EMPLOYEE'S EXPERIENCES OF WORK: EMOTIONAL, COGNITIVE, SOCIAL, AND PERSONALITY FACTORS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCES

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY

KORTNEY M. KOSAK B.S.

DENTON, TEXAS

MAY 2021

DEDICATION

The researcher humbly dedicates this piece of work to everybody for their support and

inspiration to her family: Alayna and Daniel.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To acknowledge the many individuals who have contributed to this thesis for their guidance. I wish to express sincere gratitude to Dr. Shannon Scott for her support, consistent feedback and dedication to assisting me. I would also like to thank my other two committee members, Dr. Dancia Harris and Dr. Lisa Rosen who provided insightful revisions.

ABSTRACT

KORTNEY M. KOSAK

EMPLOYEE'S EXPERIENCES OF WORK: EMOTIONAL, COGNITIVE, SOCIAL,

AND PERSONALITY FACTORS

MAY 2021

Often affective influences in organizational research link to workplace behaviors. In this study, we examined several relationships between critical variables that have been missing within workplace literature. The current study examined how dispositional factors (i.e., susceptibility to emotional contagion and personality), affective (emotional) factors, and workplace performance factors (i.e., in-role and extra-role) predicted organizational outcomes (i.e., affective commitment and task effectiveness). All of these factors predicted positive workplace outcomes. However, workplace changes in the early stages of COVID-19 did not add any additional predictive ability.

Keywords: emotional contagion, personality, affective commitment, extra-role performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, COVID-19

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Emotions connect people and are contagious within the proximity of others when in the presence of emotional stimuli triggers (Hatfield et al., 1994). Elaine Hatfield, the co-author of the book *Emotional Contagion* (1994), argues the multilevel phenomenon breaks down into three phases: mimicry, feedback, and contagion. In order to *catch* another person's emotions, psychophysiological, behavioral, and social phenomena interact. R. William Doherty (1997) developed the Emotional Contagion (EC) scale to assess people's susceptibility to *catching* the five fundamental emotions (1) joy and happiness, (2) love, (3) fear and anxiety, (4) sadness, and (5) depression.

EC is described as the process of an individual's emotional states impacting another's through interaction. Nakahashi and Ohtsuki (2015) described this process as a social learning strategy, which is influential to group relationships. EC is considered adaptive to group-living, especially if sharing the same environment and thus potential sources of danger (Nakahashi & Ohtsuki, 2015). EC impacts the work environment (Ashkanasy & Humphrey, 2011; Johnson, 2008; Kimura et al., 2008; Petitta et al., 2019), susceptibility will influence relationships in the workplace by catching emotions consistent with facial mimicry, vocalization, and body language. In return, emotional factors and additional cognitive, social, and personality factors impact workplace outcomes. An understanding of EC and its effect on job performance and outcomes are

2

relevant to a healthy work-life between employees—the expression of emotions affecting work and life roles. Without deliberate or conscious processing, evolutionary theory summarizes the sensory input provided by facial expressions demonstrates one's emotional experiences (Doherty, 1997).

Consequently, emotional experiences should be profoundly affected by feedback from facial expressions (Doherty, 1997). At hand, coworkers that may demonstrate high levels of EC will direct job performance outcomes. For example, an employee with high levels of EC anger will affect goal completion of job-related tasks. This paper explored the susceptibility effect of emotional contagion (ECS) on perceived extra-role performance (ERP), personality, and affect factors in return produce organizational outcomes (i.e., affective commitment [AC] and task effectiveness [TE]). The ERP consists of behaviors beyond the formal requirements of a job description without an advance (Hugten, 2017). Organizational citizenship behaviors checklist (OCBs) measure the individual's performance beyond said job requirements. Employees are extending services beyond formal job requirements (i.e., ERP) for the benefit and effectiveness of the organization. The involvement of ECS, ERP, and personality in the workplace contributes to an individual's emotional attachment to the organization (i.e., AC) and the team TE.

Three primary objectives address the relationship between (1) dispositional factors (i.e., ECS and personality), (2) affect (emotions at work), and (3) ERPs in predicting organizational outcomes (i.e., AC and TE). By utilizing a hierarchal approach

2

after controlling for each variable to verify the results of the predicted outcomes. To be precise, if a person more susceptible to EC (i.e., high levels) and engaging in extra-role behaviors (e.g., took time to advise, coach, or mentor a coworker), how do the emotional experiences of work influence organizational outcomes.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Emotions in the Workplace

Emotional experiences had by employees' impact on how an organization maintains and performs in multiple ways. The emotional processing of employees and supervisors influences employees' job attitudes and behavior (Deutsch & Madle, 1975; Doherty et al., 1995; Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002; Hatfield et al., 1994). Emotions from other life roles are brought from outside environments to the workplace and vice versa. The effects of these emotional experiences alone often do not explain the impact emotions have on the quality of both work and life. An employee's emotional intelligence predicts their awareness of their own emotions and ability to control their emotions at work. Therefore, emotional intelligence enhances an employee's performance at work and the ability to balance work and life roles (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002). Examining emotions in the workplace is essential for understanding both the workplace and employees' lives outside of work.

Work environments create challenges that produce a variety of emotional states (e.g., frustration, worry, anger, shame, envy, or positivity), which are expressed through the synchronization of facial, vocal, and body movements (Hatfield et al., 1994). An individual's ability to recognize emotions through these nonverbal signals predicts ERPs (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002). Researchers have examined how individual

characteristics of employees influence emotion within the workplace. At the individual level, emotional displays impact the perception of leaders differentially by gender (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000). For example, negative emotions displayed by female leaders are perceived as more unacceptable than neutral affect. However, when male leaders show sadness, which is a passive negative emotion, they are rated as less effective than if they display anger or neutral affect (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000).

Characteristics of Emotional Experiences

Attitudes shaped by cultural differences is another influencing factor of an individual's emotional experience impacting the work environment (Hu & Kaplan, 2014). For example, Eastern cultures have typically been associated with decreased affective display compared to Western cultures (Boiger & Mesquita, 2012; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Mesquita et al., 1997). Deng et al. (2019) found that individuals from Eastern cultures were more likely to prefer emotional regulation implicitly and explicitly as compared to individuals from Western cultures. An underlying tenet encouraging emotional regulation in individuals from Eastern cultures is its perceived relationship to social class. Those of higher social class within Eastern cultures (e.g., Japanese individuals) are less likely to display positive emotions compared to Westerners (Deng et al., 2019).

Beyond emotional expression, emotional recognition is a critical skill for the workplace. Overall, individuals of high power tend to be extremely sensitive to emotional signals in their environment (Donhauser et al., 2015). However, when compared to

counterparts, this increased sensitivity did not apply to all emotions. Individuals with high power did not recognize facial expressions of the emotion joy more accurately (Donhauser et al., 2015). Joy or happiness may be a particularly challenging emotion to detect as it may be more likely to be displayed by others for impression management (i.e., people attempt to influence the impressions others have of them). Researchers have evidence indicating coworkers may not perceive impression management behaviors in the workplace accurately (Bourdage et al., 2008). A skilled employer or supervisor may need greater skills in determining IM motivation (Yun et al., 2007).

Beyond the individual level, research has examined the role emotion plays at the group or team level and the organizational level (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000). Specifically, this literature examines how organizational rules impact emotional expression and recognition—these organizational rules regarding emotion impact organizational socialization, identity, communication, and cohesion. At the group or team level, these same processes occur. In understanding the emotional experiences in the workplace, it is critical to recognize that the multiple levels (e.g., individual, team, and organizational) interact in various cyclical ways.

Supervisors' Impact

Another area of general workplace research has examined the impact of supervisors or leaders' emotions on the work environment (Bono et al., 2007; Cheng et al., 2012; Wu & Hu, 2009; Visser et al., 2013). As performance evaluations are generally considered high stakes events, it is unsurprising that both leaders and subordinates are

often emotionally impacted by performance evaluations (Bono et al., 2007). For example, supervisors may experience negative emotions during performance evaluations, mainly if the employee displays negative emotions (Bono et al., 2007; Wu & Hu, 2009). Therefore, the employee's interpretation of the feedback directly impacts the supervisor's emotional state.

Supervisors' display of feelings can impact the performance of subordinates (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002; Visser et al., 2013; Volmer, 2012). Researchers report supervisors' display of negative nonverbal signals decreases the productivity of employees (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002). The impact of supervisors' display of affect on employee productivity, as well as the impact of employees' affect on supervisors' emotions during performance evaluations, occurs through the process of EC. Thus, sharing the everyday experiences in the workplace, such as completing a task, will be influenced by the individual team member's affective state (Ilies et al., 2007; Johnson, 2009; Volmer, 2012).

A study conducted by Visser et al. (2013) also explored the leader's affective state involving the impact of leadership effectiveness and subordinate's performance. Visser et al. (2013) described task performance to be the key to the direction of affect valence, and the type of task determines the performance at hand. The researcher's findings indicate that a happy leader display enhances follower creative performance, and a sad leader display enhances analytical performance (Visser et al., 2013). Also, a happy leader yields higher leadership effectiveness, and a sad leader displays a lower rating, both mediated

7

by follower happiness (Visser et al., 2013). Thus, examining emotions in the workplace is essential for understanding the affective states of employees, which impacts performance and, in return, organizational outcomes (i.e., AC and TE).

Emotional Contagion

Hatfield et al. (1994) defined primitive EC as the "tendency to automatically mimic and synchronize facial expressions, vocalizations, postures, and movements with those of another person and, consequently, to converge emotionally" (p. 5). The mechanisms contributing to EC are (a) emotional mimicry and synchrony and (b) emotional experience and feedback (Hatfield et al., 1994). According to Hatfield et al. (1994), emotional experiences are composed of three significant elements including (a) the central nervous system commands that direct mimicry and synchrony; (b) the sensory feedback from the latter including facial, vocal, and postural changes; and (c) an individual's self-perception about their emotional states due to the emotional expressions and behaviors of others (Hatfield et al., 1994).

After the foundational work of Hatfield et al. (1994), several researchers have identified steps in this cyclical process. If considering a supervisor and an employee, the employee receives visual information on the supervisor's affective display during the social interaction. As nonverbal displays do not necessarily adequately provide an understanding of the leader's emotional state (Johnson, 2008), the employee automatically mimics the supervisor's affective state via shared neural activation of the autonomic nervous system (ANS; Prochazkova & Kret, 2017). ANS activity (e.g., heart

rates, pupil dilation, breathing patterns, and hormonal levels) has been found to synchronize between individuals conversing together regarding emotional experiences (Creaven et al., 2013; Fawcett et al., 2016; Hatfield et al., 1994; Kret & de Dreu, 2017; Saxbe et al., 2014). Beyond the ANS, emotional experiences involve the mimicry and synchronization of the motor system and mirror neurons in the central nervous system. Thus, emotions are transmitted through facial, vocal, muscle, and postural mimicry, as well as movement coordination and the modeling of instrumental behavior.

Emotion research has shown that this mimicry and subsequent synchronization impact emotional experiences. Examination of the facial feedback hypothesis, vocal feedback hypothesis, and postural feedback hypothesis has demonstrated that the movement of facial muscles, vocalization muscles, and postural muscles associated with emotion results in changes in experienced emotion (Hatfield et al., 1994). Also, the muscular contraction feedback hypothesis studies resulted in somatic activation that contributes to approach-avoidance mechanisms relating to affective behaviors (i.e., positive and negative valences; Berntson et al., 1993; Cacioppo et al., 1993).

An alternate theory proposed by Prochazkova and Kret (2017) argues that a perception-action mechanism automatically activates when perceiving a target's emotional state. As a result, people tend to feel other's actual emotions through the process of attending to the moment-to-moment reactions. Mirror neurons in the observer activate when the expresser is communicating to the observer, promoting a shared emotional experience (Prochazkova & Kret, 2017). These shared emotional experiences

impact social relationships and are critical for empathy (Prochazkova & Kret, 2017).

