

The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Employee Personality on Employee Performance with Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a Mediation (Empirical Study at Pandanaran University)

¹Dheasey Amboningtyas, ²Sinta Petri Lestari, ³Andi Tri Haryono, ⁴Leonardo Budi Hasiholan

¹Program Studi Fotografi, Fakultas Seni Media Rekam, ISI Yogyakarta, ²Program Studi Kewirausahaan, Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Pandanaran, ³Program Studi Manajemen, Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Wahid Hasyim, ⁴Program Studi Manajemen, Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Pandanaran
Email: dheasey@isi.ac.id

This study aims to test and analyze the effect of job satisfaction and employee personality on employee performance with organizational citizenship behavior as a mediation (Empirical Study at Pandanaran University). The population in this study were all permanent employees of Pandanaran University. The study was conducted using SPSS analysis tools. The results of the study showed that job satisfaction positively affects team member performance. Team member personality does not affect team member performance. Job satisfaction positively influences organizational citizenship behavior. Team member personality has a positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior positively impacts team member performance. Organizational citizenship behavior mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and team member performance. Organizational citizenship behavior mediates the effect of team member personality on team member performance.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, Employee personality, Employee performance, Organizational citizenship behavior

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](#) license



Corresponding Author:

Dheasey Amboningtyas
Program Studi Fotografi, Fakultas Seni Media Rekam, ISI Yogyakarta
miftahfrdh@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Human resources play a crucial role in an organization's success and progress. Every organization seeks a workforce that is fully empowered, trained, and developed to achieve company goals effectively (Djoemadi et al., 2019). Organizations expect their workforce to perform tasks competently and to be willing and able to exceed the job responsibilities set by the company (Mangku & Riana, 2021). Undeniably, performance quality plays a driving force, accelerating the development and progress of an organization (Safitri & Kasmari, 2022). Organizational leaders need to measure team member performance to achieve organizational goals continuously (Arifin et al., 2019). Methods for measuring team member performance include work results, knowledge of responsibilities and tasks, creativity in overcoming difficulties, understanding superior instructions, a spirit of cooperation, and discipline in carrying out tasks and roles. Organizations use these components as indicators to evaluate team member performance (Nirmalasari & Amelia, 2020).

Every organization wants satisfied employees. To address team member dissatisfaction with their jobs, companies need to implement strategies such as compensation or salary adjustments, promotion opportunities for high-performing employees, a conducive work environment, and other measures. Through these measures, team member job satisfaction can be achieved (Setiawan & Gunawan, 2019). When employees experience job satisfaction, they will perform their duties optimally, even putting in extra effort beyond their primary responsibilities. This can lead to OCB (Organizational Citizenship

The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Employee Personality on Employee Performance with Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a Mediation. Dheasey Amboningtyas et al

Behavior) among employees (Al-Jabari & Ghazzawi, 2019). Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) can encourage employees to take on additional tasks that contribute to organizational effectiveness (Beigi & Lajevardi, 2020). Hemakumara (2020) demonstrated that increased team member job satisfaction is linked to increased OCB and positively impacts superior work performance within the organization, and strengthens customer retention. OCB can also reduce team member turnover, strengthen organizational commitment, and improve the efficiency of organizational resources.

Job satisfaction not only influences OCB but also impacts team member performance. A company's performance reflects its success in managing its resources. This success can be achieved through effective and structured workforce management to improve team member job satisfaction and ultimately enhance optimal performance (Noercahyo et al., 2021). Employees who demonstrate OCB behaviors, such as helping coworkers and contributing to a positive work environment, can improve team and organizational performance. This phenomenon indicates that individual performance is influenced not only by personal factors but also by social interactions in the workplace.

Organizational justice theory, developed by Greenberg (1987), explains how employees' perceptions of organizational justice can influence their job satisfaction. Perceived fairness in distribution, procedures, and interactions can increase job satisfaction, which in turn can affect team member performance. OCB can act as a mediator, with employees who feel treated fairly exhibiting more positive and proactive behavior. Meanwhile, personality theory emphasizes that individual personality characteristics, such as openness, conscientiousness, extroversion, and emotional stability, can influence how they interact with the work environment. Employees with positive personalities tend to exhibit greater OCB, which ultimately improves their performance.

2. Method

Data Types and Sources

The type of data used in this study naturally aligns with the study's objectives, thus using quantitative data. The intended design was then followed up through hypothesis testing. Furthermore, the data sources for this study were:

- a. Secondary Data
Secondary data consisted of documents from Pandanaran University related to its history, number of employees, organizational structure, and job descriptions.
- b. Primary Data
The primary data in this study were collected through the distribution of questionnaires using a 5-point Likert scale.

Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

The population in this study was all 64 permanent employees. The sampling technique used was saturated sampling, meaning the entire population was used as the sample, yielding a total of 64 individuals. Saturated sampling was used because the sample size was relatively small, less than 100 individuals.

Data Analysis Technique

Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis in this context was conducted using descriptive statistical methods, calculating and analyzing the minimum, maximum, mean, median, and standard deviation of respondents' responses to all questions posed.

The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Employee Personality on Employee Performance with Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a Mediation. Dheasey Amboningtyas et al

Instrument Testing

In this regard, instrument testing was conducted in the following stages:

1. Validity Testing

The validity test in this study used Principal Component Analysis (PCA). The research instrument is considered valid if its loading factor is > 0.4 (Nazarudin & Basuki, 2015).

2. Reliability Testing

Reliability testing was conducted using Cronbach's alpha. If the Cronbach Alpha value > 0.6 , the indicator is considered reliable.

