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Affective states influence an individual’s level of job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Affective states also influence behavior (e.g., withdrawal intentions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors). The present study investigated the inverse relationship—that is, whether job and life satisfaction influence immediate mood state, and consequently withdrawal intentions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. Participants, who role-played a restaurant server, were given a scenario that induced either positive job or life satisfaction, negative job or life satisfaction, or no information was given regarding their level of job or life satisfaction. Participants then responded to instruments measuring immediate mood state and behavioral consequences. Results indicated that an individual’s level of job and life satisfaction influenced immediate mood state. In addition, job and life satisfaction influenced both withdrawal intention and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors.
Introduction and Review of Literature

Affect in the workplace is a topic of current discussion and debate in organizations. Dealing with emotions in the workplace is a challenge for many managers. However, it is essential that managers pay attention to how their employees are feeling, even to what appears relatively minor. According to Ashkanasy and Daus (2002), it is the everyday events experienced by employees that are important. All of these positive and negative events determine how employees feel, think, and behave regarding their jobs, employers, and co-workers. It is no surprise, then, that employee moods and emotions have a large impact on how they experience job satisfaction. The fact that affect, specifically immediate mood states and personal disposition, has an effect on job satisfaction has been substantiated in a number of studies (Brief, Butcher, & Roberson, 1995; Kraiger, Billings, & Isen, 1989; Weiss, Nicholas, & Daus, 1999). Research has also shown that one’s immediate mood state influences his or her evaluation of overall life satisfaction (Schwarz & Clore, 1983). However, the reverse relations have not yet been explored. Therefore, this paper seeks to explore the influence of both job and life satisfaction on one’s immediate mood states.

A Brief Background on Job Satisfaction

In 1976, Locke (as cited in Brief & Weiss, 2002) defined job satisfaction as a “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience” (p. 282). More specifically, it is the extent to which a person derives pleasure from a job (Muchinsky, 1993). According to Motowildo (as cited in Brief & Weiss), job satisfaction is defined as “self-report judgments about the favorability of the work environment” (p. 283)
Most recently, Weiss (as cited in Brief & Weiss) defined job satisfaction as “a positive or negative evaluative judgment one makes about one’s job or job situation” (p. 283).

Clearly, job satisfaction has been a popular topic of research and controversy, and has been the focus of a myriad of studies attempting to identify its underlying determinants. The emphasis on this job attitude is understandable due to the great influence job satisfaction appears to have on an individual’s welfare, as well as on a variety of consequences such as withdrawal intentions (Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986).

It is clear that job satisfaction is considered to be an affective reaction to one’s job; however, Organ and Near (as cited in Brief & Weiss, 2002) recognized that job satisfaction also has a cognitive component. Many researchers question the extent to which common measures of job satisfaction are able the capture both the affective and cognitive components. Brief and Roberson (as cited in George & Brief, 1992) compared the extent to which three commonly used measures of job satisfaction, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967), the Job Descriptive Index (Balzer & Smith, 1980), and the Faces scale (Kunin, 1955), effectively captured both components. They found that only the Faces scale (Kunin) captured both the affective and cognitive components of job satisfaction equally, while the other two scales primarily measured the cognitive component. The main problem, then, is that although job satisfaction is often interpreted in affective terms, it is frequently only the cognitive component that is measured (Brief & Weiss, 2002).

Job satisfaction is an individual response. Two individuals can report the same level of global, overall job satisfaction, but have very different reasons behind their ratings. There are a number of job factors, often referred to as facets, that influence how
one perceives his or her level of job satisfaction. These facets include: pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers, and the work itself (Muchinksy, 1993). There is still an ongoing debate over how an individual determines his or her level of job satisfaction. There are three traditional theories that attempt to explain job satisfaction; however, none of them seem to completely solve the puzzle (Muchinsky). The first theory, according to McCormick and Illgen (as cited in Muchinsky), is the Intrapersonal-Comparison Processes Theory. This theory states that the degree of satisfaction one experiences is based on the comparison between what the employee wants (the standard) with what he or she actually receives. The standard is based on the employee’s individual needs or values, and the comparison is based on the extent to which the individual perceives the job meets those needs and values. The second theory is the Interpersonal-Comparison Processes Theory. According to Salancik and Pfeffer (as cited in Muchinsky), the employee will compare himself or herself to other people in similar jobs and then derive feelings of satisfaction based on how that person feels about his or her job. Both of these theories believe that affective feelings are comparative. The final theory, Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory, is the most popular yet least supported theory of job satisfaction. Herzberg (1966) believed that content factors (i.e., achievement, recognition, the work itself, advancement, responsibility) lead to satisfaction, while context factors (i.e., company policy, administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations with supervisors, working conditions) cause dissatisfaction. Under this theory, managers should seek to maximize factors leading to satisfaction and minimize factors leading to dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). Due to several failed attempts to replicate his findings, Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory is not fully accepted as an accurate explanation of the
dynamics of job satisfaction. Currently, both of the social comparison theories are more defensible, especially the Intrapersonal-Comparison processes theory (Muchinsky).

In addition, new theories are being proposed in an attempt to explain the complete causal bases of job satisfaction. In fact, according to the Affective Events Theory (AET), it is the employee’s work environment, daily work events (e.g., hassles and uplifts), personal dispositions (e.g., positive and negative affectivity), and experienced emotional mood states that are the main causes of worker attitudes, such as job satisfaction, loyalty, and commitment (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002). New theories, such as the AET, have sparked a renewed interest in understanding both mood states and personal disposition in an attempt to gain a better understanding of the causes of worker attitudes, such as job satisfaction.

*Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction*

According to Shin and Johnson (as cited in Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), life satisfaction can be defined as “a global assessment of a person’s quality of life according to his chosen criteria” (p. 72) and is a cognitive, judgmental process. Much like the Intrapersonal-Comparison Theory, perceptions of one’s life satisfaction are dependent upon a comparison of one’s circumstances with his or her personal standards. Life satisfaction is not externally imposed. Although some criteria may be desirable for all individuals, such as one’s health, the extent to which that particular criterion is important to the individual is a personal decision. When measuring life satisfaction, researchers ask for a person’s overall evaluation of happiness in his or her life, rather than summing across their satisfaction with specific domains (Diener, et al.).
It is believed that job satisfaction and life satisfaction effect one another. In fact, there are three theories that attempt to explain the relationship (Kabanoff, 1983; Watson & Slack, 1993). The first theory, the Compensation Theory, states that high satisfaction in one domain (job or life) may compensate for less satisfaction in the other domain (life or job). The second theory is referred to as the Spillover Theory. It assumes that high satisfaction (or high dissatisfaction) in one domain will spillover into the other domain. This theory suggests one would experience similar or equal levels of satisfaction in both areas, as the feelings generalize. The final theory, the Segmentation Theory, assumes that the two domains are independent. More specifically, the amount of satisfaction an employee feels in his or her working domain will have no effect on the amount of satisfaction experienced in his or her social and leisure domain (Kabanoff; Watson & Slack). Research has determined that the Segmentation Theory is most likely inaccurate. It is highly unlikely that people can completely separate the two domains from one another. In addition, the Compensation Theory has been questioned. According to Weaver (1980), people are either generally satisfied or dissatisfied with the many factors that contribute to their sense of happiness, and it is unlikely that a satisfying job can compensate for dissatisfaction felt in the other areas in one’s life.

*Mood States and Personal Disposition*

Affect, or more specifically, mood, is generally thought of in two ways: as a trait or as a state. Mood as a state captures how a person feels at any given time and can change over time (George & Brief, 1992). On the other hand, mood as a trait represents stable individual personality differences and is usually referred to as positive or negative affect (PA or NA; George & Brief). Mood states and PA/NA are both conceptually and
empirically distinct and should be measured independently of one another. Dispositional mood is important to study primarily to understand how it affects one’s mood state. Although disposition influences mood state, it is essentially the mood state that initiates behavior (George, 1991). The present study looks at the effect of job and life satisfaction on immediate mood states; however, both dispositional mood and mood states will be examined in more detail in an effort to differentiate the two.

Job satisfaction and one’s general temperament mutually influence one another. Affective dispositions greatly influence the extent to which people are satisfied with and derive pleasure from their jobs (Brief & Weiss, 2002). Positive affectivity (PA) is an enduring personality trait that predisposes people to experience positive emotions and moods, as well as to have a positive outlook and orientation on life (George & Brief, 1992). In general, individuals high in PA tend to experience more positive moods than individuals low in PA; however, an individual low in PA may experience positive moods in a given context, and vice versa (George, 1991). According to Costa and McCrae (as cited in Larsen & Ketelaar, 1991), extraversion, sociability, activity, and surgency all correlate strongly with PA. Positive affect provides the dispositional source for job satisfaction. Specifically, positive affect has been found to have a true score correlation of .49 with job satisfaction (Connolly & Viswesvaran, 2000). Connolly and Viswesvaran noted that there was a true score correlation of .36 between job satisfaction and affective disposition in general. Extraversion (.25) and emotional stability (.29), both of which are strongly related to PA, were found to be strong predictors of job satisfaction in Judge, Heller, and Mount’s (2002) meta-analysis. As previously stated, one would expect that individuals who generally experience positive emotionality would tend to be happy in
both their lives and jobs. It should also be noted that Judge et al. compared their results with DeNeve and Cooper’s (as cited in Judge et al., 2002) meta-analysis that looked at the relationship between extraversion and life satisfaction. Results indicate that extraversion is similarly related to life satisfaction, with a true score correlation of .22.

Negative affectivity (NA) is an enduring personality trait that predisposes an individual to experience negative emotions and to view the world in negative terms, leading to distress and dissatisfaction (Abraham, 1999). NA is significantly associated with various indicators of distress at work and life in general (George & Brief, 1992). Individuals high in NA are more likely to experience negative mood states and distress than those low in NA. According to Costa and McCrae (as cited in George & Brief), NA is correlated with personality traits such as neuroticism, impulsiveness, resentfulness, and aggressiveness. Those individuals who are predisposed to experience negative emotionality (NA) tend to place themselves in situations where they experience diminished levels of job satisfaction (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002). In fact, In Connolly and Viswesvaran’s (2000) meta-analysis, NA had a true score correlation of -.33 with job satisfaction. Connolly and Viswesvaran noted that there was a true score correlation of .36 between job satisfaction and affective disposition in general. Neuroticism, the primary source of NA, emerged as the most consistent predictor of job satisfaction in Judge et al. meta-analysis (-.29). Additionally, Judge et al. (2002) compared their results with DeNeve and Cooper’s (as cited in Judge et al.) meta-analysis, which looked at the relationship between neuroticism and life satisfaction. Similarly, neuroticism had a true score correlation of -.30 with life satisfaction (Judge et al.). Connolly and Viswesvaran (2000) concluded that although, based on their study, 10-25% of the variance in general
job satisfaction can be explained by affective disposition, a sizeable amount of the variance is still unexplained. Thus, there must be other factors that contribute to job satisfaction.

In general, it is expected that negative mood at work is influenced by NA, while positive mood at work is influenced by PA (George & Brief, 1992). NA and PA are also related to an individual’s level of job satisfaction, as well as their level of life satisfaction.

