

## Within-Person Approaches to the Study of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: Antecedents, Consequences, and Boundary Conditions

Brent A. Scott, Fadel K. Matta, and Joel Koopman

### Abstract

This chapter provides a review of the nascent (but growing) literature on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) at the within-person level of analysis. We organize our review of the existing literature chronologically, discussing antecedents and consequences of within-person fluctuations in OCB. After providing a narrative review of the literature, we provide a quantitative summary of the literature via meta-analysis, summarizing the within-person relationships between OCB and its most common within-person correlates (i.e., positive affect, negative affect, job satisfaction, stressors, strain, and task performance). Looking to the future of OCB at the within-person level of analysis, we suggest that researchers can contribute to the domain by tailoring the measurement of OCB to the within-person level of analysis, better illuminating the causal direction between OCB and affect, clarifying the relationship between OCB and counterproductive work behavior at the within-person level, expanding the “dark side” of within-person OCB, exploring between-person differences in within-person OCB variability, and incorporating new theories.

**Key Words:** organizational citizenship behavior, meta-analysis, within-person, experience sampling, positive affect, negative affect, job satisfaction, stressors, strain, performance

Since its introduction to the organizational behavior literature, the vast majority of research on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; Organ, 1988; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) and related constructs, including prosocial behavior (George, 1991), organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992), extrarole behavior (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), proactive behavior (Crant, 2000; Morrison & Phelps, 1999), and contextual performance (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994), has focused on identifying why some employees engage in higher levels of OCB than others (e.g., Organ & Ryan, 1995) and the consequences of their behavioral tendencies for outcomes at both the individual and organizational levels (e.g., Podsakoff, Whiting,

Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). Though research at this *between-person* level of analysis has been critical for understanding OCB, even the best employees sometimes do not engage in OCB; similarly, even the worst employees sometimes do engage in OCB. In other words, there are substantial and systematic fluctuations in employees’ episodic, or momentary levels, of OCB. This is an important departure from traditional cross-sectional research, which typically would view such fluctuations as transient error.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the emerging literature on OCB conducted at the *within-person* level of analysis. We first review the research that has been conducted to date at this level of analysis, focusing on the antecedents and

consequences of momentary engagement in OCB. We then provide a quantitative summary of this literature via meta-analysis in order to provide a snapshot of what we know as well as to lay the groundwork for where we might go to move this emerging stream of research forward. In so doing, we draw comparisons to the broader stream of research examining between-person differences in OCB. Finally, and perhaps most important, we discuss the future of research in this area. Issues that we tackle include the measurement of OCB at the within-person level of analysis, the potential “dark side” of engaging in momentary OCB, between-person variability in OCB, and theoretical frameworks that can guide research on OCB at the within-person level.

### Within-Person Research on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The incorporation of experience-sampling methodology (ESM; Larson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1983) has proven to be an invaluable tool for illuminating the dynamic, within-person nature of OCB. Typically, ESM studies (sometimes referred to as diary studies) use systematic or random prompts to obtain observations of focal variables from individuals daily, or perhaps multiple times per day. Initially, ESM was used by researchers to capture moods and emotions (e.g., Alliger & Williams, 1993), which by their nature are fleeting states and thus best examined in situ. It is perhaps not surprising then that the bulk of within-person research on OCB has linked the construct to positive and negative affective states (where *affect* is an umbrella term that encompasses both moods and emotions). Although scholars argued during the early 1990s that OCB and mood should be associated with each other (e.g., George & Brief, 1992), the initial research that followed using ESM captured affective states at the within-person level but assessed OCB at the between-person level (e.g., Fisher, 2003), and therefore the relationship between affect and OCB was still assessed at the between-person level.

This changed with Sonnentag's (2003) publication. In an ESM study of 147 employees from public service organizations who completed daily surveys for a 5-day period, she found that 46% of the variance in proactive behavior (operationalized as personal initiative) was within-persons. Feelings of recovery in the morning were positively associated with reports of proactive behavior at the end of the day, and work engagement mediated this relationship.

Two years later, Miner, Glomb, and Hulin (2005) examined within-person OCB more directly. Drawing from affective events theory (AET; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), the authors argued that OCB at the momentary level represents what AET refers to as an “affect-driven behavior” (as opposed to a “cognition-driven behavior,” which would be influenced more by job attitudes). Their ESM study consisted of 41 manufacturing employees who completed surveys each day over a 2- to 3-week period. Following a morning survey that assessed initial mood, participants were signaled at four, stratified random times throughout the workday. Mood, or “hedonic tone,” was assessed with both positively (e.g., happy, pleased) and negatively valenced (e.g., blue, sad) items. Self-reported OCB was assessed with two items that captured both OCB directed toward the organization (OCBO) and OCB directed toward coworkers (OCBI) (e.g., Williams & Anderson, 1991), with respondents indicating in a *yes/no* format whether they were engaging in these behaviors at the time they were signaled. Participants completed 59% of the daily surveys, and 56% of the variance in hedonic tone was within persons (the percentage of within-person variance in OCB was not reported, though participants did report spending approximately 23% of their time helping coworkers). Although their prediction of a relationship between hedonic tone and OCB was not supported, their investigation laid the groundwork for future research treating OCB as an outcome of affect. It is also noteworthy that Miner et al. (2005) controlled for hedonic tone in the morning, which permitted an examination of whether a change in hedonic tone was associated with OCB—a point to which we return later.

Following the publication of Miner et al. (2005), Ilies, Scott, and Judge (2006) conducted a 3-week ESM study with 62 participants from a variety of occupations. Toward the end of each workday, participants completed measures of positive affect from the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), job satisfaction, and OCB, with 89% of all daily surveys completed. To assess OCB, the authors utilized 11 items from the widely used OCBI and OCBO scales developed by Lee and Allen (2002), eliminating items that “would be less likely to vary daily” (567). Twenty-nine percent of the variance in OCB was within persons, and both positive affect and job satisfaction were positively associated with daily engagement in OCB. Although the authors did not distinguish between OCBI and OCBO in their

main analysis, a supplemental analysis revealed that OCBO was associated with both job satisfaction and positive affect, while OCBI was associated with positive affect only, suggesting that OCBI may be more affect driven. Perhaps most interesting, in an analysis linking within- and between-levels of analysis, trait agreeableness (but not conscientiousness) moderated the within-person relationship between positive affect and OCB, such that the relationship was more positive for those low in agreeableness. In contrast, those high in agreeableness engaged in OCB regardless of their momentary mood. In all, the Ilies et al. (2006) study is important because it reveals the complex ways in which stable, individual traits can interact with experienced states to predict momentary OCB (see also Mischel & Shoda, 1995).

In a rather unique study of 44 flight attendants who completed surveys over three consecutive trips, with three surveys per trip, Xanthopoulou, Heuven, Demerouti, Baker, and Schaufeli (2008) examined the effects of state self-efficacy and colleague support on extra-role (as well as in-role) performance. Extra-role performance was assessed with two items that referenced doing more work than was required and helping colleagues. Participants completed 63% of the diary surveys, and 60% of the variance in extra-role performance was within persons. The results of their model, which was inspired by the job demands–resources model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001), showed that state self-efficacy, but not colleague support, was positively associated with extra-role performance. Moreover, state work engagement mediated this effect. Overall, their study provides some insight into the motivational processes underlying momentary engagement in OCB, as opposed to purely affective processes.

