25**	-6.12**, i

k = number of samples; n = sample size; r = sample size weighted correlation; r_c = sample size weighted correlation corrected for reliability; CI = confidence interval [95% CI that does not include zero indicates a significant r_c]; CV = credibility interval; Q = test for heterogeneity; Z-score test = test for significant difference between effect sizes.

^{\$} Null results for leave-one-out sensitivity analysis (Viechtbauer, 2010); ^a Z-value for self-report (vs. other-report) OCB; negative value indicates stronger negative relationship for self-report; ^b Z-value for publication test (published vs. non-published); negative value indicates stronger negative relationship for published; ^c correlation based on trim & fill analyses (imputations based on the results of Egger's regression test); ^d Z-value for comparing effect sizes (r_c); negative value indicates stronger negative relationship.

^e 2.1 vs. 2.2

^f 3.1 vs. 3.2

^g 4.1 vs. 4.2

^h 4.1 vs. 4.3

ⁱ 4.1 vs. 4.4 (inverse of 4.4 vs. 4.1)

^j 4.4 vs. 4.3

^k 4.4 vs. 4.2

^l 4.4 vs. 4.1 (inverse of 4.1 vs. 4.4)

^{ns} p > .10

[†] p < .10

* p < .05

** p < .01

Figure 1

Relative Strength of Relationships between Negative Affect and OCB.

	<i>Trait Negative Affect</i>	<i>State Negative Affect</i>
<i>OCBO</i>	Strong	Moderate
<i>OCBI</i>	Moderate	Weak

Appendix
References of Studies Considered but Excluded

No negative affect variable for individuals (29)

- Akoto, E. O. (2014). Contexts of the commitment–citizenship link: a test of economic volatility in a dual organization setting. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 84(3), 332-344.
- Aryee, S., Chay, Y. W., & Chew, J. (1996). The motivation to mentor among managerial employees: An interactionist approach. *Group & Organization Management*, 21(3), 261-277.
- Bettencourt, L. A., Gwinner, K. P., & Meuter, M. L. (2001). A comparison of attitude, personality, and knowledge predictors of service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 29-41.
- Bies, R. J., Martin, C. L., & Brockner, J. (1993). Just laid off, but still a “good citizen?” Only if the process is fair. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6(3), 227-238.
- Bommer, W. H., Miles, E. W., & Grover, S. L. (2003). Does one good turn deserve another? Coworker influences on employee citizenship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(2), 181-196.
- Bourdage, J. S., Lee, K., Lee, J. H., & Shin, K. H. (2012). Motives for organizational citizenship behavior: Personality correlates and coworker ratings of OCB. *Human Performance*, 25(3), 179-200.
- Chan, A. W., Snape, E., & Redman, T. (2011). Multiple foci and bases of commitment in a Chinese workforce. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(16), 3290-3304.
- Chi, N. W., Chung, Y. Y., & Tsai, W. C. (2011). How do happy leaders enhance team success?

- The mediating roles of transformational leadership, group affective tone, and team processes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(6), 1421-1454.
- Christoforou, P. S., & Ashforth, B. E. (2015). Revisiting the debate on the relationship between display rules and performance: Considering the explicitness of display rules. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 249-261.
- De Cremer, D., Van Dijke, M., & Mayer, D. M. (2010). Cooperating when “you” and “I” are treated fairly: The moderating role of leader prototypicality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(6), 1121-1133.
- Dimotakis, N., Davison, R. B., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (2012). Team structure and regulatory focus: The impact of regulatory fit on team dynamic. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 421-434.
- George, J. M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(2), 299-307.
- Gilmore, P. L., Hu, X., Wei, F., Tetrick, L. E., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2013). Positive affectivity neutralizes transformational leadership's influence on creative performance and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(8), 1061-1075.
- Harris, R. B., Harris, K. J., & Harvey, P. (2008). An examination of the impact of supervisor on the relationship between job strains and turnover intention for computer workers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(8), 2108-2131.
- Ilies, R., Scott, B. A., & Judge, T. A. (2006). The interactive effects of personal traits and experienced states on intraindividual patterns of citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3), 561-575.