3. Results And Discussion

Descriptive Statistics

Respondent Characteristics

The characteristics of the research respondents consist of their gender and education level. The following are the characteristics of the respondents in this study:

Table 1. Respondent Gender

Gender	Amount	Percentage (%)
Man	43	67.19
Woman	21	32.81
Total	64	100

Source: Pandanaran University, 2025

The table above shows that the majority of employees at Pandanaran University are male, accounting for 67.19%.

Table 2. Respondents' Education Level

Level of education	Amount	Percentage (%)
High School or Equivalent	26	40.62
S1	35	54.69
S2	3	4.69
Total	64	100

Source: Pandanaran University, 2025

The table above shows that the majority of respondents, namely employees at Pandanaran University, have a Bachelor's degree (54.69 %).

Descriptive Statistics of Respondents' Answers

Descriptive statistics are performed by calculating the mean, median, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation values for each variable. The following are the results of the descriptive statistics calculations:

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics Table of Variables

		Statistics			
		Job Satisfaction	Employee Personality	OCB	Employee Performance
N	Valid	64	64	64	64
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.4181	4.5764	4.4841	4.3527
Median		4.3500	4.7050	4.4700	4.2857
Std. Deviation		.33306	.37942	.31151	.26813
Minimum		3.88	3.91	4.00	4.00
Maximum		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

The Likert scale ranges from 5 (highest) to 1 (lowest). The categories are low, medium, and high. The calculation of the interval range for each category is as follows:

(Highest value – lowest value) : 3 = (5 – 1) : 3 = 1.33. So the interval for each category is with the mean value:

Low: 1 to 2.33

Medium: 2.34 to 3.67

Height : > 3.67

The mean job satisfaction (X1) value is 4.4181 > 3.67, which means that the average team member at Pandanaran University has high job satisfaction. The mean team member personality (X2) value is 4.5764, which is greater than 3.67, indicating that the average team member at Pandanaran University has a good personality. The mean organizational citizenship behavior value is 4.4841. A value greater than 3.67 indicates that the average team member at Pandanaran University has strong OCB. The mean team member performance value of 4.3522 is greater than 3.67, meaning that the average team member of Pandanaran University has good performance. The following are the descriptive statistical results for each indicator of the job satisfaction variable (X1):

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Job Satisfaction Variable (X1)

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
X1.1	64	3	5	4.47	.590
X1.2	64	3	5	4.53	.616
X1.3	64	3	5	4.66	.541
X1.4	64	4	5	4.59	.495
X1.5	64	3	5	4.59	.526
X1.6	64	4	5	4.67	.473
X1.7	64	3	5	4.52	.591
X1.8	64	3	5	4.58	.529
X1.9	64	4	5	4.69	.467
X1.10	64	3	5	4.48	.563
X1.11	64	3	5	4.37	.701
X1.12	64	3	5	4.06	.614
X1.13	64	3	5	4.28	.519
X1.14	64	3	5	3.98	.654
X1.15	64	3	5	4.06	.614
X1.16	64	3	5	4.08	.543
X1.17	64	3	5	4.23	.584
X1.18	64	2	5	4.30	.609
X1.19	64	2	5	3.98	.701
X1.20	64	3	5	4.05	.677
X1.21	64	3	5	4.52	.534
X1.22	64	4	5	4.66	.479
X1.23	64	4	5	4.53	.503
X1.24	64	3	5	4.64	.515
X1.25	64	3	5	4.66	.511
X1.26	64	3	5	4.67	.506
X1	64	3.88	5.00	4.4181	.33306
Valid N (listwise)	64				

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

Based on the table, each indicator has a mean > 3.67. This means that Pandanaran University employees feel that Pandanaran University provides salaries and wages in line with their expectations, provides incentives, provides appropriate benefits, provides appropriate facilities, provides appropriate bonuses, and provides appropriate indirect compensation. In addition, they feel that they have high loyalty to Pandanaran University, have high creativity and have added value, often provide solutions to problems that occur in the office, think that their professionalism is appreciated, feel that they can communicate well, feel that they have a work period that is in accordance with my expectations at Pandanaran University, think that Pandanaran University pays attention to the level of education of its employees, have active communication with fellow employees at Pandanaran University.

They also feel that there is mutual respect between employees, there is good collaboration between employees, there is mutual support between employees, there is mutual trust between employees and superiors, there is effective and open communication between employees and their superiors, there is support from superiors, there is a satisfactory work space, there is a guarantee of job security and there is a good work culture.

The following are descriptive statistics for each indicator for the Employee Personality variable (X2):

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Employee Personality Variable (X2)

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
X2.1	64	3	5	4.44	.614
X2.2	64	3	5	4.50	.642
X2.3	64	3	5	4.67	.506
X2.4	64	4	5	4.58	.498
X2.5	64	4	5	4.62	.488
X2.6	64	4	5	4.66	.479
X2.7	64	3	5	4.48	.617
X2.8	64	4	5	4.61	.492
X2.9	64	3	5	4.47	.563
X2.10	64	4	5	4.66	.479
X2.11	64	3	5	4.41	.635
X2.12	64	4	5	4.66	.479
X2.13	64	4	5	4.59	.495
X2.14	64	3	5	4.27	.672
X2.15	64	4	5	4.69	.467
X2.16	64	3	5	4.70	.494
X2.17	64	4	5	4.66	.479
X2.18	64	4	5	4.70	.460
X2.19	64	4	5	4.59	.495
X2.20	64	3	5	4.47	.590
X2.21	64	3	5	4.58	.586
X2.22	64	4	5	4.69	.467
X2	64	3.91	5.00	4.5764	.37942
Valid N (listwise)	64				

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

The table above shows a mean value of > 3.67 for each indicator, indicating that they generally have good personalities. This means that Pandanaran University employees, on average, feel capable of managing anxiety at work, are not afraid of work, can control their anger at work, do not feel stressed at work, and feel sociable.