Several papers examining OCB within persons were published in 2009. In what has proven to be an influential study on the relationship between OCB and counterproductive work behavior (CWB), Dalal, Lam, Weiss, Welch, and Hulin (2009) surveyed 48 employees from a software company (Study 1) and 67 employees from a variety of occupations (Study 2) over a 3-week period (i.e., 15 workdays). In Study 1, the employees completed four surveys each day. OCB was measured with six items adapted from existing sources. Similar to Ilies et al. (2006), the authors omitted items that “were likely to occur rarely, if at all” (Dalal et al., 2009, p. 1056). Similar to Miner et al. (2005), employees indicated whether they had engaged in each

behavior (as opposed to the extent to which they had engaged in each behavior), and affect pleasantness was assessed in a bipolar fashion such that negatively valenced items were reverse-coded. However, in contrast to results of Miner et al. (2005), affect pleasantness (at the current time point, but not the previous time point) was positively associated with OCB. OCB and CWB were not related. In Study 2, the employees completed two surveys each day. OCB was assessed more comprehensively, with six items referencing coworkers, six items referencing the supervisor, and six items referencing the organization. The percentage of variance in OCB within individuals was similar for each referent (44.2%, 50%, and 52%, respectively). Importantly, positive and negative affect were kept separate in the analyses (as opposed to the bipolar operationalization utilized in Study 1). Positive affect was positively associated with all three forms of OCB, while negative affect was not. Moreover, neither positive nor negative affect at the previous time point was associated with OCB. Again, the relationship between OCB and CWB was generally weak. Overall, given that lagged predictors were controlled in the regression equation, the results of the studies by Dalal et al. reveal that an increase in affect (specifically, positive affect) was associated with an increase in OCB. Their results also suggest the intriguing notion that, even at the momentary, within-person level of analysis, OCB and CWB are independent, distinct constructs, which parallels findings at the between-person level of analysis (Dalal, 2005).

Binnewies, Sonnentag, and Mojza (2009) drew from conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989) to explain the relationship between the state of being recovered in the morning and engagement in OCB during that day. Ninety-nine public service employees completed surveys on pocket computers in the morning, immediately after work, and in the evening for four consecutive workdays, with 91% of all surveys completed. OCBI was measured with five items adapted from existing scales, and 50% of the variance was within persons. The results revealed that the state of being recovered was positively associated with OCBI. Moreover, there was a cross-level interaction between individuals’ stable levels of job control and recovery, such that the within-person relationship between the state of being recovered and OCB was positive for those with high job control but not significant for those with low job control. Overall, the Binnewies et al. study suggests that resources are important for daily engagement in OCB, and job control is needed in order for

employees to capitalize on days when their resource pool has been replenished.

Integrating affective events theory with the transactional model of stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), Rodell and Judge (2009) investigated the within-person relationships among challenge and hindrance stressors, emotions, and both OCB and CWB. Challenge stressors are job demands that create potential for personal growth, whereas hindrance stressors are job demands that present obstacles to personal growth (Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000). One hundred participants from a variety of organizations were given 3 weeks to complete 10 daily surveys toward the end of their workday. OCB was assessed with 11 items from Lee and Allen's (2002) measure, and 38% of the variance in OCB was within persons. Challenge stressors had a positive, indirect relationship with OCB through the affective state of attentiveness. In addition, both challenge and hindrance stressors had a negative, indirect relationship with OCB through the affective state of anxiety. No differences were observed when OCB was broken down into OCBI and OCBO. As an aside, the authors also assessed CWB, and the within-individual correlation between OCB and CWB was negative and significant. The upshot of the Rodell and Judge (2009) study is that not all stressors are equal when it comes to daily engagement in OCB. Although hindrance stressors appear to be unequivocally "bad," the relationship between challenge stressors and OCB is more complex, with offsetting effects on OCB via a relationship with an affective state that is "good" for OCB (i.e., attentiveness) and an affective state that is "bad" for OCB (i.e., anxiety).

Examining antecedents of daily proactive behavior, Fritz and Sonnentag (2009) had 172 civil service employees complete morning and afternoon surveys for a 3-day period. Proactive behavior was operationalized as taking charge (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). The percentage of variance in proactive behavior that was within persons was not reported. Positive mood was associated with proactive behavior on the same and the following workday. Interestingly, stressors in the form of time pressure and situational constraints were also positively associated with proactive behavior, suggesting that individuals "took charge" in an effort to alleviate their undesirable situation.

Last but not least in 2009, Conway, Rogelberg, and Pitts had 80 participants from a variety of organizations use palm computers to complete five surveys each day for 5 workdays, with 87% of surveys

completed. Helping (OCBI) was assessed with a single item ("since the last signal, did you voluntarily help someone else [in a way that was not an assigned duty]?") (p. 328). In contrast to the previously reviewed studies, only 13% of the variance in OCBI was within persons. Positive affect (assessed with four items) in the previous time period was not associated with OCBI. However, trait altruism (but not trait empathy) moderated the within-person relationship between positive affect and OCBI, such that individuals high in altruism engaged in OCBI regardless of their positive affect, while individuals low in altruism engaged in OCBI as their positive affect increased. This result is similar to the finding of Ilies et al. (2006) that agreeableness (of which altruism is a facet) moderated the within-person relationship between positive affect and OCBI. In a supplemental analysis with positive affect as an outcome instead of a predictor, OCBI was not associated with a change in positive affect. Overall, the lack of significant within-person results may have been due, in part, to the restricted amount of within-person variance in OCBI.

Departing methodologically from prior research, Binnewies, Sonnentag, and Mojza (2010) examined weekly relationships involving OCB and recovery. Similar to daily designs, 47.5% of the variance in OCB was within persons. Results indicated that the state of being recovered (assessed on Monday) was positively associated with engagement in OCB that week, suggesting that OCB is more likely for individuals who take time to replenish their resources over the weekend.

Ohly and Fritz (2010) had engineers from an automotive manufacturer rate their daily engagement in proactive behavior (operationalized as personal initiative) for a 3-day period. A total of 43.1% of the variance in proactive behavior was within persons. Similar to the findings of Fritz and Sonnentag (2009), the authors found that challenging characteristics of work (i.e., time pressure and job control) were positively associated with proactive behavior, and these relationships were partially mediated by challenge appraisals.

Miner and Glomb (2010) had 67 call-center employees complete one morning and four or five randomly scheduled surveys throughout the workday for 3 weeks, with 84% of surveys completed. OCB was measured with two items that captured behavior directed toward the organization (OCBO) and behavior directed toward others (i.e., helping; OCBI). The amount of within-person variance in OCB was not reported. Affect ("hedonic tone")

was assessed in the morning and during the workday with both positively and negatively valenced items, with negatively valenced items reverse-coded (cf. Miner et al., 2005). Engaging in OCB was not associated with a change in hedonic tone, and “metamood,” which captures a person’s general tendency to attend to and regulate his or her emotions (Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey, & Palfai, 1995) did not moderate this within-person relationship. Although the authors found significant results with other predictors (e.g., work withdrawal), the lack of findings for OCB could have been due to the measurement of affect, which utilized a bipolar operationalization as opposed to keeping positive and negative affect separate (cf. Dalal et al., 2009).

Glomb, Bhawe, Miner, and Wall (2011) did separate positive and negative affect in their ESM study of 68 managerial and professional employees. In an intriguing departure from prior work, Glomb et al. proposed that individuals engage in OCB in order to repair a negative mood, thereby positioning affect as an outcome rather than an antecedent of OCB. The employees in their sample completed randomly signaled surveys (a morning survey used to capture baseline affect and four surveys throughout the workday) on palmtop computers for 3 weeks. Approximately 53% of the surveys were completed. The altruism and courtesy dimensions of OCB were assessed with multiple items, and similar to previous research, the authors eliminated items less likely to occur on a daily basis. Seventy percent and 87% of the variance in altruism and courtesy, respectively, was within persons. The results of their ESM study showed that negative affect at the previous time period was associated with an increase in altruism but not courtesy. Positive affect at the previous time period was not associated with a change in either form of OCB. Subsequently, engaging in both forms of OCB was associated with an increase in positive affect. However, courtesy was also associated with an increase in negative affect. Finally, there was a cross-level interaction with extraversion such that extraverts’ positive affect increased more following their altruistic behavior. What is interesting and important about the Glomb et al. (2011) study is that it departs from the focus on OCB as solely an outcome in within-individual studies. That is, not only might individuals engage in OCB in an attempt to repair their negative mood but also engaging in OCB may have downstream consequences.

