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PART I

Emotion and Proactivity – Why and How It Matters
Feeling Energized to Become Proactive: A Systematic Literature Review of the Affect-Proactivity Link

Kelly Z. Peng, Wanlu Li, and Uta K. Bindl

There is “the affective revolution in organizational behaviour” (Barsade, Brief, and Spataro 2003, p 3) occurring early this century, which transforms the earlier belief by managers that emotions are barriers to rationality at work (for example, Barsade and Gibson, 2007). It is well-accepted that employees’ behaviour at work, including proactive behaviour, is shaped by both ‘cold’ cognitive motivational processes as well as ‘hot’ affective motivational processes (Mitchell and Daniels, 2003). However, proactivity research to date has mainly focused on the ‘cold’ side (Parker, Bindl, and Strauss, 2010), and recently more attention is called to draw to the ‘hot’ side (for example, Cai et al, 2019; Cangiano, Bindl, and Parker, 2016). The increasing importance and interest in the ‘hot’ side affect and proactivity link at work is reflected in the descriptive statistics offered by the Web of Science database (shown in Figure 1.1 and 1.2) in the past 30 years with its highest citation frequency captured in 2019. In this chapter we review the role of affective experiences – particularly, (core) affect/mood and (discrete) emotions – in shaping proactivity (detailed definitions are summarized in Table 1.1), generally defined as self-initiated action to bring about change in oneself, team, and/or the organization (Grant and Ashford, 2008).

In proactivity literature, Parker, Bindl, and Strauss (2010) identified three motivational processes that can promote proactive
behaviours: ‘can do,’ ‘reason to,’ and ‘energized to,’ where ‘can do’ and
‘reason to’ map onto the aforementioned ‘cold’ cognitive motivational
pathways (Mitchell and Daniels, 2003), whereas ‘energized to’ captures
the influence of ‘hot’ affective processes on proactivity. In line with the
idea of the ‘energized to’ pathway, Quinn and Dutton (2005) defined
energy (or energetic activation) as a feeling that one is eager and being
vitalized to act, which serves as a motivational factor that induces the
direction of human action at work. Individuals who feel emotionally
energized are more engaged in their work, which has been shown to
inspire employees to engage in a wide variety of proactive behaviours.
For example, experiencing positive affect facilitates taking charge
(Fay and Sonnentag, 2012; Zhou, Liu, Li, Cheng, and Hu, 2018) and
proactivity (Cullen-Lester, Leroy, Gerbasi, and Nishii, 2016). Apart from the effect of positive feelings, the effect of negative affect is not conclusive in the literature and many scholars call for more attention (for example, Cangiano et al., 2016; Lebel and Kamran-Morley, in press; Sonnentag and Starzyk, 2015), not to say the variety of negative (discrete) emotions. As a whole, we still have limited knowledge about this ‘hot’ side of being proactive at work.

This chapter aims to summarize and consider future directions of literature that has focused particularly on the ‘energized to’ motivation to become proactive, including both (core) affect/ mood and (discrete) emotions. We build from, and substantially extend, Cangiano and colleagues’ (2016) review, which unraveled ‘an affect-based perspective on proactivity in organizations’. Although their review has been invaluable for scholars to understand the development of the topic, it has primarily relied on qualitative approaches for reviewing the content and topics of the extant literature. We believe that, apart from additional research published since this initial review, more knowledge may be gained from adapting systematic, quantitative-based review approaches, especially, a new method – bibliometric analysis (for example, Antonakis, Bastardoz, Jacquart, and Shamir, 2016; Chatterjee and Sahasranamam, 2018). Thus, firstly we employed this method to provide a quantitative visualization of the evolution of affect and proactivity literature according to the time sequence through 30 years (with the first publications appearing in 1989, until 2019 from the Web of Science database). After tracing the evolutionary pathway of the topic visually then we further provide a qualitative-based overview of the highly relevant and frequently cited papers and summarize the research findings on the topic. Finally, by integrating our quantitative review and qualitative summary of the topic, we provide a roadmap for future affect and proactivity research.