- Johnson, M. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2012). Cognitive and affective identification: Exploring the links between different forms of social identification and personality with work attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(8), 1142-1167.
- Kabasakal, H., Dastmalchian, A., & Imer, P. (2011). Organizational citizenship behaviour: A study of young executives in Canada, Iran, and Turkey. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(13), 2703-2729.
- Krumm, S., Grube, A., & Hertel, G. (2013). The Munster work value measure. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(5), 532-560.
- Little, L. M., Nelson, D. L., Wallace, J. C., & Johnson, P. D. (2011). Integrating attachment style, vigor at work, and extra-role performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(3), 464-484.
- Lord, R. G., Diefendorff, J. M., Schmidt, A. M., & Hall, R. J. (2010). Self-regulation at work. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 543-568.
- Mason, C. M., & Griffin, M. A. (2005). Group task satisfaction: The group's shared attitude to its task and work environment. *Group & Organization Management*, 30(6), 625-652.
- O'Connell, M. S., Hartman, N. S., McDaniel, M. A., Grubb, W. L., & Lawrence, A. (2007). Incremental validity of situational judgment tests for task and contextual job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(1), 19-29.
- Redman, T., Hamilton, P., Malloch, H., & Kleymann, B. (2011). Working here makes me sick! The consequences of sick building syndrome. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21(1), 14-27.
- Rioux, S. M., & Penner, L. A. (2001). The causes of organizational citizenship behavior: a

- motivational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1306-1314.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 219-227.
- Spence, J. R., Brown, D. J., Keeping, L. M., & Lian, H. (2014). Helpful today, but not tomorrow? feeling grateful as a predictor of daily organizational citizenship behaviors. *Personnel Psychology*, 67(3), 705-738.
- Tsai, W. C., Chen, H. W., & Cheng, J. W. (2009). Employee positive moods as a mediator linking transformational leadership and employee work outcomes. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(1), 206-219.
- Tourigny, L., Han, J., & Baba, V. V. (2014). *Gender and trust: Their effect on shared responsibility, knowledge sharing and OCB*. Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Tsai, W. C., Chen, C. C., & Liu, H. L. (2007). Test of a model linking employee positive moods and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1570-1583.
- Wang, H., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2008). Leader-member exchange, employee performance, and work outcomes: An empirical study in the Chinese context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(10), 1809-1824.
- No OCB variable (4)**
- Groth, M., Hennig-Thurau, T., & Walsh, G. (2009). Customer reactions to emotional labor: The roles of employee acting strategies and customer detection accuracy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5), 958-974.
- Scott, B. A., Garza, A. S., Conlon, D. E., & Kim, Y. J. (2014). Why do managers act fairly in the

first place? A daily investigation of “hot” and “cold” motives and discretion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(6), 1571-1591.

Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Hoobler, J., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employees' attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 455-465.

Thomason, S. J., Weeks, M., Bernardin, H. J., & Kane, J. (2011). The differential focus of supervisors and peers in evaluations of managerial potential. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 19(1), 82-97.

Non-employee sample (4)

Bachrach, D. G., & Jex, S. M. (2000). Organizational citizenship and mood: An experimental test of perceived job breadth. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(3), 641-663.

Johnson, S. K., Podratz, K. E., Dipboye, R. L., & Gibbons, E. (2010). Physical attractiveness biases in ratings of employment suitability: Tracking down the “beauty is beastly” effect. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 150(3), 301-318.

Tong, Y. K., & Arvey, R. D. (2012). Investigating the cross-cultural applicability of the personnel reaction blank using american and singaporean respondent groups. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(3), 376-382.

Venkataramani, V., & Dalal, R. S. (2007). Who helps and harms whom? Relational antecedents of interpersonal helping and harming in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 952-966.

OCB predicts affect (1)

Baranik, L. E., & Eby, L. (2016). Organizational citizenship behaviors and employee depressed

mood, burnout, and satisfaction with health and life: The mediating role of positive affect. *Personnel Review*, 45(4), 626-642.

Affect directed at supervisor (1)

Nifadkar, S., Tsui, A. S., & Ashforth, B. E. (2012). The way you make me feel and behave: Supervisor-triggered newcomer affect and approach-avoidance behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(5), 1146-1168.

Affect directed at the organization (1)

Kickul, J., & Lester, S. W. (2001). Broken promises: Equity sensitivity as a moderator between psychological contract breach and employee attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16(2), 191-217.

OCB directed at supervisor (1)

Burton, J. P., Taylor, S. G., & Barber, L. K. (2014). Understanding internal, external, and relational attributions for abusive supervision. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(6), 871-891.

Sample overlap (1) with Barclay and Kiefer (2014)

Kiefer, T., & Barclay, L. J. (2012). Understanding the mediating role of toxic emotional experiences in the relationship between negative emotions and adverse outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85(4), 600-625.