In two ESM studies, Halbesleben and Wheeler (2011) drew from conservation of resources theory

to understand the relationship between feelings of exhaustion and OCB. In Study 1, 199 participants from a variety of organizations took part in a week-long study, completing an online survey each day for five workdays. OCBI was assessed using Williams and Anderson’s (1991) scale, and 31% of the variance in OCBI was within persons. Counterintuitively, exhaustion was positively associated with OCBI. This association was more positive in relationships where the focal employee received more than she or he contributed (i.e., in relationships characterized by positive reciprocity). In Study 2, 155 participants from a variety of organizations took part in a weeklong ESM study, similar in design to Study 1. Both OCBI and OCBO were assessed using the Williams and Anderson (1991) scale, and 35% of the variance in OCBI, and 22% of the variance in OCBO, was within persons. Again, exhaustion was positively associated with OCBI, and this relationship was stronger in relationships characterized by positive reciprocity. However, exhaustion was negatively associated with OCBO, and this relationship was also stronger in relationships characterized by positive reciprocity. The authors explained the rather counterintuitive finding between exhaustion and OCBI by suggesting that when experiencing a state of exhaustion, employees choose more wisely where to invest their limited resources, and OCBI is more lucrative in this regard compared to OCBO.

Drawing from social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954) and AET (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), Spence, Ferris, Brown, and Heller (2011) had 99 participants from a variety of occupations complete an online survey each day for a 2-week period, with 78% of surveys completed. OCB was measured with 14 items from the Lee and Allen (2002) OCBI and OCBO scales. Forty-three percent of the variance in OCB was within persons. Downward social comparisons (where the focal employee perceives that she or he is better off than others) were associated with higher levels of OCB, but upward social comparisons (where the focal employee perceives that she or he is worse off than others) were not associated with OCB. Both forms of social comparisons had an indirect effect on OCB through positive affect. In addition, both of these within-person relationships were moderated by employees’ characteristic beliefs in a just world, such that those who believe in a just world were more likely to engage in OCB when they made downward social comparisons but less likely to engage in OCB when they made upward social comparisons. Overall, the Spence et al. (2011) study



raises the interesting notion that how employees see themselves in relation to a target influences whether they engage in OCB toward that target.

Fay and Sonnentag (2012), using palmtop computers, had 52 German employees from a variety of organizations participate in a week-long ESM study with three surveys per day. Employees completed 91% of the daily surveys, and 88% of the variance in OCB (operationalized by time spent on proactive behavior) was within persons. Positive affect was associated with an increase in time spent engaging in OCB. In contrast, high levels of momentary experienced competence were associated with more time spent on core task activities and less time spent on OCB. The authors argued (but did not test directly) that low feelings of competence motivate individuals to repair the negative state, and OCB is one way to accomplish this.

Examining forms of support as predictors of OCB, Schreurs, Van Emmerik, Gunter, and Germeys (2012) had 56 Dutch employees complete a weekly survey for 3 weeks, achieving a 95% response rate for the weekly surveys. OCB (extra-role performance) was assessed with seven items developed by Goodman and Svyantek (1999), and 60% of the variance in OCB was within persons. In terms of predictors, although supervisor support was positively associated with OCB, neither colleague support nor job security was associated with OCB.

Wu and Parker (2012) had 58 undergraduates report on their proactive behavior (measured by adapting a scale of proactive personality [Bateman & Crant, 1993] on a monthly basis for 4 months. A total of 40.8% of the variance in proactive behavior was within persons. The states of curiosity, core self-evaluations, and future orientation were all associated with higher levels of proactive behavior at that time. In addition, there were cross-level interactions, such that the within-person relationship between core self-evaluations and proactive behavior was weaker, while the within-person relationship between future orientation and proactive behavior was stronger, for individuals with high levels of relationship anxiety. The authors concluded that people who worry about their social relationships are hesitant to engage in proactive behavior as a result of having a positive self-concept at that time.

Barnes, Ghumman, and Scott (2013) examined the relationship between sleep quantity and daily engagement in OCB. Eighty-five employed university students were surveyed twice daily over the course of 5 workdays, and they completed 78% of

the surveys. A preshift survey assessed sleep quantity, and a postshift survey assessed job satisfaction and OCB over the course of the workday. OCB was measured using the 16-item Lee and Allen (2002) measure, and 30% of the variance in OCBI, and 20% of the variance in OCBO, was within persons. Sleep quantity was positively associated with engagement in both OCBI and OCBO, and job satisfaction mediated these relationships.

Three studies on OCB at the within-person level were published in 2014, and they extend the aforementioned research in several ways. First, in a unique focus on managers and their engagement in justice-relevant actions, Johnson, Lanaj, and Barnes (2014) drew from theory on regulatory resources (e.g., Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998) to understand the consequences of engaging in procedural and interpersonal justice for managers themselves. Seventy-nine managers were surveyed in the morning and afternoon for 10 workdays (2 weeks), and they completed 69% of the daily surveys. Managers' engagement in OCBI (helping others) was measured with four items from Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, and Kessler (2012), and 34% of variance in OCBI was within persons. Engaging in procedural justice was associated with an increase in feeling depleted the next day, whereas engaging in interpersonal justice was associated with a decrease in feeling depleted the next day. Moreover, depletion mediated the effects of justice behaviors on OCBI. In a supplemental analysis demonstrating support for the authors' proposed causal direction, OCBI was not associated with either justice or depletion the next day. Finally, the positive, indirect effect of interpersonal justice on OCB via depletion was stronger for managers low in extraversion and for managers high in neuroticism. The findings for depletion, in which feelings of depletion were associated with lower levels of OCB, are somewhat in contrast to the findings of Halbesleben and Wheeler (2011), who found that exhaustion was positively associated with engagement in OCBI.

In an intriguing analysis of within-person variation in personality traits, which historically have been thought to be stable, Judge, Simon, Hurst, and Kelley (2014) collected data from 122 participants from a variety of occupations who took part in a 2-week ESM study. Participants completed 86% of the daily surveys. OCB was measured with 12 items tapping both OCBI and OCBO from the Lee and Allen (2002) scale, and 48% of the variance in OCB was within persons. Engagement in OCB was positively associated with next-day

extraversion, agreeableness, and openness to experience. Thus, the more individuals engaged in OCB, the more they reported behaving in an extraverted, agreeable, and open manner the following day. In contrast, the effects of personality states on next-day OCB were not significant. These results suggest that the approach-oriented nature of OCB triggers corresponding, approach-oriented personality states in individuals. As such, they are yet another example of how within-person research can differ dramatically from between-person research, which historically has treated personality as a stable antecedent of OCB (e.g., Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Departing from previous research that has focused on positive and negative affect as broad states, Spence, Brown, Keeping, and Lian (2014) examined the discrete emotion of state gratitude and its relationship with OCB at the within-person level. The authors conducted two ESM studies. The first consisted of 67 participants from various occupations who completed a morning and afternoon survey each day for 5 workdays, with 80% of the surveys completed. OCB was assessed with 14 items from the Lee and Allen (2002) scale, and 38% of the variance in OCB was within persons. State gratitude was positively associated with engagement in OCB. In Study 2, 104 participants from an array of occupations completed an afternoon survey each day for 10 workdays, with 63% of the surveys completed. Dalal et al.'s (2009) 18-item scale was used to assess OCB. In terms of variance, 33%, 41%, and 34% of the variance in OCB directed toward the supervisor, coworkers, and organization, respectively, was within persons. Over and above positive affect, state gratitude was positively associated with OCB directed toward one's supervisor and coworkers, but not toward one's organization. Overall, their study demonstrates the utility of a discrete emotion approach, and it is one of the few studies that have taken such an approach.

In an interesting analysis of the effects of pain on discretionary behavior, Christian, Eisenkraft, and Kapadia (2015) conducted two ESM studies examining promotive, extra-role behaviors within persons. In the first, 85 employees experiencing chronic pain took part in a 3-week study whereby they completed morning and afternoon measures. Participants completed approximately 78% of those surveys, and 49% of the variance in extra-role behavior was within persons. Daily pain was indirectly associated with less extra-role behavior via lower work engagement, but there was not a significant, indirect effect through resource depletion.

In the second study, the authors investigated intentions to engage in extra-role behaviors (66% of the variance was within persons). Results of that study, which utilized archival data from 650 participants who provided 6,820 observations over the course of a week, were similar to the results of the first study, except that the indirect effect of pain on extra-role behavior through resource depletion was significant. Overall, their studies demonstrate the importance of human energy for momentary engagement in OCB, even over and above moods and emotions.

Gordon, Demerouti, Bipp, and Le Blanc (2015) also examined work engagement in concert with OCB (contextual performance). Their 5-day ESM study of 49 nurses achieved a 60% daily response rate, and 60% of the variance in OCB was within persons. Intuitive decision making was positively associated with OCB, particularly for nurses with high levels of work engagement.