In addition, they feel friendly, like to talk, have self-confidence, are open to new ideas, have a strong imagination, are aesthetically sensitive, enjoy new experiences, and seek praise. They also feel that they are people who often say sorry, are not people who are afraid to say no, are not people who compare themselves to others, are people who think well, people who do not expect anything in return, people who do not delay kindness, people who are not affected by criticism, people who feel they have shortcomings, and are not arrogant. The following are descriptive statistics for the Organizational Citizenship Behavior variable (Y1).

Table 6 of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior variable (Y1)

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Y1.1	64	3	5	4.48	.534
Y1.2	64	3	5	4.48	.617
Y1.3	64	3	5	4.63	.519
Y1.4	64	4	5	4.53	.503
Y1.5	64	4	5	4.59	.495
Y1.6	64	4	5	4.53	.503
Y1.7	64	3	5	4.42	.612
Y1.8	64	4	5	4.44	.500
Y1.9	64	4	5	4.56	.500
Y1.10	64	3	5	4.30	.494
Y1.11	64	4	5	4.55	.502
Y1.12	64	3	5	4.36	.545
Y1.13	64	4	5	4.50	.504
Y1.14	64	3	5	4.44	.588
Y1.15	64	4	5	4.45	.502
Y1	64	4.00	5.00	4.4841	.31151
Valid N (listwise)	64				

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

The table above shows that the mean for each indicator exceeds 3.67. This means that employees, on average, exhibit good Organizational Citizenship Behavior. They feel they always try to maintain calm, constantly encourage their coworkers, always show respect, do not complain, and always put their interests above their own.

They also feel that they always protect the company from external threats, always promote the company's reputation, always maintain general compliance, always obey the rules, do not prioritize personal work, and volunteer to complete the tasks assigned. Besides, they feel they always attend meetings, understand the issues involved, and engage in activities to improve their skills and experience. The following are descriptive statistics for the team member performance variable (Y2):

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics Table of Employee Performance Variable (Y2)

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Y1	64	4.00	5.00	4.4841	.31151
Y2.1	64	3	5	4.28	.519
Y2.2	64	3	5	4.31	.500
Y2.3	64	4	5	4.42	.498
Y2.4	64	4	5	4.34	.479
Y2.5	64	4	5	4.38	.488
Y2.6	64	4	5	4.41	.495
Y2.7	64	4	5	4.33	.473
Y2	64	4.00	5.00	4.3527	.26813
Valid N (listwise)	64				

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

This table also shows that each indicator of the Employee Performance variable (Y2) has a mean > 3.67. This means that, on average, employees feel they perform well. They think they produce high-quality work, feel capable of completing work in the targeted quantity, have good work skills, have adequate

knowledge related to their work, maintain social relationships with others, and maintain psychological support. In addition, they also perform informal tasks.

Validity Test

Validity testing is conducted to determine whether each questionnaire item measures the variable being tested. The test was conducted using Principal Component Analysis. The instrument is valid if the loading factor is > 0.4 . The following is a summary of the validity test results for each variable based on SPSS output:

Table 8 Job Satisfaction Variable Validity Test Table (X1)

Indicator	Loading Factor	Standard	Conclusion
X1.1	0.744	> 0.40	Valid
X1.2	0.626	> 0.40	Valid
X1.3	0.698	> 0.40	Valid
X1.4	0.758	> 0.40	Valid
X1.5	0.724	> 0.40	Valid
X1.6	0.659	> 0.40	Valid
X1.7	0.577	> 0.40	Valid
X1.8	0.671	> 0.40	Valid
X1.9	0.726	> 0.40	Valid
X1.10	0.738	> 0.40	Valid
X1.11	0.676	> 0.40	Valid
X1.12	0.547	> 0.40	Valid
X1.13	0.470	> 0.40	Valid
X1.14	< 0.40	> 0.40	Invalid
X1.15	0.604	> 0.40	Valid
X1.16	0.521	> 0.40	Valid
X1.17	0.566	> 0.40	Valid
X1.18	0.523	> 0.40	Valid
X1.19	0.490	> 0.40	Valid
X1.20	0.438	> 0.40	Valid
X1.21	0.706	> 0.40	Valid
X1.22	0.560	> 0.40	Valid
X1.23	0.692	> 0.40	Valid
X1.24	< 0.40	> 0.40	Invalid
X1.25	0.548	> 0.40	Valid
X1.26	0.417	> 0.40	Valid

Source: SPSS output, processed, 2026

Table 9. Job Satisfaction Variable Validity Test Table (X1) After Indicator Elimination

Indicator	Loading Factor	Standard	Conclusion
X1.1	0.750	> 0.40	Valid
X1.2	0.626	> 0.40	Valid
X1.3	0.713	> 0.40	Valid
X1.4	0.769	> 0.40	Valid
X1.5	0.738	> 0.40	Valid
X1.6	0.670	> 0.40	Valid

Indicator	Loading Factor	Standard	Conclusion
X1.7	0.589	> 0.40	Valid
X1.8	0.680	> 0.40	Valid
X1.9	0.743	> 0.40	Valid
X1.10	0.746	> 0.40	Valid
X1.11	0.676	> 0.40	Valid
X1.12	0.537	> 0.40	Valid
X1.13	0.453	> 0.40	Valid
X1.15	0.584	> 0.40	Valid
X1.16	0.504	> 0.40	Valid
X1.17	0.562	> 0.40	Valid
X1.18	0.512	> 0.40	Valid
X1.19	0.466	> 0.40	Valid
X1.20	0.426	> 0.40	Valid
X1.21	0.710	> 0.40	Valid
X1.22	0.556	> 0.40	Valid
X1.23	0.689	> 0.40	Valid
X1.25	0.554	> 0.40	Valid
X1.26	0.401	> 0.40	Valid

Source: SPSS output, processed, 2026.