Moods as a state, on the other hand, are distinctively different from personal disposition. According to Clark and Isen (as cited in George & Brief, 1992), moods can be defined as generalized feeling states that are not typically identified with a particular object or stimulus and do not demand one’s complete attention. Although mood states do not interrupt ongoing thought processes, attitudes, and behaviors, they do influence them and often provide an affective context. Because moods capture the typical day-to-day feeling states and provide the affective context for thought processes and behaviors, they are a major influence on an individual’s behavior (George, 1990). Moods are often described in positive and negative underlying dimensions. Positive mood and negative mood should be thought of as independent dimensions, instead of at either end of one continuous dimension (Watson & Tellegen, 1985). High positive mood may be described as a pleasurable or positive engagement, producing feelings of “elation” and “enthusiasm.” Low positive mood is described as sadness and lethargy, causing an individual to feel “drowsy” and “dull” (Watson & Tellegen). On the other hand, a high negative mood is described as a state of unpleasurable engagement, which triggers feelings of “distress” and “fear.” A low negative mood refers to a state serenity, producing feelings of “calmness” and “relaxation” (Watson & Tellegen). According to
Zevon and Tellegen (as cited in George & Brief, 1992), the high poles of each dimension reflect a more engaged and aroused mood state, while the low poles of both dimensions represents a relative lack of engagement or arousal. These two dimensions are conceptually different on many levels and have emerged as independent factors in a broad range of types of mood measures. Watson and Clark (as cited in George & Brief) found that they have different correlates. Costa and McCrae (as cited in George & Brief) found they have different antecedents. Zautra (as cited in George & Brief) found that they are differentially related to life events. Tellegen (as cited in George & Brief) found that the two dimensions have different relationships with personality tests.

As previously mentioned, one’s personal disposition has an impact on immediate mood states at work. However, moods are also influenced by situational factors and the interaction between the person and situation. Although one’s disposition is important, it seems that, at times, the situation can be the more powerful influence. In fact, according to Headey and Wearing (as cited in George & Brief, 1992) life events affect mood over and above the influence of personality and disposition. For example, if a person is low on positive affect, yet they experience a positive life experience, it will result in a positive mood (George & Brief). Moods vary depending on a person’s life events, which can be positive or negative and work related or nonwork related. Positive work related events might include completing a significant project, receiving a promotion or pay raise, being treated with respect, or receiving a reward. Negative work related events might include dealing with an impending layoff, receiving a reduction in pay or benefits, or receiving a demotion. Positive nonwork related events might include having a satisfactory romantic
relationship or getting married, while negative nonwork related events might include an
unsatisfactory romantic relationship or death of a loved one (George & Brief, 1992).

**The Relationship between Mood State and Life Satisfaction**

Overall, an individual’s immediate mood state has been shown to influence a
wide variety of memory-based and judgmental tasks. There are three models that seek to
explain the role of affect in information processing. Schwarz’s Affect as Information
Model (as cited in Brief, Butcher, & Roberson, 1995) states that individuals use their
momentary affective state as an indicator of their feelings towards a stimulus, as well as a
basis for making various kinds of judgments. More specifically, one uses his or her
current mood state when evaluating level of job satisfaction. The second model is
Bower’s Affect Priming Model (as cited in Brief et al.), which states that when affect is
primed at recall, the individual selectively retrieves specific mood congruent memories.
For example, when one is in a positive mood, memories about his or her job will be more
favorable and positive (Brief et.al). The final theory, Affect as a Directive Function,
states that moods direct one’s attention to specific classes of information in an attempt to
determine the likely causes for their feelings (Schwarz & Clore, 1983).

Schwarz and Clore (1983) conducted one of the most well known studies of the
effects of mood on judgments of overall happiness and life satisfaction. Their study
consisted of two experiments, both of which supported the Affect as Information Model
that suggests individuals use their momentary mood states when evaluating the quality of
their lives. The first experiment asked participants to give a detailed description of either
a happy or sad event in their recent past to indicate how the experience made them feel
and what aspects of the experience made them feel that way. The experiment was
conducted in an unusual soundproof room, designed to encourage the participants to attribute their feelings to situational factors. It was even suggested to some participants that the room might make them feel “tense” or “elated.” Schwarz and Clore (1983) hypothesized participants would evaluate their overall happiness and satisfaction depending on their momentary mood state. However, it was also believed that those participants who attributed their feelings to the unusual room would be less likely to use their feelings as an informational base when evaluating their level of life satisfaction.

Participants rated their general level of happiness and satisfaction, their present affective state, and their causal attribution for their momentary moods. Schwarz and Clore found that participants did, in fact, use their momentary mood states when making evaluative judgments regarding their overall satisfaction and happiness. However, when participants were in a negative mood and in the “tense” room, they misattributed their negative mood to the situation. The same was not true for those in positive moods. These participants did not attribute away their feelings of positive affect when given situational factors that could account for their feelings. Schwarz and Clore’s second experiment was a field study in which researchers called students on either sunny or rainy spring days during the months of April and May. During the phone interview, the weather was either directly mentioned, indirectly mentioned, or not mentioned at all (control). The students were then asked questions regarding their perceived quality of life and present affective state.

The caller was blind to the hypothesis, and did not expect an interaction between priming and weather. Researchers found that participants called on sunny days reported feeling generally happy and satisfied with their lives regardless of the priming conditions. Subjects called on rainy days reported feeling less happy and less satisfied with their
lives. These results were more pronounced in the no-priming condition than in the direct or indirect-priming conditions (Schwarz and Clore).

Together, these two studies provide evidence that participants use their momentary moods to make judgments about their overall level of happiness and satisfaction. However, when an individual is in a negative mood and an outside explanation is available, participants will use this to explain their negative mood state. But, when participants are in a good mood, they will attribute their mood to their quality of life, even when there is an alternative explanation. These results are consistent with the idea that individuals are more likely to seek explanations for negative rather than positive feelings (Schwarz & Clore, 1983). These two experiments provided great insight into the effect moods have on judgments and evaluations. Schwarz and Clore’s findings led researchers to question whether individuals making judgments regarding job satisfaction would use their affective states as information in much the same way they had for life satisfaction.

The Relationship between Mood State and Job Satisfaction

The study of affect at work emerged as a research concern in the 1930’s. In 1932, Hersey (as cited in Brief & Weiss, 2002) found a clear relationship between daily affect levels and daily performance levels. Then, in 1935, Hoppock (as cited in Brief & Weiss) found certain elements of the work environment, such as supervisors, influenced one’s perception of job satisfaction. The diversity and interest of the 30’s soon faded out, and it was not until the mid 1980’s and early 1990’s that organizational researchers “rediscovered” affect in the workplace (Brief & Wiess). Mood at work is defined as “affective states encountered on the job” (George & Brief, 1992, p. 310). Affect at work
and job satisfaction are distinct constructs, but they are not completely independent of one another. Mood at work is concerned with affect while at work rather than affect toward work. Job satisfaction is more cognitively filtered than mood at work (George & Brief).

Once researchers realized that individuals use their momentary mood states to make judgments about their overall level of happiness and satisfaction, it was believed that moods would have similar effects on thought processes and behaviors at work and in organizational settings (George & Brief, 1992). In fact, it was believed that when making judgments regarding job satisfaction, individuals would use their affective states as information in much the same way as was shown in Schwarz and Clore’s study (1983). Kraigei, Billings, and Isen (1989) examined the influence of temporary mood states on perceptions of task characteristics and task satisfaction in the actual workplace. They were able to generalize Schwarz and Clore’s (1983) findings to the workplace. Participants were told they would be evaluating two different teaching assistant selection methods. Half of the participants were given a positive mood induction in the form of two videotapes containing television bloopers introduced as part of an unrelated study. Immediately after viewing this tape, participants rated their current feelings on a series of bipolar scales. All subjects participated in two selection tasks, one enriched and one unenriched, that took twenty minutes each. During this time, ratings of task characteristics and task satisfaction were measured from items taken from two well-established measures: the Job Characteristics Inventory (Sims, Szilagyi, & Keller, 1976) and the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). Kraigei et al. found that the level of task design (enriched versus unenriched) had a strong influence on the
participants’ ratings of task characteristics and satisfaction, and that their affective state also influenced the ratings of task characteristics and satisfaction. Ratings were significantly higher for the positive affect subjects than the neutral affect subjects. Perhaps the most relevant finding of the study is that the participants’ affective states influenced their global satisfaction with the task. The participants’ mood state had a highly significant effect and the accounted for considerable variance in the satisfaction ratings. The participants’ affective states influenced their perceptions of the task itself. Those students who viewed funny films assessed the tasks to which they were assigned in the lab as more satisfying than students who did not receive a positive mood inducement (Kraigei et al.).

Woodward and Chen (1994) examined the effects of immediate mood states on pharmacists’ job satisfaction and career satisfaction. North and Kirk (as cited in Woodward & Chen) addressed the need to control participant’s mood when conducting job attitude surveys because mood can influence responses. Participants were mailed a questionnaire in which they were asked about the type of day they were having, to which they could respond: “a good day,” “a typical day,” or “a bad day” (Woodward & Chen). Both job and career satisfaction were assessed. It was hypothesized that these measures would be affected by the participant’s mood state because they are affective-based factors of satisfaction. Only twelve participants indicated that they were having a bad day, thus only those who responded to having a “good day” (44%) and those having a “typical day” (52.8%) were included in the analysis. Woodward and Chen found that the pharmacists’ levels of job and career satisfaction were related to their mood that day. Those participants who responded that they were having a “good day” were significantly
more satisfied with their jobs than those who had a “typical day.” The individuals having a “good day” were also more satisfied with their careers (Woodward & Chen).

Brief, Butcher, and Roberson (1995) provided a small gift as a positive mood inducement to half of the hospital workers completing their on-site questionnaire. They found that those participants who were exposed to the positive inducement rated their level of job satisfaction higher than those who did not receive the positive inducement. The researchers concluded that regardless of what the stimulus is--a video, an appliance, a task characteristic, or the work environment--a person in a positive mood will evaluate it more positively than those in a neutral mood (Brief et al.).

In sum, the research indicates that individuals use their immediate mood state as information when making judgments regarding job satisfaction. Kraigei, Billings, and Isen (1989) concluded that an individual’s positive mood state increased his or her ratings of task characteristics, task satisfaction, and overall satisfaction. Woodward and Chen (1994) found that individuals who reported having a “good day (positive),” reported feeling more satisfied with their job and career than those individuals who reported having a “typical day (neutral).” In addition, Brief, Butcher, and Roberson (1995) concluded that those participants who received a positive mood inducement rated their level of job satisfaction higher than those who did not receive an inducement.

Consequences of Mood States on Work Behaviors

Affect, specifically immediate mood state, results in several behavioral consequences. These behaviors include judgments, creative problem solving, prosocial behaviors, general performance levels, negotiations, and withdrawal behaviors (Brief & Weiss, 2002). This list is not all-inclusive, because the research has not been exhausted.
Two behavioral consequences addressed in the present study have received attention in current research, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) and withdrawal intentions.