Sonnentag and Starzyk (2015), in a 2-week ESM study of 153 employees who completed two surveys per day, examined a dual, affective pathway model to engagement in proactive behavior (operationalized as issue identification and issue implementation). Roughly half of the variance in these forms of proactive behavior was within persons. In support of their dual-pathway approach, perceptions of prosocial impact were associated with an increase in positive affect later that day, which in turn was associated with greater issue implementation (but not identification). In contrast, perceptions of situational constraints were positively associated with an increase in negative affect later that day, which in turn was associated with greater issue identification (but not implementation). Overall, their findings suggest that different aspects of OCB may be triggered by both positive and negative affect. Moreover, their findings appear to be consistent with research on emotion showing that negative affect causes people to reflect and plan (e.g., Izard & Ackerman, 2000), while positive affect causes people to engage and execute (e.g., Fredrickson, 2001).

In an illustration of the infancy of research on within-individual OCB, Trougakos, Beal, Cheng, Hideg, and Zweig (2015) proposed a model that contradicts the previously discussed manuscript by Halbesleben and Wheeler (2011). Drawing on ego depletion theory, Trougakos et al. (2015) hypothesized that daily surface acting increases emotional exhaustion and decreases engagement in OCBI. Using three items from Williams and Anderson's (1991) OCBI subscale (the percentage of variance that was within individuals was

not reported), these authors found support for their model. Note that the direction of the relationship proposed between emotional exhaustion and OCBI is opposite to that proposed and found by Halbesleben and Wheeler (2011). This contradiction is interesting due to several notable differences between the studies. First, although both used items from Williams and Anderson (1991), Trougakos and colleagues used only three items, whereas Halbesleben and Wheeler (2011) used all seven. Could there be differences in the omitted items that influence the relationship that substantially? A more likely culprit is that OCBI was measured from different sources between the studies. Specifically, Halbesleben and Wheeler (2011) relied upon self-reports, as is common in within-individual studies of OCB. Trougakos and colleagues instead obtained a daily report from one of the focal employee's coworkers. We return to some of the implications of this decision in a subsequent section.

Finally, two recent studies illustrate the evolution of ESM research on OCB sparked by Glomb et al. (2011) by focusing not on antecedents, but instead on downstream outcomes. In a follow-up to their 2011 study described earlier, Halbesleben and Wheeler (2015) investigated a mechanism by which OCBI may serve as a resource investment in others. These authors adopted a dyadic ESM method in which 177 pairs of employees completed daily surveys for a 1-week period. Instead of the Lee and Allen (2002) measure, OCBI was assessed using the seven-item OCBI subscale from Williams and Anderson (1991) (the percentage of OCB variance that was within persons was not reported). In support of their hypotheses, Halbesleben and Wheeler showed that on days when a given employee engaged in higher levels of OCBI, his or her coworker perceived higher levels of resources available through that relationship (operationalized as social support). This higher level of support was associated with higher levels of trust that day and increased reciprocation of OCBI the following day. Finally, in support of the notion of resource gain spirals proposed by conservation of resources theory (Halbesleben, Neveu, Paustian-Underdahl, & Westman, 2014; Hobfoll, 1989), these authors showed that levels of support, trust, and OCBI increased over the course of the study.

Koopman, Lanaj, and Scott (2016) similarly focused on the outcomes of OCB to actors, but these authors departed from extant

within-individual research on OCB in an important way. In the aforementioned studies, OCB has generally been conceptualized as a positive behavior (e.g., associated with positive affect, a means of investing resources, a mechanism for mood repair). However, OCB research at the between-individual level of analysis has identified a potential "dark side" to these behaviors (for a review, see Bolino, Klotz, Turnley, & Harvey, 2013). Koopman et al. (2016) developed a similar theory at the within-individual level and tested a model illustrating the "bright" and "dark" sides of daily engagement in OCB. In their ESM study, 82 employees from a variety of occupations completed three online surveys each day for a period of 2 weeks (10 workdays), with a 91% day-level response rate. OCBI was assessed with six items reported in Dalal et al. (2009), and 54% of its variance was within persons. On the "bright side," OCBI was associated with an increase in positive affect, and positive affect mediated the relationship between OCBI and both affective commitment and job satisfaction, but not emotional exhaustion. On the "dark side," OCBI was associated with feelings of reduced goal progress, and goal progress mediated the relationship between OCBI and the three well-being outcomes (i.e., affective commitment, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion). Interestingly, these opposing relationships were moderated by individuals' trait regulatory focus (Higgins, 1997), such that the positive relationship between OCBI and positive affect was stronger for those with a high promotion focus, while the negative relationship between OCBI and perceptions of work goal progress was stronger for those with a high prevention focus. Combining these analyses, evidence for moderated mediation of the first stage of the indirect effect was found. Overall, the results of the Koopman et al. study suggest that momentary engagement in OCB has both benefits and drawbacks. Although it boosts positive affect, it also interferes with goal progress on core work tasks because engagement in OCB must necessarily come at the expense of task performance at a given moment in time. Thus, when it comes to answering the question as to whether engaging in OCB is "good" or "bad" for a given employee, it appears that the question should be changed to "for whom is OCB good or bad, and why" (Koopman et al., 2016, p. 28)—a point to which we return later.



## A “Mini” Meta-Analysis on Within-Person Organizational Citizenship Behavior Research

Having described the existing research on within-person antecedents and consequences of OCB, we wanted, to the extent possible, to provide a quantitative summary of that research. Therefore, we meta-analyzed those within-person relationships involving OCB that have been examined most frequently.

Before we get to those relationships, we wanted to get an idea of the amount of variance in OCB that is within persons. As reviewed earlier, the percentage of variance in OCB that is within persons varies quite a bit from study to study. In fact, the range was approximately 25% to 88%. The average amount of within-person variance was 45.5% ( $SD = .15$ ). For OCBI, it was slightly higher, at 48.2% ( $SD = 15.7\%$ ). For OCBO, it was slightly lower, at 36.0% ( $SD = 12.0\%$ ). In considering these differences, it could be the case that OCBI varies more within persons because acts such as helping others may depend on interaction opportunities with specific coworkers (or with one’s supervisor). Similarly, within-person variance in OCBI may be higher because of greater fluctuations in coworkers’ (or one’s supervisor’s) need for help on a given day. In contrast, OCBO may vary more between persons because one’s relationship with the organization is more stable over short periods of time, thus reflecting a general tendency to be a “good citizen.” Caution, however, should be taken with respect to the differences between OCBI and OCBO because the results for OCBO were based on only six studies.

How do the variance results for OCB compare to within-person variance in other constructs that have been frequently studied at the within-person level? Quite well, as it turns out. In the studies on OCB that we reviewed earlier and included in our meta-analysis, state-positive ( $M = 51.4\%$ ,  $SD = 16.5\%$ ) and state-negative ( $M = 57.2\%$ ,  $SD = 10.1\%$ ) affect exhibited similar amounts of within-person variance. Because one would expect affective states, which are often fleeting and ephemeral, to exhibit a substantial amount of within-person variance, the similar amount of within-person variance for OCB is noteworthy. For the sake of further comparison, the within-person variance in other constructs included in our review was as follows: job satisfaction ( $M = 29.4\%$ ,  $SD = .05$ ), task performance ( $M = 43.8\%$ ,  $SD = 20.4\%$ ), stressors ( $M = 43.0\%$ ,  $SD = 14.1\%$ ), and strain ( $M = 61.5\%$ ,  $SD = 17.7\%$ ). Overall, these results demonstrate the importance

of examining OCB within persons over time. After all, if scholars only concentrated on between-person variance in OCB, which was the case only a decade ago, they would be missing half of the story.

Turning now to within-individual relationships involving OCB, we conducted our meta-analysis following Hunter and Schmidt’s (2004) guidelines. Our results include the sample-size-weighted point estimate of the study correlations ( $r$ ), a 95% confidence interval around that point estimate, the number of studies ( $k$ ), and the cumulative sample size ( $N$ ). In addition, we report the correlation after correcting for unreliability in both the predictor and the criterion ( $r_c$ ), with corrections performed at the independent sample level (i.e., prior to meta-analyzing the correlations). For studies that did not include reliability information, we substituted the weighted average from the studies that did report that information. Finally, we report both the standard deviation of the corrected meta-analytic correlation ( $SDr_c$ ), the 80% credibility interval (which provides an estimate of the variability in individual correlations across the studies), and the percentage of variance in the correlations explained by artifacts. Together, these latter three estimates can be used to suggest the presence of moderators.

