

## **Exploring the Structure of Job Satisfaction and Its Impact on the Satisfaction-Performance Relationship**

**Stephen H. Wagner**  
**Governors State University**

*This research assessed the structure of job satisfaction and examined its impact on the satisfaction-performance relationship. Seventy-five employees of a midwestern university completed a survey assessing global job satisfaction, job cognitions, negative job affect, and positive job affect. Supervisors of these employees rated their job performance, organizational citizenship behaviors focused on the organization (OCB-O), and organizational citizenship behaviors focused on individuals (OCB-I). Positive job affect was positively related to both in-role performance and OCB-Os. Job cognitions and positive job affect had positive relations with OCB-Is. A three-way interaction between global job satisfaction, job cognitions, and negative job affect predicted OCB-Is.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Job satisfaction is typically regarded as an attitude, however few studies on job satisfaction have investigated properties of attitudes, such as attitude structure, that are studied by social and political psychologists (Brief, 1998). It is generally agreed that an attitude is an evaluative tendency toward a stimulus object along a dimension of favor/disfavor and that an attitude develops as direct and indirect experiences provide information about an attitude object, including cognitive and affective information (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). According to this framework, job satisfaction can be considered a general evaluative tendency toward one's job that has a structure of associated mental representations that may include beliefs about one's job (i.e., job cognitions; e.g., perceiving that your job provides you with a variety of things to do) and emotions associated with one's job (i.e., job affect; e.g., feeling worried about your job).

Attitude structure, the consistency between one's overall attitude and its cognitive and affective components, has been associated with numerous outcomes that are indicative of attitude strength (Chaiken, Pomerantz, & Giner-Sorolla, 1995; Norman, 1975; Prislin, 1996; Rosenberg, 1956; Wagner, Lavine, & McBride, 1997). Strong attitudes are durable and impact information processing and behavior (Krosnick & Petty, 1995). Thus, attitude structure may help to explain whether job satisfaction will be related to important organizational behaviors, such as in-role job performance and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB).

### **Cognitive and Affective Components of Job Satisfaction**

Theories of job satisfaction often diverge from contemporary attitude theory in defining attitude. Specifically, job satisfaction is often designated as an affective (i.e., emotional) reaction to one's job (Locke, 1976). The assumption that attitude and affect are isomorphic also existed in past theories of

attitude (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Rosenberg, 1956). However, research suggests that in some cases attitudes can have cognitive and/or behavioral foundations and may have no affective basis (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Zanna & Rempel, 1988; Zajonc, 1980). Thus, the definition of job satisfaction should make a distinction between the overall evaluation of the job (global job satisfaction) and the beliefs and emotions associated with the job. Recent theories of job satisfaction have made progress in making these distinctions between the components of an attitude (Brief, 1998; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

Organ and Near (1985) proposed that standard job satisfaction measures tend to focus on the cognitive, rather than the affective foundations of attitudes. Brief and Roberson (1989) tested this proposition empirically and found that different measures of job satisfaction vary in the extent that they capture the cognitive and affective components of attitude. Recognizing that measures of job satisfaction tend to have affective or cognitive foundations, Organ and Near (1985) questioned whether affectively-loaded job satisfaction and cognitively-loaded job satisfaction might have distinct effects on work behavior.

Research has investigated the extent to which OCB can be predicted by job affect and job cognition. A number of studies have found that the cognitive component of job satisfaction predicts OCBs better than the affective component (Moorman, 1991; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Williams & Anderson, 1991). It has been suggested that because OCBs are discretionary behaviors they are associated with cognitive processes, such as those described in Adam's (1965) equity theory (Organ, 1997). However, some studies have found that OCBs are uniquely predicted by both the cognitive and affective components of job satisfaction (Kemery, Bedeian, & Zatur, 1996) or by the affective component and not by the cognitive component (George, 1991). One rationale for the association between job affect and OCBs is that individuals with a positive mood are more likely to exhibit helping behaviors than individuals with a neutral or negative mood (Lee & Allen, 2002).