**A quantitative-based review of the affect–proactivity link**

We adopted Citespace, a Java-based visualization software created by Chen (2004), to generate bibliometric maps of the existing literature. The bibliometric maps are generated based on published articles and references cited by these published articles. By analyzing the co-cited references and their authors, there is document co-citation and author co-citation figures respectively. Further, by analyzing the citing documents, there is the keyword co-occurrence figure. Specifically, there are three resulting figures: (1) document co-citation figures (each
node represents a cited document and the larger the node is, the more frequently the document has been cited); (2) author co-citation figures (each node represents a cited author and the linkages between the nodes mean that one citing document cited these two authors simultaneously and called author co-citation); (3) keywords co-occurrence figures (visualizes the most frequently occurring patterns of keywords to show the evolving research themes of this field across time) (Xie, 2015; Zhu, Song, Zhu, and Johnson, 2019).

**Sample and procedure**

We collected data from the Web of Science core collection database from the year 1989 to 2019 in the two key research areas of ‘Management’ and ‘Psychology Applied’, without restrictions on journal selection within these areas. We firstly identified three keywords in affective experiences: affect, emotion, and mood. We then followed the categorization by Parker and Collins (2010) to determine proactive behaviours: four types of proactive work behaviours (refers to taking control of, and bringing about change within, the internal organizational environment) and another four types of proactive person–environment fit (P–E fit) behaviours (refers to changing oneself or the situation to achieve greater compatibility between one’s own attributes and the organizational environment) (see Table 1.1 for detailed definitions for eight types of behaviours). For each search, we combined and paired keywords from two types: one type of affective experience with one type of proactive behaviour. In sum, our sample includes 537 citing documents with 28,060 cited (secondary) documents. Following Zhu et al (2019), we also adopted five years as a slice, six slices as a whole (1990–2019) to generate findings in the context of affect and proactivity research.

**Affect–proactive work behaviour link**

We firstly zoom in on proactive work behaviours, including taking charge, voice, problem prevention, and personal initiatives, and their relationships with affect. As shown in Figure 1.3, voice is an overriding proactive work behaviour that receives the most attention from scholars over the years. Few most frequently cited papers are worth being mentioned. On the one hand, Morrison (2011) integrated previous definitions of voice and identified essential motivating factors, such as: the motives to help the organization or unit, perceived safety,
### Table 1.1: Definitions of affective and proactive constructs in this chapter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>(Core): A neurophysiological state that is consciously accessible as a simple, non-reflective feeling that is an integral blend of valence (pleasure–displeasure) and activation (sleepy–activated) values. Combinations of activation and valence result in four distinct quadrants: high-activated positive affect, low-activated positive affect, low-activated negative affect, and high-activated negative affect (Russell, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Discrete): Begins with an individual’s assessment of the personal meaning of some antecedent event and triggers a cascade of response tendencies which manifest across a loosely coupled component system (Fredrickson, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>Prolonged core affect with no object (simple mood) or with a quasi-Object (Russell, 2003). It is frequently categorized as positive and negative mood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Discretionary behaviour intended to effect organizationally functional change (Morrison and Phelps, 1999).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive work</td>
<td>(Taking charge): Discretionary communication of ideas, suggestions, concerns, or opinions about work-related issues with the intent to improve organizational or unit functioning (Morrison, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Voice): A work behaviour that is self-starting and proactive that overcomes barriers to achieve a goal (Frese and Fay, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Problem prevention): Self-directed and anticipatory action to prevent the reoccurrence of work problems (Frese and Fay, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Personal initiative): A form of proactive socialization in which individuals attempt to change their job so that it better fits their skills, abilities, and preferences (Ashford and Black, 1996; Parker and Collins, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Career initiative): Individual’s active attempts to promote his or her career rather than a passive response to the job situation as given (Seibert, Kraimer, and Crant, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Job change negotiation): The physical and cognitive changes individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their work (Bindl et al, 2019; Wrzesniewski and Dutton, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Job crafting): Individual actions to gather information relevant to one’s own behaviour; two methods are identified as inquiry and monitoring (Ashford, Blatt, and Van de Walle, 2003; Anseel et al, 2015).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.3: Document co-citation of proactive work behaviour and affective constructs
efficacy of voice, and potential affective motivational factors (fear, anger, anticipatory emotions, etc). Following this review, she then specified that anger may serve as a motivator that drives individuals to speak up, but that fear inhibits one to voice (Morrison, 2011; 2014). During the same period, Liang, Farh, and Farh (2012) distinguished promotive and prohibitive voice and suggested that psychological antecedents have different effects on these two different types of voice. Although this article does not directly focus on the affect and proactivity link, it sheds light on future study in choosing emotional antecedents for these two types of voice (for example, Qin, DiRenzo, Xu, and Duan, 2014 illustrated that a curvilinear relationship exists between emotional exhaustion and prohibitive voice, from a resource perspective).