Numerous studies (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Carlson, Charlin, & Miller, 1988; George, 1991; George & Brief, 1992) have shown that Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) are facilitated by positive mood states. George found that positive mood state influences prosocial behaviors more than a person's personal disposition. In addition, individuals seek to maintain a positive mood. There are five common forms of OCB that help them do just that (George & Brief, 1992). The first of these is voluntary, unplanned, not assigned helping behaviors directed toward co-workers. The second occurs when employees report such things as theft or vandalism in an attempt to protect the organization and reduce the risk of damage and loss to the organization. The third form of prosocial behavior involves making creative and constructive suggestions to improve the functioning of the organization. The fourth form of organizational helping behavior is when an employee engages in professional development. When an individual is in a positive mood, he or she is more likely to feel more self-confident and capable. This means they are more likely to engage in self-development activities to enhance their knowledge, skills, and abilities in an effort to perform better in their current job. These behaviors are considered to be beyond the call of duty and have the potential to benefit the entire organization. Finally, spreading goodwill within the organization is the fifth form of organizational helping. It involves employees telling friends and family how happy they are at work and how much they enjoy working for their company. When one is in a positive mood, he or she is more likely to evaluate the organization more favorably. This favorable evaluation is thought to benefit marketing strategies for the
organization and to help recruiting (George & Brief). According to Katz (as cited in George, 1991), spontaneous performance of extra-role prosocial behaviors is essential for a functioning organization. It is important to note that the influence negative mood has on helping behaviors is less clear. Although negative mood has been connected to certain types of behaviors (i.e., neuroticism, impulsiveness, aggressiveness), these are not generally related to OCB (George & Brief).

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) are not only related to positive mood states but to job satisfaction as well (George, 1991). Organ (as cited in George) argued that job satisfaction measures tap fairness cognitions that are associated with the performance of OCB. The driving force behind the relationship between job satisfaction and extra-role OCB is thought to be fairness cognitions.

The other frequently investigated consequence of mood state and job satisfaction (or job dissatisfaction) is withdrawal intentions. Both absenteeism and turnover are considered to be the two key withdrawal behaviors (Pelled & Xin, 1999). There are three main differences between absenteeism and turnover. First, due to the fact that the consequences of voluntary turnover are generally more serious, these decisions require more mental consideration than does absenteeism. According to Mowday, Porter, and Steers (as cited in Pelled & Xin), absenteeism is typically more spontaneous and is a relatively easy decision, while the decision to quit usually requires more consideration over time. Second, vocalizing one’s decision to quit generally requires more interpersonal interactions with supervisors, co-workers, and subordinates than does simply calling in absent for a day. Finally, deciding to leave an organization and/or position is a much more extreme and significant decision than is calling in absent for a day (Pelled & Xin).
It is important to consider both job attitudes and emotions when attempting to predict and manage employee withdrawal behaviors. Several researchers (George, 1989; Iverson & Simon, 2001; Munson, 2001; Pelled & Xin, 1999) have shown that both positive and negative affect are related to absenteeism and turnover intentions. It seems logical to assume that if a person is in a positive mood state at work, he or she would be more likely to attend work. George (1989) found that the extent to which an individual experiences a positive mood at work is significantly negatively related to absenteeism. Negative mood was not found to be a significant determinant of absenteeism in this study. However, Clore, Schwarz, and Conway (as cited in Pelled & Xin) stated that negative emotional states make people aware that their current situation is problematic, prompting them to take action, such as withdrawing from the organization. Johns and Nicholason (as cited in George) believe workers may use absence to control their mood, as well as the nature and quality of the affective experience. George also found that both positive and negative moods predicted turnover intentions, with commitment mediating this relationship. Pelled and Xin found that both positive mood and negative mood are related to withdrawal intentions. Specifically, positive mood at work has a significant negative correlation with absenteeism, while negative mood has a significant positive correlation with both absence and turnover (Pelled & Xin). Negative mood does seem to have more of an impact when one is contemplating voluntary turnover. Overall, when individuals experience negative emotional states at work, they seek to escape those situations. On the other hand, positive mood states seem to discourage such an escape (Pelled & Xin).

One's level of job satisfaction is also related to withdrawal behavior. Numerous researchers (e.g., Hackett, 1989; Scott & Taylor, 1985) have found that satisfaction with
work is a consistent predictor of absenteeism. However, the relationship between satisfaction and attendance is neither simple nor direct. There are many factors that intervene, such as pressure to attend (economic factors and work group norms), motivation to attend, and ability to attend (family responsibilities and illness) (Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978; Steers & Rhodes, 1978). Overall, job satisfaction is related to intentions to quit. According to Mobley et al., if the costs of quitting are too high or if the alternative job does not look good, the individual may decide to stay, even though he or she is dissatisfied.

The Present Study

Understanding affect in the workplace helps to explain the behavior and attitudes of employees. Research has shown that one’s immediate mood state influences his or her perceptions of job and life satisfaction. When an individual is in a positive mood, ratings of his or her level of job and life satisfaction are significantly higher than those individuals who are in a neutral mood state.

This study seeks to take a different approach to understanding the relationship between mood state and the perception of certain attitudes. Although it is clear that one’s immediate mood state influences perceptions of job and life satisfaction, is it possible that one’s perception of his or her job or life satisfaction influences his or her immediate mood state? If this relationship is indeed a reciprocal one, the behavioral consequences, such as withdrawal intentions and prosocial behavior, should be consistent with past research.

In the present study, each participant was asked to read a work-related scenario and then role-play an employee who is a restaurant server. The work-related scenario
induced feelings of either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, life satisfaction or
dissatisfaction, or no information on either of these attitudes was given to the participant.
An adapted version of the Faces scale (Kunin, 1955) and The Satisfaction with Life Scale
(SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larson, & Griffin, 1985) served as the manipulation checks
for job satisfaction and life satisfaction, respectively. Participants were then asked to
complete the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, &
Tellegen, 1988) to measure their immediate mood state. Finally, the participants were
asked to complete an instrument measuring two behavioral consequences, withdrawal
intentions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB).

The following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1a. When there is an inducement of positive job satisfaction, the
participant will report a more positive mood state than when there is an
inducement of negative job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1b. When no information is given about ones job satisfaction, the
participants will report a more negative mood than participants who received an
inducement of positive job satisfaction, and a more positive mood than those
participants who received an inducement of negative job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2a. When there is an inducement of positive life satisfaction, the
participant will report a more positive mood state than when there is an
inducement of negative life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2b. When no information is given about ones life satisfaction, the
participant will report a more negative mood than those participants who received
an inducement of positive life satisfaction, and a more positive mood than those
participants who received an inducement of negative life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3a. When there is an inducement of positive job or life satisfaction,
the participant will report lower levels of withdrawal intentions than when there is
an inducement of negative job or life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3b. When no information is given about one's job or life satisfaction,
the participant will report higher withdrawal intentions than those who received
an inducement of positive job or life satisfaction, and lower withdrawal intentions
when the participant had an inducement of negative job or life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4a. When there is an inducement of positive job or life satisfaction,
the participant will report participating in more Organizational Citizenship
Behaviors than when there is an inducement of negative job or life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4b. When no information is given about one's job or life satisfaction,
the participant will report participating in fewer Organizational Citizenship
Behaviors (OCB) than those who received an inducement of positive job or life
satisfaction, and will report participating in more OCB than those who received
an inducement of negative job or life satisfaction.
Method

Participants

Participants were 167 undergraduate students from a medium-sized university in the southeast. Only data from the 154 participants who passed the manipulation check were retained for the analysis. The sample included 57 (37%) males and 97 (63%) females, and the average age of the participants was 20. The majority of the sample was Caucasian (92.2%). African Americans made up 7.1% of the sample. There was one (.6%) Native American participant. The participants were students in introductory courses in psychology and may have received extra credit for participating in the study.

Design and Procedure

This study utilized a six-level univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) (job satisfaction: positive, neutral, negative/ life satisfaction: positive, neutral, negative). The positive condition represented high levels of job or life satisfaction, while the negative condition represented low levels of job or life satisfaction. The neutral condition contained no information regarding job or life satisfaction.

Participants were first informed that the purpose of the study was to look at how different job characteristics affect one’s attitudes. They were then told that the current study would involve role-playing the job of a restaurant server. The rules and guidelines for role-playing were read and explained to the participants. The participants then received their packet, which included a detailed job description of a restaurant server. Each participant also received a scenario in his or her packet. The scenario contained information designed to induce either positive job or life satisfaction or negative job or
life satisfaction, or a scenario containing no job or life satisfaction inducing information (neutral condition). The script used for running the study may be found in Appendix A. The six scenarios may be found in Appendix B. The packet also contained explicit directions on how to complete the adapted version of the Faces scale (Kunin, 1955), the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) and an instrument measuring Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) and withdrawal intentions. The researcher reviewed these directions with the participant to ensure they fully understood how to respond to each of the instruments. At this time, the researcher read aloud the complete job description of the restaurant server, and then asked the participants to read their scenarios, following the role-play rules and guidelines that were read at the beginning of the session. Significant emphasis was given to the fact that the participants must completely immerse themselves into the role of restaurant server, as well as the particular situation that had been presented to them. After reading the role-play scenario, the participants were given both the adapted Faces scale (Kunin) and The SWLS (Diener, et al.) to serve as a manipulation check to ensure the intended level of satisfaction was properly induced. Both the job and life satisfaction manipulation checks were given regardless of the scenario the participant received. The adapted Faces scale can be found in Appendix C, and the SWLS can be found in Appendix D. Next, the participants were asked to complete the PANAS scale (Watson, et al.), responding as the restaurant server character in their given scenario would. The PANAS can be found in Appendix E. Finally, the participants were asked to respond to a twelve-item instrument measuring OCB and withdrawal intentions. This measure was developed specifically for
this study and pertained specifically to the restaurant server character the participant was asked to portray in the scenario. Participants were asked to complete this instrument as the character in their given scenario would respond. In other words, the participants were still role-playing when they responded to the items. The twelve-item instrument measuring OCB and withdrawal intentions can be found in Appendix F.

Materials

Work-related Scenario. Brief and Weiss (2002) stated that several endogenous factors may cause an individual’s mood at work. Stressful events, such as role overload, can have an immediate effect on an individual's mood. In addition, an employee’s leader or supervisor may have an effect on immediate mood state. According to George (as cited in Brief & Weiss), leaders who are excited and energetic are likely to energize followers, while leaders who are distressed and hostile are likely to negatively affect their employees. Work group characteristics, or group affective tone, can influence employee moods. Physical settings and organizational rewards and punishments were also mentioned as causes of an individual’s immediate mood state at work. The scenarios used in this study that were designed to induce job satisfaction included the job facets from the JDI (Balzer & Smith, 1985) as well as the factors identified by Brief and Weiss. For example, the scenario that had the purpose of inducing positive job satisfaction included a pay raise, supervisory recognition, organizational rewards, enjoyment with the work itself, and positive relations with co-workers. On the other hand, the scenario that induced negative job satisfaction included a pay decrease, lack of recognition, organizational punishment, and poor relations with co-workers.
In addition, an individual’s mood can vary depending on his or her particular circumstances or life events (George & Brief, 1992). These life events, which are not related to work, may be either positive or negative. Examples of positive life events include getting married, birth of a child, or experiencing feelings of well-being and health. Examples of negative life events would be marital problems, sickness, or death of a loved one (George & Brief). In addition, Brief and Weiss (2002) state that exogenous factors can cause various mood states. Specifically, cycles in feelings and moods can arise from rhythms related to an individual’s lifestyle or sociocultural factors. The scenarios used in this study that were created to induce life satisfaction included some of these life events. For example, the scenario that was designed to induce positive life satisfaction included good marital relations, pregnancy, feelings of well-being and health, and no feelings of stress or role overload. The scenario that induced negative life satisfaction included marital problems, permanent houseguest, feelings of sickness, and feelings of stress and role overload.