Barrett et al.'s (2007) review of emotion explains that content, conceptual knowledge, and neurobiological processes both make up an experience of emotion.

Cognitive and Social Processing

While this primitive EC and perception-action mechanism partially explain these shared mechanisms, social and cognitive processes are also engaged. Hess and Fischer (2013) argue that emotional mimicry occurs within social contexts, and thus, social and cognitive processes must be considered. Specifically, emotional mimicry occurs when one is attempting to establish affiliation. Therefore, people are more likely to emotionally mimic those individuals whom one has a positive attitude towards, those with whom one is cooperating as compared to competing with, and those within one's in-group (Hess & Fischer, 2013). Also, the direction of the emotional signal, as well as the valance of the emotional signal, impacts whether emotional mimicry occurs (Hess & Fischer, 2013). Thus, social cognition plays a significant role in EC beyond the perception-action mechanism and implicit cognition that has traditionally been associated with EC (Barsade, 2002; Hatfield et al., 1994; Prochazkova & Kret, 2017).

Beyond the cognitive processing of social contexts and person perception, more complex and explicit cognitive processes occur in shared emotional experiences. For example, employees who hear their peers discussing their emotional reactions to evaluations may attend more to their own emotions and others' related experiences (Deutsch & Madle, 1975). Leading employees to re-experience their most recent

evaluation cognitively, and thus, emotionally (Deutsch & Madle, 1975). Through cognitive reappraisal, knowledge of other's evaluations, memories of recent work events, or memories from one's prior evaluations may impact how one emotionally experiences an evaluation and thus impacts the shared emotional experience. Therefore, EC occurs within a sociocultural context that engages both implicit and explicit cognitive processes.

EC in the Workplace

Research has demonstrated the role of EC within the workplace (Ashkanasy & Humphrey, 2011; Kimura et al., 2008; Petitta et al., 2019). The degree of EC may vary depending on the type of industry and one's role within the organization (Doherty et al., 1995). A few careers that may show resistance to EC include newscasting, banking, law practice, firefighting, policing, and nursing (Doherty et al., 1995; Johnson, 2008). EC may be particularly important to understand the leadership role and the leader's effect on the subordinate's performance and outcomes (Johnson, 2008). Research has shown EC of positive moods from leaders to group members resulting in more group cooperation (Sy et al., 2005). Dasborough et al. (2009) argued that EC can also occur from group members to leaders.

EC between employees can also have a negative impact leading to cognitive failures (Petitta et al., 2019). Cognitive failures and workplace accidents are more likely to occur when a subordinate observed a supervisor displaying an angry response (Petitta et al., 2019). These findings further suggest that EC of anger can lead to cognitive failures and incorrect task performance (Petitta & Naughton, 2015). The results also

11

indicate that EC of joy may prevent mental lapses in cognitive functioning, preventing

the likelihood of workplace accidents occurring (Petitta et al., 2019). Further

investigation of the discrete emotions (e.g., sadness or fear) may suggest similar

cognitive functioning during contextual or task performances (Petitta et al., 2019).

At a team or group level, colleagues' performances often reflect an affective group

tone, which occurs when workgroups experience highly similar levels of state affect

(Volmer, 2012). EC will influence the team's affective tone and contextual performance

during collaboration (Kelly & Barsade, 2001). Rules and procedures often evoke

emotions within the workplace (Mallory & Rupp, 2015). EC can impact overall work

outcomes through its influence on compliance with these rules and procedures (Volmer,

2012). As EC plays a significant role in inexperienced emotions, job satisfaction,

cooperation, and task performance, it is critical to examine the effects of susceptibility to

EC between subordinates in the workplace (Johnson, 2008, 2009).

Susceptibility to EC

One's mood impacts EC susceptibility (ECS) in senders and receivers (Bhullar,

2012). Consistent with Hess and Fischer's (2013) assertion that the need for affiliation

underlies emotional mimicry, Bhullar (2012) found that EC is more likely to occur when

highly positive emotions are displayed. Due to the role of shared emotional experiences

in building stronger relationships between individuals (Bhullar, 2012). However, anger

has also been found to show high ECS when it leads to an affiliation (Lewis, 2000), such

as when a group of activists shows high anger convergence when encountering an

example counter to their beliefs. Cognitive load theory states that a load of a particular task on the learner's cognitive system via working memory also plays a role. EC of anger is more likely to occur during both high and low load conditions (Kelly et al., 2016); however, happiness EC is more likely to occur during low load conditions. That is, under high load conditions, individuals are less likely to perceive happiness accurately, and anger EC occurs more automatically compared with happiness (Kelly et al., 2016). This difference most likely occurs due to evolutionary importance of detecting negative emotions even when resources are decreased (e.g., high load tasks).

Hatfield et al. (1994) proposed three traits that people with strong communicating skills possess (a) they must feel strong emotions, (b) they must be able to express those intense emotions, and (c) when experiencing others' emotions that are incompatible with their own, they tend to be unresponsive to the feelings of others. These individuals are more likely to transmit their emotions with others despite the particular relationship. Therefore, the ability to convey one's own emotion and resist the EC of conflicting emotions of others is a critical component of strong communication skills and demonstrates differences in ECS.

One's level of power also affects ECS (Hatfield et al., 1994). When individuals observe or interact with each other, emotions displayed by leaders are more likely to be contagious (Visser et al., 2013). In a work setting, the motive to mimic individuals in power derives from the desire to receive the boss's approval. Likewise, social power within the group or team level also impacts ECS (Kimura et al., 2008). Individuals with

low social power within a team or group mimic those of people with high social power, and thus, they are more susceptible to the targeted person's emotional expressions (Kimura et al., 2008).

Other aspects that have been found to influence ECS include a collectivist orientation (Ilies et al., 2007), personality characteristics (Czarna et al., 2015; Lundqvist, 2008), culture (Hatfield et al., 2014; Lundqvist & Kevrekidis, 2008), and gender (Doherty et al., 1995; Hatfield et al., 2014; Lundqvist & Kevrekidis, 2008). Ilies et al. (2007) reported affective linkages in teams with individuals displaying a collectivist nature being more susceptible to affective influences. Also, those individuals higher in ECS displayed more reliable connections to other team members (Ilies et al., 2007).

Prior research suggests personality traits correlate with workplace behaviors (Ilies et al., 2006). As personality has also been found to impact susceptibility in mood induction to positive and negative emotions (Larsen & Ketelaar, 1991), studies have examined the relationship between EC and personality (Czarna et al., 2015; Lundqvist, 2008). Narcissists show decreased ECS of positive mood and lower levels of EC (Czarna et al., 2015). Lundqvist (2008) found the following: (a) high reward dependence was associated with increased overall ECS, (b) increased harm avoidance was related to increased ECS to negative emotions, (c) self-directedness was positively associated with ECS to positive emotions, and (d) novelty seeking and persistence was not associated with ECS of whom they are attached (Lundqvist, 2008).

In addition to individual differences, gender also plays a role. Gender is associated with differential emotional display rules and expressivity (Doherty, 1997; Hatfield et al., 1994; Hatfield et al., 2014; Lundqvist & Kevrekidis, 2008). As emotional expression may differ, some researchers argue that ECS may occur more in women due to increased emotional display by women; therefore, societal messages and expectations around gender and emotion contribute to these differences in ECS (Doherty et al., 1995; Hatfield et al., 1994). Lundqvist and Kevrekidis (2008) qualify these findings showing that women are generally more susceptible to EC than men except in anger EC. Which further supports the role of societal expectations in gender differences.

While mood, power, collectivist orientation, personality, and other individual characteristics impact susceptibility to EC (Bhullar, 2012; Czarna et al., 2015; Hatfield et al., 2014; Ilies et al., 2007; Kimura et al., 2008; Lundqvist & Kevrekidis, 2008; Visser et al., 2013). It is unclear how ECS relates to other factors that have been associated with attitudinal, affective, and performance outcomes in the workplace. Thus, exploring the different dispositional factors of employees will contribute to the social interaction in workplace behaviors affecting ERP that impacts AC and TE.

Personality Factors

Many researchers (Costa & McCrae, 1980; Lucas & Fujita, 2000; Lucas et al., 2000; Lundqvist, 2008) have examined personality and its relationship to emotional processing. For instance, extraversion has been associated with positive affect and subjective well-being (Costa & McCrae, 1980). Such characteristics increase social

15

interest, sociability, and social activity (Costa & McCrae, 1980). In contrast, Costa and

McCrae (1980) showed that negative affect has been associated with neuroticism. Thus,

related psychosomatic symptoms and poor role adjustment (Costa & McCrae, 1980).

Lucas and Fujita (2000) further researched the relationship between affect and

personality. Consistent with other research, extraversion and positive affect is the most

consistent finding regardless of the method of measurement (e.g., self-report, or

informant report, daily or global reports, or emotional state or trait measure; Lucas &

Fujita, 2000). The size of the association differs across the methods. While the

relationship between extraversion and affect did not alter, mood induction has been found

to influence reward sensitivity (Lucas & Fujita, 2000). Depending on cultural context,

personality expression is significant concerning emotions influenced by rewards (Lucas

et al., 2000). Those within collectivist cultures are more likely to follow group norms and

roles, which may prompt positive emotions in response to rewarded social behavior.

Extraversion may be more fundamentally associated with an increased sensitivity to

reward as opposed to sociability.

Not only might personality be associated with the tendency to experience or

express particular emotions (e.g., extraversion and positive affect), personality may also

be related to differential ECS (Lundqvist, 2008). Reward sensitivity may relate to

personality (Lucas et al., 2000), and reward dependence is associated with increased

ECS; there has been remarkably little research examining the relationship between ECS

and personality. Doherty (1997) found the following relationships: increased self-

centeredness showed more ECS, increased introversion associated with increased ECS to positive emotions, and increased extroversion associated with increased ECS to negative emotions. Further research should be conducted to examine these relationships in regard to ERPs and predicted outcomes (i.e., AC and TE).

Personality in the Workplace

Beyond interpersonal interactions, personality impacts the individual's fit with the environment. Person-environment (PE) fit theory states that personality impacts the degree to which a person is compatible with the organization's environmental characteristics (Cable & DeRue, 2002). Ryan and Kristof-Brown (2003) further expand PE fit theory by discussing the need to consider person-organization (PO) fit (e.g., matching a person and organization attributes), person-job (PJ), person-vocation (PV), and person-group (PG) fit. While research has focused on PO, research has suggested that PO fit is associated with personality (Ryan & Kristof-Brown, 2003). Also, PO fit based on personality sharply defines short-term individual affective outcomes but does not explain long-term performance outcomes (Ryan & Kristof-Brown, 2003).

Organizational research has sought to discover how personality traits can be used to predict an individual's behaviors while at work (Johnson, 2003). Job performance predictability has consistently been found in levels of conscientiousness. Although extraversion, agreeableness, and openness to experience varied depending on the occupation type (Johnson, 2003). Johnson (2003) found three critical determinants of job performance: declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge and skill, and motivation

(Johnson, 2003). Johnson (2003) further argues that personality influences performance when that performance is dependent on one of these three determinants.

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) focused on the impact of personality on OCBs, task performance, and ERPs. These attributes of personality (e.g., conscientious) facilitate the broader work environment, including the prediction of contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Ilies et al. (2006) supported that higher levels of agreeableness and conscientiousness increase the likelihood of engaging in ERPs. Ilies et al. (2006) further found that agreeableness served as a moderator of positive affect and job satisfaction as predictors of within-individual variance in OCB levels. However, the moderator effect for conscientiousness was not significant in the results for either individual or organizational targeted OCB (Ilies et al., 2006). Bowling (2010) found that conscientiousness levels serve as a direct predictor of ERPs and OCBs. Also, high agreeableness and conscientiousness were to be negatively related to counterproductive work behaviors such as withdrawal or avoidance (Bowling & Eschleman, 2010).

