INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT CALCUTTA

WORKING PAPER SERIES

WPS No. 651/ March 2010

Being Positive and Behaving Positively

by

Abhishek Goel

Assistant Professor, Indian Institute of Management Calcutta, Joka, Kolkata 700104

BEING POSITIVE AND BEHAVING POSITIVELY

Abhishek Goel

Faculty, Behavioral Sciences Group

Indian Institute of Management Calcutta

agoel@iimcal.ac.in

Correspondence may be addressed to:

Abhishek Goel
E-203, NTB, Indian Institute of Management Calcutta
DH Road, Joka, Kolkata – 700104 INDIA
Ph: +91-33-24678300 to 04 (Ext: 523)
agoel@iimcal.ac.in

Being Positive and Behaving Positively
ABSTRACT

It has been proposed that some organizationally relevant positive psychology constructs would be able to explain positive outcomes for organizations. This study tested the presence and extent of relationship between an individual's six positive characteristics, his/her superior's perception of these characteristics, and his/her engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB). Results showed small but significant positive relationship between self report of hope, resilience, SWB and overall OCB report of the superior. But the relationship between positive perception of characteristics of an individual and his or her OCB were strongly positive. Implications for theory, measurement of behaviors, and practice have emerged.

KEYWORDS: Positive characteristics; Organizational citizenship behaviors; Hope, Optimism, Resilience, Subjective well-being, Generalized self-efficacy, Job satisfaction, India

Being Positive and Behaving Positively

Positive psychology (PP) proposes that a positive approach be taken towards studying people (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), organizations (Cameron, Dutton, Quinn, 2003) and their combinations (Luthans, 2005). Often an implicit assumption of a relationship between positive characteristics and positive outcomes is made (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007; Luthans & Youssef, 2007; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). However, the exact nature of relationship between positive characteristics and attitudes and behaviors of organizational importance is yet to be established. This study tries to bridge this gap.

From organizational viewpoint, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) represent a set of behaviors that have positive outcome for both the person engaging in them and the organization (Vandyne, Cummings, & McLean Parks, 1995). Similarly job satisfaction has been found to have a positive influence on the individual's performance and is one of the most studied attitudes in organizational context (Judge & Bono, 2001). Despite a lot of research on both antecedents and consequences of OCB and job satisfaction, there is no clarity about their relationships with positive dispositional characteristics (e.g., Luthans et al., 2007). It is proposed here that test of organizationally relevant positive characteristics suggested by Luthans (2005) in relation to OCB and job satisfaction would highlight the utility of studying such constructs and build scientific credence of the claims of positive constructs.

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS

Organ (1977) questioned a simplistic linkage between job satisfaction and subsequent (improved) performance. Drawing from the human relations tradition he argued that better performance of satisfied workers could also be seen as repayment of social debt by employees (Gouldner, 1960) through extra effort or helping behaviors (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ,

1977; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Organ (1988) also argued that organizational citizenship beahviors (OCB) are driven by intrinsic motivation of individuals and they do not seek any gain out of it, defining it as,

"…individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988, p. 4)."

Over the course of two decades OCB has been conceptualized to have seven dimensions (Organ, Podsakoff, & Mackenzie, 2006; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). These dimensions are altruism, sportsmanship, loyalty towards organization, civic virtue, individual initiatives, compliance to organization, and self-development. All dimensions except for self-development and organizational loyalty have been empirically verified and established.

Altruistic behaviors represented helping behaviors like voluntary help directed at people in need. Helping behaviors have been classified into work-related help (Podsakoff et al., 2000), cheerleading, peacemaking and interpersonal help to others. *Sportsmanship* behaviors such as handling minor errands and irritations of the job without whining or complaining, maintaining a positive attitude, taking criticism in stride and not getting offended by it (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The third OCB dimension is *Organizational Loyalty* such as spreading goodwill about the organization; talking up about organization and promoting it (Moorman & Blakely, 1995). This dimension is also theoretically reported to be distinct from other dimensions but its uniqueness has not been empirically demonstrated (Organ et al., 2006). *Civic Virtue* is the fourth OCB dimension referring to employee's commitment to organization and its governance with the overriding concern being of contributing to betterment of the organization (Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004; Organ, 1988, 1990). *Individual Initiatives* or *conscientiousness* behaviors are the

ones that require the individual to go beyond the call of duty and perform voluntary acts of creativity and innovation enthusiastically (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Organ et al. (2006) indicated that such behaviors are very difficult to measure because the differences are in degree of expression and not the form of behavior. *Organizational compliance* represents behaviors that are exhibited for the sake of the system rather than being directed at individuals (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The guiding question for such behaviors is – what a good employee ought to do? The seventh conceptual dimension is *self-development* by an employee to promote own learning and development for benefit of the organization (Katz, 1964; George & Jones, 1997; Organ et al., 2006).

Predictors of OCB

An important line of research is the investigation of antecedent variables that would predict the engagement of employee in OCB. Most studies have focused on studying organizational and situational factors such task characteristics, work environment, organizational characteristics and leadership (e.g., Blakely, Andrews, & Fuller, 2003; Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). The organizational and task related variables have been found to be influenced by positive attitudes of employees such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Job satisfaction has been found to be one of the consistent and important attitudinal antecedents of OCB ($r = .22$ to .28) in a recent meta-analysis (Organ et al., 2006). The influence of attitude on OCB points to the fact that a few dispositions of individuals also have some role to play in deciding how one interprets a situation and decides to engage in OCB (Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Organ, 1990, 1994). Very few dispositional characteristics have been tested for their influence on an individual's engagement in OCB. Some studies have used dispositional characteristics included

in the Big-5 model of personality (McCrae & Costa, 1987) (openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism) to study their relationship with OCB and its dimensions. Agreeableness has been found to be related to courtesy and civic virtue, while conscientiousness has been found to be related to organizational compliance and civic virtue (Konovsky & Organ, 1996). It has been reported that the variance explained by these characteristics was small and non-significant especially when common method variance (CMV) was controlled for (Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Organ et al., 2006). Few studies use other personality characteristics such as dispositional affectivity and service empathy and their influence on OCB (Bettencourt, Gwiner, & Meuter, 2001; George, 1990; George & Brief, 1992). They find that relationship with these characteristics is weakly positive. To conclude on the basis of limited evidence that individual differences are not significant predictors of OCB may be premature for several reasons. The use of Big-5 model of personality itself may be inadequate. The dimensions in this model have been factorially/statistically derived (Costa & McCrae, 1988; McCrae & Costa, 1987). Owing to the statistical analysis' tendency to regress towards mean, some interesting psychological phenomena and thematic details could be missed out (Hogan, 1991). It might indeed be beneficial to look beyond Big-5 characteristics. Trait constellations rather than complete models could be a good starting point for studying the influence of dispositional characteristics on some behaviors of interest (Bettencourt et al., 2001; Borman et al., 2001; Hogan, Hogan, & Bursch, 1984; Organ et al., 2006).