Job Satisfaction Manipulation Check. In order to verify that the level of job satisfaction was successfully manipulated in the intended direction, an adaptation of the Faces Scale (Kunin, 1955) was used. Brief and Roberson (as cited in Brief & Weiss, 2002) found that the Faces scale is relatively balanced in terms of capturing both the cognitive and affective components of job attitudes. In fact, the Faces scale has been found to be significantly associated with positive affect, negative affect, and job cognition (Brief & Roberson, 1989). Most of the popular measures of job satisfaction, such as the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; Balzer & Smith, 1985) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967), tap only the
cognitive component. Job satisfaction is generally interpreted in affective terms, but often measured only in cognitive terms. Therefore, the inclusion of the Faces scale was especially relevant to this study. The Faces scale is a nonverbal measure of job satisfaction in which the respondent chooses from a series of six faces on a continuum that ranges from extremely positive and happy, shown by a wide smile, to extremely negative and sad, depicted by a deep frown. Participants were asked to rate on a Faces scale their level of satisfaction with each of the following areas: pay, opportunity for promotion, supervision, co-workers, the work itself and the job in general. Dunham and Smith (1977) found convergent validity among the JDI, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and the Faces Scale. In addition, the Faces scale was found to have good convergent validity in measuring the five areas of job satisfaction measured by the JDI (Dunham & Herman, 1975). The adapted Faces scale was used to verify that the participants' level of job satisfaction was manipulated in the intended direction. The data for those participants whose level of job satisfaction was not correctly manipulated were not included in the analyses.

Life Satisfaction Manipulation Check. The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larson, & Griffin, 1985), which assesses global life satisfaction, was used to verify that life satisfaction was successfully manipulated. The SWLS is a 5-item scale that asks participants to indicate on a 7-point scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, the degree to which they agree or disagree with the items. Test-retest reliability is high (.82), as is the scale's internal consistency reliability (.87; Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster, 1988). The data for those participants whose level of life satisfaction was not correctly manipulated were not included in the analyses.
Measures of Mood. The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) was used to measure participants’ mood. The PANAS consists of ten positive affect descriptor terms and ten negative affect descriptor terms. The ten descriptors of the PA scale include the following: attentive, interested, alert, excited, enthusiastic, inspired, proud, determined, strong, and active. The ten descriptors of the NA scale are as follows: distressed, upset, hostile, irritable, scared, afraid, ashamed, guilty, nervous, and jittery. Watson et al. compared the PANAS to five other PA and NA mood measures developed by the following researchers: Bradburn (1969), Diener and Emmons (1984), McAdams and Constantian (1983), Stone, Hedges, Neale, and Satin (1985), and Warr, Barter, and Brownbridge (1983). All six scales were found to have factorial validity, meaning that two large factors emerged in each analysis and accounted for 75.4% and 73.3% of the common variance. In addition, with the exception of the Bradburn scale (1969), all of the mood scales have good convergent validity (.76 to .92). However, none were higher than the values for the PANAS scales. The PANAS has consistently been found to have discriminant validity under .20. PANAS has been used with various time frames ranging from momentary mood to one’s mood during the past year. In summary, the PANAS scales provide reliable, precise, and largely independent measures of positive affect and negative affect, regardless of the subject studied or the time frame and response format used (Watson et.al.) Although there is much support for PANAS, Brief and Weiss (2002) stated they are uncertain if this measure is appropriate for measuring immediate mood states. The Job Affect Scale (JAS; Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster, 1988) was also considered as a possible measure of mood.
However, A.P. Brief (personal communication, January 22, 2003) verified that the JAS (Brief et al.) is very similar to PANAS. He did not recommend using both of these scales.

*Measures of Behavioral Consequences.* Data were collected on two exploratory measures, withdrawal intentions and extra-role Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB), or helping behaviors. Many studies have focused on the organizational consequences of affective states, and both turnover intentions and helping behaviors have been found to be connected to one’s mood at work (Brief & Weiss, 2002). An instrument was developed to measure both of these behaviors. The instrument consists of twelve items, all of which are job related and specific to the situation. Six of these questions are related to OCB; the other six questions are related to withdrawal intentions. Participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale indicating the degree to which they agree ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The six questions focusing on OCB covered all five forms: a) voluntary, unplanned behaviors directed at co-workers, b) protecting the organization, c) making creative suggestions to improve organization, d) professional development, and e) spreading goodwill about the organization. The six questions regarding withdrawal intentions focused on both intention to attend and intention to quit.

*Analysis.* Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4 were assessed using a six-level univariate ANOVA. Hypotheses 1b, 2b, 3b, and 4b were evaluated through the use of post-hoc tests.
Results

*Manipulation Check*

All participants were asked to complete both the job satisfaction and life satisfaction manipulation check regardless of their condition. The job satisfaction manipulation check consisted of an adaptation of the Faces scale (Kunin, 1955). Participants were asked to use the Faces scale anchors to rate their level of satisfaction with six areas: pay, opportunity for promotion, supervision, co-workers, the work itself, and the job in general. The life satisfaction manipulation check consisted of the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larson, & Griffen, 1985). The SWLS is a 5-item measure that asks participants to indicate on a 7-point scale the extent to which they agree or disagree with each item.

Of the original 167 participants, 154 passed their condition-appropriate manipulation check. Criteria were set for both manipulation measures to establish a determinant for whether or not an individual was satisfied or dissatisfied. A composite score of 19 or less out of a possible 36 on the six Faces scales was interpreted to mean the individual was dissatisfied with their job, while a total score of 17 or less out of a possible 35 was interpreted to mean the individual was dissatisfied with their life. Of the thirteen individuals who did not pass the manipulation check, 6 were in the job satisfaction condition, 6 were in the life satisfaction condition, and one simply did not complete all of the needed information.

Only data from the participants who passed their condition-appropriate manipulation check were retained for subsequent analyses. Thus, for example, all individuals who were given scenarios intended to induce positive job satisfaction did in
fact rate job satisfaction high, and all individuals who were given scenarios intended to induce negative job satisfaction rated their level of job satisfaction as low. Twenty-three participants received an inducement of positive job satisfaction and 25 received an inducement of positive life satisfaction; all 48 participants rated both job and life satisfaction as high. Of the 25 participants who received an inducement of negative job satisfaction, 15 rated life satisfaction negatively and 10 rated life satisfaction positively. All 25 of these participants rated job satisfaction negatively. Of the 26 participants that received an inducement of negative life satisfaction, 10 rated job satisfaction negatively, while 16 rated job satisfaction positively. All 26 of these participants rated life satisfaction negatively. Seventy participants received no information regarding their job or life satisfaction. In general, these participants tended to rate their level of satisfaction more positively, with 40 participants rating their life satisfaction as high and 48 rating their job satisfaction as high.

**Descriptives and Correlations**

Descriptive statistics and correlational analyses were used to investigate bivariate relationships. Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations are provided in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, all dependent variables were significantly correlated with one another. The six dependent variables are positive affect, negative affect, intention to quit, intention to attend, withdrawal intentions, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Withdrawal intentions is the collective term for two indicators of withdrawal intentions: intention to attend and intention to quit. It should be noted that the variable intention to attend was scored so that a higher score indicated that the individual would attend, while the variable intention to quit was scored so that a higher score indicated that the
individual would likely quit his or her job. However, when the two variables were combined to form the variable withdrawal intentions, intention to attend was reversed scored so that higher withdrawal intention scores indicated that the individual would be likely to fail to attend and would be likely to quit.

As shown in Table 1, there is a significant negative correlation between positive affect and negative affect. There is a significant negative correlation between withdrawal intentions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB). Positive affect was positively correlated with intention to attend and OCB, and negatively correlated with intention to withdraw and withdrawal intentions. As expected, negative affect had the opposite relationship with each of these dependent variables. In addition, there was a significant negative correlation between intention to attend and intention to quit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Positive Affect</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative Affect</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intention to Attend</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>-.70**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intention to Quit</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Withdrawal Intentions</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>-.72**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td>-74**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **p<.001
Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Based on the intercorrelated dependent variables, a 6-level (level of job satisfaction: positive, neutral, negative; level of life satisfaction: positive, neutral, negative) MANOVA was conducted indicating a Pillai's $F(25, 147) = 11.13$, $p<.001$. Accordingly, univariate ANOVAs were conducted to further explore the results for each dependent variable.

Analyses of Variance

Following the significant MANOVA, six univariate ANOVAs were conducted to test the hypotheses. Significant main effects were found for each of the six dependent variables. The results of each of these one-way ANOVAs may be found in Table 2.

Table 2
Analyses of Variance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MSe</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2652.75</td>
<td>64.55**</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1668.77</td>
<td>69.33**</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Quit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>144.26</td>
<td>30.93**</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Attend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>109.19</td>
<td>43.62**</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal Intentions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>460.32</td>
<td>47.20**</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>271.31</td>
<td>36.29**</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error for each ANOVA</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **$p<.001$

Positive Affect. There was a significant one-way analysis of variance for positive affect, $F(5, 148) = 64.55$, $p<.001$. The $R$ squared for positive affect was .68, with an adjusted $R$ squared of .67. The complete results from the Tukey's HSD post-hoc test for
the significant main effect of positive affect may be found in Table 3. The Tukey’s HSD post-hoc test for positive affect indicated that there was no difference between negative job satisfaction and negative life satisfaction, no difference between neutral job satisfaction and neutral life satisfaction, and no difference between positive job satisfaction and positive life satisfaction. Furthermore, each of these three clusters were different from one another. Specifically, negative job and life satisfaction produced significantly lower positive affect scores than did neutral job and life satisfaction, which, in turn, produced lower positive affect scores than positive job and life satisfaction.

Table 3

*Tukey’s HSD Post-Hoc Test for Positive Affect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M 1</th>
<th>M 2</th>
<th>M 3</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>17.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Life Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.83</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Life Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.12</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subset for alpha = .05

*Negative Affect.* There was a significant one-way ANOVA for negative affect, F (5, 148) = 69.33, p< .001. The R squared for negative affect was .71, with an adjusted R squared of .70. The complete results from the Tukey’s HSD post-hoc test for the significant main effect of negative affect may be found in Table 4. The Tukey’s HSD post-hoc test for negative affect indicated that positive job satisfaction was significantly
different from neutral job satisfaction, negative job satisfaction and negative life satisfaction. Positive job satisfaction was not significantly different from positive life satisfaction or neutral life satisfaction. Positive life satisfaction was significantly different from negative job satisfaction and negative life satisfaction. Negative job satisfaction and negative life satisfaction do not significantly differ from one another; however, they do significantly differ from the other four clusters. As expected, negative job and life satisfaction produced significantly higher negative affect scores than did neutral job and life satisfaction and positive job and life satisfaction.

Table 4

*Tukey's HSD Post-Hoc Test for Negative Affect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M 1</th>
<th>M 2</th>
<th>M 3</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Life Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subset for alpha = .05

The results of the post-hoc tests for positive and negative affect support both Hypotheses 1 and 2. Specifically, when participants received an inducement of positive job or life satisfaction, they reported a more positive mood state than those who received no information about their level of job or life satisfaction who, in turn, reported a
more positive mood than those participants who received an inducement of negative job
or life satisfaction.

*Intention to Quit.* There was a significant one-way analysis of variance for
intention to quit, $F(5, 147) = 30.93, p < .001$. The $R$ squared for intention to quit was .51,
with an adjusted $R$ squared of .50. The results from the Tukey’s HSD post-hoc test for the
significant effect of intention to quit may be found in Table 5. The Tukey’s HSD post-
hoc test for intention to quit indicated that there was no significant difference between
positive job satisfaction and positive life satisfaction. Additionally, no significant
difference was found between neutral job satisfaction, neutral life satisfaction and
negative life satisfaction. Negative job satisfaction was significantly different from the
other clusters and had the highest intention to quit scores. Neutral job and life satisfaction
and negative life satisfaction had significantly higher intention to quit scores than did
positive job and life satisfaction.