Personality is a driving force establishing employee-motivated behaviors that impact situational factors such as task characteristics and social roles (Barrick et al., 2013). External situations will moderate individual behavior (Barrick et al., 2013). Therefore, personality traits will influence affiliation job characteristics and goals, which, in return, impact perceived meaningfulness at work. Extraversion is related to increased reward sensitivity, status, or power within the workplace may be motivated by this

increased need for reward (Barrick et al., 2013). Extraversion may be more related to power in the workplace when there is a more reliable situational link between reward and power (Barrick et al., 2002).

Overall, the research suggests that it is essential to consider an individual's personality traits in understanding organizational behavior. The relation of emotional states, personality factors, external social conditions (e.g., job characteristics, contextual performance) influences the employee's experiences of work. Previous research connected personality traits to experienced states (i.e., positive affect and job satisfaction) and intraindividual effects of OCBs (Ilies et al., 2006). This study expands the literature to review dispositional factors such as personality in the workplace related to AC and TE.

Extra Role Performance

Organizational research often seeks to measure task performance. Task performance can consist of formal work tasks (i.e., in-role performance) but can also include ERP (i.e., contextual performance). The ERP includes activities beyond the formal requirements of the job description (Hugten, 2017). It is a primary form to assess voluntary behaviors that are not a part of the official job duties, that is, assisting colleagues, encouraging positivity, plus more involvement in the organization without advance. Studies conducted by Harrison et al. (2006) assessed job attitudes and job performance concerning contextual and focal performance (i.e., in-role performance), contextual performance is often characterized by the undertaking of helping extra-role behaviors (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Regarding withdrawal behaviors (i.e.,

19

absenteeism, lateness, and turnover) and contextual performance, Harrison et al. (2006) describe a negative relationship but focal performance to be positively related. However, the variability in effect sizes between performance types with turnover did suggest potential moderators (Harrison et al., 2006).

Past studies suggest positive emotions and one's well-being encourages the likelihood of being more helpful at one's work (Hugten, 2017). The degree to which one identifies one's psychological well-being "by the same attributes that one's self believes in one's organization" impacts the likelihood that one will identify with the organization (Lee et al., 2015, p. 1049). Extra-role behavior is an outcome of organizational identification in that assisting others with work-related tasks beyond one's role also helps one increase psychological well-being (Lee et al., 2015). Organization identification further influences goal completion for both the individual and the organization.

Extra-role behavior has been found to be positively related to job performance outcomes and social interactions in the workplace (Yun et al., 2007). OCBs help identify forms of extra-role behavior that are helpful to the organization (Bowling, 2010). When OCBs are associated with positive outcomes such as self-enhancement, they become positively correlated with role ambiguity to encourage extra-role behaviors (Yun et al., 2007). Yun et al.'s (2007) research findings demonstrate job performance behaviors motivated by the need to impress management due to employee's perceptions of their role (i.e., role ambiguity). However, management regarding a reward system does not formally recognize OCBs, thus differing the outcome of impression management (i.e.,

self-enhancement) for organizational effectiveness (Yun et al., 2007). Therefore, employees will engage in OCB behaviors in a way they can impress others, especially managers, despite true intentions. In return, it influences managers' decisions about employee's OCBs and rewards due to their commitment to the organization, thus encouraging the dismissal of OCBs.

ERP engagement increases an organization's success, employees' positive affect, employees' organizational commitment; however, employees with lower positive affect reported lower intentions to perform extra-role behaviors (Hoption et al., 2012). As a result, this decreased ERP engagement discourages dynamic interactions with peers and leaders and challenges leaders' in-role behaviors (Hoption et al., 2012). Therefore, the lack of performing ERP decreases commitment to the organization as well as reinforces a leader's evaluation of the employee as lacking initiative and needing direction (Hoption et al., 2012). Therefore, ERP is not only impacted by an employee's emotional state, but it also affects an employee's emotional state and the leader's perception of the employee.

With the interference of role performance, mood contagion, and leadership outcomes display the effects of follower's mood mediated by the leaders (Johnson, 2009). In return, ERPs also impact colleagues' affect, performance attitudes, and performance behaviors (Johnson, 2009). That is, the mood and emotions influenced by the leaders upon employees will impact the direction of the employees' mood and performance. Further, depending on the employee's mood, which has been impacted by the leader, they then choose whether to engage in ERPs (Hoption et al., 2012; Johnson, 2009; Yun et al.,

2007). However, Johnson's (2009) findings did not indicate the leader's mood impacted performance but were dependent on the performance of the type of task. For that reason, marking the difference in in-role performance assigned by upper-level management can be clear and defined while ERPs go unseen.

ERPs represent a challenge in that they are not part of the expected job duties and thus are not generally part of the evaluation process (Welbourne et al., 1998). As performance evaluations focus on expected role behaviors, ERPs may be viewed as negatively impacting through the redirection of time and resources to other non-job related behaviors. Therefore, employees do not often receive credit for ERPs (Welbourne et al., 1998). However, the research does suggest that ERPs are essential to recognize for both their positive impact on the affect and performance of employees and leaders (Hoption et al., 2012; Yun et al., 2007), but also the impact on organizational success (Parayitam & Guru-Gharana, 2010). Besides, leaders will be impacted due to OCBs being negatively correlated with role ambiguity (Yun et al., 2007). Therefore, the researchers suggest it may be helpful for leaders to clearly define job roles to encourage OCBs regarding the mediation of role ambiguity.

Organizational success and effectiveness are dependent on the task performance of both in-role behavior and ERPs. Parayitam and Guru-Gharana (2010) found that failing organizations need to focus on recognizing employees' ERP that benefits specific individuals. ERPs that reflect collaboration, extra effort, and willingness to take the initiative by an employee is critical to altering the trajectory of failing businesses. As

employees who score higher in agreeableness are more likely to engage in ERPs independent of affect (Ilies et al., 2006), recognizing these behaviors may be particularly crucial to reaching organizational goals and assist in keeping good employees. ERPs are more likely to be displayed by employees with positive affect (Hoption et al., 2012; Hugten, 2017; Yun et al., 2007).

A gap within the literature exists as research has not examined whether EC increases ERPs. It is also unclear whether those more prone to EC, particularly positive emotions, are more likely to exhibit ERPs. This study begins to address this gap. It is noteworthy that extra-role behaviors can be seen as a positive trait (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) or a negative trait contingent to the emotional state, which encourages role ambiguity (Mañas et al., 2018). Although Mañas et al.'s (2018) research examine the employee's experience of negative affective states when procedures are not clearly defined, there remains a literature gap regarding the adverse effects of ERPs in the workplace balancing job demands. The researcher's findings suggest that due to an adverse impact of affective engagement between the employee and organization, role ambiguity shows a negative relationship with ERPs. Therefore, Mañas et al. (2018) indicated the influence of affective engagement being the reason. Addressing these research gaps, this study explores this by controlling for dispositional factors (i.e., susceptibility to EC and personality) and predict organizational outcomes (i.e., AC and TE) concerning ERP.

Purpose of the Study

This study will expand on previous research by examining the variables listed to determine the impact of an employee's AC and TE. The current study explores different types of predictors, including dispositional factors (i.e., personality and ECS), ERP, affect factors, to determine their relative ability to predict AC and TE. Precisely, the examination of the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. Dispositional factors (ECS and personality) will predict:

1a. affective commitment

1b. task effectiveness

Hypothesis 2. After controlling for dispositional factors, affect (emotions at work) will predict:

2a. affective commitment

2b. task effectiveness

Hypothesis 3. After controlling for dispositional factors and affect factors, extra-role performance will predict:

3a. affective commitment

3b. task effectiveness

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Participants

A convenience sampling of working adults was recruited via various online platforms, specifically Facebook and Reddit, and the TWU SONA-system (see Appendix A and B). Those who participated through the SONA-system received research-credit applied to their undergraduate psychology courses. As no differences were found between the different groups of participants, analyses were conducted on the overall sample. In addition, the data collection occurred during the first few months of the COVID-19 pandemic (April through June). Due to the anticipated possible impact of the global pandemic, an additional five questions were added to the demographic survey (see Table 1).

The study's eligibility requirements included 18 years of age or older and employment for a minimum of 18 hours a week. The total sample consisted of 276 employees after data cleaning, excluding all respondents who did not complete the entirety of the survey or meet the eligibility requirements ($N = 102$). Participants self-reported as follows: Black/African American/African/Caribbean 7.6% ($n = 21$), Latin(o/a/x)/Hispanic/Hispanic American 13.4% ($n = 37$), Native American/Pacific Islander/Indigenous Person 1.8% ($n = 5$), Asian/Asian American/Arab/Arab American 6.9% ($n = 19$), White/European American 67.4% ($n = 186$), and as other self-identity 2.9% ($n = 8$).

Summary statistics for all demographic variables are presented in Table 2. The age of the participants was not collected. The majority of the respondents were women (72%). On average, the respondents' weekly hours in their current organizations were 36.02 hours, ranging from 18 to 70 hours per week ($SD = 11.22$). A majority of the participants (64%) indicated they were a supervisee (employee), 21% reported management-level positions, and 15% indicated being both supervisee and management level. The majority (54%) of respondents were not currently students, reported no caregiving responsibility (71%), reported being middle class (51%), and worked in a variety of industries, with the largest being education (21%; see Table 3).

Table 1

COVID-19 Related Questions

COVID-19 Related Questions	N	Percentage
Are you working remotely due to COVID-19?		
Yes	137	49.6
No	130	47.1
Did you lose employment due to COVID-19?		
Yes	39	14.1
No	225	81.5
Has COVID-19 impacted your employment?		
Yes	165	59.8
No	111	40.2
Has COVID-19 impacted your view of your employment?		
Yes	125	45.3
No	151	54.7
Has COVID-19 impacted your view of co-workers?		
Yes	68	24.7
No	207	75.3
Total	276	100

Table 2

Demographic Variables

Variables	*N*	Percentage
Gender	276	
Man		26.4
Woman		72.1
Transgender		1.1
Prefer not to say		.4
Race and Ethnicity	276	
Black/African-American/African/Caribbean		7.6
Latin (o/a/x)/Hispanic/Hispanic-American		13.4
Native-American/PacificIslander/IndigenousPerson		1.8
Asian/Asian-American/Arab/Arab-American		6.9
White/European-American		67.4
Self-Identify		2.9
Role	276	
Management level		20.7
Supervisee		64.1
Both		15.2
College Student Status	276	
Full-time		34.8
Part-time		11.2
N/A		54.0
Caregiver Status	276	
Child		25.0
Adult		5.8
N/A		69.2
Social Class	276	
Upper middle		17.0
Middle		51.4
Lower middle		24.3
Lower		7.2

Table 3

Industries

Industry	N	Percentage
Education	63	21.4
Healthcare	37	13.4
Food	29	8.7
Business	27	8.3
Retail	23	7.6
Social Services	18	5.4
Labor	18	5.4
Customer Service	17	5.1
Technology	14	5.1
Caregiving	9	2.5
Sales	7	2.2
Warehouse	6	2.2
Clerical	6	1.8
Hospitality	5	1.8
Law	5	1.8
Automotive	4	1.4
Entertainment	3	1.1
Public transportation	3	1.1
Government	2	.7
Military	2	.7
Counseling	2	.7
Dentistry	2	.7
Ministry	2	.4
Consulting	1	.4
Total	276	100

Additionally, COVID-19 questions revealed 50% of respondents were working remotely due to COVID-19 and that 81% had to retain their job in spite of COVID-19. A small majority said their employment was impacted (60%), also that COVID-19 did not affect their employment view (55%; see Table 3). However, the majority (75%) stated the

pandemic did not impact their view of coworkers. Additional information about how

COVID-19 had impacted employment and views of employment can be found in Tables

4 through 6.