Only two out of the five traits (conscientiousness and agreeableness) are defined and measured in positive terms. Also, these have been found to have a larger and more significant effect on OCB. Thus it could be argued that positive psychology traits may be more likely to

predict who would engage in OCB even when the situation is held constant. The question this study would therefore explore is, would more positive people be likely to do more OCB? and would positive people be also more positive in their attitude?

Some of the organizationally relevant positive characteristics from the pool of positive characteristics that are focused on in positive psychology are subjective well-being, optimism, generalized self-efficacy, hope, emotional intelligence, and resilience (Luthans 2002, 2005). However, emotional intelligence is a multi-dimensional construct and several of the dimensions are not yet accepted within the literature and thus no clear theorization is possible (Bar-On, 2000; Goleman, 1995; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004). This set also comes close to the Psycap set chosen by Luthans et al. (2007). However, there are two reasons for using these individual characteristics rather than Psycap. Firstly, the measures used in studies involving psycap take a swing between disposition and state, thus creating confusion. However, this confusion serves well in calling these constructs "state-like" (Luthans & Avolio, 2007). Secondly, these constructs have been found to be dispositional in nature (*for example*, Judge et al., 1998; Scheier & Carver, 1992; Snyder, 2000) that lie at the core of an individual. Though the argument for a shifting core may sound fascinating to practitioners, still the state like properties are yet to be established in the body of literature.

SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

Subjective well-being (SWB) is an individual's emotional and cognitive interpretation and evaluation of one's own life. The SWB is comprised of satisfaction with own life events from significant others' viewpoint, satisfaction with external but relevant factors like work, family, friends, etc., and presence of feelings of joy along with absence of negative affect (Diener, 1984; Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). It has been found that SWB is largely

determined by dispositional characteristics of a person and is stable over time (Diener, 2000;

DeNeve & Cooper, 1998)

Few studies have looked at SWB in the workplace. A meta-analysis of 34 studies

covering nearly 20,000 data points reported that job-satisfaction and life-satisfaction are

positively related ($r = .44$) (Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989). In an attempt to determine causality

between SWB and job satisfaction, Judge and Hulin (1993) and Judge and Wantanabe (1993)

concluded that SWB could predict job satisfaction five years later. It has also been found to

influence efforts in attaining a set goal (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003).

Relationship between SWB and OCB

SWB of an individual is found related to the satisfaction of an individual with the job,

influence interactions with significant others at work to improve the feeling of togetherness at the

workplace (Schiff & Bargal, 2000). In forced interaction between members of self-help groups,

helping behaviors were reported to be positively related to satisfaction with the group and

subjective well-being of the members of the group. Secondly, SWB and job satisfaction have

been found to be closely related (Judge & Bono, 2001; Tait et al., 1989), and so are job

satisfaction and OCB. Therefore, the conceptual argument of satisfaction leading to OCB

(Organ, 1994; Organ et al., 2006) makes the case for expecting SWB - OCB relationship.

Therefore, it is expected that:

Hypothesis 1. There is a positive relationship between subjective well-being of an

employee and engagement in OCB.

GENERALIZED SELF-EFFICACY

Generalized self-efficacy is understood to be "a belief about oneself in executing some

courses of actions to deal with future situations" (Bandura, 1982:122). It can also be defined as

"individuals' perception of their ability to perform across a variety of different situations"

(Judge, Erez, & Bono, 1998, p. 170). This generalized form is a more stable, trait-like form that

could be viewed as a dispositional characteristic.

As one of the most researched concepts among individual related variables, clear positive

linkages have been found between self-efficacy and other concepts related to organizational

behaviour. In a meta-analysis Stajkovic and Luthans (1998), found significant .38 weighted

average correlation between self efficacy and task performance. Other studies have found it to be

positively related to coping with change for self ($r = .65$, at $p < .01$) and negatively related to

career plateau ($r = -.27$, at $p < .01$) (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Welbourne, 1999). In another

meta-analysis, generalized self efficacy was found to be related to job satisfaction (Judge, Bono,

& Locke, 2000); and predicted tough goal setting, higher commitment, higher performance, and

perseverance to pursue tasks (Erez & Judge, 2001). Yet another meta-analysis by Judge and

Bono (2001) revealed that self-efficacy was correlated with job satisfaction to the extent of $r =$

.45 (N = 12,903; variance explained 9% for the model).

Relationship between GSE and OCB

Given that employees with higher self-efficacy will be confident about completing their

tasks, they are less likely to be bothered by minor irritants and show sportsmanship. Similarly, if

there is a breakdown that an employee can handle on his/her own without asking for additional

help, he/she would do it thereby showing individual initiative (Kumar, 2007; Speier & Frese,

1997). Highly self-efficacious employees are also more likely to help others (Dussault, 2006).

Thus, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 2. There is a positive relationship between an individual's generalized self-

efficacy and engaging in OCB.

OPTIMISM

Optimism is treated as a global expectation that future holds more of good than bad (Scheier & Carver, 1992). Consequently optimists are people who expect good things to happen to them (Carver & Scheier, 2003). They also persevere more in pursuit of their goals. Carver and Scheier (2003) posited that optimism is more than personal control

"…because they [optimists] believe they are immensely talented, because they are hard-working, because they are blessed, because they are lucky, because they have friends in the right places, or any combination of these or other factors that produce good outcomes (Carver & Scheier, 2003, p. 77)."

In longitudinal studies, optimism has been found to impact well being of individuals (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 2001), physical and psychological well being of coronary by-pass patients (e.g., Scheier et al., 1989) and performance of individuals (Aspinwall and Taylor, 1992). Optimists have also been found to treat personal failures as a temporary phenomenon (Carver & Scheier, 2003; Peterson, 2000). In organizational settings, dispositional optimism has been found to influence coping with change situations, better planning and focus on problems (Scheier, Weintraube, & Carver, 1986), performance and stay in the organization (Seligman, 1998). It has been reported to have direct positive implication on leadership (Wunderley, Reddy, & Dember, 1998).