Table 24.1 presents the results of our “mini” meta-analysis (“mini” simply because there are not a large number of studies on OCB at the within-person level, though that number is increasing). Unfortunately, there were not enough studies that measured OCBO to breakdown our meta-analytic results by referent (i.e., OCBO versus OCBI). For the sake of comparison, in discussing our results, we also present correlations from prior meta-analyses at the between-person level. As shown in Table 24.1, OCB is positively correlated with positive affect ( $r = .18$ ;  $r_c = .22$ ), and the 95% confidence interval for this relationship excluded zero. OCB is also positively (albeit weakly) correlated with negative affect ( $r = .07$ ;  $r_c = .08$ ), as the 95% confidence interval excluded zero. Shockley, Ispas, Rossi, and Levine (2012) reported a between-person correlation of  $r_c = .32$  for state-positive affect and  $r_c = -.02$  for state-negative affect. Interestingly, the positive correlation between OCB and negative affect supports the view that OCB is used on a momentary basis as a form of mood repair (Glomb et al., 2011). The stronger results for positive affect compared to negative affect also support the view that positive and negative affect should be separated when examining their relationships with OCB (as opposed to

**Table 24.1 Meta-Analytic Results of Within-Person Correlates of Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Correlate	Organizational Citizenship Behavior	
	r (95% CI) k (N)	$r_c$ (80% CV) SD $r_c$ (%V $_{art}$ )
Positive affect	.18 (.11, .24) 9 (7,476)	.22 (.04, .39) .14 (8.86)
Negative affect	.07 (.01, .12) 6 (5,606)	.08 (-.01, .17) .08 (26.21)
Job satisfaction	.27 (.14, .41) 3 (2,154)	.33 (.15, .50) .15 (8.08)
Stressors	.24 (.12, .35) 6 (3,003)	.32 (.10, .53) .18 (10.23)
Strain	.02 (-.15, .19) 5 (3,650)	.02 (-.27, .30) .23 (3.98)
Task performance	.23 (.11, .35) 5 (2,432)	.32 (.12, .52) .17 (12.93)

CI, confidence interval around uncorrected population correlation; CV, credibility interval around weighted corrected mean correlation;  $k$ , number of studies;  $N$ , cumulative sample size; %V $_{art}$ , percentage of variance in  $r_c$  explained by study artifacts;  $r$ , uncorrected population correlation;  $r_c$ , corrected population correlation.

combining positive and negative affect items into a single “hedonic tone” measure).

OCB is also positively correlated with job satisfaction ( $r = .27$ ;  $r_c = .33$ ). Putting these results together with the results for positive affect supports the notion from affective events theory that OCB, if considered an outcome of affective events, is likely both an affect-driven behavior and a cognition-driven behavior (see Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Similarly, LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) reported a between-person correlation of  $r_c = .24$ .

Table 24.1 also shows that OCB is positively associated with stressors ( $r = .24$ ;  $r_c = .32$ ), as the 95% confidence interval for this correlation does not include zero. Here, stressors represent a variety of factors, including workload, job insecurity, and job demands, that both challenge and hinder. Between-person research, focused on stressors such as role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload, have reported corrected correlations ranging from  $r_c = -.06$  to  $r_c = -.15$  (Eatough, Chang, Miloslavic, & Johnson, 2011). With the exception of challenge stressors, between-person research has generally deemed the stressors included in the within-person research we reviewed to be bad for employee well-being. On the one hand, the positive, within-person

relationship between OCB and stressors suggests that on days when individuals are faced with a greater than usual level of stressors (and hence feel stressed), they invest their remaining resources into OCB, perhaps with the hope that such behaviors will be reciprocated (cf. Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2011). On the other hand, OCB is not significantly associated with strain ( $r = .02$ ;  $r_c = .02$ ). This differs from between-person meta-analytic estimates, which have reported a negative correlation ( $r_c = -.16$ ) between OCB and strain (specifically, emotional strain) (Chang, Johnson, & Yang, 2007). It should be noted that the relationship between OCB and strain has the lowest percentage of variance explained by study artifacts (at 3.98%), which suggests the presence of moderators. In all, future research is needed to better understand how momentary levels of stressors, stress, and strain relate to engagement in OCB.

Finally, OCB is positively correlated with task performance ( $r = .23$ ;  $r_c = .32$ ), which, similar to findings at the between-person level of analysis ( $r_c = .37$  for OCB;  $r_c = .39$  for OCBO; Podsakoff et al., 2009), supports the view that these two dimensions of job performance are distinct.

### Issues and Future Directions for Within-Person Research on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Having reviewed what we know about OCB at the within-person level of analysis, we now discuss issues in the study of OCB at this level of analysis, as well as potential directions for future research in this area, in order to lay the groundwork for where we might go.

#### *Measurement of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Within Persons Over Time*

The first issue deals with the measurement of OCB at the within-person level of analysis, and there are several subissues within this larger issue. First, as noted in our review, the majority of within-person investigations of OCB have relied on the OCBI and OCBO scales developed by Lee and Allen (2002). Sometimes OCBI and OCBO are kept separate, and other times they are combined into an overall OCB scale. Although we do not take exception with examining overall OCB, the potentially bigger issue in our mind is that studies differ in the items that they take from these scales. To be fair, most of the within-person studies to date have used the majority of items from the Lee and Allen (2002) scales, but

when items are eliminated, it is difficult to make comparisons across studies because the full scale is not provided. Thus, we encourage researchers using existing scales to be clear about which items are included and which items are excluded. Alternatively, future research may benefit from using the scales reported in Dalal et al. (2009), who developed scales of OCB suitable for within-person research by drawing from different sources and provided the items in an Appendix. The use of these scales, which were tailored for a within-person focus, could better allow for “apples to apples” comparisons across studies. That said, a potential downside is that the entire measure consists of 18 items (with OCB toward coworkers, the supervisor, and the organization), and therefore the development of a shorter, overall OCB scale would be welcomed given the practical limitations of ESM.

Second, when items are excluded from existing scales such as Lee and Allen (2002), authors have done so based on the notion that some forms of OCB are unlikely to vary on a daily basis. Such exclusions are reasonable given that these scales were developed to capture differences in OCB between persons. For example, it probably is unlikely that one would observe variation over a short period of time for a behavior such as “adjust your work schedule to accommodate other employees’ requests for time off” or “attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image” (Lee & Allen, 2002). That being said, this is ultimately an empirical question that research has yet (but needs) to answer. Moreover, once items are eliminated, the question is whether this creates deficiency in the measure of OCB. One argument is that it does create deficiency because the full scale is not being used, yet those items are representative of the construct of OCB. However, an alternative argument is that the elimination of items that vary little over short periods of time does not create deficiency because the construct of OCB differs slightly across level of analysis. In other words, over short periods of time, such as hours or days, some of the behaviors thought to represent OCB are so rare as to be virtually irrelevant. Thus, it may be that OCB is not completely isomorphic across levels of analysis, with the degree of isomorphism between “within-person” OCB and “between-person” OCB increasing as the period of time in between measurements of within-person OCB increases.

We noted earlier that shorter scales may be necessary at times given the demanding nature of ESM

studies. To get around this issue, some researchers (e.g., Dalal et al., 2009) keep a common core of items on each momentary survey yet cycle other items in. On the one hand, there are several benefits to this technique: a larger aspect of the construct space is captured, reducing potential deficiency that would be created if items were eliminated, and it may reduce priming effects because participants are faced with a slightly different set of items each time (Hulin & Judge, 2003; Miner et al., 2005). On the other hand, the slight differences across scales make it difficult to know whether a relationship at a given moment in time (e.g., an employee reports high levels of both positive affect and OCB on Monday; on Tuesday that same employee reports high positive affect but low OCB) is being accurately captured or is due to differences in item content (the specific types of OCB that this employee engages in was on Monday’s scale but not Tuesday’s).