Table 4

Has COVID-19 impacted your employment?

Has COVID-19 impacted your employment? Yes, explanations.	Count	% of Total
Remotely	16	10.7
Hours	24	16.0
Engagement	2	1.3
Cannot Work	4	2.7
Closure	10	6.7
Documentation	1	0.7
Pay	10	6.7
Change	15	10.0
Job Description	2	1.3
Stress	4	2.7
Colleague Interaction	1	0.7
Virtual	11	7.3
Revenue	2	1.3
Furloughed	23	15.3
Health	5	3.3
Travel	1	0.7
Employment	2	1.3
Workload	17	11.3
Total	150	100

Table 5

Has COVID-19 impacted your view of employment?

Has COVID-19 impacted your view of employment? Yes, explanations.	Count	% of Total
Money	5	4.5
Purpose	3	2.7
Uncertainty	3	2.7
Mental Health	2	1.8
Management	5	4.5
Caring	10	9.1
Employment Status	22	20.0
Development	3	2.7
No Action	1	0.9
Technology	2	1.8
Risks	7	6.4
Business Aspects	6	5.5
Thankful	16	14.5
Adapt	2	1.8
Preparation	5	4.5
Entitlement	2	1.8
Face-to-face interaction	2	1.8
Remotely	13	11.8
Emotional	1	0.9
Total	111	100

Table 6

Has COVID-19 impacted your view of co-workers?

Has COVID-19 impacted your view of co-workers? Yes, explanations.	Count	% of Total
Money	1	1.8
Personal	6	10.5
Mental Health	1	1.8
Communication	4	7.0
Withholding	2	3.5
Risks	15	26.3
Performance	2	3.5
True Intentions	3	5.3
Interaction	5	8.8
Management	3	5.3
Appreciation	7	12.3
Productivity	8	14.0
Total	57	100

Procedure

To test the research hypotheses, participants completed the study online using PsychData, a secure data collection platform to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. After an introduction to the study, participants completed a short researcher-developed demographic questionnaire (see Appendix C). Participants then completed the following scales in the listed order: Individual Workplace Performance Multi-Affect Indicator (IWP-MAI; Warr et al., 2013; see Appendix D), Emotional Contagion Scale (EC scale; Doherty, 1997; see Appendix E), Affective Commitment Scale (ACS; Allen & Meyer, 1990; see Appendix F), Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (IWPQ; Koopmans et al., 2014; see Appendix G), Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C;

Spector et al., 2010; see Appendix H), Workplace effectiveness scale (WES; Johnson et al., 2009; see Appendix I), and the Big Five Personality Test (B5PT; Goldberg, 1992; see Appendix J).

<div align="center">**Measures**</div>

Demographic Survey

The researcher generated a demographic survey that asked participants to self-report their gender, race and ethnicity, employment status, length of employment, college student status, and caregiver status. The survey ended with an open-ended question asking participants to describe their workplace to a close friend. As COVID-19 impacted the United States immediately before the beginning of the study, additional questions were added to the demographic survey to provide context for the results.

IWP-MAI

The job-related questionnaire, IWP-MAI, focuses on emotions in work settings (Warr et al., 2013). The scale is based on a circumplex model of emotion in which valence and arousal levels are utilized to create four quadrants. The four quadrants are (1) Anxiety (activated negative; HANA), (2) Enthusiasm (activated positive; HAPA), (3) Comfort (low-activation positive; LAPA), and (4) Depression (low-activation negative; LANA). The four subscales have been found to be highly reliable measures in prior studies, HAPA $\alpha = .86$, HANA $\alpha = .87$, LAPA $\alpha = .85$, and LANA $\alpha = .78$ (Madrid & Patterson, 2014). Acceptable reliability was also found in the current study with HAPA $\alpha = .91$, HANA $\alpha = .87$, LAPA $\alpha = .89$, and LANA $\alpha = .84$.

The scale consists of 16 items examining the approximate percentage of time the participant felt the emotion (e.g., tense) at work during the past week. Participants are asked to select their responses on a 7-point Likert scale with the options: *Never* (0% of the time), *A little of the time* (1% to roughly 20%), *Some of the time* (Roughly 21% to 40%), *About half the time* (Roughly 41% to 60%), *Much of the time* (Roughly 61% to 80%), *A lot of the time* (Roughly 81% to 99%), and *Always* (100% of the time). Item scoring of the responses consisted of a sum of each quadrant, after reverse-scoring negative items, so that higher scores represent higher well-being.

Emotional Contagion Scale

Doherty (1997) developed the EC scale, which consists of 15-items and examines people's tendency to mimic five fundamental emotions (i.e., happiness, sadness, fear, anger, and love). Participants self-report how often they engage in the fifteen items of a 4 point scale with (1) meaning *never* and (4) meaning *always*. A sample item is "I tense when overhearing an angry quarrel." Thus, a higher score indicates that one is more susceptible to EC. Doherty (1997) evaluated the scale to be a reliable measure, reporting a Cronbach's alpha of .90. The scale was found to have acceptable reliability in the current study, $\alpha = .78$.

Affective Commitment

AC is considered an emotional attachment to the team's task and involvement in the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Allen and Meyer (1990) developed the AC scale, consisting of eight items. The scale has been shown to have strong reliability ($\alpha = .87$; Allen & Meyer, 1990). Sample items from the survey include, "I enjoy discussing

my workgroup with people outside it" and "I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this workgroup." Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *agree strongly*, and four items are reverse scored. Scores are summed, and a higher score reflects more involvement in the organization with higher emotional attachment. The current study reported a Cronbach's alpha of .78.

IWPQ Role Performance

The IWPQ consists of two subscales: the contextual subscale (CP) and the task performance subscale (TP; Koopmans et al., 2014). The CP consists of eight items preceded with an "In the past three months…" stem and followed with statements like, "I took on extra responsibilities." The CP has strong internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of .86 (Koopmans et al., 2014).

The in-role performance was measured using the TP scale, including five items with, "In the past three months…" and a sample item, "I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time." The questions consist of a 4-point Likert scale on a self-report measure from (1) *never* to (4) *always* with higher scores reflecting a higher task and contextual performance. Overall, the IWPQ shows strong reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of .90 (Koopmans et al., 2014). The current study reported Cronbach's alpha of .89 for the CP subscale and a Cronbach's alpha of .80 for the TP subscale.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist

Spector et al.'s (2010) short version of the OCB-Checklist, consisting of ten items, measures workplace behaviors relating to contextual performance (i.e., extra-role behaviors). Participants were asked to respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranged from (1)

strongly disagree to (5) *strongly agree* for each item. A sample item from the survey is "Took time to advise, coach, or mentor a coworker." Higher scores indicate higher ratings on the behavior of interest (Spector et al., 2010). Spector et al. (2010) study measured OCB-C in the two areas showing and reported strong reliability on; agreement ($\alpha = .82$) and frequency ($\alpha = .84.$) as well as and strong internal consistency within items for employees ($\alpha = .80$) and for supervisors ($\alpha = .86$). The overall scale was reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha of .88 in a prior study indicating a strong, reliable measure (Spector et al., 2010). The current study reported an overall Cronbach's alpha of .89.

Workplace (Task) Effectiveness

Johnson et al. (2009) developed a task and non-task effectiveness scale for workplace effectiveness. The non-task effectiveness scale consisted of four items ($\alpha = .87$) and consisted of items such as, "I feel positive about my experience working with this group." The TE scale consists of six items ($\alpha = .86$), such as "My group regularly meets its deadlines." All the item responses are scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. A higher score indicates greater effectiveness (i.e., non-task or task) perceived by an individual belonging to a workgroup. The scale showed strong internal consistency and reliability across college students (Johnson et al., 2009). The current study utilized the TE scale, which reported Cronbach's alpha of .93 for task effectiveness and Cronbach's alpha of .93 for non-task effectiveness. The subscale TE was used for the current study; however, both scales were administered.

Big Five Personality Test

Goldberg (1992) developed a factor structure to examine personality traits and created what is commonly known as the Big 5 scale, which measures: (1) Extraversion, (2) Agreeableness, (3) Conscientiousness, (4) Neuroticism, and (5) Openness to Experience. The scale consists of 50 items, with ten items in each domain. The items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale of (1) *disagree*, (2) *slightly disagree*, (3) *neutral*, (4) *slightly agree*, and (5) *agree*. The sum of each domain was calculated with a range of 0 to 40.

Prior studies have reported acceptable to strong Cronbach's alpha's ranging from .74 (Neuroticism) to .93 (Extraversion; Barrick et al., 2001; Johnson, 2003). The current study found acceptable Cronbach's alpha for each subscale, as follows: Extraversion α = .88, Agreeableness α = .83, Conscientiousness α = .80, Neuroticism α = .85, and Openness to Experience α = .76.

Analytical Plan

The data was first prepared for analysis. All reverse scored items were recoded, and all scale scores were created. In addition, an Extra-Role Composite variable was calculated. As the IWPQ contextual performance subscale and the OCB measure are highly related, the two measures were combined to create this composite variable. The use of the composite variable addressed multicollinearity in the regression analyses. The composite variable was strongly reliable in the current study, α = .91.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. Importantly, the researcher first obtained all descriptive statistics and internal

consistency reliabilities using Cronbach's α for all study variables and scales. A bivariate

correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between the study

variables. Several simple regression analyses of demographic and independent variables

were performed to break down the large hierarchical regression analysis between IVs and

DVs. Also, to understand the potential impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, a separate

COVID-19 regression analysis was conducted. Hierarchical regression analysis was used

to determine the predictive value of dispositional factors, affect (emotion) factors, and

workplace performance factors for the outcome variables of AC and TE (see Figure 1).

Figure 1

Model for testing the predictors of affective commitment and task effectiveness

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Outcome Variables
Dispositional	**Affect**	**ERP**	**COVID-19**	
Emotional Contagion Scale: Anger ECS Fear ECS Happy ECS Sad ECS **Big 5 Personality:** Agreeableness Conscientiousness Neuroticism Openness to New Experiences Extraversion	**IWP Scale:** Enthusiasm HAPA Depression LANA	**Extra-Role Scale:** Composite variable (contextual performance and OCB-C)	**COVID-19 Scale:** Loss of Work Remote Work Employment Impact Employment View Coworker View	**Affective Commitment** **Task Effectiveness**

Note. The abbreviations align with each scale.

37

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

To examine the unique contribution of ECS, personality, affect, and ERPs in the

explanation of AC and TE, multiple hierarchical regression analyses were performed.

Prior to conducting the analyses, all assumptions were assessed. The linearity assumption

was evaluated by scanning the scatterplots for a linear relationship. By examining each

variable's boxplots, any potential outliers that could affect the data set were assessed. The

linearity assumption was met, and no outliers were found. Homoscedasticity with all

variables was normally distributed. The assumption of multicollinearity was deemed to

have been met and within acceptable limits.

Descriptive Statistics and Preliminary Analyses

The independent variables (i.e., ECS, personality, affect, and ERPs) and the

outcome variables (i.e., AC, and TE) means and standard deviations are displayed in

Table 7. An examination of correlations revealed no independent variables were highly

correlated with any demographic variables (see Table 8) and the main variables of

interest. A simple regression analysis was conducted to examine gender predicting ECS.