Relationship between Optimism and OCB

In an organization undergoing major organizational changes, employees who were more optimistic were more open to changes and reported higher job satisfaction, less irritability at work, and stayed for longer period with the same organization than their less optimistic counterparts (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Welbourne, 1999). The results could be logically

extended here to argue that optimistic employees showing greater satisfaction (Youssef & Luthans, 2007), less irritability and promise to stay longer are more likely to engage in helpful behaviors towards their colleagues (e.g., Aspinwall & Taylor, 1992), complain less about irritants, maintain a cheerful workplace, participate more in organizational processes/organizational change processes, and happily comply with legitimate demands of the organization. In short, more optimistic employees are more likely to engage in OCB. Also given that optimists stay calm, focused on problem and plan better (Scheier et al., 1986), in times of distress optimists are more likely to persevere towards achieving desired organizational goals. Based on the above possibilities from the literature it is hypothesized that

Hypothesis 3. There is a positive relationship between an individual's optimism and engaging in OCB.

HOPE

Hope has been conceptualized as "the sum of perceived capabilities to produce routes to desired goals, along with the perceived motivation to use those routes (Snyder, 2000: 8)." Thus, a more hopeful individual would be able to find more routes mentally towards desired goals and would also be motivated to tread those routes in order to reach the goals than a less hopeful person.

Hope has been found to be helpful in predicting positive outcomes in stressful situations and has led to increased satisfaction, profitability, and lesser turnover (Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998; Luthans & Jensen, 2002; Peterson & Luthans, 2003). The findings have been verified in different contexts that include sports, leadership, entrepreneurship, and labor intensive work situations. It was also found to have a moderating effect on burnout (Rodriguez-Hanley & Snyder, 2000) and handling pressure at work (Snyder, 1994).

Relationship between Hopefulness and OCB

OCB are generally shown in situations demanding thinking on the spot and action to troubleshoot or move ahead when an obstacle is encountered (Mischel, 1977). Conceptually, more hopeful employees are more likely to find alternate ways to respond to such situations and be more motivated to follow alternatives. Thus they are more likely to take initiatives, show loyalty towards organization and coworkers, and show civic virtue and conscientiousness. It is expected that more hopeful people will take up responsibilities beyond their job descriptions especially in tough situations like change/downsizing where such tasks are of paramount importance for people who stay in the organization (Ozag, 2006). Secondly, hope has been found to be related to job satisfaction (e.g., Youssef & Luthans, 2007). As argued above job satisfaction and OCB have been found to be related. So it is expected that,

Hypothesis 4. There is a positive relationship between hope and engaging in OCB.

RESILIENCE

Resilience could be best understood as adaptability (Block & Kremen, 1996), or the tendency of bouncing back from adverse situations as individuals adaptively encounter the vagaries of environmental context in long and short term (Klohnen, 1996). It is therefore, "a class of phenomena characterized by patterns of positive adaptation in the context of significant adversity or risk" (Masten & Reed, 2002, p.75). Resilient people are seen as more resourceful and more capable of understanding a situation and solving a problem (Block & Kremen, 1996).

Resilience of individual members has been found to impact resilience of the family (Hawley & Deehan, 1996, as cited in Greeff & Ritman, 2005). By extension, it can be argued that if team members are high on resilience, the team is likely to be more resilient. In leadership development resilience has been found to be an important trait (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa,

Luthans, & May, 2004). It has been related to increasing commitment to leadership and organization (McCarthy, 2003) and for organizations' growth as well (Luthans, 2005).

Relationship between Resilience and OCB

As argued above, resilience involves understanding a difficult situation, maintaining calm, staying focused on problem and perseverance to achieve desired success in the task (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Resilience has been reported to be related to job satisfaction (Luthans et al., *2007*). As argued earlier by Organ (1977, 1988, 1997) and Organ et al., (2006), more satisfied employees are more likely to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors.

Resourcefulness of resilient employees is likely to result in greater sportsmanship, civic virtue, helping (in times of difficulty and/or change) behaviors, staying committed to organization, i.e. showing organizational loyalty and inspiring others to engage in similar behaviors (McCarthy, 2003). Therefore, it is hypothesized,

Hypothesis 5. here is a positive relationship between resilience and engaging in OCB.

JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction is a function of expectations and achieved outcomes. It is understood to be a sum of cognitive, affective and evaluative reactions resulting from experiences at work (Locke, 1976), job characteristics (Judge, Bono, & Locke, 2000), and work environment (Judge & Wantanabe, 1993; Shalley, Gilsom, & Blum, 2000). More satisfied school employees also showed better performance and consequently the organizational level performance also improved (Ostroff, 1992). Meta-analysis of satisfaction-performance hypothesis at organizational level has showed significant impact on safety, customer satisfaction, productivity, employee turnover, and following safety norms in organizations (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). Job satisfaction

12

showed a strong relationship with work place performance in a meta-analysis ($r = .30$, Judge, Bono, Thoresen, & Patton, 2001).

It has been found to be strongly associated with disposition of individuals in a meta analysis ($r=.41$, Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002). The "core self-evaluation traits" (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997) comprising of self-efficacy, locus of control, self-esteem and neuroticism showed a consistently high correlation with job satisfaction (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998) across samples with varied profiles. Generalized self-efficacy strongly predicted job satisfaction in a meta-analysis ($rho=.45$, Judge & Bono, 2001). However, in a cross-cultural study, US sample showed a significant and positive relation between job satisfaction and generalized self-efficacy, while the South East Asian sample's results were positive but not significant (Luthans, Zhu, & Avolio, 2006). More recently, hopefulness, optimism and resilience have been shown to be positively related to job satisfaction (Luthans et al., *2007*; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). It is hypothesized that,

H6: *There is a positive relationship between positive characteristics and job satisfaction of an individual.*

METHOD

Procedure

The study utilized a quasi-experimental design to select people who engaged in OCB (Cook & Campbell, 1979). The sample was drawn from 26 organizations in and around cities in Western India. All participating organizations were told in advance that data will not be shared at any stage to maintain anonymity and confidentiality of individual's responses. In all these organizations team leader(s) were contacted after obtaining permission from the functional head of the organization. These team leaders or superiors were primed about OCB with the help of

contrasting behavior profiles of two individuals; one who engaged in OCB, and the other who did not engage in OCB. The superior then identified individuals based on his or her experience of working with the individual. To make sure that a pattern rather than one-off instance of behavior was considered, at least 6 months old teams were only considered. Once the individuals were identified, the superior was asked about the names and every individual employee who was going to be rated on OCB was assigned a code. After receiving his or her set of OCB rating questionnaires for the employees, the superior introduced the researcher to his or her team members in a training room or a conference room. The individuals were told that this is a study on personality characteristics on employees in current organizations, and that they were being rated by their superior on OCB patterns, was not disclosed to them. The participants were assured that all data would remain confidential and their responses would not be shared with their superior. At this point the superior was asked to leave.