On the other hand, Detert and Burris (2007) propose that voice is a risky behaviour and employees need to build psychological safety to overcome the fear and uncertain feelings in performing such behaviours. Further, Burris, Detert, and Chiaburu (2008) indicated that psychological attachment to the organization (measured as affective commitment) is unable to predict employees’ voice behaviour, but detachment with the organization reduced voice to supervisor. After those initial explorations of the affect and voice link, Detert and Edmondson (2011) also added by suggesting that affect can serve as situation (information) cues for one to interpret whether it is safe to speak up based on self-protective implicit voice theories. More recently, Liu and his colleagues research (Liu et al, 2017; Liu et al, 2015) extends this idea by examining the effect of leaders’ negative and peers’ positive affect on focal employees’ voice. This stream of researchers identified that the different emotions from different parties in the organization may have different impacts on proactive voice behaviours of focal employees. It contributes to the literature from a relational perspective on affect–proactivity link and specifically focuses on discrete emotions rather than core affect.

Although overridden by voice research, the affect–proactive work behaviours link is significantly advanced by Parker, Bindl, and Strauss (2010) to a great extent. They identified ‘energized-to’ as a key motivational state that enhances proactive goal generation (that is, the setting of proactivity–related goals) and sustains goal striving (that is, the implementation of proactive action at work), over and above two cognitive motivational pathways to proactivity: ‘can do’ and ‘reason do’. Following this conceptual work in explicitly discussing the role of affect for proactivity, by way of the ‘energized to’ motivational mechanism, research attention shifted to focusing on various affect–proactive work behaviour links, other than the affect–voice link, especially taking
positive affect into account as a key antecedent of proactive behaviours (Lam, Spreitzer, and Fritz, 2014; Bindl et al, 2012).

In **Figure 1.4**, the five most cited authors that have, at least briefly, discussed the affect–proactive work behaviour link, are all in voice topic, including Morrison, Van Dyne, Detert, Milliken, and LePine. In particular, Morrison, Detert, and Milliken all focused their attention on voice (or silence) behaviour as we have already reviewed in the previous section, while Van Dyne and LePine focus on voice and helping as kinds of extra role behaviour in early literature (Van Dyne and LePine, 1998). They discuss the role of emotion in voicing in different ways. Morrison (2014) suggested that fear hinders employees to speaking up, while Van Dyne Ang, and Botero (2003) indicated that fear leads to defensive voice. More recently, voice can also be identified as promotive and prohibitive voice (Liang, Farh, and Farh, 2012). In this sense, given the different nature of different types of voice, we may expect there would be differential affect–voice links, especially concerning various discrete emotions (for example, Kiewitz et al, 2016; Liu et al. 2015; Lebel, 2016; Lebel, 2017), which can also be observed in the next figure as the trend shown after 2010.