The gender variable did add statistical significance to the prediction of sad ($\beta = .40$, $p <$

.01), anger ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$), happiness ($\beta = .19$, $p < .01$), fear ($\beta = .28$, $p < .01$),

overall ECS ($\beta = .32$, $p < .01$), but not love ECS.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics Independent and Dependent Variables

Variables	*N*	*M*	SD
ECS	276	43.41	7.30
Sad	276	8.20	2.05
Anger	276	7.83	1.79
Happiness	276	9.90	1.75
Love	276	9.21	2.20
Fear	276	8.30	2.03
Personality			
Extraversion	276	31.06	7.24
Agreeableness	276	39.19	5.56
Conscientiousness	276	36.30	5.76
Neuroticism	276	31.33	6.99
Openness to Experience	276	37.39	5.11
Affect			
HAPA enthusiasm	276	15.72	5.83
HANA anxiety	276	19.82	5.56
LAPA comfort	276	16.10	5.83
LANA depression	276	23.82	4.30
Extra-role Performance	276	24.92	4.22
OCB	276	38.27	7.01
Extra-Role (composite)	276	63.20	9.85
AC	276	27.20	5.895
TE	276	22.94	4.82

Note. ECS = Emotional Contagion susceptibility; OCB = Organizational citizenship behavior; AC = Affective commitment; and TE = Task effectiveness

Table 8

Demographic, Independent and Dependent Variables: Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1 Gender																						
2 Tenure	-.24**																					
3 sad EC	.39**	-.07																				
4 anger EC	.21**	.07	.46**																			
5 happiness EC	.19**	-.03	.45**	.32**																		
6 love EC	.11	-.08	.40**	.34**	.49**																	
7 fear EC	.27**	-.06	.56**	.67**	.33**	.37**																
8 ECS total	.32**	-.05	.78**	.74**	.68**	.71**	.79**															
9 HAPA	-.06	-.14*	.14*	.08	.32**	.24**	.06	.22**														
10 HANA	-.06	.03	-.12*	-.13*	.09	.07	-.16**	-.07	.20**													
11 LAPA	-.09	-.08	-.01	.08	.17**	.19**	.02	.12*	.61**	.44**												
12 LANA	.09	.06	-.05	-.15*	.21**	.07	-.12*	-.01	.25**	.66**	.25**											
13 Extraversion	-.13*	.10	.07	-.11	.22**	.09	-.07	.05	.24**	.08	.06	.15*										
14 Agreeableness	.25**	.04	.41**	.21**	.39**	.28**	.33**	.44**	.11	.01	.04	.20**	.22**									
15 Conscientiousness	.15*	.01	.12*	.02	.29**	.19**	.07	.18**	.12*	.08	.05	.12*	.05	.28**								
16 Neuroticism	-.18**	.20**	-.15*	-.19**	.16**	.07	-.30**	-.11	.20**	.31**	.24**	.24**	.20**	.12*	.25**							
17 Openness to Experience	-.08	.16**	.08	.04	.11	.13*	.12	.13*	.11	.04	.02	.14*	.30**	.40**	.10	.06						
18 Extra-role Performance	.15*	.06	.19**	.03	.41**	.16**	.14*	.25**	.27**	.06	.08	.24**	.27**	.35**	.28**	.13*	.20**					
19 OCB	.05	.20**	.15*	.07	.27**	.09	.08	.17**	.17**	.12	.03	.26**	.30**	.32**	.17**	.15*	.25**	.51**				
20 Extra_Role (composite)	.10	.17**	.18**	.06	.37**	.13*	.12	.23**	.24**	.11	.06	.29**	.33**	.37**	.24**	.17**	.26**	.79**	.93**			
21 AC	.00	.07	.28**	.08	.26**	.17**	.15*	.25**	.36**	.20**	.23**	.32**	.25**	.33**	.05	.15*	.16**	.29**	.33**	.36**		
22 TE	.04	.06	.11	-.02	.23**	.19**	.04	.15*	.22**	.17**	.16**	.30**	.17**	.28**	.15*	.16**	.21**	.34**	.32**	.38**	.49**	

Note. AC = Affective commitment; TE = Task effectiveness. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$.

<center>**Main Analyses**</center>

Two 3-stage hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to evaluate the prediction of AC and TE from dispositional factors, affect (emotion) factors, and ERP factors. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a fourth step was added to determine if how one's employment or perception of their employment had changed during COVID-19 impacted AC and TE. Despite the order of the block analysis and separate models, COVID-19 related questions did not differ. ECS and personality variables were entered at Stage 1 of the regressions to control dispositional factors predicting DVs (AC and TE). After controlling for dispositional factors, the second stage, affect, focused on emotions at work (IWP-MAI) predicting DVs. Stage 3 controlled for dispositional factors and affect factors and ERPs measured by composite variable (i.e., Extra-Role) were entered. Stage 4 controlled for all the variables previously entered, and COVID-19 changes were entered.

Hypothesis 1. ECS and Personality

Results from regression models testing the hypotheses are presented in Table 9. Consistent with the first hypothesis, ECS and personality contribute significantly to the first regression model of AC, $F(10, 265) = 6.29$, $p < .001$, accounting for 16% of the variance. The following independent variables contributed to the model significantly in Step 1: sad ECS ($\beta = .18$, $p < .05$), anger ECS ($\beta = -.06$, $p < .05$), happiness ECS ($\beta = .07$, $p < .05$), Extraversion ($\beta = .15$, $p < .01$), Agreeableness ($\beta = .20$, $p < .01$), Conscientiousness ($\beta = -.10$, $p < .05$) and Neuroticism ($\beta = .14$, $p < .01$).

<center>41</center>

In the TE regression model, ECS and personality contributed significantly, $F(10, 265) = 4.27$, $p < .001$, accounting for 14% of the variation (see Table 10). The following predictors accounting for significant variation are as follows: anger ECS ($\beta = -.11$, $p < .05$), happiness ECS ($\beta = .12$, $p < .05$), love ECS ($\beta = .09$, $p < .05$), Extraversion ($\beta = .04$, $p < .05$), Agreeableness ($\beta = .15$, $p < .01$), Neuroticism ($\beta = .07$, $p < .05$), and Openness to Experience ($\beta = .11$, $p < .01$).

Hypothesis 2. Affect - Emotions at Work

Table 9 also provides the results for the tests of the second hypothesis. In Step 2, affect factors accounted for significant variation in AC, $F(14, 265) = 6.29$, $p < .001$, and in TE, $F(4, 261) = 4.21$, $p < .01$. Sad ECS ($\beta = .20$, $p < .01$), fear ECS ($\beta = .07$, $p < .05$), Extraversion ($\beta = .11$, $p < .01$), Agreeableness ($\beta = .19$, $p < .01$), Conscientiousness, ($\beta = -.10$, $p < .01$), Neuroticism ($\beta = .08$, $p < .05$), HAPA enthusiasm, ($\beta = .24$, $p < .01$), and LANA depression ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$) significantly predicted AC. Only the predictor LANA depression significantly predicted TE ($\beta = .22$, $p < .05$). For the AC model, the change in R-square from Step 1 to Step 2 was .11 reflecting a significant increase in explained variance, $F(4, 261) = 10.21$, $p < .001$. Adding affect factors to the TE regression model explained an additional 5% of the variation in TE, $F(4, 261) = 3.86$, $p < .001$.

Table 9

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Predicting Likelihood of Affect Commitment

Variable	R_s^2	Step 1 b	Step 1 SE	Step 1 β	Step 2 b	Step 2 SE	Step 2 β	Step 3 b	Step 3 SE	Step 3 β	Step 4 b	Step 4 SE	Step 4 β
Step 1: Dispositional ECS													
Sad	.73	.52	.22	.18**	.58	.21	.20**	.58	.20	.20**			
Anger	.07	-.19	.26	-.06*	-.11	.24	-.03	-.12	.24	-.04			
Happiness	.64	.24	.25	.07*	-.11	.24	-.03	-.22	.24	-.07*			
Love	.27	.01	.18	.01	-.10	.17	-.04	-.05	.17	-.02			
Fear	.21	.15	.25	.05	.21	.24	.07*	.19	.23	.06*			
Personality													
Extraversion	.41	.13	.05	.15**	.09	.05	.11**	.06	.05	.08*			
Agreeableness	.72	.21	.08	.20**	.20	.07	.19**	.17	.07	.16**			
Conscientiousness	.01	-.10	.06	-.10*	-.10	.06	-.10**	-.12	.06	-.11**			
Neuroticism	.14	.12	.05	.14**	.06	.05	.08*	.06	.05	.07*			
Openness to Experience	.16	.01	.07	.01	.02	.07	-.02	-.04	.07	-.03			
Step 2: Affect													
HAPA enthusiasm	.70				.25	.07	.24**	.23	.07	.22**			
HANA anxiety	.21				.02	.08	.02	.03	.08	.03			
LAPA comfort	.27				.01	.08	.01	.02	.08	.02			
LANA depression	.54				.29	.10	.21**	.24	.10	.17**			
Step 3: ERP													
Extra-Role								.10	.04	.17**			
Step 4: COVID-19													
Loss of Work (Yes)											.51	1.97	.03
(No)											-	-	-
Remote Work (Yes)											-	-	-
(No)											-.71	.77	-.06
(Both)											.64	2.07	.02
Employment Impact (Yes)											1.09	.80	.09
(No)											-	-	-
Employment View (Yes)											-	-	-
(No)											.70	.79	.06
Coworker View (Yes)											-	-	-
(No)											-1.19	.87	-.08
R^2				.19**			.30**			.32**			.04
Adjusted R^2				.16**			.24**			.28**			.01
ΔR^2							.11			.02			.04
ΔF							10.21**			7.91**			1.35

Note. *$p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 10

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Predicting Likelihood of Task Effectiveness

Variable	R_s^2	Step 1 b	Step 1 SE	Step 1 β	Step 2 b	Step 2 SE	Step 2 β	Step 3 b	Step 3 SE	Step 3 β	Step 4 b	Step 4 SE	Step 4 β
Step 1: Dispositional													
ECS													
Sad	.16	.01	.18	.01	.06	.18	.03	.06	.17	.03			
Anger	-.01	-.31	.21	-.11*	-.25	.21	-.09*	-.26	.21	-.10*			
Happiness	.70	.33	.21	.12*	.14	.21	.05*	.01	.21	.01			
Love	.45	.21	.15	.09*	.17	.15	.08*	.23	.15	.10*			
Fear	.02	.01	.21	.01	.04	.21	.02	.01	.20	.01			
Personality													
Extraversion	.27	.03	.04	.04*	.02	.04	.03	-.01	.04	-.01			
Agreeableness	.67	.13	.06	.15**	.11	.06	.13**	.08	.06	.09*			
Conscientiousness	.21	.02	.05	.03	.02	.05	.03	.01	.05	.01			
Neuroticism	.23	.05	.05	.07*	.03	.05	.04	.02	.04	.03			
Openness to Experience	.14	.10	.06	.11**	.09	.06	.09**	.07	.06	.08*			
Step 2: Affect													
HAPA enthusiasm	.43				.06	.06	.07*	.03	.07	.04			
HANA anxiety	.26				-.04	.07	-.05	-.03	.07	-.04			
LAPA comfort	.22				.04	.07	.04	.06	.06	.07*			
LANA depression	.78				.25	.09	.22*	.20	.09	.18**			
Step 3: ERP													
Extra-Role								.12	.03	.25**			
Step 4: COVID-19													
Loss of Work													
(Yes)											-1.63	1.59	-.12
(No)											.06	1.50	.01
Remote Work													
(Yes)											-	-	-
(No)											-.76	.62	-.08
(Both)											-.48	1.68	-.02
Employment Impact													
(Yes)											-	-	-
(No)											.39	.65	.04
Employment View													
(Yes)											-	-	-
(No)											-.93	.64	-.10
Coworker View													
(Yes)											-	-	-
(No)											.99	.70	.09
R^2		.14**			.19*			.23**					.04
Adjusted R^2		.11**			.14**			.19**					.02
ΔR^2					.05			.04					.04
ΔF					3.86**			14.34**					1.62

Note. *p < .05. ** p < .01.

44

Hypothesis 3. Extra-Role Performance

It was hypothesized that ERPs play a significant role in an employee's AC and TE. Results from the AC regression model demonstrated that the ERP predictor in Step 3 accounted for significant variation. The change in R^2 from Step 2 to Step 3 was .02, reflecting a significant increase in explained variation in AC, $F(1, 260) = 7.90$, $p < .001$.