Once the team members were assembled in a conference room or a training room, the participants were distributed coded questionnaires on personality characteristics and attitude. The instructions for the questionnaire were read out to the participants by the researcher. They were explained the scoring scheme for marking the responses. To ensure that mid-point response was not a reflection of lack of understanding about the item, the participants were urged to mark 6 (Can't say) only after ensuring that they understood the item clearly and could not choose on any other rating. In case a participant could not understand an item it was read again and explained by the administrator. In the mean time the superior filled OCB reports for his team members in parallel in his or her cabin. This method allowed data on positive characteristics and behaviors to come from independent sources and therefore common method variance could be controlled for (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986).

Respondents

A total of 334 usable responses were collected. Of these 334 responses, 75.8% respondents were men. The average age of a respondent was 31.8 years (youngest being 20 years and the oldest being 59 years old) with mean total work experience of 107.89 months (minimum of 6 months to a maximum of 444 months) out of which an average of 52.14 months (minimum 6 months and maximum 444 months) were spent in the current organization. The 81 supervisors had been working in the current organization for an average of 68.5 months (ranging from 6 months to 214 months). The respondents of this study were employed in a variety of organizations. These organizations were engaged in activities such as scientific research labs, project management consulting, banking, sales and marketing, manufacturing, designing, energy generation, teaching, retailing, telecommunication, and social work.

Measures

Filled by the superior - OCB measure

OCB was measured using the scale developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990). Its content, convergent and discriminant validity has been well established (Klein & Verbeke, 1999; Lam, Hui, & Law, 1999; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Van Yerpen, Van Der Berg, Willering, 1999). Here, three out of five negatively worded items in sportsmanship subscale were reworded as positive items. The items were rated on a six point scale for frequency of engaging in a behavior. A score of 1 represented "Never" and 6 represented "Always". Cronbach's alpha for the whole scale was .907. The subscales, altruism (.890), conscientiousness (.844), courtesy (.892), civic virtue (.754), and sportsmanship (.837) had reliabilities in the acceptable range (Nunnally, 1978; Nunnally & Brenstein, 1994). The five dimensional structure was confirmed via confirmatory factor analysis.

Filled by the individual - Positive characteristics and job satisfaction

All scale structures were tested for their reliability and usability using confirmatory factor analysis. The unidimensional satisfaction with life scale (SWLS, Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) was used to measure SWB of the respondents. The validity of SWLS has been established in several studies (*see*, Pavot & Diener, 1993, 1998). Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .717. New General Self-efficacy (NGSE) scale was used for measuring generalized self-efficacy (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). Chen et al. (2001) have also established discriminant and convergent validities of the NGSE scale. Cronbach's alpha for this unidimensional scale was .828. The validated version (Carver & Scheier, 2003) of life orientation test – revised (LOTS-R) was used to measure dispositional optimism of an individual (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994). The negative items indicating pessimism were reworded to represent positive valence and therefore, optimism. All six items loaded on one dimension as expected. Cronbach's alpha for this sample was .673. The adult dispositional hope scale (Snyder et al., 1991) was used to measure hope. The validity of the scale has been well established (Snyder et al., 1991, Lopez, Snyder, & Pedrotti, 2003). The Cronbach's alpha for this unidimensional scale was .804. Resilience was measured using 14-item Ego Resiliency Scale (ER-89, Block & Kremen, 1996). The scale was used as a single construct. Cronbach's alpha for the resilience scale was .765. Job satisfaction was measured using six item Job Satisfaction Index (Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992). This scale's validity has been established in previous studies (Cohen 1997, Tsui etal., 1992). The scale had six items to assess satisfaction with different aspects of the job. All six statements loaded on a single dimension. Cronbach's alpha for the sample was .808.

As a larger scoring scheme was better able to capture variations in respondent scores (Snyder, Rand, & Digmon, 2002) an 11-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all applicable to me)

to 11 (Completely applicable to me) with 6 being the mid-point (Can't say). All items for positive characteristics and job satisfaction were pooled together and randomized to control for response bias.

Analysis Procedure

To be able to test for relationships between positive characteristics and job satisfaction and OCB regression analysis was carried out. The data was checked for assumptions of normality and was found to satisfactorily meet the standards.

RESULTS

Positive characteristics and OCB

Table 1 presents the mean, standard deviations, correlation and reliability values for various constructs and scales.

Insert Table 1 about here

From table 1, the results showed that overall OCB was positively and significantly related to SWB ($r = .143$, $p<.05$), hopefulness ($r = .129$, $p<.05$), and resilience ($r = .119$, $p<.05$) of an individual. The variance explained in overall OCB by SWB, hope, and resilience was small but significant at 1.8%, 1.4%, and 1.1% respectively. The results therefore supported hypotheses 1, 4, and 5. The remaining two characteristics - GSE and optimism - showed somewhat positive but non-significant relationship with engagement in overall OCB. Therefore, the results did not support hypotheses 2 and 3.

Among different dimensions of OCB, the results showed that only hopefulness and resilience of an individual were positively and significantly related to engagement in altruistic

behaviors. The correlation coefficients were $r = .139$ (Adj. $R^2=1.6\%$, $p<.05$) and $r = .132$ (Adj. $R^2=1.4\%$, $p<.05$) for hope and resilience respectively. Likewise, only SWB of an individual showed to have some positive and significant bearing on engagement in sportsmanship behaviors ($r = .130$, $p<.05$, Adj. $R^2=1.4\%$). The conscientiousness and courtesy dimensions of OCB did not show a noticeable relationship with any of the positive characteristics. The relationship with SWB and hope was somewhat positive for both dimensions though non-significant.