A final issue with regard to the measurement of OCB deals with self-report. In between-individual research, it is not overly difficult to have independent raters (e.g., supervisors or coworkers) assess the OCB of a focal employee. Indeed, the inclusion of self-reported OCB in between-persons research is sometimes viewed as a major limitation. However, in within-persons research, particularly in intense ESM studies over short periods of time, independent assessments are unrealistic and infeasible to obtain. Moreover, it may be the case that focal employees are the best sources for information about momentary OCB because independent raters such as supervisors may have limited observational opportunities. Fortunately, some causes of same-source bias can be ruled out by within-person designs, by individually mean-centering the data, which removes causes of same-source bias such as response tendencies and trait affect (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Nevertheless, within-person investigations of OCB would benefit by incorporating other data besides self-report. Unobtrusive measures may be one promising area, particularly in laboratory settings.

An alternative to unobtrusive measures would be to seek daily ratings from coworkers as we discussed earlier. Though difficult in an ESM study, such designs are not impossible (e.g., Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2015; Trougakos et al., 2015). Moreover, far from being simply a methodological point, such investigations may be necessary to establish the theoretical domain of the daily OCB construct. As noted earlier, OCB may differ somewhat at the within-individual level (compared to

the between-individual level). Given the contradiction in the Halbesleben and Wheeler (2015) and Trougakos et al. (2015) papers discussed earlier, perhaps measurement from different sources exacerbates such differences further. That is, at the aggregate, between-individual level perhaps employees can “spread” their OCB around so that the particular coworker providing a measurement is unimportant. Contrast this with the daily level where an employee may engage in a high level of OCB (and would thus self-report this), but the particular coworker providing the measurement was not the recipient of that OCB and therefore reports that the focal employee engaged in little OCB. Future research is necessary to determine how such situations might influence within-person OCB relationships and whether other reports of OCB are even appropriate in ESM studies.

### ***Causal Direction of Affect–Organizational Citizenship Behavior Relationships***

Much of the research on affective states and OCB was predicated on affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). AET positions affective reactions to events as antecedents of behavior; thus, it is perhaps not surprising that studies using AET as a theoretical framework to understand within-person OCB have treated OCB as an outcome of affect. For example, Dalal et al. (2009, p. 1053) noted that “state affect is the primary antecedent of [OCB and CWB].” Spector and Fox’s (2002) model of voluntary work behavior also positions affect as an antecedent of OCB and CWB. Yet it is also reasonable (and recent studies have shown) that affect may be a consequence of engaging in OCB (e.g., Glomb et al., 2011; Koopman et al., 2016). Thus, although OCB may indeed be a consequence of affective events, OCB may also constitute an affective event in and of itself that elicits emotion (most likely, positive affect). Given that ESM studies are now often collecting multiple surveys per day, lagged analyses and the examination of change scores are possible, allowing researchers to better illuminate the causal direction between OCB and other constructs.

### ***The Relationship Between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Counterproductive Work Behavior at the Within-Person Level***

Not included in our meta-analysis due to an insufficient number of studies, the within-person relationship between OCB and CWB is important to examine. Dalal (2005), in a meta-analysis at the

between-person level of analysis, found that OCB and CWB were only moderately and negatively correlated, and the two constructs exhibit differential patterns of relationships with other variables. Thus, one might conclude at the between-person level of analysis that these two concepts are distinct, such that a person who engages in high levels of OCB may (or may not) engage in high levels of CWB. The independence of OCB and CWB was also the conclusion of Dalal et al. (2009), who found that the two constructs were unrelated at the within-person level. In contrast, Rodell and Judge (2009) reported a negative (albeit small) correlation between OCB and CWB at the within-person level. Although these findings appear to mirror research at the between-person level, we wonder whether they are the result of being unable to capture engagement in OCB and CWB in the same moment in time. That is, by asking about engagement in OCB and CWB over the course of the day (Rodell & Judge, 2009) or since the previous survey (Dalal et al., 2009) and thereby providing participants with a range of time, we allow for the possibility that an employee’s OCB and CWB are unrelated. For example, over the course of a day, an employee would have time to engage in both OCB and CWB, high levels of one but not the other, or neither behavior at all. If, however, we dug down to the actual moment of behavioral execution, would we still find OCB and CWB to be independent? We suspect not. Instead, we expect that OCB and CWB (and task performance, if one wants to capture the domain of job performance) to display strong, negative correlations with each other, perhaps to the point of being opposite ends of the same continuum. This is because the more fine-grained the time frame becomes, the more one behavior must be performed at the expense of the other. Thus, it seems highly unlikely that both behaviors can be performed simultaneously. In sum, to provide a more definitive answer to the question as to “whether a person who engages in OCB on a particular occasion must also refrain from CWB on that occasion” (Dalal et al., 2009, p. 1052), it may be that qualitative data or direct observation is needed to capture the precise behaviors that individuals are engaging in at a given point in time.

### ***Expanding the “Dark Side” of Within-Person Organizational Citizenship Behavior***

As discussed earlier, the Koopman et al. (2016) paper differed from the other manuscripts that have investigated OCB at the within-individual



level by drawing attention to the potential “dark side” of these behaviors. That OCB may have a dark side is already well known, however, theoretical and empirical investigations here have focused on issues such as how OCB conflicts with aggregate task performance or long-run career trajectories (e.g., Bergeron, 2007; Bergeron, Shipp, Rosen, & Furst, 2013; Rubin, Dierdorff, & Bachrach, 2013). Koopman and colleagues illustrated that engaging in OCBs entails tradeoffs at the daily level, too.

This highlights a number of potentially interesting opportunities for future research. Glomb et al. (2011) noted that managers should view engaging in OCB as a means to promote well-being among employees. Is this recommendation contradicted by the findings of Koopman et al. (2016)? It would seem so, given that these authors linked OCB to reduced well-being due to a lack of progress toward daily work goals. However, these authors also noted an increase in well-being through positive affect that was comparatively larger than the reduction in well-being through a lack of work-goal progress, particularly for promotion-focused employees. Should the take-home message then be that, in spite of some downsides, engaging in OCB has a net benefit for employees, particularly in light of the potential social benefits (e.g., Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2011, 2015)? This position has some merit; however, if employees consistently fall short of their work goals, then in the long run they may experience the career-related consequences of OCB noted by others (e.g., Bergeron, 2007). Future research that blends an individual’s daily experiences of OCB with the longer run implications of this behavior is needed in order to provide recommendations to both managers and employees.

There is another aspect to the dark side of OCB that has been almost entirely overlooked in research at both the within- and between-individual level: Who is on the receiving end of this helping behavior? This shift in focus is important because there are reasons to think that OCB could have a “double dark side”—that is, not only might it have negative implications to the actor, but it might also be detrimental to the receiver. For example, Deelstra and colleagues (2003) showed that recipients of helping behavior imposed upon them had negative reactions in terms of both reduced self-esteem as well as increased heart rate. Thus, not only might helping behavior be bad for the actor, but it might also be bad for the receiver. Of note here is that the helping behavior was “imposed” upon recipients,

and so future research should examine these effects more closely.

One final opportunity for future research on the dark side of OCB that we wish to discuss maintains the dual focus on actor and receiver but also highlights potential negative consequences to the organization as well. Research in other domains has identified that some employees may be considered “core” or “more tightly linked to the overall performance of the team” (Humphrey, Morgeson, & Mannor, 2009, p. 49). Consider then several possible scenarios. Perhaps a “non-core” employee engages in OCB toward a “core employee” on a given day. Although there may be a reduction in performance to the actor (e.g., Barnes, Hollenbeck, Wagner, DeRue, Nahrgang, & Schwind, 2008; Koopman et al., 2016), the overall contribution to team or organizational performance might be a net positive if the help facilitates the work of the core employee that day. However, consider the reverse situation, where a core employee engages in OCB toward a non-core employee. This situation might result in an overall net loss in productivity on that day. Thus, future research on OCB at the within-individual level could attempt to identify *who* is doing the helping, and how this might impact the individuals involved in the behavior as well as the organization.