In line with **Figure 1.3** and 1.4, **Figure 1.5** also indicates that voice is the most studied proactive work behaviour from an affective perspective. Before 2010, voice frequently co-occurred with judgment, organizational justice, and satisfaction directly. After 2010, focus turns more to discrete emotions: anger and anxiety in particular are two main emotions that have been linked with proactive behaviours in the network. For instance, from a functional perspective of emotions, anger provides an assessment of the injustice issue (Keltner and Haidt, 1999), which triggers speaking up behaviours in the organization (for example, Edwards, Ashkanasy, and Gardner, 2009; Harvey, Martinko, and Douglas, 2009). In addition, depression, positive affect and positive emotion as independent nodes isolate from the major network. This suggests that these are still inconclusive and wait to be further explored in this field.

**Affect–proactive person–environment fit behaviour link**

We now turn to proactive P–E fit behaviours, including job crafting, feedback-seeking, job change negotiation, and career initiative behaviours, and their relationship with affect. Both document (**Figure 1.6**) and author co-citation figures (**Figure 1.7**) indicate that, although this topic has received less attention (the highest co-citation frequency of key references is 13 and no burst paper was found in
Figure 1.4: Author co-citation of proactive work behaviour and affective constructs
Figure 1.5: Keyword co-occurrence of proactive work behaviour and affective constructs
Figure 1.6: Document co-citation of proactive P-E fit behaviours and affective constructs.
this category in the latter qualitative review), researchers have mainly studied this topic from 1995 until 2014, with less linkage shown in more recent research. The major part of the network represents the development of feedback-seeking behaviours, which are defined as the conscious devotion of effort towards determining the correctness and adequacy of behaviours for attaining valued end states (Ashford, 1986). From Figure 1.6, we can infer that Grant and Ashford (2008) is one of the most critical nodes that summarized previous literature and offered a new direction for future research.

According to Figure 1.7, two important landmark authors in this field are Ashford and Morrison. Ashford is the most significant researcher in the proactive behaviour field, especially feedback-seeking behaviour. She suggests feedback is evaluative information about the self, so that it is more emotionally charged (Ashford, Blatt, and Van de Walle, 2003). Meanwhile, Morrison also concentrated on feedback- and information-seeking among newcomers, and their socialization process (for example, Morrison, 1993a; 1993b; Morrison, Chen, and Salgado, 2004). These results showed an initial connection between negative discrete emotions, such as fear, and feedback-seeking behaviour. For example, seeking feedback requires individuals to cope with their emotions for potential negative information afterwards, such as fear and depression (for example, Pettit and Joiner, 2001). Thus, current literature, which is yet very limited, mainly focuses on affective consequences of proactive behaviours, which we will discuss in more detail in the qualitative review section.

According to Figure 1.8, feedback-seeking behaviour is still the central topic discussed under this category. Despite this, the figure shows that before 2000 this proactivity literature tended to discuss the negative affective constructs, including anxiety, shyness, depression, shame, and guilt (as shown on the left side of the network), while there were few direct investigations on the specific affect–feedback-seeking behaviour link. In the next ten years (1999–2009) affective constructs, such as depression, anxiety, guilt, and shame, appear as node, they are not directly linked with feedback-seeking behaviours (or job crafting). Instead, these emotions are linked to affective responses to feedback, say affective consequence of sought feedback, which is consistent with our observation as above. As a whole, there is much less research focus on P–E fit proactive behaviour and their association with affective experience, compared to proactive work behaviours’ literature.
Figure 1.7: Author co-citation of proactive P–E fit behaviours and affective constructs
Figure 1.8: The keywords co-occurrence of proactive P–E fit behaviour and affective constructs
Qualitative-based review on highly relevant and frequently cited papers

To get more overarching insights into the affect–proactivity link, we further focus on those highly relevant and frequently cited papers (updated to July 2020) from the quantitative review. Following the guidance of the quantitative visualization results, we narrowed our focus on those papers that (1) directly tested the relationship between proactive behaviours and affective constructs; and (2) had a citation frequency of larger than or equal to 2. As a result, 30 papers in proactive work behaviour and 13 papers in proactive P–E fit behaviours are presented in Tables 1.2 and 1.3. In the following sections, we will firstly critically review and summarize the major theoretical lens in the affect–proactivity link. Then, by zooming in on different types of affect, we will provide a review of the articles that directly focused on positive and negative affect and proactivity, and ones that directly focused on (discrete) emotions and proactivity respectively. Then, there is a review of articles that focused on affective consequences of proactivity, which is a more emerging topic in the literature. Lastly, we will briefly discuss the articles that involve emotional regulations, say ability in handling emotions, and study its role in proactivity, which could also inform the affect–proactivity link.