As results in tables 1 and 2 show, civic virtue dimension showed comparatively stronger positive relationships with all five positive characteristics. All relationships except for optimism were significant at $p<.01$, with variance explained ranging between 1.2% for hope and 3.6% for SWB. The results therefore indicated stronger relationship of positive characteristics and civic virtue. Thus, while optimism and GSE did not show a relationship to engagement in overall OCB, the support for their relationship with civic virtue form of OCB was unequivocal.

Positive characteristics and Job Satisfaction

Table 2 presents results correlation and variance explained for relationship between job satisfaction and positive characteristics.

Insert Table 2 about here

From Table 3 it can be seen that all positive characteristics showed moderate to strong positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction. The variance explained varied between 8.7% for optimism-job satisfaction relationship to 22.2% for SWB-job satisfaction relationship. The results therefore supported hypothesis 6 about expecting a positive relationship between positive characteristics and job satisfaction of an individual.

Superior's perception of positive characteristics and OCB

18

Table 3 gives the results for superior's perception of the relationship between positive characteristic and engagement in different dimensions of OCB.

Insert Table 3 about here

When superior's report for SWB was matched with observed OCB patterns, all OCB dimensions showed strongly positive relationships (Table 3). The explained variance varied between 15.9% for civic virtue and 39.4% for sportsmanship behaviors. The explained variance for all relationships was significant at .1% significance level. Similarly, when superior's perception of generalized self efficacy of participants were matched with superior's ratings of overall OCB, the relationship was strongly positive (r= .655 explaining 42.7% variance in OCB, $p < .001$). Other OCB dimensions also showed a strongly positive relationship with generalized self efficacy. The explained variance was the least for courtesy dimension (27.0%, $p < .001$) and maximum for altruism behaviors (35.8%, $p < .001$) see Table 5-2). Thus, there was strong support for hypothesis when superior's perceptions of positive characteristics were considered. A subordinate's optimism showed a strong positive relationship with his or her OCB ($r = .672$, Adj. $R^2 = .450$, $p < .001$) and its dimensions. A minimum of 22.3% variance was explained for optimism-civic virtue combination. Sportsmanship dimension was the strongest correlate of optimism with a correlation of .614 resulting in 37.5% explained variance that was significant at $p < .001$. The results suggest that if the same source were to be considered for behaviors and personality characteristics, there is a strong positive relationship between perception of an individual's optimism and assessment of his or her engagement in OCB.

When superior's perception of hope and OCB ratings of the participants were analyzed, perception of dispositional hope explained 42.4% variance in overall OCB ($r = .653$, $p < .001$).

Various dimensions also showed a consistently high and positive relationship. Minimum explained variance was 22.7% in civic virtue and the highest was 36.3% for sportsmanship behaviors. Together, there is strong supporting evidence that at both perceptual and behavioral levels, hopefulness is linked to engagement in positive behaviors in the workplace. Similar results evincing a strong positive relationship between perception of characteristic and engagement in behavior was found for resilience as well. The correlation coefficient of resilience with overall OCB was .667 (variance explained 44.3% at $p = .001$). Various dimensions of OCB too were significantly related to resilience of an individual. Civic virtue had the lowest correlation ($r = .503$, Adj. $R^2 = .304$, $p < .001$). The highest was with conscientiousness ($r = .597$, Adj. $R^2 = .350$, $p < .001$).

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide empirical support to comparative usefulness of positive characteristics in explaining positive outcomes made by Cameron et al., (2003), Luthans and his colleagues (e.g., Luthans, 2002, 2005, Luthans et al., 2007), and Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000). Thus, the speculation between being positive and doing positive in organizational circumstances should come to rest. In addition, the results also provide empirical support to the implicit conceptual assumption of a positive relationship of hopefulness and resilience of an employee with engagement in OCB (Luthans & Youssef, 2007; Luthans et al., 2007; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). The results established the explanatory power of positive characteristics for OCB and its various dimensions. It could be argued that the absolute variance explained by positive characteristics was low. However, it needs to be noted that the values here were after controlling the common method variance. CMV is estimated to create an inflation of up to 50% in explained variance statistic of behaviors if dispositional characteristics are involved

(Podsakoff et al., 2003). A low explained variance is quite common in personality traits-organizational behaviors linkage (Allen, Barnard, Rush, & Russell, 2000; Organ, 1994). After a detailed review of OCB and its antecedents, Organ et al. (2006) have suggested that correlation of this magnitude are consistent and these are the expected strengths in personality-behavior relationship. This could be because personality is more likely to influence the motive or manner rather than substance (Organ & McFall, 2004). The results of this study are in line with the range of variance explained by two of the strongest OCB correlates from Big-5 personality factors – conscientiousness and openness to experience.

The significant relationship of hopefulness and resilience with altruism behaviors could be explained by the norms of social exchange (Gouldner, 1960). As OCB is more common in unstructured situations, an extra resource or helping hand might be useful in mitigating the situation or crisis. More hopeful people could therefore see helping behaviors leading to positive results by way of reciprocal actions from another source. Such belief may increase their resource base to face a future situation and in turn enhances their motivation to work out the unstructured weak situations.

Weak situations by definition demand higher resilience. For altruistic behaviors *per se,* helping others would invoke future helping behaviors out of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). Thus, every helping behavior potentially adds another future resource to face a tough situation later on thereby resulting in an increased adaptability for a similar future scenario where helping behaviors would be required.

The relationship between SWB and sportsmanship behaviors supports the contention that those who are content with their lives see no point in raking up trivial issues and accept non-major irritants and errands in their stride (Martin, 2007, Rigby & Slee, 1993). They are possibly

more at peace with themselves and those around them, and this helps them focus better by staying away from wasteful arguments or discussions over minor issues.

The civic virtue dimension showed a consistently positive and significant relationship with all positive characteristics. Civic virtue consists of behaviors such as being well-informed about what is going on in the organization and bringing recognition to the organization and the department through increased participation in outside events. From the results of this study it can be said that generally satisfied, self-confident, forward looking, hopeful and adaptable people showed a tendency to take pride in their organization's governance. Therefore, the attitude towards organizational systems is positive in people with positive characteristics and this positive attitude is reflected in their behaviors in the workplace.

Conscientiousness is related to going beyond the prescribed task to work for the team or the organization and maintain a conduct that befits an ideal employee for a task *per se*. Its relationships with positive characteristics varied in magnitude making it difficult to ascertain any trend from these results. At best, hope and SWB could be inferred to have weak positive relationship with conscientious behaviors. Courtesy, on the other hand is related to the interpersonal aspects of the job. It is about maintaining cordial relations with coworkers and respecting their personal space. The extent of correlation of conscientiousness and courtesy dimensions varied across constructs and there was no significant trend. Thus, much cannot be inferred about conscientiousness and courtesy behaviors relationship with positive characteristics of an individual.