Lee and Allen (2002) found that the cognitive component of job satisfaction predicts OCBs focused on the organization (OCB-O) better than the affective component, whereas affective components of job satisfaction predict OCBs focused on individuals (OCB-I) better than the cognitive component. Although these findings support a promising explanation for the relationship between the affect and cognitive components of job satisfaction and OCBs, further research is needed to confidently draw conclusions about this phenomenon. Williams and Anderson (1991) also assessed OCB-Is and OCB-Os but found that the cognitive component had unique relationships with both OCB-Is and OCBO-Os whereas the affective component did not. Furthermore, there are other potential explanations for the mixed findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and OCBs that may compliment Lee and Allen's (2002) findings. In particular, the structure of job attitudes may moderate the extent to which they are related to OCBs. That is, one's global job attitude (i.e., his or her overall evaluation of job satisfaction) may be more related to OCBs when it consistent with its cognitive and affective structure.

### **Attitude Structure and Attitude Strength**

Assessing the structure of job satisfaction may help explain when job satisfaction is associated with important organizational behaviors. An attitude's structure is one property that is believed to determine whether that attitude would be characterized as strong, that is, stable over time, resistant to change, and related to information processing and behavior (Eagly & Chaiken, 1995; Krosnick & Petty, 1995). Two properties of attitude structure have been delineated as indicators of attitude strength: *evaluative-cognitive consistency* (consistency between the overall attitude and beliefs about the attitude object) and *evaluative-affective consistency* (consistency between the overall attitude and emotions associated with the attitude object) (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

Research investigating the effects of attitude structure supports the assertion that structurally-consistent attitudes are more durable and have greater influence on information processing and behavior than structurally-inconsistent attitudes. Rosenberg (1956) found that individuals with greater evaluative-cognitive consistency had attitudes that were stable over time and more resistant to persuasive appeals. Norman (1975) replicated and extended this line of research by demonstrating that evaluative-cognitive

consistency was also positively associated to the correspondence between one's attitude and one's behavior.

Evaluative-affective consistency was found to be uniquely related to attitude stability, when controlling for evaluative-cognitive consistency (Prislin, 1996). The joint effects of evaluative-cognitive consistency and evaluative-affective consistency have also been investigated. Research suggests that attitudes that are evaluatively consistent with *either* beliefs or emotions (or both) are more stable over time (Chaiken, Pomerantz, & Giner-Sorolla, 1995) and more likely to result in selective exposure to attitude-congruent information (Wagner, Lavine, & McBride, 1997) than attitudes that are inconsistent with beliefs *and* emotions. In sum, these findings suggest that research on attitude structure should examine both evaluative-cognitive and evaluative-affective consistency.

When an attitude is activated by relevant cues, beliefs and emotions associated with that attitude tend to be activated also (Eagly & Chaiken, 1996). Attitudes with a consistent structure should also demonstrate greater effects on information processing because they possess supportive information that may be used to actively refute new counterattitudinal information and to elaborate on new proattitudinal information (Chaiken, Pomerantz, & Giner-Sorolla, 1995; Wood, Rhodes, & Biek, 1995). Thus, the relationship between attitude structure and attitude strength may be associated with findings that working knowledge (the amount of attitude-relevant information a person can retrieve from memory) and direct experience with the attitude object are positively related to the durability of an attitude and its impact on information processing and behavior (Fazio, 1989; Woods, Rhodes, & Biek, 1995).

As stated previously, the concept of attitude structure has received limited attention in research on job satisfaction. In two studies, Schleicher, Watt, and Greguras (2004) found that the cognitive component of job satisfaction had a greater relationship with in-role job performance when it had greater consistency with the affective component of job satisfaction. In further research, Schleicher, Smith, Casper, Watt, and Greguras (2015), found that the structural consistency of job satisfaction, as defined by a composite of consistency between overall evaluation, cognitive satisfaction, and affective satisfaction, moderated relations between job satisfaction and various organizational behaviors, including, performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover intentions. Their findings suggest that relations between job satisfaction and organizational behaviors is stronger when there is greater structural consistency in the elements of job satisfaction.