Table 10. Validity Test Table for Employee Personality Variable (X2)

Indicator	Loading Factor	Standard	Conclusion
X2.1	0.830	> 0.40	Valid
X2.2	0.652	> 0.40	Valid
X2.3	0.780	> 0.40	Valid
X2.4	0.892	> 0.40	Valid
X2.5	0.863	> 0.40	Valid
X2.6	0.821	> 0.40	Valid
X2.7	0.577	> 0.40	Valid
X2.8	0.538	> 0.40	Valid
X2.9	0.819	> 0.40	Valid
X2.10	0.821	> 0.40	Valid
X2.11	0.503	> 0.40	Valid
X2.12	0.821	> 0.40	Valid
X2.13	0.807	> 0.40	Valid
X2.14	< 0.40	> 0.40	Invalid
X2.15	0.797	> 0.40	Valid
X2.16	0.606	> 0.40	Valid
X2.17	0.821	> 0.40	Valid
X2.18	0.685	> 0.40	Valid
X2.19	0.807	> 0.40	Valid
X2.20	0.789	> 0.40	Valid
X2.21	0.560	> 0.40	Valid
X2.22	0.797	> 0.40	Valid

Source: SPSS output, processed, 2026

Table 11. Validity Test Table for Employee Personality Variable (X2) After Indicator Elimination

Indicator	Loading Factor	Standard	Conclusion
X2.1	0.826	> 0.40	Valid
X2.2	0.649	> 0.40	Valid
X2.3	0.781	> 0.40	Valid
X2.4	0.890	> 0.40	Valid
X2.5	0.864	> 0.40	Valid
X2.6	0.824	> 0.40	Valid
X2.7	0.581	> 0.40	Valid
X2.8	0.542	> 0.40	Valid
X2.9	0.814	> 0.40	Valid
X2.10	0.824	> 0.40	Valid
X2.11	0.502	> 0.40	Valid
X2.12	0.824	> 0.40	Valid
X2.13	0.808	> 0.40	Valid
X2.15	0.797	> 0.40	Valid
X2.16	0.605	> 0.40	Valid
X2.17	0.824	> 0.40	Valid
X2.18	0.685	> 0.40	Valid
X2.19	0.808	> 0.40	Valid
X2.20	0.785	> 0.40	Valid
X2.21	0.559	> 0.40	Valid
X2.22	0.797	> 0.40	Valid

Source: SPSS output, processed, 2026

Table 12. Validity Test Table for Organizational Citizenship Behavior Variable (Y1)

Indicator	Loading Factor	Standard	Conclusion
Y1.1	0.719	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.2	0.472	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.3	0.677	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.4	0.857	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.5	0.646	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.6	0.719	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.7	0.521	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.8	0.515	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.9	0.601	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.10	0.635	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.11	< 0.40	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.12	0.559	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.13	0.807	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.14	< 0.40	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.15	0.677	> 0.40	Valid

Source: SPSS output, processed, 2026

Table 13. Validity Test Table for Organizational Citizenship Behavior Variable (Y1)
 After Indicator Elimination

Indicator	Loading Factor	Standard	Conclusion
Y1.1	0.719	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.2	0.476	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.3	0.681	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.4	0.863	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.5	0.653	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.6	0.725	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.7	0.510	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.8	0.503	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.9	0.599	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.10	0.639	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.12	0.544	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.13	0.810	> 0.40	Valid
Y1.15	0.685	> 0.40	Valid

Source: SPSS output, processed, 2026

Table 14. team member Performance Variable Validity Test Table (Y2)

Indicator	Loading Factor	Standard	Conclusion
Y2.1	0.606	> 0.40	Valid
Y2.2	0.495	> 0.40	Valid
Y2.3	0.441	> 0.40	Valid
Y2.4	0.441	> 0.40	Valid
Y2.5	0.496	> 0.40	Valid
Y2.6	0.580	> 0.40	Valid
Y2.7	0.729	> 0.40	Valid

Source: SPSS output, processed, 2026

Reliability Test

Reliability testing was conducted to determine whether each question in the questionnaire was free of ambiguity or bias and whether each respondent had the same understanding of the questionnaire's contents. A questionnaire is considered reliable if the Cronbach's Alpha value is > 0.6 (Ghozali, 2018). Reliability testing was only conducted on valid indicators. The following are the results of the reliability test:

Table 15. Reliability Test Results Table

Variables	Cronbach Alpha	Standard	Conclusion
Job Satisfaction	0.926	> 0.6	Reliable
team member Personality	0.957	> 0.6	Reliable
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	0.881	> 0.6	Reliable
team member Performance	0.603	> 0.6	Reliable

Source: SPSS output, processed, 2026

Testing equation 1

Regression equation 1 is the equation for the direct influence of job satisfaction and team member personality on organizational citizenship behavior. The following is the regression equation used:

The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Employee Personality on Employee Performance with Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a Mediation. Dheasey Amboningtyas et.al

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$$

Y1 = organizational citizenship behavior

a = constant

b = regression coefficient

X1 = job satisfaction

X2 = team member personality

Test of the Coefficient of Determination of Equation 1

Table 16. Determination Coefficient Test Table for Equation 1

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.884 ^a	.782	.775	.16053

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Personality, Job Satisfaction

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

Regression equation 1 for the influence of Job Satisfaction and Employee Personality on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) shows an adjusted R-square of 0.775 (77.5%). This means that the Job Satisfaction and Employee Personality variables explain 77.5% of the variance in the Organizational Citizenship Behavior variable, while other variables outside this study explain the remaining 22.5%.