The results here also showed that GSE and SWB in Indian context as predictive have a positive relationship with job satisfaction as reported in previous studies (Judge & Bono, 2001). The extent of relationship of job satisfaction with SWB was relatively higher than that reported

in studies (*see,* Judge & Bono, 2001). It is quite likely that the Indian value emphasis on feeling content with whatever one has could have led to a general higher level satisfaction with the job. This could be an area of future study. Job satisfaction was found to be also positively related to hope, resilience, and optimism. This indicates that there is a positive linkage between self-report of positive dispositions and positive attitudes.

Superior's perception of characteristics and behaviors

The findings and the strength for this part were startling. There's a chicken and egg problem at hand. It is difficult to establish causality between is positive and therefore does positive, or does positive and therefore is (understood to be) positive. While controlling for common method variance and collecting data from two independent sources supported the former argument, the consistently strong positive relationship between a superior's perception of positive characteristics and evaluation of a subordinate's OCB was a clear example of the latter. It seems that if an individual does positive behaviors consistently, he or she is also understood to be a more positive person, a favorable evaluation in tough times like today. This also bolsters Bolino and colleagues position of OCB being a potential tool for managing impression on the superior and managing better gains for oneself (Bolino & Turnley, 1999; Bolino, Varela, Bande, & Turnley, 2006).

This also calls for improvement in understanding about positive-positive relationships. There has to be clarity about whose perspective is more important to understand such relationships. Is it the superior's evaluation and therefore, by implication, a subordinate's appraisal? Or, is it all about being self-driven to attain a more positive outcome for inner self and others. Clearly, the time is ripe for understanding the process of positive characteristics leading to positive behaviors. The process studies could happen at two levels. One is the individual and

his or her motive or intention behind such behaviors, and the other is the influence of social context extracting such behaviors out of individuals.

LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

As this work is in an emerging field it would be more important to highlight the need for further theory building and addressing limitations more carefully. There could be artificial inflation despite the best efforts were made to evoke the set of behaviors and reinforce "patterns of such behavior". It is possible that while responding to the reported OCB of subordinates a superior's overwhelming memory of a recent incident could have inflated the rating of the concerned individuals. Likewise, participants rating themselves on the characteristics questionnaire could have shown social desirability bias. The need to be socially desirable could be accentuated as several participants sat in the same room.

Future studies could be designed to exclusively collect data from people who are high or low on positive characteristics and study their relationships with attitudes like job satisfaction, organizational commitment, or behaviors. While the study could control for CMV in behavior reports, the same could not be done with attitude (job satisfaction). It is suspected that same rater could have accentuated the report of job satisfaction. Randomization of items alone could not ensure that job satisfaction items would not be guessed. At the same time measurement of attitude through other's report is also not accurate. One indirect method of measuring job satisfaction could be through mapping of behaviors that a satisfied employee would show (Allen et al., 2000). This method then would come close to choosing a behavior that follows out of satisfaction much like OCB. However, there are not many well developed indirect measures of job satisfaction available in the literature.

An important implication of this study is the utility of studying further the link between positive dispositions, state of mind, attitudes, and behaviors in organizational context. The studies on positive traits and their relationships with positive outcomes have often been criticized as being a fad and lacking substance to stand on its own or explain relevant outcomes for individuals and organizations (e.g., Lazarus, 2003). In contrast to such claims, the results of this study have shown that positive characteristics are able to predict relevant attitudes and behaviors. This is however, just the beginning. Their advantage could be better established by designing studies and longer term programs that can compare and contrast between the strength of relationship between variables such as conscientiousness, neuroticism, agreeableness etc., and positive characteristics with commitment, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. The results of this study also underline the need to study the exact nature of relationship between being positive and doing positive.

REFERENCES

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. 1991. *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Allen, T. D., Barnard, S., Rush, M. C., & Russell, J. E. A. 2000. Ratings of Organizational citizenship behavior: Does the source make a difference? *Human Resource Management Review*, 10 (1): 97-114.

Aspinwall, L. G., & Taylor, S. E. 1992. Modeling cognitive adaptation: A longitudinal investigation of the impact of individual differences and coping on college adjustment and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63 (6): 989-1003.

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W., L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. 2004. Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15 (6): 801-823.

Bandura, A. 1982. Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37: 122-147.

Bar-On, R. 2000. Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the emotional quotient inventory. In R. Bar-On, & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace*: 363-388. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. 1983. Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26: 587-595.

Bettencourt, L. A., Gwinner, K. P., & Meuter, M. L. 2001. A comparison of Attitude, Personality, and Knowledge Predictors of Service-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (1): 29-41.

Blakely, G. L., Andrews, M. C., & Fuller, J. 2003. Are chameleons good citizens? A longitudinal study of the relationship betwen self-monitoring and organizational citizenship behaivor. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18 (2): 131-144.

Block, J., & Kremen, A. M. 1996. IQ and ego-resiliency: Conceptual and empirical connections and separateness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70 (2): 349-361.

Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. 1999. Measuring Impression Management in Organizations: A Scale Development Based on the Jones and Pittman Taxonomy. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2(2): 187-206.

Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Niehoff, B. P. 2004. The other side of the story: Reexamining prevailing assumptions about organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 14(2): 229-246.

Borman, W. C., Penner, L. A., Allen, T. D., & Motowidlo, S. J. 2001. Personality Predictors of Citizenship Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9 (1&2): 52-69.

Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. 2003. *Positive Organizational Scholarship*. San Francisco CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. 2003. Optimism. In S. J. Lopez, & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive Psychological Assessment: A handbook of models and measures*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. 2001. Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4 (1): 62-83.

Cohen, A. 1997. Non-work influences on withdrawal cognitions: An empirical examination of an overlooked issue. *Human Relations*, 50 (12): 1511-1537.

Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. 1983. *Applied multiple/regression correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. 1979. *Quasi-experimentaion: Design & analysis issues for field settings*. Boston: Houghton Miffin Company.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. 1988. Personality in Adulthood : A Six-Year Longitudinal Study of Self-Reports and Spouse Ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (5): 853-863.

DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. 1998. The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124 (2): 197-229.

Diener, E. 1984. Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 93: 542-575.