## The Current Research

The present study investigated the structure of job satisfaction by assessing four components of this attitude: global job satisfaction (an overall evaluation of one's job), job cognitions (beliefs about the characteristics of one's job), negative job affect (emotional reactions to one's job associated with displeasure), and positive job affect (emotional reactions to one's job associated with arousal). Past research on attitude structure has been criticized for using different response formats to measure distinct components of an attitude's structure (Crites, Fabrigar, & Petty, 1994). In order to control for measurement artifacts that may have contributed to differences in the components of attitude structure in past research, existing measures of the cognitive and affective components of job satisfaction were modified to provide a consistent response format. These measures were used to calculate three kinds of attitude structure: evaluative-cognitive, evaluative-negative affect, and evaluative-positive affect.

Three aspects of job performance were examined in this research: in-role performance (performance of tasks prescribed by the job), OCB-O (performance of discretionary, prosocial behaviors focused on the organization), and OCB-I (performance of discretionary, prosocial behaviors focused on individuals). It was hypothesized that global job satisfaction would predict aspects of job performance better when it was associated with consistent cognitive and affective structures. For instance, it was also predicted that global job satisfaction would have a stronger relationship with dimensions of job performance when it is associated with favorable job cognitions and low levels of negative job affect than when it has other patterns of structure. Furthermore, it was predicted that, global job satisfaction would have a stronger relationship with dimensions of job performance when it is associated with favorable job cognitions and high levels of positive job affect than when it has other patterns of structure. By examining facets of

affective satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors were examined, the current research was designed to extend the research conducted by Schleicher and her colleagues (Schleicher et al., 2002, Schleicher et al. 2015)

## METHOD

### Participants and Procedure

Non-academic employees at a medium-sized midwestern university were randomly sampled and mailed a request to participate in research on job satisfaction. This survey assessed global job satisfaction, job cognitions, negative job affect, and positive job affect. Participants were given five dollars for completing the survey and informed that they would receive another five dollars for having their supervisors complete a separate survey assessing job performance. The job satisfaction survey was completed by 126 participants, consisting of 45 male and 80 female respondents. The mean tenure of these respondents was 11 years with a range of two months to 35.3 years on the job. Information regarding job classification was also collected and indicated that 38.4% held office or administrative support positions, 19.2% were in administrative management, 9.6% had maintenance positions, 9.6% worked in education services, 8.8% listed themselves in the ‘other’ category, 8% were in computer technologies and the remaining 6% held positions in human resource, food service, social or health services, or financial management.

A second survey assessing job performance was mailed six weeks later to participants who completed the job satisfaction survey. Participants were told to have their immediate supervisor complete this survey and return it to the investigators. Completed surveys were returned for 75 participants (24 male and 51 female) or 60% of those who responded to the job satisfaction survey. The mean tenure of participants with job performance ratings was 11 years, with a range from 3 months to 32.1 years. Once again, the majority held administrative positions as either support (48%) or management (12%). The remainder of the sample with job performance ratings included 10.7% in maintenance, 6.7% in education services, 8% listed themselves as ‘other’, 6.7% were in computer technologies, and the remaining 8% were in financial management, food service, or social and health services.

### Measures

#### *Global Job Satisfaction*

Participants rated global job satisfaction with 4 survey items. Three items were semantic differential scales (bad/good, negative/positive, unfavorable/favorable) asking respondents to evaluate his/her job, as a whole on a nine-point response scale (-4 to +4). The fourth item asked respondents to rate the quality of their job on a response scale with 11 points prescaled for favorableness (Ironson & Smith, 1981), including: 1 = “Best Imaginable,” 2 = “Excellent,” 3 = “Highly Favorable,” 4 = “Good,” 5 = “Satisfactory,” 6 = “Neutral,” 7 = “Poor,” 8 = “Bad,” 9 = “Very Bad,” 10 = “Terrible,” 11 = “Worst Imaginable” (reverse coded). The four items assessing global job satisfaction exhibited internal-consistency reliability,  $\alpha = .92$ .