Model Feasibility Test (F Test) Equation 1

The F test was conducted to determine whether regression equation 1 in this study is suitable for use (fit). The model is considered fit if the significance value is < 0.05. The following are the results of the F test for equation 1:

Table 17. F Test Table Equation 1 (Goodness of Fit)

ANOVA^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.641	2	2.820	109.438	<.001 ^b
	Residual	1.572	61	.026		
	Total	7.213	63			

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Personality, Job Satisfaction

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

The table above shows a significance value of < 0.001, less than 0.05. This means that regression model 1 used in this study is suitable for use (fit).

t-Test Equation 1 (Hypothesis Testing)

Equation 1 was used to test the direct influence of job satisfaction and team member personality on organizational citizenship behavior (Hypotheses 1 and 2). The hypothesis is supported if the p-value is < 0.05. The following are the t-test results for equation 1:

Table 18. t-Test Table Equation 1
Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.708	.264		2.683	.009
	Job Satisfaction	.289	.109	.294	2.649	.010
	Employee Personality	.544	.097	.623	5.616	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: OCB

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

Based on the table above, it is evident that job satisfaction (X1) has a direct influence on organizational citizenship behavior (Y1) ($p = 0.010 < 0.05$). That team member personality (X2) has a direct influence on organizational citizenship behavior (Y1) ($p < 0.001$). This means that hypotheses 1 and 2 are proven. A positive beta value indicates that job satisfaction (X1) and team member personality (X2) positively influence organizational citizenship behavior (Y1).

Testing Equation 2

Regression equation 2 is used to test the influence of job satisfaction, team member personality, and organizational citizenship behavior on team member performance. The following is the regression equation used:

$$Y2 = a + b3X1 + b4X2 + b5Y1 + e$$

Y2 = team member performance

a = constant

b = regression coefficient

X1 = job satisfaction

X2 = team member personality

Y1 = organizational citizenship behavior

Test of the Coefficient of Determination of Equation 2

Table 19. Test Table of Determination Coefficient for Equation 2

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.813 ^a	.661	.644	.15995

a. Predictors: (Constant), OCB, Job Satisfaction, Employee Personality

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

The table shows an Adjusted R Square of 0.644, or 64.4%. This means that the variables job satisfaction, team member personality, and organizational citizenship behavior explain 64.4% of team member performance, while other variables outside this study explain the remaining 35.6%.

F Test Equation 2

The F test was conducted to determine whether regression equation 2 in this study is suitable for use (fit). The model is considered fit if the significance value is < 0.05 . The following are the results of the F test for equation 2:

Table 20. F Test Table for Equation 2 (Goodness of Fit)

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.994	3	.998	39.013	<.001 ^b
	Residual	1.535	60	.026		
	Total	4.529	63			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), OCB, Job Satisfaction, Employee Personality

Source: SPSS output, 2026.

The table above shows a significance value of <0.001, which is less than 0.05. This means that the second regression model, which tests the influence of job satisfaction, team member personality, and organizational citizenship behavior on team member performance, is suitable for use (fit).

T-test of equation 2

Equation 2 was used to test the direct effects of job satisfaction, team member personality, and organizational citizenship behavior on team member performance. The hypothesis is supported if the p-value is < 0.05. The following are the t-test results for equation 2:

Table 21. t-Test Table Equation 2

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.355	.278		4.873	<.001
	Job Satisfaction	.320	.115	.410	2.787	.007
	Employee Personality	-.133	.119	-.192	-1.118	.268
	OCB	.489	.128	.617	3.832	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

The table above shows a significance value of job satisfaction of <0.001 with a positive beta value. This means that hypothesis 3, which states that job satisfaction has a positive effect on team member performance, is proven. The significance value of team member personality of 0.268 > 0.05 proves that there is no direct influence of team member personality on team member performance. This means that hypothesis 4, which states that team member personality has a positive impact on team member performance, is not proven. The significance of organizational citizenship behavior (p < 0.001) and a positive beta value indicate a positive influence of organizational citizenship behavior on team member performance. This means that hypothesis 5 is proven.

Indirect Effect Testing.

The indirect effect of job satisfaction and team member personality on team member performance was tested using the Sobel test, as the data met the assumption of normality. Based on the t-test table for equations 1 and 2, the regression coefficients and standard errors for each variable are shown. The

following table summarizes the t-test results as a reference for calculations using the Sobel Test calculator:

Table 22. Summary Table of t-Test Results

Variables	Beta (Standardized coefficient)	Standard Error	Information
Job Satisfaction	0.294	0.109	Equation 1
team member Personality	0.623	0.097	Equation 1
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	0.617	0.128	Equation 2

Source: SPSS output, processed, 2026.