#### ***Using Experience-Sampling Methodology to Study Between-Person Differences in Within-Person Variability***

In addition to complementing research on between-individual differences in average levels of OCB with the study of within-individual fluctuations in OCB over time, researchers should also utilize ESM methods to merge these two streams of research by exploring between-individual differences in the stability of OCB over time. This type of approach has furthered our understanding of numerous organizational phenomenon including self-esteem (e.g., Kernis, Cornell, Sun, Berry, & Harlow, 1993), personality (Fleeson, 2001), interpersonal trust (Fleeson & Leicht, 2006), and emotional labor (Scott, Barnes, & Wagner, 2012). Variability in organizational phenomenon has been associated with both beneficial (e.g., Kernis et al., 1993) and detrimental outcomes (e.g., Scott et al., 2012), and it is unclear whether OCB variability will be beneficial or detrimental for employees. On the one hand, OCB variability may be beneficial for an employee because it may lessen the likelihood of job creep (which occurs when others expect

employees to engage in OCB as an ongoing part of their role expectations; Van Dyne & Ellis, 2004) and escalating citizenship (which occurs when engaging in OCBs becomes so normative that employees feel obligated to continually increase OCBs to be seen as going the extra mile; Bolino & Turnley, 2003). For example, when OCB is performed consistently (as opposed to variably), it is more likely to be expected and considered the norm. On the other hand, OCB variability may be detrimental for an employee if third parties (e.g., coworkers and supervisors) view these behaviors as impression management. For example, an employee who only performs OCB in the presence of his supervisor may not be viewed as favorably as an employee who performs OCB more consistently and regardless of the situation. Overall, we see between-person differences in within-person OCB variability as a particularly fruitful area for future research.

### ***Incorporating Other Theories to Understand Within-Person Organizational Citizenship Behavior***

To date, scholars investigating OCB at the within-individual level have tended to rely on affective events theory or conservation of resources theory as their overarching theoretical frameworks. However, given the relative nascence of research in this area, we feel that scholars may gain interesting insights into OCB at this level of analysis by drawing upon alternative theoretical frameworks. Thus, we conclude our chapter with a brief discussion of how several such theories might be leveraged to increase our understanding of daily OCB.

As reviewed earlier, Trougakos et al. (2015) recently applied ego depletion theory to their investigation of surface acting as an antecedent of OCBI. One challenge to within-individual OCB research is that conservation of resources theory and ego depletion theory are often applied in very similar ways (e.g., that purposeful acts can reduce available resources). However, these theories are not identical. Conservation of resources theory, for example, specifies that certain events may be resource generating as well as being resource consuming. Ego depletion theory does not clearly articulate this generation mechanism; however, it may possibly be more suited to theorizing at the momentary level of analysis where the depletion of available self-regulatory resources might be the proximal cause of either action or inaction. Future research could therefore attempt to parse the mechanisms associated with

these two theories to better understand how OCB influences an individual's resources.

Moving beyond these theories, however, we think that there are opportunities to apply a number of other theoretical lenses to within-individual OCB to better understand both why employees engage in OCB, as well as the consequences of this behavior to actors and recipients. One option is moral licensing theory (Merritt, Effron, & Monin, 2010). Briefly, application of this theory suggests that a positive relationship would be found between OCB and CWB as a result of the accumulation or reduction of moral credits. Klotz and Bolino (2013) recently applied this theory to OCB at the between-individual level of analysis, but would similar effects be found at the within-individual level as well? As our discussion of OCB and CWB earlier suggests, it is unlikely that a positive association would be found in concurrent measurement of these constructs. However, if a positive relationship were found over the course of a day or perhaps even from one day to the next, then perhaps a moral licensing framework could be applied to explain this relationship.

Building on the findings of Koopman et al. (2016) and a meta-analysis by Lanaj, Chang, and Johnson (2012), regulatory focus theory could potentially be applied to understanding daily OCB. Lanaj et al. (2012) found that people with high trait promotion focus engage in more OCB, in general, and Koopman et al. (2016) found that high trait promotion focus amplified the positive affective outcomes of OCB. Combining these two findings, perhaps individuals primed with a high *state* promotion focus would be more likely to see OCB as a means of enhancing social relationships (e.g., Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2015) and thus engage in more OCB compared to individuals primed with a high *state* prevention focus, as such individuals might be more attuned to the implications of taking time away from assigned tasks to engage in OCB.

Continuing the theme introduced earlier regarding looking at the recipients of OCB on a daily basis, researchers could draw upon theory on self-esteem threat (Fisher, Nadler, & Whitcher-Alagna, 1982) as one explanatory framework. Deelstra et al. (2003) drew upon this theory to explain why recipients of help reacted negatively, and such an explanation could be similarly incorporated at the within-individual level. However, according to Fisher et al. (1982), help need not always be interpreted as a threat; instead, helping can be seen as supportive as well (for example, see: Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2015). Thus, self-esteem threat could be

used to model both the “bright” and “dark” sides of receiving help as well and explain when, why, and for whom receiving help threatens one’s self-esteem, and when it does not.

Each of the earlier discussions focuses on those who receive help in the workplace. What about those who do not receive help? Here, theory on social comparisons (Wood, 1996) may be relevant. For example, do employees make social comparisons with their coworkers about the amount of help they receive? Research on LMX social comparisons suggests that employees do make social comparisons with their workgroup peers about the resources they receive from others (e.g., Vidyarthi, Liden, Anand, Erdogan, & Ghosh, 2010). Moreover, social comparison theory has already been a useful lens for understanding within-individual fluctuations in OCB (e.g., Spence et al., 2011). As such, research could explore the influence of daily social comparisons about the amount of help employees receive from others as well as when upward OCB social comparisons result in contrastive (aversive) or assimilative (comforting) social comparison reactions (Greenberg, Ashton-James, & Ashkanasy, 2007).

Finally, considering the important influence that role theory has played on between-person OCB research, it could also be applied to extend our understanding of within-person fluctuations in OCB. At the between-person level, scholars have typically drawn upon role theory to explain why some employees often perceive citizenship as part of their required behavior at work (e.g., Morrison, 1994). Related to our previous discussion about using ESM to study between-person differences in within-person variability in OCB, role theory is likely to be a useful theoretical perspective. Specifically, because role theory suggests that role conceptualizations provide action templates for employees (Katz & Kahn, 1978), role theory would suggest that an employee is likely to consistently strive to engage in OCB on a daily basis when she sees OCB as part of her work role (i.e., her daily action template includes OCB). Alternatively, when an employee sees OCB as extra-role (i.e., her daily action template does not include OCB), role theory would suggest that daily OCB is likely to fluctuate in accordance with the amount of daily resources available for behaviors that are viewed as “not my job” (Morrison, 1994, p. 1563).

## Conclusion

Although OCB research has typically focused on identifying antecedents and consequences of

between-person differences in levels of OCB, our review documents that research on within-person fluctuations in OCB is beginning to burgeon. Considering the relatively nascent state of the field, we view this domain as one that is ripe for further inquiry. Our review highlights several promising future research opportunities, and we hope it helps stimulate new and novel research on the topic.

## References

- Alliger, G. M., & Williams, K. J. (1993). Using signal-contingent experience sampling methodology to study work in the field: A discussion and illustration examining task perceptions and mood. *Personnel Psychology, 46*, 525–549.
- Barnes, C. M., Ghumman, S., & Scott, B. A. (2013). Sleep and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18*, 16–26.
- Barnes, C. M., Hollenbeck, J. R., Wagner, D. T., Derue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., & Schwind, K. M. (2008). Harmful help: The costs of backing-up behavior in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 529–539. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.529
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 103–118.
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1252–1265.
- Bergeron, D. M. (2007). The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: Good citizens at what cost? *Academy of Management Review, 32*, 1078–1095.
- Bergeron, D. M., Shipp, A. J., Rosen, B., & Furst, S. A. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and career outcomes: The cost of being a good citizen. *Journal of Management, 39*, 958–984.
- Binnewies, C., Sonnentag, S., & Mojza, E. J. (2009). Daily performance at work: Feeling recovered in the morning as a predictor of day-level job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*, 67–93.
- 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*, 419–441.
- Bolino, M. C., Klotz, A. C., Turnley, W. H., & Harvey, J. (2013). Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*, 542–559. doi:10.1002/job.1847
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2003). Going the extra mile: Cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior. *The Academy of Management Executive, 17*, 60–71.
- Cavanaugh, M. A., Boswell, W. R., Roehling, M. V., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). An empirical examination of self-reported work stress among U.S. managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 65–74.
- Chang, C., Johnson, R. E., & Yang, L. (2007). Emotional strain and organizational citizenship behaviours: A meta-analysis and review. *Work & Stress, 21*, 312–332.
- Christian, M. S., Eisenkraft, N., & Kapadia, C. (2015). Dynamic associations between somatic complaints, human energy, and