#### *Job Cognitions*

Participants rated their agreement with 20 statements describing characteristics of their job that were identified by Dawis and Lofquist (1984) as important job outcomes. Examples include: “My job allows me to make use of my abilities,” “I receive recognition for the work I do,” and “My job provides me with friendship.” Respondents used a seven-point response scale, where 1 = “Strongly Disagree,” 2 = “Disagree,” 3 = “Mildly Disagree,” 4 = “Neutral,” 5 = “Mildly Agree,” 6 = “Agree,” 7 = “Strongly Agree.” The twenty items assessing job cognitions exhibited internal-consistency reliability,  $\alpha = .93$ .

#### *Negative Job Affect*

Participants rated 10 items describing emotional states identified by Watson and Tellegen (1985) as indicators of negative affect (i.e., emotions associated with displeasure). The emotional states used to

indicate negative job affect included angry, content (reverse-coded), worried, calm (reverse-coded), tense, relaxed (reverse-coded), miserable, cheerful (reverse-coded), anxious, and confident (reverse-coded). The emotions rated were preceded by the phrase, "My job makes me feel..." Respondents used a seven-point response scale, where 1 = "Strongly Disagree," 2 = "Disagree," 3 = "Mildly Disagree," 4 = "Neutral," 5 = "Mildly Agree," 6 = "Agree," 7 = "Strongly Agree." The ten items assessing negative job affect exhibited internal-consistency reliability,  $\alpha = .91$ .

#### *Positive Job Affect*

Participants rated 10 items describing emotional states identified by Watson and Tellegen (1985) as indicators of positive affect (i.e., emotions associated with arousal). The emotional states used to indicate positive job affect included motivated, tired (reverse-coded), full of energy, assertive, timid (reverse-coded), fatigued (reverse-coded), alert, irritated (reverse-coded), lively, and incompetent (reverse-coded). The emotions rated were preceded by the phrase, "My job makes me feel..." Respondents used a seven-point response scale, where 1 = "Strongly Disagree," 2 = "Disagree," 3 = "Mildly Disagree," 4 = "Neutral," 5 = "Mildly Agree," 6 = "Agree," 7 = "Strongly Agree." The ten items assessing negative job affect exhibited internal-consistency reliability,  $\alpha = .85$ .

#### *In-Role Job Performance*

Participants' supervisors rated four items, developed by Williams and Anderson (1991), assessing in-role job performance (i.e., performance of behaviors associated with prescribed job duties.) Examples include, "He/She adequately completes assigned duties," and "He/She performs tasks that are expected of him/her." Respondents used a seven-point response scale, where 1 = "Strongly Disagree," 2 = "Disagree," 3 = "Mildly Disagree," 4 = "Neutral," 5 = "Mildly Agree," 6 = "Agree," 7 = "Strongly Agree." The four items assessing in-role job performance exhibited internal-consistency reliability,  $\alpha = .91$ .

#### *Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Focused on the Organization (OCB-O)*

Participants' supervisors rated four items, developed by Williams and Anderson (1991), assessing discretionary, prosocial behaviors directed toward the organization. Examples include, "His/Her attendance at work is above the norm," and "He/She follows informal rules designed to maintain order." Respondents used a seven-point response scale, where 1 = "Strongly Disagree," 2 = "Disagree," 3 = "Mildly Disagree," 4 = "Neutral," 5 = "Mildly Agree," 6 = "Agree," 7 = "Strongly Agree." The four items assessing OCB-O exhibited internal-consistency reliability,  $\alpha = .71$ .

#### *Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Focused on Individuals (OCB-I)*

Participants' supervisors rated four items, developed by Williams and Anderson (1991), assessing discretionary, prosocial behaviors directed toward individuals. Examples include, "He/She helps others who have been absent," and "He/She passes along information to co-workers." Respondents used a seven-point response scale, where 1 = "Strongly Disagree," 2 = "Disagree," 3 = "Mildly Disagree," 4 = "Neutral," 5 = "Mildly Agree," 6 = "Agree," 7 = "Strongly Agree." The four items assessing OCB-I exhibited internal-consistency reliability,  $\alpha = .84$ .