Table 23. Summary Table of Calculation Results Using the Sobel Test
 The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance Through OCB

X1-Y1-Y2	Mark
a	0.294
b	0.617
sa	0.109
sb	0.128
Statistical Test	2,354
p-value (significance)	0.018
Standard	< 0.05
Conclusion	Mediating

Source: Sobel Test Output (danielsoper.com, 2026)

Table 24. Summary Table of Calculation Results Using the Sobel Test
 The Influence of Employee Personality on Employee Performance Through OCB

X2-Y1-Y2	Mark
a	0.623
b	0.617
sa	0.097
sb	0.128
Statistical Test	3,855
p-value (significance)	0.0001
Standard	< 0.05
Conclusion	Mediating

Source: Sobel Test Output (danielsoper.com, 2026)

Based on the results of the Sobel Test calculations in tables 4.18 and 4.19 above, it can be shown that organizational citizenship behavior mediates the influence of job satisfaction and team member personality on team member performance. This means that hypotheses 6 and 7 are proven.

Discussion

The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Based on the table, it is shown that team member personality (X2) has a direct influence on organizational citizenship behavior (Y1), with a significance value of $0.010 < 0.05$ and a calculated t value of 2.649. This means that hypothesis 1, which states that job satisfaction (X1) has a positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior (Y1), is supported. The higher a team member's job satisfaction, the more likely they

are to volunteer to help their coworkers. Therefore, the higher the job satisfaction, the greater the organizational citizenship behavior.

The results of this study support the theory of organizational justice. Organizational justice theory explains how employees' perceptions of organizational justice can influence their job satisfaction. Perceived fairness in distribution, procedures, and interactions can increase job satisfaction, which, in turn, can affect team member performance. The results of this study support the research of Rusmayanti et al. (2022), Sambung (2019), and Budiarto & Kurniawati (2024), which showed that job satisfaction has a positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior. The greater the team member's job satisfaction, the higher their organizational citizenship behavior.

The Influence of Employee Personality on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Based on the table, it is evident that team member personality (X2) has a direct influence on organizational citizenship behavior (Y1), with a significance value of <0.001 and a calculated t value of 5.616. This means that hypothesis 2, which posits that team member personality (X2) positively influences organizational citizenship behavior (Y1), is supported. The better a team member's personality, the more likely they are to volunteer to help coworkers, even if it is not part of their job description. Personality theory emphasizes that individual personality characteristics, such as openness, conscientiousness, extroversion, and emotional stability, can influence how they interact with the work environment. Employees with positive personalities tend to have higher job satisfaction and demonstrate greater OCB.

The results of this study align with the research by Isyah and Palupiningdyah (2020), which shows that team member personality influences organizational citizenship behavior. The results of this study are also in line with research by Udin & Yuniawan (2020) and Batilmurik & Faymau (2021), which show that team member personality influences organizational citizenship behavior.

The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance

The table shows a significance value of 0.007 for job satisfaction, which is < 0.05 , with a t-value of 2.787. This means that job satisfaction positively affects team member performance. The higher a team member's job satisfaction, the better their performance will be.

The results of this study support the theory of organizational justice. Organizational justice theory holds that when employees feel they are treated fairly, their job satisfaction increases, ultimately improving team member performance. These results align with research by Mohamad and Nawawi (2020), which demonstrated that job satisfaction has a positive and significant impact on team member performance. The results of this study are also in line with research by Rizal et al. (2020), Rusmayanti et al (2022), Sambung (2019), and Budiarto and Kurniawati (2024), where the emergence of a sense of satisfaction can make a team member's performance optimal in achieving the goals or targets to be achieved.

The Influence of Employee Personality on Employee Performance

Personality theory emphasizes individual personality characteristics, suggesting that employees with good personalities will also perform well. The results of this study do not support the direct influence of personality theory on team member performance. The significance value of team member personality in the table, $0.268 > 0.05$, proves that team member personality does not directly influence team member performance. This means that even if employees have an upbeat personality, this does not necessarily improve their performance. This is because even if they have a cheerful personality, if they do not perceive fairness in the workplace, their performance will not necessarily improve. These results support the

research of Aponno et al. (2017) and Billah et al. (2021), which proves that team member personality does not influence team member performance.

The Influence of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Employee Performance

The table shows the significance value of organizational citizenship behavior of <0.001 and the calculated t value of 3.832. This means that organizational citizenship behavior positively affects team member performance. The better the organizational citizenship behavior, the better the team member performance. The results of this study support the direct influence of personality on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Personality theory emphasizes that individual personality characteristics, such as openness, conscientiousness, extroversion, and emotional stability, can influence how they interact with the work environment. Employees with positive personalities tend to have higher job satisfaction and demonstrate greater OCB.

The results of this study align with those of Hermanto & Srimulyani (2022), which demonstrated a positive influence of organizational citizenship behavior on team member performance. Similarly, research by Sambung (2019), Rusmayanti et al. (2022), and Budianto & Kurniawati (2024) also demonstrated a positive influence of organizational citizenship behavior on team member performance.

The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance Mediated by Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The table for the Sobel Test shows a p -value of 0.0018 (< 0.05) and a test statistic of 2.354. Organizational citizenship behavior can mediate the influence of job satisfaction on team member performance. This means that increased job satisfaction, accompanied by increased organizational citizenship behavior, will improve team member performance. In other words, Job satisfaction can influence team member performance by increasing organizational citizenship behavior. The results of this study support the findings of Mohamad and Nawawi (2020), who found that organizational citizenship behavior mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and team member performance. The results of this study also support theories of justice and personality.