Diener, E. 2000. Subjective Well-Being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a National Index. *American Psychologist*, 55 (1): 34-43.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. 1985. The Satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49 (1): 71-75.

Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. 2003. Personality, Culture, and Subjective Well-Being: Emotional and Cognitive Evaluations of Life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54 (1): 403-425.

Diener, E., Suh, E., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. 1999. Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125 (2): 276-302.

Dussault, M. 2006. Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Psychological Reports*, 98 (3): 427-432.

Erez, A., & Judge, T. A. 2001. Relationship of core self-evaluations to goal setting, motivation, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (6): 1270-1279.

Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. 1990. Accounting foir organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus specification. *Journal of Management*, 16 (4): 705-721.

Farh, J. L., Zhong, C.-B., & Organ, D. W. 2004. Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Organization Science*, 15 (2): 241-253.

George, J. M. 1990. Personality, affect, and behavior in groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75 (2): 107-116.

George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. 1992. Feeling Good-Doing Good: A conceptual analysis of mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112 (2): 310-329.

George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. 1997. Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance*, 10 (2): 153-170.

Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. 1992. Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, 17 (2): 183-211.

Goleman, D. 1995. *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Gouldner, A. W. 1960. The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25 (2): 161-178.

Greeff, A. P., & Ritman, I. N. 2005. Individual characteristics associated with resilience in single parent families. *Psychological Reports*, 96 (1): 36-42.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. 2002. Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (2): 268-279.

Hogan, J. 1991. Structure of Physical Performance in Occupational Tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76 (4): 495-507.

Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Busch, C. M. 1984. How to measure service orientation? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69 (1): 167-173.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. 2001. Relationship of core self-evaluation traits - self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability - with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (1): 80-92.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., & Locke, E. A. 2000. Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating

role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85 (2): 237-249.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Thoresen, C. J., & Patton, G. K. 2001. The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127 (3): 376-407.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Bono, J. E. 1998. The power of being positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance*, 11 (2): 167-187.

Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. 2002. Five-Factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (3): 530-541.

Judge, T. A., & Hulin, C. L. 1993. Job satisfaction as a reflection of disposition: A multiple causal source analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 56 (4): 388-421.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. 1997. The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19: 151-188.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. 1998. Disposition effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83 (1): 17-34.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T. M. 1999. Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84 (1): 107-122.

Judge, T. A., & Watanabe, S. 1993. Another look at the job satisfaction - life satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (6): 939-948.

Katz, D. 1964. The motivational basis of orgnaizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9: 131-146.

Keith, T. Z. 2006. *Multiple Regression and beyond*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Klein, D. J., & Verbeke, W. 1999. Autonomic feedback in stressful environments: How do individual differences in autonomic feedback relate to burnout, job performance, and job attitudes in salespeople? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84 (6): 911-924.

Klohnen, E. C. 1996. Conceptualization and measurement of the construct of Ego-Resiliency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70 (5): 1067-1079.

Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. 1996. Dispositional and Contextual Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17 (3): 253-266.

Kumar, R. 2007. *Tacit knowledge and organizational citizenship performance*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad, Ahmedabad.

Lam, S. S., Hui, C., & Law, K. S. 1999. Organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing perspectives of supervisors and subordinates across four international samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84 (4): 594-601.

Lazarus, R. S. 2003. Does the positive psychology movement have legs? *Psychological Inquiry*, 14 (2): 93-109.

Locke, E. A. 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*: 1297-1343. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lopez, S. J., Snyder, C. R., & Pedrotti, J. T. 2003. Hope: Many definitions, many measures. In S. J. Lopez, & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive psychological assessment: A handbook of models and measures*: 91-107. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Luthans, F. 2005. *Organizational Behavior* (10th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. 2007. Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60 (3): 541-572

Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. 2002. Positive organizational behavior: A new approach to global management. *Singapore Nanyang Business Review*, 1 (1): 17-30.

Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. 2007. Emerging positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Management*, 33 (3): 321-349.

Luthans, F., Zhu, W., & Avolio, B. J. 2006. The impact of efficacy on work attitudes across cultures. *Journal of World Business*, 41 (2): 121-132.

Martin, M. W. 2007. Happiness and virtue in positive psychology. *Journal for the theory of social behavior*, 37 (1): 89-103.

Masten, A. S., & Reed, M.-G. 2002. Resilience in Development. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology*: 74-88. New York: Oxford.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. 2004. Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Findings, and Implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15 (3): 197-215.

McCarthy, J. F. 2003. *Short stories at work: Organizational story telling as a leadership conduit during turbulent times*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Proceedings.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. 1987. Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (1): 81-90.

Mischel, W. 1977. The interaction of person and situation. In D. Magnusson, & N. S. Endler (Eds.), *Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology*.

Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mishra, A. K., & Spreitzer, G. M. 1998. Explaining how survivors respond to downsizing: The roles of trust, empowerment, justice, and work design. *Academy of Management Review*, 23 (3): 567-588.

Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. I. 1995. Inidvidualism-Collectivism as an individual difference predictor of orgainzational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16 (2): 127-142.

Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. I., & Niehoff, B. P. 1998. Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41 (3): 351-357.

Nunnally, J. C. 1978. *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. 1994. *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Organ, D. W. 1977. A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 2 (1): 46-53.

Organ, D. W. 1988. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. 1990. The motivational basis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 12: 43-72. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Organ, D. W. 1994. Personality and organizational citizenship behaivor. *Journal of Management*, 20 (2): 465-478.

Organ, D. W. 1997. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10 (2): 85-97.

Organ, D. W., & McFall, J. B. 2004. Personality and citizenship behavior in organizations. In B. Schneider, & D. B. Smith (Eds.), *Personality and organizations*: 291-316. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. 2006. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. 1995. A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48 (4): 775-802.

Ostroff, C. 1992. The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (6): 963-974.

Ozag, D. 2006. The relationship between the trust, hope, and normative and continuance commitment of merger survivors. *Journal of Management Development*, 25 (9): 870-883.

Pavot, W., & Diener, E. 1993. Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5 (2): 164-172.

Pavot, W., Diener, E., & Suh, E. 1998. The Temporal Satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 70 (2): 340-354.

Peterson, C. 2000. The future of optimism. *American Psychologist*, 55 (1): 44-55.

Peterson, S. J., & Luthans, F. 2003. The positive impact and development of hopeful leaders. *Leadership and Organizational Development*, 24 (1): 26-31.

Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & William, E. S. 1999. Fairness perception and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25 (6): 897-933.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. 2003. Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88 (5): 879-903.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. 1990. Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1 (2): 107-142.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. 2000. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 26 (3): 513-563.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. 1986. Self reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12 (1): 69-82.

Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. 1993. Dimensions of interpersonal relation among Australian children and implications for psychological well-being. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133 (1): 33-42.

Rodriguez-Hanley, A., & Snyder, C. R. 2000. The demise of hope: On losing positive thinking. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of Hope: Theory, Measures, and Applications*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. 1939. *Management and Workers: An account of a research program conducted by the Western Electric Company Hawthorne Works*. London: Harvard Business School Press.

Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. 1992. Effects of optimism on psychological and physical well-being: Theoretical overview and empirical update. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 16

(2): 201-228.

Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. 1994. Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57 (6): 1024-1040.

Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. 2001. Optimism, pessimism, and psychological well-being. In E. C. Chang (Ed.), *Optimism and Pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice*: 189-216. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Scheier, M. F., Matthews, K. A., Owens, J. F., Magovern, G. J., Lefebvre, R. C., Abbott, R. A., & Carver, C. S. 1989. Dispositional Optimism and Recovery From Coronary Artery Bypass Surgery: The Beneficial Effects on Physical and Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57 (6): 1024-1040.

Scheier, M. F., Weintraub, J. K., & Carver, C. S. 1986. Coping with stress: Divergent strategies of optimists and pessimists. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51 (6): 1257-1264.

Schiff, M., & Bargal, D. 2000. Helping characteristics of self-help and support groups: Their contribution to participants' subjective well-being. *Small Group Research*, 31 (3): 275-304.

Seligman, M. E. P. 1998. *Learned optimism: How to change your mind and your life*. New York: Pocket Books.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. 2000. Positive Psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55 (1): 5-14.

Shalley, C. E., Gilson, L. L., & Blum, T. C. 2000. Matching creativity requirements and the work environment: Effects on satisfaction and intentions to leave. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43 (2): 215-223.

Shim, W. S., & Steers, R. M. 2001. The entrepreneurial basis of Korean enterprise: Past accomplishments and future challenges. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 7 (4): 22-43.

Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. 1983. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68 (4): 653-663.

Snyder, C. R. 1994. *The psychology of hope: You can get there from here*. New York: Free Press.

Snyder, C. R. 2000. Hypothesis: There is Hope. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of Hope: Theory, Measures, and Applications*: 3-21. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., Yoshinobu, L., Gibb, J., Langelle, C., & Harney, P. 1991. The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual differences measure of hope. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 60 (5): 570-585.

Snyder, C. R., Rand, K. L., & Digmon, D. R. 2002. Hope Theory: A member of the positive psychology family. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology*: 257-276. New York: Oxford.

Speier, C., & Frese, M. 1997. Generalized self-efficacy as a mediator and moderator between control and complexity at work and personal initiative: A longitudinal field study in East Germany. *Human Performance*, 10 (2): 171-192.

Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. 1998. Self-Efficacy and work related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124 (2): 240-261.

Tait, M., Padgett, M. Y., & Baldwin, T. T. 1989. Job satisfaction and life satisfaction: A reexamination of the strength of the relationship and gender effects as a function of the date of the study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74 (4): 502-507.

Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A. I. 1992. Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37 (4): 549-580.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & McLean Parks, J. 1995. Extra-role behaivors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (A bridge over muddied waters). In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 17: 215-285.

Van Yerpen, N. W., Van Den Berg, A. E., & Willering, M. C. 1999. Towards a better understanding of the link between participation in decision-making and organizational citizenship behavior: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72 (3): 377-397.

Wunderley, L. J., Reddy, W. P., & Dember, W. N. 1998. Optimism and pessimism in business leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28 (7): 751-760.

Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. 2007. Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of Management*, 33 (5): 774-800.

Positive characteristics and positive behaviors

TABLE 1

Mean, S.D. and Correlation between Variables

N=334	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 OCB	109.192	18.105	(.907)										
2 Altruism	21.713	4.839	.891**	(.890)									
3 Consc	23.904	4.182	.840**	.663**	(.844)								
4 Courtesy	23.075	4.602	.884**	.728**	.680**	(.842)							
5 CVirtue	17.269	3.518	.713**	.611**	.514**	.494**	(.754)						
6 Sport	23.231	4.272	.868**	.705**	.674**	.773**	.470**	(.837)					
7 SWB	39.763	8.042	.143*	0.087	0.106	0.103	.198**	.130*	(.717)				
8 GSEff	73.533	8.496	0.093	0.086	0.056	0.015	.187**	0.072	.498**	(828)			
9 Optimism	51.608	8.204	0.075	0.089	-0.007	0.034	.124*	0.086	.425**	.512**	(.673)		
10 Hope	72.569	9.054	.129*	.139*	0.084	0.083	.154**	0.092	.565**	.444**	.737**	(.804)	
11 Resilience	119.189	15.165	.119*	.132*	0.056	0.069	.164**	0.09	.473**	.480**	.628**	.648**	(.765)

Figures in parentheses show Cronbach's alpha for the scale

* $p < .05$ (2-tailed).

** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

TABLE 2

Relationship of Job Satisfaction with Positive Characteristics

	SWB	GSE	Optimism	Hope	Resilience
Correlation	.474	.308	.299	.348	.334
Adj R^2	.222	.092	.087	.118	.109

All correlation and Adj R^2 were significant at $p<.001$.

TABLE 3

β and Adj. R^2 of OCB and its dimensions by superior perception of positive characteristics

Superior's report	OCB	Altruism	Conscientiousness	Courtesy	Civic virtue	Sportsmanship
SWB	.653	.543	.595	.566	.402	.629
	(.425)	(.293)	(.352)	(.318)	(.159)	(.394)
Gen Self-efficacy	.655	.600	.575	.522	.531	.533
	(.427)	(.358)	(.329)	(.270)	(.280)	(.282)
Optimism	.672	.599	.567	.567	.474	.614
	(.450)	(.357)	(.319)	(.319)	(.223)	(.375)
Hope	.653	.561	.555	.546	.479	.604
	(.424)	(.313)	(.305)	(.296)	(.227)	(.363)
Resilience	.667	.593	.597	.553	.503	.558
	(.443)	(.350)	(.350)	(.304)	(.304)	(.310)

Adj. R2 is shown in parentheses, N = 334

All β and Adj. R-square explained were significant at p < .001