- discretionary behaviors: Experiences with pain fluctuations at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60, 66–102.
- Conway, J. M., Rogelberg, S. G., & Pitts, V. E. (2009). Workplace helping: Interactive effects of personality and momentary positive affect. *Human Performance*, 22, 321–339.
- Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26, 435–462.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1241–1255.
- Dalal, R. S., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. R., & 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, 1051–1066.
- Deelstra, J. T., Peeters, M. C. W., Zijlstra, F. R. H., Schaufeli, W. B., Stroebe, W., & Van Doornen, L. P. (2003). Receiving instrumental support at work: When help is not welcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 324–331. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.324
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499–512.
- Eatough, E. M., Chang, C., Miloslavic, S. A., & Johnson, R. E. (2011). Relationships of role stressors with organizational citizenship behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 619–632.
- Fay, D., & Sonnentag, S. (2012). Within-person fluctuations of proactive behavior: How affect and experienced competence regulate work behavior. *Human Performance*, 25, 72–93.
- Festinger, L. (1954). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fisher, C. D. (2003). Why do lay people believe that satisfaction and performance are correlated? Possible sources of a commonsense theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 753–777.
- Fisher, J. D., Nadler, A., & Whitcher-Alagna, S. (1982). Recipient reactions to aid. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 27.
- Fleeson, W. (2001). Toward a structure- and process-integrated view of personality: Traits as density distributions of states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 1011–1027.
- Fleeson, W., & Leicht, C. (2006). On delineating and integrating the study of variability and stability in personality psychology: Interpersonal trust as illustration. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 5–20.
- 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, 199–220.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56, 218–226.
- Fritz, C., & Sonnentag, S. (2009). Antecedents of day-level proactive behavior: A look at job stressors and positive affect during the workday. *Journal of Management*, 35, 94–111.
- 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.
- 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, 191–223.
- Goodman, S. A., & Svyantek, D. J. (1999). Person organization fit and contextual performance: Do shared values matter? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55, 254–275.
- Gordon, H. J., Demerouti, E., Bipp, T., & Le Blanc, P. M. (2015). The job demands and resources decision making (JD-R-DM) model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24, 44–58.
- Greenberg, J., Ashton-James, C. E., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2007). Social comparison processes in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 102, 22–41.
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., Neveu, J.-P., Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., & Westman, M. (2014). Getting to the “cor”: Understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources theory. *Journal of Management*, 40, 1334–1364. doi:10.1177/0149206314527130
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Wheeler, A. R. (2011). I owe you one: Coworker reciprocity as a moderator of the day-level exhaustion-performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32, 608–626.
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Wheeler, A. R. (2015). To invest or not? The role of coworker support and trust in daily reciprocal gain spirals of helping behavior. *Journal of Management*, 41, 1628–1650.
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280–1300.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513–524.
- Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Job attitudes. In I. B. Weiner (series ed.) & W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (vol. eds.), *Handbook of psychology*, vol. 12: Industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 255–276). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Humphrey, S. E., Morgeson, F. P., & Mannor, M. J. (2009). Developing a theory of the strategic core of teams: A role composition model of team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 48–61. doi:10.1037/a0012997
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ilies, R., Scott, B. A., & Judge, T. A. (2006). The interactive effects of personal traits and experienced states on intra-individual patterns of citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 561–575.
- Izard, C. E., & Ackerman, B. P. (2000). Motivational, organizational, and regulatory functions of discrete emotions. In M. Lewis and J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of emotion* (pp. 253–264). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Johnson, R. E., Lanaj, K., & Barnes, C. M. (2014). The good and bad of being fair: Effects of procedural and interpersonal justice behaviors on regulatory resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 635–650.
- Judge, T. A., Simon, L. S., Hurst, C., & Kelley, K. (2014). What I experienced yesterday is who I am today: Relationship of work motivations and behaviors to within-individual variation in the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 199–221.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York, NY: Wiley.



- Kernis, M. H., Cornell, D. P., Sun, C. R., Berry, A., & Harlow, T. (1993). There's more to self-esteem than whether it is high or low—the importance of stability of self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 1190–1204.
- Klotz, A. C., & Bolino, M. C. (2013). Citizenship and counterproductive work behavior: A moral licensing view. *Academy of Management Review*, *38*, 292–306.
- 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*, 414–435.
- Lanaj, K., Chang, C. H., & Johnson, R. E. (2012). Regulatory focus and work-related outcomes: A review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *138*, 998–1034.
- Larson, R., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1983). The experience sampling method. In H. T. Reis (Ed.), *Naturalistic approaches to studying social interaction*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. F. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York, NY: Springer.
- 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.
- Merritt, A. C., Efron, D. A., & Monin, B. (2010). Moral self-licensing: When being good frees us to be bad. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *4*, 344–357.
- Miner, A. G., & Glomb, T. M. (2010). State mood, task performance, and behavior at work: A within-persons approach. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *112*, 43–57.
- Miner, A. G., Glomb, T. M., & Hulin, C. (2005). Experience sampling mood and its correlates at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *78*, 171–193.
- Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system of personality: Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structures. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 246–268.
- Morrison, E. W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior—the importance of the employees perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*, 1543–1567.
- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extra-role efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, *42*, 403–419.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*, 475–480.
- Ohly, S., & Fritz, C. (2010). Work characteristics, challenge appraisal, creativity, and proactive behavior: A multi-level study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*, 543–565.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- 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, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and Organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*, 122–141.
- 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*, 879–903.
- 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*, 1438–1451.
- Rubin, R. S., Dierdorff, E. C., & Bachrach, D. G. (2013). Boundaries of citizenship behavior: Curvilinearity and context in the citizenship and task performance relationship. *Personnel Psychology*, *66*, 377–406. doi:10.1111/peps.12018
- Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Goldman, S. L., Turvey, C., & Palfai, T. P. (1995). Emotional attention, clarity, and repair: Exploring emotional intelligence using the Trait Meta-Mood Scale. In J. W. Pennebaker (Ed.), *Emotion, disclosure, and health* (pp. 125–154). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schreurs, B. H. J., Van Emmerik, I. J., Gunter, H., & Germeyns, F. (2012). A weekly diary study on the buffering role of social support in the relationship between job insecurity and employee performance. *Human Resource Management*, *51*, 259–280.
- Scott, B. A., Barnes, C. M., & Wagner, D. T. (2012). Chameleonic or consistent: A multilevel investigation of emotional labor variability. *Academy of Management Journal*, *55*, 905–926.
- 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*, 377–411.
- Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between nonwork and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *3*, 518–528.
- Sonnentag, S., & Starzyk, A. (2015). Perceived prosocial impact, perceived situational constraints, and proactive work behavior: Looking at two distinct affective pathways. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*, 806–824.
- 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.
- 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*, 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*, 547–571.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*, 653–663.
- Trougakos, J. P., Beal, D. J., Cheng, B. H., Hideg, I., & Zweig, D. (2015). Too drained to help: A resource depletion perspective on daily interpersonal citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*, 227–236.
- Van Dyne, L., & Ellis, J. B. (2004). Job creep: A reactance theory perspective on ocb as overfulfillment of obligations. In J. C. Shapiro, L. M. Shore, S. Taylor, & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 181–205). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

- 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.
- Vidyarthi, P. R., Liden, R. C., Anand, S., Erdogan, B., & Ghosh, S. (2010). Where do i stand? Examining the effects of leader-member exchange social comparison on employee work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*, 849–861.
- 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.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *18*, 1–74.
- 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*, 601–617.
- Wood, J. V. (1996). What is social comparison and how should we study it? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*, 520–537.
- Wu, C., & Parker, S. K. (2012). The role of attachment styles in shaping proactive behaviour: An intra-individual analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *85*, 525–530.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Heuven, E., Demerouti, E., Baker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. (2008). Working in the sky: A diary study on work engagement among flight attendants. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *13*, 345–356.