Table 5

*Tukey’s HSD Post-Hoc Test for Intention to Quit*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M 1</th>
<th>M 2</th>
<th>M 3</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subset for alpha = .05
Intention to Attend. There was a significant one-way ANOVA for intention to attend, $F(5, 148) = 43.62$, $p<.001$. The $R^2$ for intention to attend was .59, with an adjusted $R^2$ of .58. The results from the Tukey’s HSD post-hoc test for the significant effect for intention to attend may be found in Table 6. Tukey's HSD post-hoc test for intention to attend indicated that negative job satisfaction and negative life satisfaction were significantly lower than the other groups. Neutral job satisfaction was not significantly different from neutral life satisfaction, but was different from all other groups. Neutral life satisfaction is not significantly different from neutral job satisfaction or positive life satisfaction; but neutral life satisfaction is significantly different from negative job satisfaction, negative life satisfaction, and positive job satisfaction. Positive life satisfaction is not significantly different from positive job satisfaction or neutral life satisfaction; however, positive life satisfaction is significantly different from all other groups. Positive job satisfaction is not significantly different from positive life satisfaction, but it is significantly different from all other groups. Positive job satisfaction and positive life satisfaction had the highest intention to attend scores, while negative job satisfaction and negative life satisfaction had the lowest intention to attend scores.
Table 6

Tukey's HSD Post-Hoc Test for Intention to Attend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M 1</th>
<th>M 2</th>
<th>M 3</th>
<th>M 4</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subset for alpha = .05

Withdrawal Intentions. There was a significant one-way analysis of variance for withdrawal intentions, $F (5, 147) = 47.20, p < .001$. The R squared for withdrawal intentions was .62, with an adjusted R squared of .60. The results from the Tukey's HSD post-hoc test for the significant effect of withdrawal intentions may be found in Table 7. The Tukey's HSD post-hoc test for withdrawal intentions indicated there is no difference between positive job satisfaction and positive life satisfaction, and that positive job and life satisfaction are significantly different from the other groups. Neutral life satisfaction is not significantly different from neutral job satisfaction, but neutral life satisfaction is significantly different from the rest of the groups. Neutral job satisfaction is not significantly different from negative life satisfaction or neutral life satisfaction, but neutral job satisfaction is significantly different from all other groups. Negative life satisfaction is not significantly different from neutral job satisfaction, but it is significantly different from all other groups. Negative job satisfaction had significantly
higher withdrawal intention scores than all other groups. In addition, negative life satisfaction and neutral job satisfaction had significantly higher withdrawal intention scores than did neutral life satisfaction, which in turn had significantly higher withdrawal scores than positive job and life satisfaction.

Table 7

_Tukey’s HSD Post-Hoc Test for Withdrawal Intentions_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subset for alpha = .05

The results of the post-hoc tests for intention to quit, intention to attend and withdrawal intentions support Hypothesis 3. Specifically, when there is an inducement of negative job or life satisfaction, the participant reported higher levels of withdrawal intentions than those who received no information about job or life satisfaction, who, in turn, reported higher withdrawal intentions than those who received a positive inducement of job or life satisfaction.

*Organizational Citizenship Behaviors.* There was a significant one-way ANOVA for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB), F (5, 148) = 36.29, p< .001. The R squared for OCB was .55, with an adjusted R squared of .53. The results from the Tukey’s HSD post-hoc test for the significant effect of OCB may be found in Table 8.
The Tukey’s HSD post-hoc test for OCB indicated that negative job satisfaction is not significantly different from negative life satisfaction, but that negative job satisfaction is significantly different from all other groups. Negative life satisfaction is not significantly different from negative job satisfaction or neutral life satisfaction; however, it is significantly different from neutral life satisfaction, positive life satisfaction, and positive job satisfaction. Neutral job satisfaction was not significantly different from neutral life satisfaction or negative life satisfaction, but neutral job satisfaction was significantly different from negative job satisfaction, neutral life satisfaction, positive life satisfaction, and positive job satisfaction. Neutral life satisfaction was significantly different from negative job satisfaction, negative life satisfaction, positive life satisfaction, and positive job satisfaction. Positive job and life satisfaction were not significantly different from each other and had significantly higher OCB scores than did neutral job and life satisfaction and negative life and job satisfaction. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported.

When participants receive an inducement of positive job or life satisfaction, they reported higher participation in OCB than those who received no information regarding their level of job or life satisfaction, who, in turn, reported participating in more OCB than those who received an inducement of negative job or life satisfaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M 1</th>
<th>M 2</th>
<th>M 3</th>
<th>M 4</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Life Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Life Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.28</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subset for alpha = .05
Discussion

The study of affect at work is not a new concept. In fact, investigating employees’ moods at the workplace has been a research concern since the 1930’s (Brief & Weiss, 2002). Since that time, much has been discovered with regard to the effect immediate mood states and personal disposition have in the workplace. Immediate mood states capture how a person feels at a given time and can fluctuate over time, while personal disposition refers to stable individual differences in the level of positive and negative emotionality one generally experiences (George & Brief, 1992). Although a person’s disposition influences his or her mood state, it is essentially the mood state that initiates behavior (George, 1991). It is now quite clear that because moods capture typical day-to-day feeling states and provide the affective context for thought processes and behaviors, they are a major influence on an individual’s behavior, thoughts, and feelings with regard to his or her jobs and co-workers (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; George, 1990).

Researchers (Brief, Butcher, & Roberson, 1995; Kraigei, Billings, & Isen, 1989; Schwarz & Clore, 1983; Weiss, Nicholas, & Daus, 1999) have consistently found that an individual’s immediate mood state influences his or her perceptions of job satisfaction, as well as perceptions of life satisfaction.

It is clear that one’s immediate mood state influences perceptions of job and life satisfaction. This study addressed whether it is possible that one’s perception of job or life satisfaction can influence one’s immediate mood state. To the author’s knowledge, this reverse relation has yet been explored. If the relationship between satisfaction and mood state is indeed a reciprocal one, the behavioral consequences, such as withdrawal intentions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB), should be consistent with
past research. Specifically, an individual in a negative mood would be more likely to withdrawal from the organization (i.e., be absent or quit) compared to an individual in a positive mood (George, 1989; Iverson & Simon, 2001; Munson, 2001; Pelled & Xin, 1999). Additionally, numerous researchers (Brief & Motowildlo, 1986; Carlson, Charlin, & Miller, 1988; George, 1991; George & Brief, 1992) have found that OCB are facilitated by positive mood states.

The first hypothesis investigated the relationship between immediate mood state and level of job satisfaction. Specifically, it was proposed that when there was an inducement of positive job satisfaction, the participant would report a more positive mood state than when there was an inducement of negative job satisfaction. Additionally, it was hypothesized that when no information was given about one’s job satisfaction, participants would report a more negative mood than participants who received an inducement of positive job satisfaction, and a more positive mood than those participants who received an inducement of negative job satisfaction. Hypothesis 1 was supported as the results indicated that those participants who received an inducement of positive job satisfaction did, in fact, report being in a more positive mood than those who received an inducement of negative job satisfaction. The results also supported the hypothesis that those who received a negative inducement of job satisfaction would report being in a more negative mood than those who received an inducement of positive job satisfaction. Post-hoc tests confirmed that those who received no information regarding their level of job satisfaction would report mood scores somewhere in the middle. More specifically, when participants received an inducement of positive job satisfaction, they reported a more positive mood state than those who received no information about the their level of
job satisfaction who, in turn, reported a more positive mood than those participants who received an inducement of negative job satisfaction.

Research has shown that when individuals are in a positive mood, ratings of their level of job satisfaction are significantly higher than individuals who are in a neutral mood state (Brief, Butcher, & Roberson, 1995). The present findings indicate that the inverse relationship is also true. Specifically, an individual’s level of job satisfaction can, in fact, influence immediate mood state. This finding contributes to the existing literature concerning the antecedents and causes of mood states.

Although an individual’s affective disposition impacts his or her experienced mood states, research has shown that moods are also influenced by situational factors and the interaction between the individual and that situation (George, 1991). In fact, an individual who is low on personal disposition PA can still experience positive moods due to positive situations or events, and vice versa (George & Brief, 1992). According to George and Brief, these events can be positively or negatively related to work. For example, positive work related events may include receiving a promotion, completing a significant project, receiving a pay raise, or receiving recognition from a supervisor (George & Brief). These examples coincide with the five job facets generally believed to influence how one perceives his or her level of job satisfaction (i.e., pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers, and the work itself; Balzer & Smith, 1985). The results of the present study support the idea that mood states result from one’s situation, as positive or negative job satisfaction impacted positive and negative affect. Brief and Weiss (2002) stated that several endogenous factors (i.e., stressful events, leaders, work group characteristics, physical settings, and organizational awards and punishments) may
influence an individual’s mood at work. The scenario used in this study that induced positive job satisfaction included a pay raise, supervisory recognition, organizational rewards, enjoyment with the work itself, and positive relations with co-workers. The scenario that induced negative job satisfaction included a pay decrease, lack of recognition, organizational punishment, and poor relations with co-workers. In this study work-related events had a significant effect on one’s immediate mood state.

The second hypothesis explored the relationship between immediate mood state and level of life satisfaction. It was hypothesized that when there was an inducement of positive life satisfaction, the participant would report a more positive mood state than when there is an inducement of negative life satisfaction. Also, it was anticipated that when no information was given about one’s life satisfaction, the participant would report a more negative mood than those participants who received an inducement of positive life satisfaction, and a more positive mood than those participants who received an inducement of negative life satisfaction. The results indicated that those participants who received an inducement of positive life satisfaction did, in fact, report being in more positive mood than those who received an inducement of negative life satisfaction. The results also supported the hypothesis that those who received an inducement of negative life satisfaction would report being in a more negative mood than those who received an inducement of positive life satisfaction. The linear relationship confirmed the proposition that those who received no information regarding their level of life satisfaction would report mood scores somewhere in between. More specifically, when participants received an inducement of positive life satisfaction, they reported a more positive mood state than those who received no information about their level of life satisfaction who,
in turn, reported a more positive mood than those participants who received an 
inducement of negative life satisfaction.

Past research has provided evidence that individuals use their momentary moods to make judgments about their overall level of happiness and satisfaction (Schwarz & Clore, 1983). The findings from the present study indicate that the inverse relationship is also true. Specifically, an individual's level of life satisfaction can, in fact, influence his or her immediate mood state.

According to George and Brief (1992), an individual's mood can vary depending on his or her particular circumstances or life events. These life events, which are not related to work, can either be positive or negative. In addition, Brief and Weiss (2002) state that exogenous factors can cause various mood states. Specifically, cycles in feelings and moods can arise from rhythms related to an individual's lifestyle or sociocultural factors. The scenario used to induce positive life satisfaction included good marital relations, pregnancy, feelings of well-being and health, and no feelings of stress or role overload. The scenario that induced negative life satisfaction included: marital problems, permanent houseguest, feelings of sickness, and feelings of stress and role overload. The present results suggest that these life events have a significant effect one's immediate mood state.