Significant predictors of AC were sad ECS ($\beta = .20$, $p < .01$), happiness ECS ($\beta = -.07$, $p < .05$), fear ECS ($\beta = .06$, $p < .05$), Extraversion ($\beta = .08$, $p < .05$), Agreeableness ($\beta = .16$, $p < .01$), Conscientiousness ($\beta = -.11$, $p < .01$), Neuroticism ($\beta = .07$, $p < .05$), HAPA enthusiasm ($\beta = .22$, $p < .01$), LANA depression ($\beta = .17$, $p < .01$), and Extra-Role ($\beta = .17$, $p < .01$).

In the TE regression model, the change in R^2 from Step 2 to Step 3 was .04, reflecting a significant increase in explained variation, $F(1, 260) = 14.34$, $p < .001$. In the final step in the TE regression model anger ECS ($\beta = -.10$, $p < .05$), love ECS ($\beta = .10$, $p < .05$), Agreeableness ($\beta = .09$, $p < .05$), Openness to Experience ($\beta = .08$, $p < .05$), LAPA comfort ($\beta = .07$, $p < .05$), LANA depression ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$), and Extra-Role ($\beta = .25$, $p < .01$) were statistically significant predictors.

Step 4 Impact of COVID-19

As the global pandemic, COVID-19 began immediately preceding the onset of the study COVID-19 related questions, which were used to provide context to the results. Summary statistics are presented in the following tables: Table 3, Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6. To determine if job context changes or perspective changes due to COVID-19

explained additional AC or TE variance in the current study, a fourth step was added to the regression model, in which each of the five questions was entered. Adding the fourth step was not significant and did not yield any additional variance to either regression model of AC, $F(10, 264) = 1.58$, $p < .113$, or TE, $F(10, 264) = 1.32$, $p < .219$.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study sought to fill a gap in the literature by examining dispositional factors, affect factors, and ERP in the prediction of perceived TE and AC. This broader approach provides unique insight into what employees and supervisors perceive to impact how committed they are to their employment and how effective they are in their job. All three hypotheses tested were supported.

Dispositional Factors and Emotional Contagion Susceptibility

As hypothesized, ECS and personality characteristics significantly predicted variance in AC and TE. Specifically, all Big 5 personality traits other than Openness to Experience and susceptibility to anger, sadness, and happiness predicted how emotionally connected one feels to their employment. How effective one felt on job-related tasks was predicted by how susceptible one was to others' displays of anger, happiness, and love as well as all Big 5 personality variables other than Conscientiousness. As previous research has emphasized that personality influences the impact of task performance and effectiveness when procedural knowledge and skills are involved (Johnson, 2003), it is interesting that conscientiousness, the notion of being responsible and goal-oriented, did not significantly predict, while other personality variables did predict, how effective one felt at their job. This may be due to multiple predictors in the first step or the range of

47

occupations represented in the current study. In particular, it may be important to consider how ECS may relate to personality. For example, neuroticism is associated with increased negative affect, which in this study predicted increased ACand perceived effectiveness. As susceptibility to anger (for both TE and AC) and sadness (for AC only) were predictive, future research should consider if susceptibility to other emotions may heighten job experiences for those who score higher in neuroticism. Similarly, extraversion is generally associated with positive affect and predicted increased emotional commitment and TE. Therefore, it may be important to consider if ECS differentially impacts the workplace experiences of those who are extraverted.

This study supported the role of EC on how emotionally connected one feels to their work and how effective they feel. In particular, being susceptible to other's expression of anger predicted AC and also TE, which is consistent with previous studies that have found it to be predictive of previous cognitive failures (Petitta et al., 2019), incorrect task performance (Petitta & Naughton, 2015), and a team's affective tone (Kelly & Barsade, 2001), As negative affect is perceived automatically, even during high load conditions (Kelly et al., 2016), it is important to continue to explore how an individual's susceptibility to negative affect in the workplace may interact with personality as well as other social and cognitive factors to impact performance and commitment to the workplace. It is noteworthy that susceptibility to the display of positive affect was found to be associated with both AC and TE. Previous research has primarily highlighted the importance of positive affect in leadership effectiveness (Visser et al., 2013). As

employees perceive happiness in leaders differently dependent on their own level of power (Bourdage et al., 2008), future research may need to consider the source of EC for positive affect. It should consider the position and relative power of the individual in future studies. The finding that dispositional factors such as personality and ECS impact one's experience of one's work emphasizes the need to consider individual characteristics of employees and supervisors in the design of any workplace programs and the need to implement a multipronged approach in order to meet the unique needs.

Affect Factors

After controlling for the dispositional factors (personality and ECS), the inclusion of the affect one has experienced at work significantly contributed to the prediction of both perceived commitment and effectiveness. The EC of sadness and fear, all personality variables other than Openness to Experience, and the experience of enthusiasm and depression at work predicted emotional commitment to one's job. This suggests that once emotion within the workplace is considered, it is the EC of negative emotions as opposed to positive emotions that impact commitment to one's employment. This finding expands previous research (Prochazkova & Kret, 2017), which found that employees unintentionally mimic the supervisor's affective state. Simultaneously, supervisors interpret the employees' nonverbal feedback, which influences their own emotional state and subsequent affective display (Bono et al., 2007; Wu & Hu, 2009).

Therefore, AC is predicted by one's personality and ECS and one's experience of both positive and negative emotions within the workplace.

The level at which one feels effective in performing job tasks was predicted by the level of depression and enthusiasm one experiences in one's employment. In the findings from previous studies, negative nonverbal expressions predict the decrease of employees' productivity (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002); however, affective displays do not necessarily provide an accurate understanding of one's emotional state (Johnson, 2008). The finding that one's self-reported high arousal level, positive and negative emotions, predict how effective one feels they perform tasks expands on previous work. Interestingly, at this step, it was only self-reported emotions that predicted effectiveness. This suggests that managers should implement a consistent approach to triggers of emotional stimuli in the workplace and consider seeking feedback about employees' emotion in order to positively impact the workplace enviroment.

Extra Role Performance in Relation to AC and TE

As hypothesized, the performance of tasks beyond one's job responsibilities predicted both how committed one is and effective one believes one is even after controlling for dispositional factors and emotions experienced at work. As found in previous work (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Hoption et al., 2012; Johnson, 2009; Mañas et al., 2018; Yun et al., 2007), engagement in extra tasks predicted increased commitment and increased TE. While extra role performance has previously been found to be dependent

on personality (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Bowling, 2010; Ilies et al., 2006) and affect (Hugten, 2017; Ilies et al., 2006; Visser et al., 2013; Yun et al., 2007), extra role performance predicted workplace outcomes even after these were controlled. This suggests the need to carefully consider how and when engagement in extra tasks heightens employee success and when it may produce the opposite outcome. One possibility may be employees' motivation to engage in the extra role behaviors or related tasks.

Presumably, performance evaluations are dependent on in-role and not extra-role behaviors (Welbourne et al., 1998); however, the impact these additional tasks have on commitment and perceived accuracy suggest that they can also impact evaluation when the person engages in these due to positive affect and commitment to their workplace. However, if a person takes on additional roles due to vague job descriptions or fear (Mañas et al., 2018; Yun et al., 2007), these behaviors may indicate an underlying problem that may lead to ERPs have on job roles encourages the vast contribution extra-role behaviors by proposing clearly define job positions. If these extra behaviors are not noticed, emotional exhaustion can occur (Dishon-Berkovits, 2017), leading to less connectivity to work and more mistakes. As mistakes increase, employees adjust their beliefs or behaviors to increase their sense of worth, which may lead employees to feel negative towards the employer in order to protect their self-image (Dishon-Berkovits, 2017).

Of note, commitment to one's work was predicted by ECS (sad, happy and fear ECS), personality factors (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism), affect at work (high arousal positive affect and low arousal negative affect) and engagement in additional tasks significantly predicted commitment to one's job. Therefore, the inclusion of all three types of predictors explained more variance and reinforced the need to consider an approach that reflects the complexity of one's connectivity to work. Only addressing a single aspect of the workplace and the individuals within it would not fully capture the complexity and thus programs designed to increase AC and TE must consider multiple factors.

Interestingly, one's perceived effectiveness also was predicted by ECS (anger and love ECS), personality factors (Agreeableness and Openness to Experience), affect at work (low arousal positive affect and low arousal negative affect), and engagement in additional tasks. However, the specific variables that predicted how effective one believes one vary from those predicting how connected one is to their workplace. This is expected as AC emphasizes emotional connectivity, and TE reflects cognitive and behavioral performance. The current study expands previous research (Hoption et al., 2012; Ilies et al., 2006; Johnson, 2003; Johnson, 2009; Mañas et al., 2018; Parayitam & Guru-Gharana, 2010; Yun et al., 2007) by demonstrating in a single study the importance of personality of the employee, the affect experienced at work, and performance of additional tasks in understanding what makes employees committed to their work and feel that they are effective in what they do.

Impact of COVID-19

In order to determine if experiencing changes in employment or perception of one's employment and colleagues due to COVID-19, an additional step was added. However, adding COVID-19 did not explain any additional variance. It is important to note that the study was conducted within the first 4 months of COVID-19 impacting the United States. As the pandemic continues, the impact on employment has altered and changes that occurred over time may not have been captured. It is difficult to know if the relatively early stage of the assessment contributed to the lack of additional impact or if the other emotional and EC variables accounted for any possible changes due to o COVID-19. Therefore, it is recommended that workplace programs consider how to address the emotional aspects of COVID as well as increased home responsibilities especially for female employees and supervisors who have been disproportionally impacted by the stay-at-home orders and increased caregiving responsibilities (Russell et al., 2020; Stokes & Patterson, 2020).

Implications

Beyond the implications already discussed, the current research clearly indicates that organizations must consider the work environment's emotional context and the tasks available to participate in, and their employees' individual characteristics. A single approach to increasing effectiveness and AC will not be effective for all employees. The need to address negative emotion in the work environment not only for the individual but

also for those who show high EC to negative emotion was supported by the current study as well as others (Kelly et al., 2016; Lewis, 2000; Mañas et al., 2018; Petitta et al., 2019).

Foremost, organizations need to acknowledge negativity in the environment and its negative impact on other employees and work effectiveness. By not ignoring these negative emotions and focusing on allowing employees to improve their psychological well-being (Lee et al., 2015), organizations can increase the positive outcomes of groups of employees through emotional contagion and affective influences on the commitment to work and productivity. These positive outcomes can then lead to increased positive affect, which benefits future commitment and performance. As employees with related emotions often interact and evaluate their environment, their emotions will align, causing their affective states to last longer (Nery et al., 2019).

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

As with all studies, the present study is subject to limitations. While the sample size, $N = 276$, is reasonable, a more robust sample may have provided additional insights and allowed a modeling approach. In addition, the findings may have been impacted by the types of jobs represented. Although an effort was made to recruit from many sites, those in education participated at higher levels. In addition, individuals' responses to the study's items may be influenced by group interactions, work responsibilities, and daily activities. However, there was no question solely asking if they are involved with working in a group. Future research should consider focusing on particular types of

54

positions and industries as well as types of coworker interactions to allow more clear implications to be developed. As the current study relied on self-report data from a convenience sample, it was subject to self-selection biases and social desirability. Future research should consider experimental approaches within a work setting to allow greater external validity.

Additionally, the current study provided important information about shifting perspectives during a global pandemic. As the majority of participants had their work impacted by COVID-19, it is interesting that approximately 45% indicated that COVID-19 impacted their employment view, and 25% reported their view of their coworkers as impacted. Therefore, the true impact of COVID-19 may not be fully present in the current study as risk and productivity, and the amount of interaction with other employees was in initial highly fluid stages. Future research should consider how major events may impact employee connectivity and effectiveness.