The Influence of Employee Personality on Employee Performance Mediated by Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The table shows a p -value of 0.0001 (< 0.05) and a test statistic of 3.855. This proves that organizational citizenship behavior can mediate the influence of team member personality on team member performance. team member personality can influence team member performance only if team member personality can increase organizational citizenship behavior, and an increase in organizational citizenship behavior can increase team member performance. In other words, team member personality can affect team member performance by increasing organizational citizenship behavior.

This research aligns with research by Isyah and Palupiningdyah (2020), which demonstrated that organizational citizenship behavior can mediate the influence of team member personality on team member performance. These findings also align with research by Udin & Yuniawan (2020) and Batilmurik & Faymau (2021), which demonstrated that organizational citizenship behavior can mediate the influence of team member personality on team member performance. The results of this study support personality theory. Personality theory emphasizes that individual personality characteristics, such as openness, conscientiousness, extroversion, and emotional stability, can influence how they interact with the work environment. Employees with positive personalities tend to have higher job satisfaction and demonstrate greater OCB.

4. Conclusion

Job satisfaction positively affects team member performance. team member personality does not affect team member performance. Job satisfaction positively influences organizational citizenship behavior. team member personality has a positive effect on organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior positively impacts team member performance. Organizational citizenship behavior mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and team member performance. Organizational citizenship behavior mediates the effect of team member personality on team member performance.

5. Reference

- Ahdiyana, M. (2015). Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in Organizational Performance. *Efficiency-Administrative Science Review*, 10 (1). <https://doi.org/10.21831/efficiency.v10i1.3965>
- Al-Jabari, B., Ghazzawi, I. (2019). Organizational Commitment: A Review of the Conceptual and Empirical Literature and a Research Agenda. *International Leadership Journal*, 11(1), 78–119.
- Allport, G. W., Bruner, J. S., & Jandorf, E. M. (1941). Personality Under Social Catastrophe: Ninety Lives-Histories of The Nazi Revolution. *Journal of Personality*. 10(1). 1-22.
- Al-Zu'bi, H. A. (2010). A Study of the Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 102-109.
- Amelia, R. F., Rizki Febriani, R., Sa'diyah, C (2022). The Effect of Islamic Leadership on Employee Performance Mediated by Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Management and Entrepreneurship*. 02 (04).
- Aponno, E. H., Brasit, N., Taba, M. I. (2017). Moderation of Local Culture "Pela Guangdong" On the Influence of Personality Towards Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employee Performance. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, Vol 40. 252–269.
- Ariani, M., & Mugiastuti, R. R. H. (2022). Determinants of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship*, 24(1), 52–63. <https://doi.org/10.9744/jmk.24.1.52-63>
- Arifin, Z., Nirwanto, N., & Manan, A. (2019). Improving the Effect of Work Satisfaction on Job Performance through Employee Engagement. *International Journal of Multi-Discipline Science (IJ-MDS)*, 2(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.26737/ij-mds.v2i1.948>
- Barnard, C. (1938). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Batilmurik, R.W., Faymau, E.Y. (2021). The Influence of Personality on Employee Performance Mediated by Organizational Citizenship Behavior (A Study of Employees at the General Bureau of the Regional Secretariat of East Nusa Tenggara Province). *Samalewa: Journal of Management Research and Studies*. 1(2). 137-143.
- Batilmurik, R. W., Sudiro, A., Noermijati, N (2020). The Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a Relations Mediator: A Study of Personality and Performance of Police in Indonesia. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*. 9(6). 133-140.
- Beigi, M. T., Lajevardi, S. J. (2020). Impact of Organizational Commitment on Job Performance. *Asian Journal of Management*, 11(3), 297. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2321-5763.2020.00046.3>
- Billah, A., Suci, N. M., Suarmanayasa, I. N (2022). Harmony Leadership and Personality on Employee Performance at Ganesha University of Education. *International Journal of Social Science and Business*. 6(3). 326-334.
- Budianto & Kurniawati (2024). Factors Affecting Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employee Performance in the Banking Sector. *International Journal of Business, Law and Education*. 5(2). 1834-1847.

- Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386–400.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- Dahkoul, Z. M. (2018). The determinants of team member performance in Jordanian organizations. *Pressacademia*, 5(1), 11–17. <https://doi.org/10.17261/pressacademia.2018.780>
- Detik.com (2024). <https://www.detik.com/sulsel/berita/d-7492545/bank-bjb-banjarmasin-perkuat-sinergi-dengan-kemenkumham-kalsel>. Accessed June 1, 2025.
- Djoemadi, F.R., Setiawan, M., Noermijati, N., & Irawanto, D.W. (2019). The effect of work satisfaction on team member engagement. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 19(2), 101–111. <https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2019.19.2.08>
- Ghozali, I. (2018). *Application of Multivariate Analysis with IBM SPSS. Ninth Edition*. Semarang: Diponegoro University Publishing Agency
- (2019). *Multivariate Analysis Application Using the IBM SPSS 25 Program*. Semarang: Diponegoro University Publishing Agency
- Graham, J.W. (1991). An Essay on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *team member Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 4, 249-270
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories. *The Academy of Management Review*, 12, 9–22.
- Hee, O. C., Shi, C. H., Kowang, T. O., Fei, G. C., & Ping, L. L. (2020). Factors influencing job satisfaction among academic staff. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(2), 285–291. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i2.20509>
- Hemakumara, H. (2020). The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Review of Literature. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 11(12), 2018–2020. <https://doi.org/10.30845/ijbss.v11n12p6>
- Hermanto, Y. B., Srimulyani, V. A. (2022). The Effects of Organizational Justice on Employee Performance Using Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior as Mediation. *Sustainability*. 14. 13322. 1-19
- Horney, K. (1939). *New ways in psychoanalysis*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Ingsih, K., Ynuardani, R. L., Suhana, S (2021). The Role of Work Discipline, Work Motivation, and Organizational Commitment Through Job Satisfaction on Nursing Performance in Indonesia. *Journal of Applied Management (JAM)*. 19(4). 838-848.
- Isyah, K. M., Palupiningdyah, (2021). The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Personality on Organizational Citizenship Behavior through Organizational Commitment. *Management Analysis Journal*. 9(4). 392-401.
- Kappagoda, U.S. (2018). Self-Efficacy, Task Performance, and Contextual Performance: A Sri Lankan Experience. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 6, 161-170
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kayoi, E. M., Bharanti, B. E., Listyarini, S (2022). The Influence of Leadership Style, Organizational Culture, and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance, Department of Education and Culture of the Yapen Islands. *Britain's International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 3(2). 370-383.
- Lestari, T. W. (2018). Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Variable on Employees of PT. Smartfren Jember. *International Journal of Social Science and Business*, 2(4), 231. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijssb.v2i4.16335>
- Loudon, D.L., and Della Bitta, A.J., (1993). *Consumer Behavior: Concepts and Application*. Singapore: Mc. Grow-Hill, Inc.
- Mangku, J., & Riana, I. G. (2021). The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment and The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Employee Personality on Employee Performance with Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a Mediation. *Dheasey Amboningtyas et al*

- Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic*, 05(01), 87–91
- Nazaruddin, letje, & Basuki, Agus Tri. (2015). *Statistical Analysis with SPSS*. Yogyakarta: Danisa Media
- Nirmalasari, & Amelia, R. (2020). The Role of Job Satisfaction in the Effect of Compensation on Employee Performance. *International Journal of Business Economics (IJBE)*, 2(1), 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.30596/ijbe.v2i1.5721>
- Noercahyo, U. S., Maarif, M.S., Sumertajaya, I.M. (2021). The Role of Employee Engagement on Job Satisfaction and Its Effect on Organizational Performance. *Journal of Management Applications*, 19(2), 296–309. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jam.2021.019.02.06>
- McCrae, R. R. (2017). *The Five-Factor Model Across Cultures*. Praeger/ABC-CLIO.
- Organ, D. W. 1988. *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books
- Panggabean, N. F., Fahri, T. S., Gunawan, W., & Hendry, H. (2021). The Influence of Leadership Style, Motivation, and Discipline on Employee Performance at PT Sumo Internusa Indonesia. *International Journal of Social Science and Business*, 5(2), 284-290.
- Philippe, A., Beatrice Siadou-Martin. (2007). Perceived justice and consumption experience evaluation. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*. 18(5): 450–71.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563.
- Purba, C. B. (2020). How do organizational commitment, integrity, and leadership influence the impact of team member performance? *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 26 (Special Issue 4), 1–10.
- Purwanto, A., Novitasari, D., & Asbari, M. (2022). Tourist Satisfaction and Performance of Tourism Industries: How the Role of Innovative Work Behavior, Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management Research*, 3(1), 1–12
- Putri, A. (2022). The Influence of Self-Efficacy on Job Satisfaction through Work Engagement in Employees. *Journal of Management Science*, 10(1), 357–369. <https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/jim/article/view/16766/7743>
- Rizal, A., Muthofa, H., Hartanto, A. D., Suharmanto, T. (2020). The Effect of Moderation of Organizational Culture on the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Work Motivation Towards Employee Performance (Studies on Employees of the National Search and Rescue Agency in Semarang City). *Advances in Economics, Business, and Management Research*. Vol 169. 440–446.
- Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rusmayanti, P. A., Martini, N. N. P., Qomariah, N (2022). The Effect of Competence and Job Satisfaction on Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employee Performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI)*. 11 (1). pp. 21–29.
- Safitri, A. N. & Kasmari, F. (2022). The Influence of Work Environment, Empowerment, and Leadership on Employee Performance (Study at PT Phapros, Tbk, Semarang). *E-QIEN: Journal of Economics and Business*. 11 (2), 14–25.
- Sambung, R. (2019). Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance; Counterproductive Work Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behavior as Mediations. *International Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*. 7 (3). pp. 50-56.
- Schiffman, L.G., & Kanuk, L.L. (2010). *Consumer Behavior (10th ed)*. New Jersey, Pearson. Prentice Hall.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653–663.
- Setiawan, D. P., Gunawa n, H. (2019). The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment On The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Employee Personality on Employee Performance with Organizational Citizenship Behavior as a Mediation. Dheasey Amboningtyas et.al

- Job Performance Through Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) as a Mediating Variable (Empirical Study on PT. Bank Mandiri At Jakarta). *Business and Entrepreneurial Review*, 18(1), 1–18.
- Thibaut, J.W. & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. L. Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale.
- Tingo, J., & Mseti, S. (2022). Effect of Employee Independence on Employee Performance. *International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management*, 6(2), 01–11. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijebm.6.2.1>
- Triani, F., Halin, H., & Wadud, M. (2020). Effect of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Employee Performance at PT Surya Dermato Medica Palembang. *International Journal of Community Service and Engagement*. 1(1), 11–18.
- Udin, U., Yuniawan, A. (2020). Psychological Capital, Personality Traits of the Big-Five, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Task Performance: Testing Their Relationships. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*. 7(9). 781-790.
- Yusnita, N., Sunaryo, W., & Yulianti, S. (2021). Improving Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Through Strengthening Organizational Climate and Personality. *Sociohumanities*, 23(1), 19.