The present study found no significant difference between positive job and life satisfaction, negative job and life satisfaction, or any of the dependent variables, with two exceptions. Negative job satisfaction had a stronger impact than did negative life satisfaction on both intention to quit and withdrawal intentions. Inducement of job satisfaction and life satisfaction produced very similar results. It is believed that job
satisfaction and life satisfaction effect one another. There are three prominent theories that attempt to explain this relationship: Compensation Theory, Spillover Theory, and Segmentation Theory (Kabanoff, 1980; Watson & Slack, 1993). The results from this study appear to support Spillover Theory, which states that high satisfaction (or high dissatisfaction) in one domain will spillover into the other domain. This theory suggests that feelings generalize; thus one would experience similar or equal levels of satisfaction in both areas. Spillover Theory provides the basis for a possible explanation for the finding of no significant difference was between the effects of positive job satisfaction and positive life satisfaction or negative job satisfaction and negative life satisfaction. Apparently feelings from one domain “spilled over” to effect feelings in the other domain. Apparently feelings from one domain “spilled over” to effect feelings in the other domain. All 48 participants in the positive conditions rated satisfaction with the other domain positively, while the spillover from the negative inducements was not as consistent.

The third hypothesis examined the relationship between job or life satisfaction and withdrawal intentions, specifically intention to attend and intention to quit. It was speculated that when there was an inducement of positive job or life satisfaction, the participant would report lower levels of withdrawal intentions than when there was an inducement of negative job or life satisfaction. In addition, when no information was given about one’s job or life satisfaction, it was proposed that the participants would report higher withdrawal intentions than those who received an inducement of positive job or life satisfaction, and lower withdrawal intentions than when the participants received an inducement of negative job or life satisfaction.
It was believed that if the relationship between satisfaction and immediate mood state was, indeed, a reciprocal one, behavioral consequences such as withdrawal intentions should be consistent with past research. Specifically, if an individual’s level of job or life satisfaction effected their immediate mood state, it would be expected that negative mood would be associated with withdrawal from the organization, while positive mood would not. Several researchers (George, 1989; Iverson & Simon, 2001; Munson, 2001; Pelled & Xin, 1999) have shown that both positive and negative affect are related to absenteeism and turnover intentions. The extent to which an individual experiences a positive mood at work is significantly related to absenteeism (George, 1989; Pelled & Xin, 1999). Pelled and Xin found that an individual’s negative mood had a significant positive relationship with both absence and turnover. Johns and Nicholason (as cited in George) believed workers may use absence to control their mood, as well as the nature and quality of the affective experience. George also found that both positive and negative moods predicted turnover intentions, with commitment mediating this relationship. One’s level of job satisfaction is also related to withdrawal behavior. Numerous researchers (e.g. Hackett, 1989; Scott & Taylor, 1985;) have found that satisfaction with work is a consistent predictor of absenteeism. However, there are a number of factors that are involved in the motivation to attend and the ability to attend (Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978; Steers & Rhodes, 1978). Job satisfaction is also related to intentions to quit. According to Mobley et al., if the costs of quitting are too high or if the alternative job does not look good, the individual may decide to stay even though they are dissatisfied. Overall, when individuals experience negative emotional states at work, they seek to escape those situations. On the other hand, positive
mood states seem to discourage such an escape (Pelled & Xin). One would expect that, in the present study, the behavioral consequences of job and life satisfaction and positive and negative affect would be consistent with past research.

This study looked at intention to quit and intention to attend both separately and together. The results indicated that those individuals who received an inducement of negative job satisfaction (negative mood), had the highest intention to quit scores, while those participants who received an inducement of positive job and life satisfaction (positive mood) had significantly lower intention to quit scores. In addition, those individuals who received an inducement of positive job satisfaction (positive mood) had the highest intention to attend scores, while those participants who received an inducement of negative job satisfaction and negative life satisfaction (negative mood) had the lowest intention to attend scores. Overall, when intention to quit and intention to attend were combined, those individuals who received an inducement of negative job satisfaction had significantly higher withdrawal intention scores than all other groups. The results found for intention to quit, intention to attend and withdrawal intentions support Hypothesis 3. Specifically, when there was an inducement of negative job satisfaction, participants reported higher levels of withdrawal intentions than those who received no information about job or life satisfaction or negative life satisfaction, who, in turn, reported higher withdrawal intentions than those who received a positive inducement of job or life satisfaction. These findings are consistent with past research. The effects of life satisfaction on withdrawal behaviors were similar to those of job satisfaction. Little research has been done on the relationship between life satisfaction and withdrawal intentions. This area is one that may warrant further explanation.
The fourth and final hypothesis of the study examined the relationship between job or life satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB). Specifically, it was anticipated that when there was an inducement of positive job or life satisfaction, the participant would report participating in more OCB than when there was an inducement of negative job or life satisfaction. It was thought that when no information was given about one’s job or life satisfaction, the participant would report participating in fewer OCB than those who received an inducement of positive job or life satisfaction, and would report participating in more OCB than those who received an inducement of negative job or life satisfaction. It was proposed that if the relationship between satisfaction and immediate mood state was, indeed, a reciprocal one, the behavioral consequences, such as OCB, should be consistent with past research. Numerous studies (e.g., Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Carlson, Charlin, & Miller, 1988; George, 1991; George & Brief, 1992) have shown that prosocial behaviors are facilitated by positive mood states. It is important to note that the influence negative mood has on helping behaviors is less clear. Although negative mood has been connected to certain types of behaviors (i.e., neuroticism, impulsiveness, aggressiveness), these are not generally related to organizational helping behaviors (George & Brief). OCB behaviors are also related to job satisfaction (George, 1991). The results from the present study showed that those individuals who received an inducement of positive job or life satisfaction had significantly higher OCB scores than those individuals who received no information about job or life satisfaction or negative life satisfaction, which, in turn, produced higher scores than negative job satisfaction. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported. These results are consistent with past research and may offer a little more insight into the relationship
between job satisfaction, immediate mood state, and OCB. Those individuals who rated job satisfaction high were more likely to help than those who rated job satisfaction low. In addition, those who reported high levels of life satisfaction were more likely to engage in prosocial behaviors within the organization. Those participants who reported being in a negative mood were significantly less likely to engage in prosocial behaviors than those who reported being in a positive mood.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

As with virtually any empirical study, there are limitations to the present study. The most obvious limitation of this research is that it was a laboratory study conducted with college students who were asked to role-play the position of restaurant server. Although the work-related scenarios apparently successfully induced either positive or negative job satisfaction or positive or negative life satisfaction, there is still some question regarding the external validity of these findings. Although the majority of the participants have likely held jobs, the generalizability of the results would be more assured if participants were evaluating their feelings toward their own jobs, rather than role-playing. Future research in this area should focus on further exploring the relationship between job satisfaction, life satisfaction and affect in a real work setting. A field study could be conducted to attempt to replicated these findings, and to provide further evidence that this relationship exists for actual job incumbents.

Participants’ current level of satisfaction with their own life potentially may have caused them to give biased responses reflecting their actual rather than assigned level of satisfaction. However, scenarios were randomly assigned to participants. Out of the 70 participants who received no information regarding job satisfaction or life satisfaction,
57% rated their life satisfaction as high. Furthermore, had individuals used their own level of life satisfaction rather than their role-play level when responding to measures, it would increase within group variability (i.e., error variance), which would make it more difficult to find effects. Even so, the present study found significant effects.

Another related potential limitation of this lab study is that the relationship between job and life satisfaction and affect may have been artificially inflated by the manipulation. The participants were specifically instructed to focus on feelings of either positive job or life satisfaction or negative job or life satisfaction and then report their immediate mood. It is not possible to determine if this manipulation represents the magnitude of the same relationship in the real world where one is not directed to attend to those stimuli.

A final potential limitation stems from the fact that this study investigated an individual’s immediate mood state. Future research should investigate whether job satisfaction has an effect on an individual’s mood state over a longer period of time, such as a week or month. In the present study, individuals responded immediately with their current mood state. Responses may differ if mood measures were taken over a longer period of time.

The relationship between life satisfaction and behavioral consequences on the job should be further investigated. To the author’s knowledge, there has been little or no research to date on the relationship between life satisfaction and behavioral consequences. Further investigation could prove to be useful when trying to understand the effect one’s level of life satisfaction has on behavioral consequences such as withdrawal intentions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors.
Conclusion

The present study provides support for the proposal that an individual’s immediate mood state may be derived from their situation, namely whether or not they are satisfied with their job and/or life. Although it is clear from past research that an individual’s personal affective disposition effects their immediate mood state, this study indicates that other factors also significantly contribute to an individual’s mood. Researchers (George, 1991; George & Brief, 1992; Brief & Weiss, 2002) have acknowledged that situations, and the reaction an individual has to certain situations, can impact the individual’s mood. In fact, according to Headey and Wearing (as cited in George & Brief, 1992), life events effect mood beyond the influence of personality and disposition. Positive everyday events that are related to either work or life can have a positive effect on one’s mood state. Likewise, negative everyday events that are related to either work or life can have a negative effect on one’s mood state. The results of the present study are consistent with this proposition.

The results from this study suggest that certain employee attitudes, such as job satisfaction, can impact an employee’s immediate mood state. Specifically, when individuals were satisfied with their job or life, they reported to be in a positive mood, while individuals who were not satisfied with their job or life reported to be in a negative mood. Additionally, behavioral consequences, such as withdrawal intentions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB), were equally effected. When individuals reported high levels of job and life satisfaction, they were less likely to indicate intention to withdrawal from the organization, and were more likely to engage in OCB. On the other hand, when individuals reported low levels of job and life satisfaction, they were
more likely to intend to withdraw from the organization and were less likely to engage in OCB.

These findings can be helpful when attempting to maximize organizational effectiveness. Managers should be aware that the extent to which their employees are satisfied with their job or life will effect their mood state. Everyday events that occur at work or at home that effect the way employees evaluate their job or life, may also effect the way employees feel in general. Employees may be more or less satisfied with their jobs or life based on these events, which will then cause them to be in a positive or negative mood state. In addition, the mood states that develop from the employee’s feelings of job or life satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) will effect several behavioral consequences, such as withdrawal intentions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB). Employees who are satisfied with their job or life, and therefore are in a positive mood, will be more likely to engage in OCB than those employees who are dissatisfied with their job or life and are therefore in a negative mood. Employees who are satisfied with their job or life and therefore in a positive mood, they will be less likely to withdrawal from the organization than those employees who are dissatisfied with their job or life, and are therefore in a negative mood. Individuals who are dissatisfied and unhappy with either their job or life will be more likely to be absent from work or to quit.

In closing, affect plays an important role in the workplace. While it has long been accepted that affect influences job satisfaction and life satisfaction, this study indicates that the inverse relationship is also valid; that is, job satisfaction and life satisfaction impact affect. The relationship between these variables and consequences such as turnover, absenteeism, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors warrants further study.
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Appendix A

Script for Running Subjects
Preparation Guide for Running Subjects for the Satisfaction and Mood Study

Materials to Go into Each Packet (in this order)

1. Informed Consent Form
2. Demographic Information Sheet
3. Work-related Scenario
4. Manipulation Check Measure (JDI, the Faces scale for the Job Satisfaction Condition and the Satisfaction with Life scale for the Life Satisfaction Condition)
5. PANAS
6. Behavioral Consequences Measures: The Organizational Citizenship Behavior measure and Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh’s measure of Turnover Intentions

Materials to take with you to run subjects:

1. Protocol/ Script for running subjects
2. Complete Packets – sufficient number to cover the entire class
3. Informed Consent Documents

**Alternate classes between the Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction Conditions**
Thank you for agreeing to participate in my research study. I am working towards my Masters degree in Industrial and Organizational Psychology and your participation in this study today will help me complete my thesis. To ensure that all participants in the research, whether in this class or another class, receive the same standardized instructions, I will be reading the instructions to you today.