## RESULTS

### Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses were conducted to assess how well the assumptions of multiple regression and correlational analyses were met. The variables were examined for normality (e.g., skewness and kurtosis), linearity, and homoscedasticity. All variables exhibited significant non-normality: negative job affect was positively skewed whereas global job satisfaction, job cognitions, positive job affect, in-role job performance, OCB-O, and OCB-I were negatively skewed. In order to normalize the variables, square root transformations were performed, with negatively skewed variables being reflected before and after calculating the square root (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). All variables were successfully normalized by the transformations and were used in all subsequent analyses.

To determine the influence of heteroscedasticity and linearity, scatterplots of residuals and Y predicted scores were examined. After all transformations were made, variables exhibited relations that were linear in nature and demonstrated homoscedasticity. Thus, after conducting transformations of the variables it was determined that the assumptions of multiple regression and correlational analyses were met.

Means, standard deviations, and correlations of the variables studied are displayed in Table 1. In order to control for extraneous relationships between components of job satisfaction and job performance, the relations between gender, job tenure, and organizational tenure and the primary variables of this study were examined. Job and organizational tenure were not significantly related to components of job satisfaction and job performance. Gender was significantly related to negative job affect and OCB-I and also had marginally-significant relations ( $p < .15$ ) with job cognitions, positive job affect, and in-role performance. Thus, gender was adopted as a control variable in subsequent analyses.

Standard multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the unique relations between the components of job satisfaction and job performance (see Table 2). In-role job performance was regressed on gender, global job satisfaction, job cognitions, negative job affect, and positive job affect. In combination, the components of job satisfaction explained 13% of the variance in in-role job performance. Positive job affect and negative job affect both had unique, *positive relations* with in-role performance ( $\beta = .66, p < .01$  and  $\beta = .58, p < .01$ , respectively). Negative job affect appears to have a suppression effect in this analysis given the extremely low correlation between negative job affect and in-role performance and the high correlations amongst the components of job satisfaction.

**TABLE 1**  
**MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND CORRELATIONS OF STUDY VARIABLES**

Variables	M	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Gender	--	--	--							
2. Global Job Satisfaction	4.66	.28	.16	--						
3. Job Cognitions	5.84	.32	.17	.61**	--					
4. Negative Job Affect	1.63	.26	-.27*	-.53**	-.59**	--				
5. Positive Job Affect	6.37	.22	.17	.62**	.69**	-.79**	--			
6. Job Performance	6.67	.25	.17	.13	.16	.00	.24*	--		
7. OCB-O	6.73	.25	.04	.03	.17	-.05	.23*	.69**	--	
8. OCB-I	6.68	.28	.24*	.18	.33**	-.08	.25*	.78**	.64**	--

Note. OCB-O = Organizational Citizenship Behaviors with Organizational Focus; OCB-I = Organizational Citizenship Behaviors with Individual Focus. Gender: -1 = Male, 1 = Female. N = 75. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .

**TABLE 2**  
**ANALYSIS OF COMBINED AND UNIQUE RELATIONS OF JOB ATTITUDE COMPONENTS  
AND JOB BEHAVIORS**

Predictors	<i>Job Performance</i>		<i>OCB-O</i>		<i>OCB-I</i>	
	$\beta$	<i>Adj. R</i> <sup>2</sup>	$\beta$	<i>Adj. R</i> <sup>2</sup>	$\beta$	<i>Adj. R</i> <sup>2</sup>
Gender	.21		.05		.25*	
Global Job Satisfaction	-.01		-.20		-.05	
Job Cognitions	.02		.12		.31*	
Negative Job Affect	.58**		.35		.44*	
Positive Job Affect	.66**		.54*		.37	
		.13*		.06		.15**

*Note.* OCB-O = Organizational Citizenship Behaviors with Organizational Focus; OCB-I = Organizational Citizenship Behaviors with Individual Focus. Gender: -1 = Male, 1 = Female.  
*N* = 75. \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .

OCB-O was regressed on gender, global job satisfaction, job cognitions, negative job affect, and positive job affect. In combination, the components of job satisfaction did not significantly predict OCB-O. This unexpected result is likely to be caused by limitations of statistical power that were exaggerated by the high intercorrelations amongst the predictors. As can be seen in Table 2, the only component of job satisfaction with a significant zero-order correlation with OCB-O was positive job affect ( $r = .23$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

OCB-I was also regressed on gender, global job satisfaction, job cognitions, negative job affect, and positive job affect. In combination, the components of job satisfaction predicted 15% of the variance in OCB-I. Gender, job cognitions, and negative job affect had unique relations with in-role performance ( $\beta = .25$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $\beta = .31$ ,  $p < .01$ , and  $\beta = .44$ ,  $p < .01$ , respectively). Again, the low correlation between negative job affect and OCB-I and the high correlations amongst the components of job satisfaction suggest that negative job affect is a suppressor variable in this equation.

### Testing the Moderating Effects of Attitude Structure on the Job Satisfaction-Performance Relationship

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to evaluate the hypothesis that attitude structure would moderate the relationship between global job satisfaction and job performance. The components of job satisfaction were centered by subtracting each individual's (transformed) composite score from the mean of that (transformed) variable. Centering variables is a method of reducing the multicollinearity between variables and their cross-product terms (Aiken & West, 1991).

It was predicted that global job satisfaction would have a stronger relationship with dimensions of job performance when it is associated with favorable job cognitions and low levels of negative job affect than when it has other patterns of structure. Three regression equations were calculated to test this hypothesis with each dimension of job performance (i.e., in-role performance, OCB-O, and OCB-I). First, global job satisfaction, job cognitions, negative job affect and gender were entered individually into the equation. The second step involved entering all two-way interactions for the components of job satisfaction (i.e., global job satisfaction x job cognitions, global job satisfaction x negative job affect, and job cognitions x negative job affect). Finally, the three-way interaction between global job satisfaction, job cognitions, and negative job affect was entered on the third step. As shown in Table 3, the three-way interaction between job satisfaction components was only significant for OCB-I. Thus, our hypothesis was not supported for in-role performance or OCB-O.

**TABLE 3**  
**ANALYSIS OF INTERACTIVE EFFECTS OF JOB COGNITIONS AND NEGATIVE JOB AFFECT ON RELATIONS BETWEEN GLOBAL JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB BEHAVIORS**

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Job Performance</i>		<i>OCB-O</i>		<i>OCB-I</i>	
	$\Delta R^2$	<i>Adj. R</i> <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	<i>Adj. R</i> <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	<i>Adj. R</i> <sup>2</sup>
<i>Step 1:</i> Gender, Global Job Satisfaction, Job Cognitions, Negative Job Affect	.08	.02	.04	.00	.17**	.13**
<i>Step 2:</i> Global Job Satisfaction x Job Cognitions, Global Job Satisfaction x Negative Job Affect, Job Cognitions x Negative Job Affect	.01	.00	.02	.00	.02	.11*
<i>Step 3:</i> Global Job Satisfaction x Job Cognitions x Negative Job Affect	.00	.00	.01	.00	.06*	.16*

*Note.* OCB-O = Organizational Citizenship Behaviors with Organizational Focus; OCB-I = Organizational Citizenship Behaviors with Individual Focus. Gender: -1 = Male, 1 = Female.  $N = 75$ . \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Follow-up analyses for the significant three-way interaction were conducted using Aiken and West's (1991) approach to interpreting multiple regression interactions. Four regression equations were calculated in which OCB-I was regressed on global job satisfaction, gender, and transformations of job cognitions and negative job affect at one standard deviation above and below their mean values. When job cognitions were high and negative job affect was low, the relationship between global job satisfaction and OCB-I was significant ( $\beta = .57, p < .05$ ). No significant relations between global job satisfaction and OCB-I were found with high job cognitions and high negative job affect ( $\beta = -.31, ns$ ), with low job cognitions and high negative job affect ( $\beta = -.10, ns$ ), or with low job cognitions and low negative affect ( $\beta = -.60, ns$ ). This pattern of findings is consistent with this hypothesis.