Future research should consider job or role ambiguity due to its impact on extra role performance and affect. When uncertainty levels are high in the work environment, team members' emotions will transfer to colleagues (Volmer, 2012). Evidence indicates that role ambiguity contributes to ERPs by allowing the behaviors to interfere with specified job duties (Mañas et al., 2018). Inclusion of the role of ambiguity may further clarify what is important to employee success. Employers should identify positions that require additional roles or responsibilities that impact employees' affective states and thus EC.

Conclusion

This research focused on the predictive ability of personality, susceptibility to others' emotions, affect, and engagement in tasks not required by one's job. The current research adds to the literature by demonstrating the impact of all these factors on the commitment to one's job and perceived effectiveness in one's job which employers would want to maximize. These finding support the need to consider personality, emotional processing and expression and willingness to engage in extra role performance both in the hiring of new employees and in trying to maximize workplace effectiveness. These factors may even transcend at least the early stages of major contextual changes such as COVID. Therefore, employers should critically consider the impact of supervisor and employee emotional experiences and expression as well as how to utilize extra role tasks effectively to maximize positive emotion rather than negative affect. By integrating psychological factors in the hiring and design of the workplace, employers will be able to retain positive employees commited to their work and completing it effectively.

REFERENCES

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *63*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *49*(3), 252–276. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0043

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Humphrey, R. H. (2011). Current emotion research in organizational behavior. *Emotion Review*, *3*(2), 214–224. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073910391684

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *9*(1&2), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00160

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Li, N. (2013). The theory of purposeful work behavior: The role of personality, higher-order goals, and job characteristics. *Academy of Management Review*, *38*(1), 132–153. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2010.0479

Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job

    performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales

    representatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(1), 43–51.

    https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.43

Barrett, Lisa & Mesquita, Batja & Ochsner, Kevin & Gross, James. (2007). The

    experience of emotion. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *58*(1), 373–403.

    https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085709

Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group

    behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *47*(4), 644.

    https://doi.org/10.2307/3094912

Berntson, G. G., Boysen, S. T., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1993). Neurobehavioral organization

    and the cardinal principle of evaluative bivalence. *Annals of the New York*

    Academy of Sciences, *702*(1 Brain Mechani), 75–102.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1993.tb17243.x

Bhullar, N. (2012). Relationship between mood and susceptibility to emotional

    contagion: Is positive mood more contagious. *North American Journal of*

    Psychology, *14*(3), 517–530.

Boiger, M., & Mesquita, B. (2012). The construction of emotion in interactions,

    relationships, and cultures. *Emotion Review*, *4*(3), 221–229.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073912439765

Bono, J. E., Foldes, H. J., Vinson, G., & Muros, J. P. (2007). Workplace emotions: The role of supervision and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(5), 1357–1367. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1357

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco.

Bourdage, J., Lee, K., & Ashton, M. (2008). Personality correlates of impression management tactic use. *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. https://doi.org/10.1037/e518442013-749

Bowling, N. A. (2010). Effects of job satisfaction and conscientiousness on extra-role behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *25*(1), 119–130. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9134-0

Bowling, N. A., & Eschleman, K. J. (2010). Employee personality as a moderator of the relationships between work stressors and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *15*(1), 91–103. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017326

Cable, D. M., & Derue, D. S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(5), 875–884. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.5.875

Cacioppo, J. T., Klein, D. J., Berntson, G. G., & Hatfield, E. (1993). *The psychophysiology of emotion.* In M. Lewis & J. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions.* The Guilford Press.

Cheng, Y.-N., Yen, C.-L., & Chen, L. H. (2012). Transformational leadership and job involvement: The moderation of emotional contagion. *Military Psychology*, *24*(4), 382–396. https://doi.org/10.1080/08995605.2012.695261

Costa, P. T., & Mccrae, R. R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*(4), 668–678. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.4.668

Creaven, A.-M., Skowron, E. A., Hughes, B. M., Howard, S., & Loken, E. (2013). Dyadic concordance in mother and preschooler resting cardiovascular function varies by risk status. *Developmental Psychobiology*, *56*(1), 142–152. https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.21098

Czarna, A. Z., Wróbel, M., Dufner, M., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2015). Narcissism and emotional contagion. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *6*(3), 318–324. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550614559652

Dasborough, M. T., Ashkanasy, N. M., Tee, E. Y., & Tse, H. H. (2009). What goes around comes around: How meso-level negative emotional contagion can ultimately determine organizational attitudes toward leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(4), 571–585. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.04.009

Deng, X., An, S., & Cheng, C. (2019). Cultural differences in implicit and explicit

    attitudes toward emotion regulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *149*,

    220–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.05.057

Deutsch, F., & Madle, R. A. (1975). Empathy: Historic and current conceptualizations,

    measurement, and a cognitive theoretical perspective. *Human Development*,

    18(4), 267–287. https://doi.org/10.1159/000271488

Dishon-Berkovits, M. (2017). The role of organizational justice and stress in predicting

    job burnout. *Journal of Career Development*, *45*(5), 411–424.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845317705469

Doherty, R. W. (1997). The emotional contagion scale: A measure of individual

    differences. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *21*(2), 131–154.

    https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1024956003661

Doherty, R. W., Orimoto, L., Singelis, T. M., Hatfield, E., & Hebb, J. (1995). Emotional

    contagion, gender, and occupational differences. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*,

    19(3), 355–371. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1995.tb00080.x

Donhauser, P. W., Rösch, A. G., & Schultheiss, O. C. (2015). The implicit need for

    power predicts recognition speed for dynamic changes in facial expressions of

    emotion. *Motivation and Emotion*, *39*(5), 714–721.

    https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-015-9484-z

Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2002). Predicting workplace outcomes from the ability

    to eavesdrop on feelings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(5), 963–971.

    https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.5.963

Fawcett, C., Wesevich, V., & Gredebäck, G. (2016). Pupillary contagion in infancy.

    Psychological Science, *27*(7), 997–1003.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616643924

Fisher, C. D., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2000). The emerging role of emotions in work life:

    An introduction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(2), 123–129.

    https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(200003)21:23.0.co;2-8

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure.

    Psychological Assessment, *4*(1), 26–42. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.26

Harrison, D. A., Newman, D. A., & Roth, P. L. (2006). How important are job attitudes?

    Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time

    sequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(2), 305–325.

    https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.20786077

Hatfield, E., Bensman, L., Thornton, P. D., & Rapson, R. L. (2014). New perspectives on

    emotional contagion: A review of classic and recent research on facial mimicry

    and contagion. *Interpersonal: An International Journal on Personal*

    Relationships, *8*(2), 159–179. https://doi.org/10.5964/ijpr.v8i2.162

Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. L. (1994). *Emotional contagion: Studies in*

    emotion and social interaction. Cambridge University Press.

Hess, U., & Fischer, A. (2013). Emotional mimicry as social regulation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *17*(2), 142–157. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868312472607

Hoption, C., Christie, A., & Barling, J. (2012). Submitting to the follower label. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie*, *220*(4), 221–230. https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000116

Hu, X., & Kaplan, S. (2014). Is "feeling good" good enough? Differentiating discrete positive emotions at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*(1), 39–58. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1941

Hugten, B. V. (2017). *Strengths use and extra-role performance: The mediating role of active and passive forms of well-being and the moderating role of self-efficacy* (Master's thesis, Tilburg University]. TU Campus Repository. http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=143206

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. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.21794672

Ilies, R., Wagner, D. T., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Explaining affective linkages in teams: Individual differences in susceptibility to contagion and individualism collectivism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(4), 1140–1148. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1140

Johnson, J. (2003). Chapter 4: Toward a better understanding of the relationship between personality and individual job performance. In *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations* (pp. 83–119). Jossey-Bass.

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.12.001

Johnson, S. K. (2009). Do you feel what I feel? Mood contagion and leadership outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(5), 814–827. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.06.012

Johnson, S. K., Bettenhausen, K., & Gibbons, E. (2009). Realities of working in virtual teams: Affective and attitudinal outcomes of using computer-mediated communication. *Small Group Research*, *40*(6), 623–649. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496409346448

Kelly, J. R., & Barsade, S. G. (2001). Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *86*(1), 99–130. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2974

Kelly, J. R., Iannone, N. E., & Mccarty, M. K. (2016). Emotional contagion of anger is automatic: An evolutionary explanation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *55*(1), 182–191. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12134

Kimura, M., Daibo, I., & Yogo, M. (2008). The study of emotional contagion from the

    perspective of interpersonal relationships. *Social Behavior and Personality: An*

    International Journal, *36*(1), 27–42. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2008.36.1.27

Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Vet, H. C. W. D., & Beek, A. J. V.

    D. (2014). Construct validity of the individual work performance questionnaire.

    Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, *56*(3), 331–337.

    https://doi.org/10.1097/jom.0000000000000113

Kret, M. E., & Dreu, C. K. W. D. (2017). Pupil-mimicry conditions trust in partners:

    Moderation by oxytocin and group membership. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*

    B: Biological Sciences, *284*(1850), 20162554.

    https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.2554

Larsen, R. J., & Ketelaar, T. (1991). Personality and susceptibility to positive and

    negative emotional states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*(1),

    132–140. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.1.132

Lee, E.-S., Park, T.-Y., & Koo, B. (2015). Identifying organizational identification as a

    basis for attitudes and behaviors: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*,

    141(5), 1049–1080. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000012

Lewis, K. M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative

    emotional expressions of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational*

    Behavior, *21*(2), 221–234. https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-

    1379(200003)21:23.0.co;2-0

Lucas, R. E., & Fujita, F. (2000). Factors influencing the relation between extraversion and pleasant affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(6), 1039–1056. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.6.1039

Lucas, R. E., Diener, E., Grob, A., Suh, E. M., & Shao, L. (2000). Cross-cultural evidence for the fundamental features of extraversion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(3), 452–468. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.3.452

Lundqvist, L.-O. (2008). The relationship between the biosocial model of personality and susceptibility to emotional contagion: A structural equation modeling approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *45*(1), 89–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.03.003

Lundqvist, L.-O., & Kevrekidis, P. (2008). Factor structure of the greek version of the emotional contagion scale and its measurement invariance across gender and cultural groups. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *29*(3), 121–129. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001.29.3.121

Madrid, H. P., & Patterson, M. G. (2014). Measuring affect at work based on the valence and arousal circumplex model. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, *17*. https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2014.54

Mallory, D. B., & Rupp, D. E. (2015). Focusing in on the emotion laborer: Emotion regulation at work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 211–236.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*(2), 224–253. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.98.2.224

Mañas, M. A., Díaz-Fúnez, P., Pecino, V., López-Liria, R., Padilla, D., & Aguilar-Parra, J. M. (2018). Consequences of team job demands: Role ambiguity climate, affective engagement, and extra-role performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02292

Mesquita, B., Frijda, N. H., & Scherer, K. R. (1997). *Culture and emotion.* In J. W. Berry, P. R. Dasen, & T. S. Saraswathi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology. Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Basic processes and human development* (p. 255–297). Allyn & Bacon.

Nakahashi, W., & Ohtsuki, H. (2015). When is emotional contagion adaptive? *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *380*, 480–488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2015.06.014

Nery, V. D. F., Franco, K. S., & Neiva, E. R. (2019). Attributes of the organizational change and its influence on attitudes toward organizational change and well-being at work: A longitudinal study. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *55*(4), 477–496. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886319848125

Parayitam, S., & Guru-Gharana, K. K. (2010). The relationship between organizational performance and performance ratings of in-role and extra-role behaviors. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, *10*(1).