The research in which you are participating today is looking at how different job characteristics affect one's attitudes. In particular, you will be given information about a job as a server. Then you will be asked to assume the role of a restaurant server. You will be given a complete job description, including the tasks and duties, for a restaurant server. The rules of role-play will also be discussed. After you have read the scenario, you will be asked to complete several questionnaires. Directions for responding to these questionnaires will be reviewed.

Now I will distribute the “Informed Consent Document.” The university requires that all research participants sign this form that states that you are a voluntary participant in the research. Please read and sign this form.

(pause)

After signing the “Informed Consent Document”, please pass this sheet to the front.

Now take out the next sheet from the envelope entitled the “Demographic Information Sheet.” When doing research like this we like to compare responses by gender and age; for example, to see if males and females respond differently. No one will be identified. In fact, do not you’re your name anywhere on these materials.

Please indicate your sex. (pause)
Next, write in your age on the given blank. (pause)
Finally, indicate your ethnicity. (pause)
Please place your Demographic Information Sheet into the back of your packet envelope.

Are there any questions at this time?

Knowing how to role-play correctly is extremely important for this study. To role-play is to assume the role of someone else, given a specific, hypothetical situation. To successfully role-play, you must imagine yourself in and respond to the hypothetical situation just as the described character would. The scenario included in this study calls for each person to assume the role of a restaurant server. That is, you must believe that YOUR job is that of a restaurant server and that YOU are the one experiencing the given situation. You must try to react and experience feelings as if you were actually in the given situation. As you read the scenario, imagine yourself in the hypothetical situation. Allow yourself to experience what is happening to you and occurring around you react accordingly to how you feel.

Before you read your scenario, I am going to go over the tasks and duties associated with being a restaurant server. This will help you to get into character. As I read the job description to you, I want you to try to imagine yourself doing the activities.
Job Description for a Restaurant Server

1. Takes orders from patron for food/beverage, writing order down or memorizing it.
2. Relays order to kitchen, or enters order into computer.
3. Serves meals or beverages to patrons.
4. Observes patrons to respond to additional requests, and to determine when meal has been completed or beverages consumed.
5. Presents menu to patron, suggests food or beverage selections, and answers questions regarding preparation and services.
6. Obtains and replenishes supplies of food, tableware, and linen.
7. Serves, or assists patrons to serve themselves, at buffet or smorgasbord table.
8. Computes cost of meal or beverage.
9. Accepts payment and returns change, or refers patron to Cashier.
10. Removes dishes and glasses from table or counter and takes them to kitchen for cleaning.
11. Prepares hot, cold, and mixed drinks for patrons, and chills bottles of wine.
12. Decorates dishes preparatory to serving.
13. Cleans and arranges assigned station, including side stands, chairs, and table pieces, such as linen, silverware, and glassware.
14. Fills salt, pepper, sugar, cream, condiment, and napkin containers.

I would like for you all to now take out the scenario from your envelope and read it.

Remember, role-playing involves completely immersing yourself into the character and the given situation. You must respond as if YOUR job is that of a restaurant server and that YOU are the one experiencing the given situation. Allow yourself to experience the situation and react according to how you feel.

(Allow participants 5-7 minutes to read their scenario).

Has everyone finished reading their scenario? Now you will respond to a variety of measures. You are still role-playing. It is extremely important that you respond to these measures as if you are the described character and have experienced the situation in the scenario.

Ok. Now take out the next few sheets in your packet. The first one is entitled Form A. What I want you to do is to read each of the statements above the line of 6 faces. After you have read the statement, put a check under the face that best expresses how you feel. Please
respond to EACH of the six individual statements. REMEMBER, you are still role-playing and responding as the character in the given situation would. You may begin now.

(Allow 5-7 minutes)

Has everyone finished? You may now place Form A back into the envelope and remove Form B.

For each of the five statements, you must indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree based on the 7-point scale. Next to each statement is a blank line. Please place the corresponding number based on the 7-point response scale on that line. For example, if you strongly disagree with the item, then place a #1 in the line next to that item. REMEMBER, you are still role-playing and responding as the character in the given situation would. You may begin now.

(Allow 5-7 minutes)

Has everyone finished?

The next measure that you will be completing is Form C. This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Your job is to read each item and then decide to what extent you feel this way right now—at the present moment. Next to each word is a blank line. Please place the corresponding number based on the 7-point response scale on the line. For example, if you agree a little, then place a #2 on the line next to that item. REMEMBER, you are still role-playing and responding as the character in the given situation would. Please begin.

(Allow 8-10 minutes, check after 8 minutes)

Has everyone finished? Good.

Now, take out the last sheet in your packet. It is entitled Form D.

Please read each of the items and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree based on the 5-point scale. Next to each statement is a blank line. Please place the corresponding number based on the 5-point response scale on that line. REMEMBER, you are still role-playing and responding as the character in the given situation would. You may begin now.

(Allow 5-7 minutes)

Has everyone finished?

(After you have collected all the materials)

I would like to thank you for your time today. Your cooperation was greatly appreciated. Thank you.
Appendix B

Work-related Scenarios
Scenario A
Positive Job Satisfaction

You have been a server at *Jack’s Place* for a little over three years. *Jack’s Place* is a restaurant/bar that has been around for over thirty years. It mainly serves American food, with the specialty being their homemade chicken potpie. The clientele ranges from families to the college crowd, many being regular customers. *Jack’s Place* is a popular restaurant and every Thursday, Friday, and Saturday night there is a wait for tables. Every Tuesday is family night, where kids eat for free. The local college kids frequent the restaurant’s bar for happy hour every Saturday night.

Your job at *Jack’s Place* was your first experience as a server in a restaurant and it took some time for you to get adjusted to the service industry. Now, you feel fairly confident in your ability as a server. You can take customer’s orders without writing anything down and you hardly ever make any errors. You know every item on the menu and can make relevant suggestions to customers. You have not spilled food on customers, broken any glassware, or made any major check errors since the first few months of working at *Jack’s Place*. You feel that you are an attentive server, refilling beverages and clearing dishes when needed.

Today, you are scheduled, as usual, for the dinner shift and will most likely work from 4:30 p.m. to 1:00 a.m., with a one hour break. As you walk into *Jack’s Place* you check who else is working tonight, and are pleasantly surprised to see that Jodi, Nick, Kelly, and Jeff are also on the schedule. Most likely you will all hang out together after work like you usually do when you all work together. Not only do you consider them to be your friends, but they are also good servers, who not only do their share of the work, but who also will help you if you get into a bind. As you are glancing at the schedule, you also notice that your manager has called a short meeting before your shift begins. You put your stuff in your locker and go into the kitchen for the meeting.

You take your seat next to Jodi just as the meeting begins. Ten minutes later, you walk out of the kitchen with a burst of energy. Your manager just informed everyone that Jack, the owner of *Jack’s Place*, is so pleased with the overall service the wait staff has been providing that he has decided to give everyone a 15% raise! This was certainly surprising and welcome news and you feel like you are rightly being recognized for your hard work and dedication to the restaurant.

As your shift begins, the hostess seats two tables of four in your section, which is no big deal. As you take their order, you notice that you have been seated with a table of ten. As you approach the table, you notice that it is a birthday celebration. You always love taking care of patrons who are celebrating a special occasion, because their excitement and joy is often contagious. This table is no exception and both you and the customers seemed to enjoy each other! You make sure to bring over balloons and have the entire wait staff sing happy birthday while the birthday boy receives his complementary piece of chocolate cake. As you return to the table with the customer’s change, they tell you what an entertaining time they have had and what great service you have provided. As
you are picking up your generous tip, your manager approaches you with a wide smile. It turns out that the customers called the manager over to compliment you on your wonderful service to them and for making their celebration especially special. Your manager is so happy with you that you are told that you will be the first one to leave for the evening. As you walk out the door at midnight, you are so pleased with your job. You feel that your hard work has paid off and are very satisfied with Jack’s Place. You can’t imagine working anywhere else right now and can’t wait to come in to work tomorrow.
Scenario B
Negative Job Satisfaction

You have been a server at Jack’s Place for a little over 3 years. Jack’s Place is a restaurant/bar that has been around for over thirty years. It mainly serves American food, with the specialty being their homemade chicken potpie. The clientele ranges from families to the college crowd, many being regular customers. Jack’s Place is a popular restaurant and every Thursday, Friday, and Saturday night there is a wait for tables. Every Tuesday is family night, where kids eat for free. The local college kids frequent the restaurant’s bar for happy hour every Saturday night.

Your job at Jack’s Place was your first experience as a server in a restaurant and it took some time for you to get adjusted to the service industry. Now, you feel fairly confident in your ability as a server. You can take customer’s orders without writing anything down and you hardly ever make any errors. You know every item on the menu and can make relevant suggestions to customers. You have not spilled food on customers, broken any glassware, or made any major check errors since the first few months of working at Jack’s Place. You feel that you are an attentive server, refilling beverages and clearing dishes when needed.

Today, you are scheduled, as usual, for the dinner shift and will most likely work from 4:30 p.m. to 1:00 a.m., with a one hour break. As you walk into Jack’s Place you check to see who else is working tonight, and are disappointed to see that Jodi, Nick, Kelly, and Jeff are also on the schedule. Those four never do their share of the work, which means that you will have to pick up their slack. Usually, they spend the night talking to each other and ignoring you unless they need something. As you are glancing at the schedule, you notice that your manager has called a short meeting before your shift begins. It seems like management always has something to say.

You take a seat in the back just as the meeting begins. Ten minutes later, you storm out of the kitchen filled with anger. Your manager just informed everyone that Jack, the owner of Jack’s Place, is so disappointed with the restaurant’s overall service that he has decided to lower everyone’s wages by 15% until things improve. You feel cheated! You do more than your share of the work and are being punished for the slack of others who don’t do their job.

Right as your shift begins, the hostess seats two tables of four in your section, which is no big deal. As you take their order, you notice that you have been seated with a table of ten businessmen. You approach their table with a smile and get ready to take their drink order; however, none of the men even acknowledges your existence. You leave and approach them again in a couple of minutes, and this time you successfully obtain their drink and appetizer orders. When you give the kitchen the men’s dinner orders, the cooks inform you it may be a little longer than usual due to the restaurant’s large crowd tonight. You politely explain this to the men and offer to take 10% off of each of their meals and give them the rest of their drinks for free, but they are outraged. The men do stay and eat, pay their discounted bills, and then leave you a total of one cent for a tip.
You are outraged! The restaurant has lost a lot of money in this ordeal and your manager is in a bad mood and is taking it out on you. You are told that you will be staying after everyone else to do the cleaning and set up for tomorrow. You feel like you are being punished for no reason and are really upset.