It was also predicted that global job satisfaction would have a stronger relationship with dimensions of job performance when it is associated with favorable job cognitions and high levels of positive job affect than when it has other patterns of structure. Three regression equations were calculated to test this hypothesis with each dimension of job performance (i.e., in-role performance, OCB-O, and OCB-I). First global job satisfaction, job cognitions, positive job affect, and gender were entered individually into the equation. The second step involved entering all two-way interactions for the components of job satisfaction (i.e., global job satisfaction x job cognitions, global job satisfaction x positive job affect, and job cognitions x positive job affect). Finally, the three-way interaction between global job satisfaction, job cognitions, and positive job affect was entered on the third step. As shown in Table 4, none of the three-way interactions between job satisfaction components were significant. Thus, this hypothesis was not supported.

**TABLE 4**  
**ANALYSIS OF INTERACTIVE EFFECTS OF JOB COGNITIONS AND POSITIVE JOB AFFECT ON RELATIONS BETWEEN GLOBAL JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB BEHAVIORS**

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Job Performance</i>		<i>OCB-O</i>		<i>OCB-I</i>	
	$\Delta R^2$	<i>Adj. R</i> <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	<i>Adj. R</i> <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	<i>Adj. R</i> <sup>2</sup>
<i>Step 1:</i> Gender, Global Job Satisfaction, Job Cognitions, Positive Job Affect	.07	.02	.08	.02	.16*	.10*
<i>Step 2:</i> Global Job Satisfaction x Job Cognitions, Global Job Satisfaction x Positive Job Affect, Job Cognitions x Positive Job Affect	.01	.00	.02	.00	.02	.08
<i>Step 3:</i> Global Job Satisfaction x Job Cognitions x Positive Job Affect	.00	.00	.01	.00	.03	.10

*Note.* OCB-O = Organizational Citizenship Behaviors with Organizational Focus; OCB-I = Organizational Citizenship Behaviors with Individual Focus. Gender: -1 = Male, 1 = Female. *N* = 75. \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01.

## DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study provide some preliminary support for the hypothesis that the structure of job satisfaction moderates its relationship with job performance. Global job satisfaction had a significant, positive relationship with OCB-I when individuals also possessed favorable job cognitions and experienced low amounts of negative job affect; whereas global job satisfaction did not predict OCB-I when job cognitions and negative job affect had a less consistent attitude structure. However, this three-way interaction was not found for OCB-O or in-role performance. It also did not emerge when examining the interactive effects of global job satisfaction, job cognitions, and positive job affect on in-role performance, OCB-O, and OCB-I.

Past research on the cognitive and affective components of job satisfaction has focused on their differential validity for predicting OCBs. In the present study, the best predictor of in-role performance and OCB-O was positive job affect. Job cognition was the best (independent) predictor of OCB-I. These findings are not very consistent with others studies examining the relationship between OCBs and the cognitive and affective components of research (Kemery, Bedeian, & Zaccar, 1996; Lee & Allen, 2002; Moorman, 1991; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Williams & Anderson, 1991). However, there is not a lot of consistency between any of the studies on this topic. The pattern of findings from different studies suggests that relations between OCBs and the cognitive and affective components of job satisfaction may be more complicated than previously believed.

The concept of attitude structure suggests that individuals may differ in the extent to which the global attitude is supported by cognitive and affective bases. These differences are believed to affect whether an attitude will predict relevant behaviors, such that attitudes with more consistent structure are more predictive of behaviors than attitudes with less consistent structure (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). These individual differences in attitude structure could be the result of personality differences associated with cognitive and affective tendencies (e.g., need for cognition, neuroticism, and extraversion). Furthermore, different aspects of job context may differentially evoke affective and cognitive experiences. The perspective that individuals may differ in the extent to which their job satisfaction is based on cognitive

and/or affective bases does not contradict the belief that some organizational behaviors are cognitively-driven while others are affectively-driven. Rather, it complements this idea and provides a rationale for the mixed findings of research on this topic.

Although the present study attempted to avoid a number of methodological problems of past research (i.e., inconsistent scaling of cognition and affect, the use of difference scores to calculate attitude structure), there are some weaknesses of this study that are worth noting. First, the sample size of this study was relatively low and did not provide a very powerful test of the hypotheses. Furthermore, the components of job satisfaction and job performance were notable skewed, suggesting that impression management may have played a role in participants' ratings of job satisfaction and their supervisors' ratings of performance. Also, having participants request performance ratings from their supervisors may have resulted in a restricted range on the job performance variables if those participants with low job performance did not return performance ratings.