Petitta, L., & Naughton, S. (2015). Mapping the association of emotional contagion to

    leaders, colleagues, and clients: Implications for leadership. *Organization*

    Management Journal, *12*(3), 178–192.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/15416518.2015.1073577

Petitta, L., Probst, T. M., Ghezzi, V., & Barbaranelli, C. (2019). Cognitive failures in

    response to emotional contagion: Their effects on workplace accidents. *Accident*

    Analysis & Prevention, *125*, 165–173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2019.01.018

Prochazkova, E., & Kret, M. E. (2017). Connecting minds and sharing emotions through

    mimicry: A neurocognitive model of emotional contagion. *Neuroscience &*

    Biobehavioral Reviews, *80*, 99–114.

    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.05.013

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the

    literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(4), 698–714.

    https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698

Russell, B. S., Hutchison, M., Tambling, R., Tomkunas, A. J., & Horton, A. L. (2020).

    Initial challenges of caregiving during COVID-19: Caregiver burden, mental

    health, and the parent–child relationship. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*,

    51(5), 671–682. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-020-01037-x

Ryan, A., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2003). Chapter 10: Focusing on personality in person-

    organization fit research. In *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of*

    personality in organizations (pp. 263–288). Jossey-Bass.

Saxbe, D. E., Margolin, G., Shapiro, L. S., Ramos, M., Rodriguez, A., & Iturralde, E. (2014). Relative influences: Patterns of HPA axis concordance during triadic family interaction. *Health Psychology*, *33*(3), 273–281. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033509

Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A., & Fox, S. (2010). Measurement artifacts in the assessment of counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: Do we know what we think we know? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(4), 781–790. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019477

Stokes, J. E., & Patterson, S. E. (2020). Intergenerational relationships, family caregiving policy, and COVID-19 in the United States. *Journal of Aging & Social Policy*, *32*(4-5), 416–424. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959420.2020.1770031

Sy, T., Côté, S., & Saavedra, R. (2005). The contagious leader: Impact of the leader's mood on the mood of group members, group affective tone, and group processes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(2), 295–305. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.295

Visser, V. A., Knippenberg, D. V., Kleef, G. A. V., & Wisse, B. (2013). How leader displays of happiness and sadness influence follower performance: Emotional contagion and creative versus analytical performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *24*(1), 172–188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.003

Volmer, J. (2012). Catching leaders' mood: Contagion effects in teams. *Administrative Sciences*, *2*(3), 203–220. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci2030203

Warr, P., Bindl, U. K., Parker, S. K., & Inceoglu, I. (2013). Four-quadrant investigation of job-related affects and behaviours. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *23*(3), 342–363. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2012.744449

Welbourne, T. M., Johnson, D. E., & Erez, A. (1998). The role-based performance scale: validity analysis of a theory-based measure. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*(5), 540–555. https://doi.org/10.5465/256941

Wu, T.-Y., & Hu, C. (2009). Abusive supervision and employee emotional exhaustion. *Group & Organization Management*, *34*(2), 143–169. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601108331217

Yun, S., Takeuchi, R., & Liu, W. (2007). Employee self-enhancement motives and job performance behaviors: Investigating the moderating effects of employee role ambiguity and managerial perceptions of employee commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(3), 745–756. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.745

APPENDIX A

Recruitment Script

Recruitment Script for Social Media

   Hello, my name is Kortney. I am a graduate student at Texas Woman's University in the Psychology Department. I am conducting a research study examining an employee's experiences, and I am inviting you to participate in the study. You must be employed a minimum of 18 hours or up to participate.

Participation in this research includes answering questions about your work attitudes, personality, and emotions. You may stop answering questions at any time.

If you would like to participate, please click the following link:___

If you have any questions, please contact me at KKosak@twu.edu or my advisor, Shannon Scott, PhD., at SScott@twu.edu or 940-898-3326.

Kortney Kosak

Texas Woman's University

Graduate student, Master's in Psychological Science

APPENDIX B

Recruitment for SONA

Study Name: Employee's experiences of work: Emotional, Cognitive, Social and Personality Factors

Brief Abstract: Participation in this study will take approximately 30 minutes and asks you to answer questions about your work attitudes, personality, and emotions. You may stop answering questions at any time. If you have any questions, please contact me at kkosak@twu.edu or my advisor, Shannon Scott, Ph.D., at SScott@twu.edu or 940-898-3326.

Eligibility: Must be currently employed for a minimum of 18 hours a week.

APPENDIX C

Demographic Survey

Gender:

__ Male   __ Female

__ Transgender   __ Self-Identity

__ Prefer not to respond

Race and Ethnicity:

___ Black/African-American/African/Caribbean

___Latin(o/a/x)/Hispanic/Hispanic-American

___Native-American/Pacific Islander/Indigenous Person

___Asian/Asian-American/Arab/Arab-American

___White/European American

___ Self-Identify

Employment Status:

On average, how many hours do you work per week? __

What type of industry do you work in? __

What is your role? __ Management __ Supervisee __ Both

How long have you worked at this workplace: _____ years _____ months

College Student Status:

__ Full-time __ Part-time __ N/A

Caregiver Status:

__ Parent of a child younger than 18 years of age

     If so, how many? __ and the ages __

If no, over 18 years of age, how many? __

__ Caregiving for any of the following

Child under 18 years of age __

Adult __

Are you working remotely due to COVID-19?

Yes or No

Did you lose employment due to COVID-19?

Yes or No

Has COVID-19 impacted your employment?

Yes or No

If yes, explain how.

Has COVID-19 impacted your view of your employment?

Yes or No

If yes, explain how.

Has COVID-19 impacted your view of coworkers?

Yes or No

If yes, explain how.

Open-ended:

How would you describe your workplace to a close friend?

APPENDIX D

Individual Workplace Performance Multi-Affect Indicator (IWP-MAI)

Instructions: For the past week, please indicate below approximately how often you have felt the following while you were working in your job.

	I have felt:	Approximate amount of your time when at work in the past week						
		Never	**A little of the time**	**Some of the time**	**About half the time**	**Much of the time**	**A lot of the time**	**Always**
		0% of the time	1% to roughly 20%	Roughly 21% to 40%	Roughly 41% to 60%	Roughly 61% to 80%	Roughly 81% to 99%	100% of the time
1	Enthusiastic							
2	Nervous							
3	Calm							
4	Depressed							
5	Joyful							
6	Anxious							
7	Relaxed							
8	Dejected							
9	Inspired							
10	Tense							
11	Laid-back							

12	Despondent						
13	Excited						
14	Worried						
15	At ease						
16	Hopeless						
17	Guilt						
18	Shame						
19	Disgust						

APPENDIX E

The Emotional Contagion Scale

Instructions: Please report responses for 1 (Never), 2 (Rarely), 3 (Often), and 4 (Always)

1. If someone I'm talking with begins to cry, I get tear-eyed.

2. Being with a happy person picks me up when I'm feeling down.

3. When someone smiles warmly at me, I smile back and feel warm inside.

4. I get filled with sorrow when people talk about the death of their loved ones.

5. I clench my jaws, and my shoulders get tight when I see the angry faces on the news.

6. When I look into the eyes of the one I love, my mind is filled with thoughts of romance.

7. It irritates me to be around angry people.

8. Watching the fearful faces of victims on the news makes me try to imagine how they might be feeling.

9. I melt when the one I love holds me close.

10. I tense when overhearing an angry quarrel.

11. Being around happy people fills my mind with happy thoughts.

12. I sense my body responding when the one I love touches me.

13. I notice myself getting tense when I'm around people who are stressed out.

14. I cry at sad movies.

15. Listening to the shrill screams of a terrified child in a dentist's waiting room makes me feel nervous.

APPENDIX F

Affective Commitment Scale (ACS)

Instructions: Please answer the following questions in terms of the group that you are focusing on. Indicate the extent to which you agree, ranging from (strongly disagree) to (strongly agree) with the following statements using the scale below.

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this workgroup

2. I enjoy discussing my workgroup with people outside it

3. I do not feel like "part of the family" with my workgroup (R)

4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this workgroup (R)

5. This workgroup has a great deal of personal meaning for me

6. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my workgroup (R)

7. I really feel as if this work group's problems are my own

8. I think that I could easily become as attached to another workgroup as I am to this one

APPENDIX G

IWPQ Work Performance (IWPQ)

Instructions: Please report responses for 1 (Never), 2 (Rarely), 3 (Often), and 4 (Always)

Task performance (TP) scale (In-role)

In the past 3 months…

1. I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time.

2. My planning was optimal.

3. I kept in mind the results that I had to achieve in my work.

4. I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work.

5. I was able to perform my work well with minimal time and effort.

Contextual performance (CP) scale (Extra-role)

In the past 3 months…

1. I took on extra responsibilities.

2. I started new tasks myself, when my old ones were finished.

3. I took on challenging work tasks, when available.

4. I worked at keeping my job knowledge up-to-date.

5. I worked at keeping my job skills up-to-date.

6. I came up with creative solutions to new problems.

7. I kept looking for new challenges in my job

8. I actively participated in work meetings.

APPENDIX H

10-Item Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C)

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree, ranging from (strongly disagree) to (strongly agree) with the following statements using the scale below.

How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?
1. Took time to advise, coach, or mentor a coworker.
2. Helped coworker learn new skills or shared job knowledge.
3. Helped new employees get oriented to the job.
4. Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a work problem.
5. Offered suggestions to improve how work is done.
6. Helped a coworker who had too much to do.
7. Volunteered for extra work assignments.
8. Worked weekends or other days off to complete a project or task.
9. Volunteered to attend meetings or work on committees on own time.
10. Gave up meal and other breaks to complete work.

APPENDIX I

Workplace Effectiveness Scale (WES)

Instructions: Thinking of the team or group at work that you most often work with, to what extent do you agree to range from (strongly disagree) to (strongly agree) with the following statements about this group.

Non-Task Effectiveness

1. I am satisfied with my experience as a group member

2. I feel positive about my experience working with this group

3. I would be would be willing to work on a similar group in the future

4. My group's overall performance meets my expectations

Task Effectiveness

1. My group produces high-quality work outcomes

2. My group regularly meets its deadlines

3. My group regularly meets its performance goals

4. This group is very productive

5. This group performs better than other groups in the company

6. This group performs better than other groups I have worked with

APPENDIX J

Big Five-Personality Test (B5PT)

Instructions: Please answer the following questions the extent to which you agree with ranging from (1) disagree, (2) slightly disagree, (3) neutral, (4) slightly agree, and (5) agree with the following statements using the scale below

Rating	I....	Rating	I.....
	1. Am the life of the party.		26. Have little to say.
	2. Feel little concern for others.		27. Have a soft heart.
	3. Am always prepared.		28. Often forget to put things back in their proper place.
	4. Get stressed out easily.		29. Get upset easily.
	5. Have a rich vocabulary.		30. Do not have a good imagination.
	6. Don't talk a lot.		31. Talk to a lot of different people at parties.
	7. Am interested in people.		32. Am not really interested in others.
	8. Leave my belongings around.		33. Like order.
	9. Am relaxed most of the time.		34. Change my mood a lot.
	10. Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.		35. Am quick to understand things.
	11. Feel comfortable around people.		36. Don't like to draw attention to myself.
	12. Insult people.		37. Take time out for others.
	13. Pay attention to details.		38. Shirk my duties.
	14. Worry about things.		39. Have frequent mood swings.
	15. Have a vivid imagination.		40. Use difficult words.
	16. Keep in the background.		41. Don't mind being the center of attention.
	17. Sympathize with others' feelings.		42. Feel others' emotions.
	18. Make a mess of things.		43. Follow a schedule.
	19. Seldom feel blue.		44. Get irritated easily.
	20. Am not interested in abstract ideas.		45. Spend time reflecting on things.
	21. Start conversations.		46. Am quiet around strangers.

	22. Am not interested in other people's problems.		47. Make people feel at ease.
	23. Get chores done right away.		48. Am exacting in my work.
	24. Am easily disturbed.		49. Often feel blue.
	25. Have excellent ideas.		50. Am full of ideas.