As you walk out the door at 1:30a.m., you are so fed up with your job. You feel that your hard work has not been acknowledged and that you get blamed for things that are not in your control. You are very dissatisfied with Jack's Place. You can't remember why you have stayed at Jack's Place for three years and you are dreading coming into work tomorrow.
Scenario C
Neutral Job Satisfaction

You have been a server at Jack’s Place for a little over three years. Jack’s Place is a restaurant/bar that has been around for over thirty years. It mainly serves American food, with the specialty being their homemade chicken potpie. The owner, Jack, and his wife, Sara, are often at the restaurant and many of the recipes come from Sara’s personal cookbook. The clientele of the restaurant ranges from families to the college crowd, many being regular customers. Jack’s Place is a popular restaurant and every Thursday, Friday, and Saturday night there is a wait for tables. Every Tuesday is family night, where kids eat for free. The local college kids frequent the restaurant’s bar for happy hour every Saturday night.

Jack’s Place opens every day for lunch at 11:30 a.m. and seats its last tables at 11:00 or 11:30 at night. There are two shifts, the lunch shift, which runs from 11:00 a.m. to around 7:00 or 7:30 p.m., and the dinner shift, which begins at 4:30 in the afternoon and usually lasts until 12:30 or 1:00 a.m. Servers typically get a one-hour break to relax and eat.

This job at Jack’s Place was your first experience as a server in a restaurant and it took some time for you to get adjusted to the service industry. Now, you feel fairly confident in your ability as a server. You can take customer’s orders without writing anything down and you hardly ever make any errors. You know every item on the menu and can make relevant suggestions to customers. You have not spilled food on customers, broken any glassware, or made any major check errors since the first few months of working at Jack’s Place. You feel that you are an attentive server, refilling beverages and clearing dishes when needed. You attend when you are scheduled to work, but you enjoy your time off, as well. You are not particularly satisfied with the job, but you are not dissatisfied, either.
Scenario D
Positive Life Satisfaction

You have been a server at Jack’s Place for a little over three years. Jack’s Place is a restaurant/bar that has been around for over thirty years. It mainly serves American food, with the specialty being their homemade chicken potpie. The clientele ranges from families to the college crowd, many being regular customers. Jack’s Place is a popular restaurant and every Thursday, Friday, and Saturday night there is a wait for tables. Every Tuesday is family night, where kids eat for free. The local college kids frequent the restaurant’s bar for happy hour every Saturday night.

Your job at Jack’s Place was your first experience as a server in a restaurant and it took some time for you to get adjusted to the service industry. Now, you feel fairly confident in your ability as a server. You can take customer’s orders without writing anything down and you hardly ever make any errors. You know every item on the menu and can make relevant suggestions to customers. You have not spilled food on customers, broken any glassware, or made any major check errors since the first few months of working at Jack’s Place. You feel that you are an attentive server, refilling beverages and clearing dishes when needed.

Today, you are scheduled, as usual, for the dinner shift and will most likely work from 4:30 p.m. to 1:00 a.m., with a one hour break. As you walk into Jack’s Place, you can’t help but smile. You just met your spouse for lunch and you had a great time together. You have been married for a little over two years, but it seems like you just got back from your honeymoon in Cancun, Mexico. You feel so lucky to be in a relationship with such a loving, fun, and caring individual. Lately the two of you have started to talk about having a family. You both feel like you are emotionally and financially ready for a new edition to the family. Your co-workers and manager know how much you and your spouse have been wanting to start a family and now you can’t wait to share your news with them! You and your spouse are having a baby! As you approach them, you are beaming with joy and pride and can’t keep the smile off your face.

As your shift begins the hostess seats two tables of four in your section. You continue to have a steady number of tables move in and out of your section. When it is time for your break, you can’t believe how energized you still feel. Lately, you have been trying to watch what you eat, drink plenty of water, take vitamins daily, and jog four times a week. It looks like your lifestyle adjustment has really started to take effect. You feel great! Now that you think about it, you haven’t been coming home from work all achy like you used to, and you didn’t come down with that bug that was going around the restaurant. You plan on maintaining your new healthy lifestyle.

As the second part of your shift starts, you are seated with a party of ten. You have handled large parties a number of times, so you don’t think too much about it. As you are waiting to take their drink and appetizer orders, you start to think about your upcoming weekend. You have Saturday and Sunday off and will finally have time to get some things done that you have been putting off for a while. Just the thought of that relieves so
much stress. You know that you will feel refreshed after some relaxation time, too. You get the food out for the table of ten in no time at all and they seem pleased.

The last customers leave and now it is just time for clean up and preparation for the next day. You whistle to the radio as you roll silverware and wipe down tables. You can’t believe how wonderful everything is right now. You feel great and are so happy with your personal life. Overall, you are truly satisfied right now and can’t imagine how things could get any better!
Scenario E
Negative Life Satisfaction

You have been a server at Jack’s Place for a little over three years. Jack’s Place is a restaurant/bar that has been around for over thirty years. It mainly serves American food, with the specialty being their homemade chicken potpie. The clientele ranges from families to the college crowd, many being regular customers. Jack’s Place is a popular restaurant and every Thursday, Friday, and Saturday night there is a wait for tables. Every Tuesday is family night, where kids eat for free. The local college kids frequent the restaurant’s bar for happy hour every Saturday night.

Your job at Jack’s Place was your first experience as a server in a restaurant and it took some time for you to get adjusted to the service industry. Now, you feel fairly confident in your ability as a server. You can take customer’s orders without writing anything down and you hardly ever make any errors. You know every item on the menu and can make relevant suggestions to customers. You have not spilled food on customers, broken any glassware, or made any major check errors since the first few months of working at Jack’s Place. You feel that you are an attentive server, refilling beverages and clearing dishes when needed.

Today, you are scheduled, as usual, for the dinner shift and will most likely work from 4:30 p.m. to 1:00 a.m., with a one hour break. As you walk into Jack’s Place, you have an awful scowl on your face. You just met your spouse for lunch and, once again, the two of you had a terrible argument. You have only been married for a little over two years, but lately, it has seemed like an eternity. Sometimes you don’t feel like either of you are the people you were when you got married. Now, your spouse just asked you if your mother-in-law could live with you for a couple of months! You couldn’t say no, but you think that this is the worst thing for your marriage right now. You need to deal with the things, just the two of you! You head toward your co-workers, ready to vent the bad news.

As your shift begins the hostess seats two tables of four in your section. You continue to have a steady number of tables move in and out of your section. When it is time for your break, you can’t believe how tired you are! Lately, you have had low levels of energy. You have to attribute some of that to the loads of fast food you have been eating and lack of exercise. You have been trying to survive on caffeine, but it doesn’t seem to be doing the trick. You used to lead a healthy lifestyle and could work your 8 or 9 hour shift with no problem. Tonight, you can barely get through four hours!

As the second part of your shift starts, you are seated with a party of ten. You have handled large parties a number of times, so you don’t think too much about it. As you are waiting to take their drink and appetizer orders, you start to think about your upcoming weekend. You have Saturday and Sunday off and had planned to use that time to finally get some things done that you have been putting off for a while. Just the thought of checking things off of your “to do” list relieved so much stress. But now that your mother-in-law is moving in, you are going to have spend your time off getting things
ready for her. You spouse has already come up with a list of things for you to do and none of them are on your list. You probably won’t even get any time to relax! You are starting to feel overwhelmed. You get the food out for the table of ten in no time at all and they seem pleased.

The last customers leave and now it is just time for clean up and preparation for the next day. You begin to roll silverware and wipe down tables. You can’t believe how terrible everything is right now. You are so frustrated with your personal life right now and are having trouble seeing the light at the end of the tunnel. You are exhausted and can’t wait to get off of your feet. Overall, you are truly dissatisfied right now and can’t imagine how things could get much worse!
Scenario F
Neutral Life Satisfaction

You have been a server at Jack's Place for a little over three years. Jack's Place is a restaurant/bar that has been around for over thirty years. It mainly serves American food, with the specialty being their homemade chicken potpie. The owner, Jack, and his wife, Sara, are often at the restaurant and many of the recipes come from Sara's personal cookbook. The clientele of the restaurant ranges from families to the college crowd, many being regular customers. Jack's Place is a popular restaurant and every Thursday, Friday, and Saturday night there is a wait for tables. Every Tuesday is family night, where kids eat for free. The local college kids frequent the restaurant's bar for happy hour every Saturday night.

Jack's Place opens every day for lunch at 11:30 a.m. and seats its last tables at 11:00 or 11:30 at night. There are two shifts, the lunch shift, which runs from 11:00 a.m. to around 7:00 or 7:30 p.m., and the dinner shift, which begins at 4:30 in the afternoon and usually lasts until 12:30 or 1:00 a.m. Servers typically get a one-hour break to relax, eat, and socialize.

This job at Jack's Place was your first experience as a server in a restaurant and it took some time for you to get adjusted to the service industry. Now, you feel fairly confident in your ability as a server. You can take customer's orders without writing anything down and you hardly ever make any errors. You know every item on the menu and can make relevant suggestions to customers. You have not spilled food on customers, broken any glassware, or made any major check errors since the first few months of working at Jack's Place. You feel that you are an attentive server, refilling beverages and clearing dishes when needed. As you walk into work, your co-workers are all standing around talking about their lives. Some can't see how things could get better and some are just plain miserable. You are not particularly satisfied with your life right now, but you would not say that you are dissatisfied either.
Appendix C

Adapted Version of the Faces Scale
FORM A

Put a check under the face that expresses how you feel about the type of supervision you receive.

Put a check under the face that expresses how you feel about the type of pay you receive.

Put a check under the face that expresses how you feel about your opportunities for promotion.
Put a check under the face that expresses how you feel about the people you work with.

Put a check under the face that expresses how you feel about the work itself.

Put a check under the face that expresses how you feel about your job in general, *including* the work, the pay, the supervision, the opportunities for promotion, and the people you work with.
Appendix D

The Satisfaction with Life Scale
Form B

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to the word using the 7-point scale below. Please be open and honest in your responding.

1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
3. I am satisfied with my life.
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.
Appendix E

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule

PANAS
Form C

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you feel this way **right now**, that is, at the present moment. Use the following scale to record your answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very slightly or not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___ interested  ___ irritable
___ distressed  ___ alert
___ excited  ___ ashamed
___ upset  ___ inspired
___ strong  ___ nervous
___ guilty  ___ determined
___ scared  ___ attentive
___ hostile  ___ jittery
___ enthusiastic  ___ active
___ proud  ___ afraid
Appendix F

Instrument Measuring Withdrawal Intentions and Organizational Citizenship Behavior
Form D

Below are twelve statements with which you may agree or disagree. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to the word using the 5-point scale below. Please be open and honest in your responding.

1 -------------- 2 ----------------- 3 ----------------- 4 ----------------- 5
Strongly Disagree     Disagree      Neither Agree or Disagree  Agree           Strongly Agree

_____ 1. I am likely to still be working at Jack's Place 3 months from now.

_____ 2. I would volunteer to work an extra shift if one of my co-workers is sick.

_____ 3. I am likely to come to work tomorrow.

_____ 4. Without being asked, I would clear the tables of one of my co-workers if they were very busy.

_____ 5. I am likely to quit my job at Jack's Place.

_____ 6. I would report one of my co-workers who was giving free food to their friends.

_____ 7. I am highly motivated to attend work tomorrow.

_____ 8. I would attend a voluntary Saturday morning meeting to learn details of new menu items.

_____ 9. If I had another job option, I would quit working at Jack's Place.

_____ 10. I would tell my family and friends how much I enjoy working at Jack's Place.

_____ 11. I should have a good attendance record for this month's work at Jack's Place.

_____ 12. If I had a creative solution to the problem of how to seat customers, I would tell it to my supervisor.