Despite these weaknesses, the findings of this study and Schleicher et al. (2002) provide support for the idea that attitude structure moderates the satisfaction-performance relationship. Thus, examining the structure of job satisfaction may be a promising avenue for future research. More studies are needed to draw confident conclusions about the effects of attitude structure on job satisfaction and its correlates. Future research should examine the attitude structure of facets of job satisfaction (e.g., pay satisfaction, coworker satisfaction, satisfaction with the work itself) and how these structures might influence organizational behavior. Finally, examining dispositional and situational influences on the structure of job satisfaction would further our understanding of why individuals differ in the extent to which their job satisfaction has cognitive and/or affective bases.

## REFERENCES

- Aiken, L.S., & West, S.G. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Brief, A. (1998). *Attitudes in and around organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brief, A., & Roberson, L. (1989). Job attitude organization: An exploratory study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 717-727.
- Chaiken, S., Pomerantz, E. M., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (1995). Structural consistency and attitude strength. In R. E. Petty & J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Crites, S. L. Jr., Fabrigar, L. R., Petty, R. E. (1994). Measuring the affective and cognitive properties of attitudes: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 20, 619-634.
- Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist, L. H. (1984). *A psychology theory of work adjustment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The Psychology of Attitudes*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1995). Attitude strength, attitude structure, and resistance to change. In R. E. Petty, & J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), *Attitude Strength: Antecedents and consequences* (pp. 413-432). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1996). Attitude structure and function. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Edwards, J. R. (1993). Problems with the use of profile similarity indices in the study of congruence in organizational research. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 641-665.
- Fazio, R. H. (1989). On the power and functionality of attitudes: The role of attitude accessibility. In A. R. Pratkanis, S. J. Breckler, & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Attitude Structure and Function* (pp. 153-179). New York: Academic Press.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- George, J. M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 299-307.
- Ironson, G. H., & Smith, P. C. (1981). Anchors away – The stability of meaning of anchors when their location is changed. *Personnel Psychology*, 34, 249-262.
- Kemery, E. R., Bedeian, A. G., & Zatur, S. R. (1996). Expectancy-based job cognitions and job affect as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 635-651.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Attitude strength: An overview. In R. E. Petty and J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behaviors and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 131-142.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and organizational Psychology*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Norman, R. (1975). Affective-cognitive consistency, attitudes, conformity, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 83-91.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance*, 10, 85-97.
- Organ, D.W. & Konovsky, M.A. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 157-164.

- Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1985). Cognition vs. affect in measures of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Psychology*, 20, 241-253.
- Prislin, R. (1996). Attitude stability and attitude strength: One is enough to make it stable. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 447-477.
- Rosenberg, M. J. (1956). Cognitive structure and attitudinal affect. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 53, 367-372.
- Schleicher, D. J., Watt, J. D., & Greguras, G. J. (2004). Reexamining the job satisfaction-performance relationship: The complexity of attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 165-177.
- Schleicher, D. J., Smith, T. A., Casper, W. J., Watt, J. D., & Greguras, G. J. (2015). It's all in the attitude: The role of job attitude strength in job attitude-outcome relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 1259-1274.
- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (1983). *Multivariate Analyses*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Wagner, S. H., Lavine, H., & McBride, T. (1997). *Intra-Attitudinal Structure and Selective Exposure to Attitude-Congruent Information*. Poster presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, IL, August.
- Watson, D., & Tellegen, A. (1985). Toward a consensual structure of mood. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, 219-235.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experience at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 18, pp. 1-74). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Williams, L.J., & Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617.
- Wood, W. L., Rhodes, N., & Biek, M. (1995). Working knowledge and attitude strength: An information-processing analysis. In R. E. Petty & J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), *Attitude Strength: Antecedents and Consequences* (pp. 283-313). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Zajonc, R. B., (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. *American Psychologist*, 36, 102-103.
- Zanna, M. P., & Rempel, J. K. (1988). Attitudes: A new look at an old concept. In D. Bar-Tal & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *The social psychology of knowledge* (pp. 315-334). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.