Theoretical lenses in the affect–proactivity link

There are two major theoretical lenses to understand the affect–proactivity link: the energy perspective and the information perspective. The first lens considers positive affect or emotions as resources that energize proactivity. Conservation of resources theory (Hobfall, 1989) and job demands–resources model (Demerouti et al, 2001) both indicate the importance of owning enough resource, such as energies (Hobfoll, 1989), for employees to be proactive (Ouyang et al, 2019; Parker et al, 2006). Emotional resource is recognized by the theories that are essential factors and in turn stimulate proactivity. Broaden-and-build theory (Fredrickson, 2001; Conway et al, 2013) offers a more specific explanation as it suggests that positive emotions broaden our mind, which in turn leads to an enlarged action repertoire and behaviour change. More recently, Quinn, Spreitzer, and Lam (2012) integrate six related theories, including the above-mentioned perspectives, to describe the causal loops of the dynamic of human energy. The energy perspective provides a useful theoretical framework that, along with
the ‘energized to’ mechanism (Parker et al, 2010), can explain the role of affect in motivating proactivity, especially positive affect. According to Figures 1.1 and 1.2, research on the affect–proactivity link got more attention in the last five to ten years (including a dramatic increase since 2015), which happens to be in co-occurrence with receipt of most research attention in the energy perspective since 2015 and 2016 (Baker, 2019). This co-occurrence may imply that not only will there be more research on affective experiences in proactivity, but that the energy perspective may become one of the dominant theoretical frame in this topic.

The second theoretical lens focuses on the information conveyed in one’s feelings, regarded as social cues (called information perspective hereafter). Feeling-as-information theory proposes that different feelings convey different information, which then impact on judgment (Schwarz, 2011). Specifically, positive affect signals that things proceed smoothly and the environment is safe, while negative affect reveals the judgment of a problematic situation in intrapersonal context. The former signals could either demotivate to be proactive as ‘everything goes alright’ and it is nature to keep status quo (e.g. Lam, et al, 2014 ); or motive to be proactive (Sonnentag and Starzyk, 2015) as it increases employees’ confidence in initiating proactive actions and helps them deal with any risks or obstacles that occur during the proactive process (Foo, Uy, and Baron, 2009). The latter signals, theoretically, may motivate one to act. However, empirically, that still waits to be answered, as studies on negative affect reported mixed findings, which will be elaborated in the next section. Different from feeling-as-information theory, which focuses on intra-personal effect, affect/emotion-as-social-information focused interpersonal effect, in particular the social-function of others’ emotional expression (van Kleef, 2009). Observing the displayed emotions, the observer processes this cue through affective reactions and inferences, and decides on the following behaviours. For example, a partner’s display of anger might serve as a sign that the observer did something wrong, and he/she might subsequently have reflections on his/ her recent behaviours. Additionally, affective event theory (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996) is another frequently adopted theory to explain how affective events at the workplace, both intra-personal and interpersonal events, have effects on job outcomes. As a whole, all three theories together explain why and how others’ (discrete) emotions (such as those of peers or leaders) may impact on employee’s proactive behaviours.
Positive and negative affect and proactivity

Theories of (core) affect describe emotional experience as falling along two dimensions: valence (pleasant versus unpleasant feelings) and activation (high versus low), from which results four quadrants (Russell, 2003). The majority of research focuses on individuals’ valence of affective experience, while some studies may indicate that activation level of affect may play a role (for example, Bindle et al., 2012; Hsiung and Tsai, 2017; Ouyang et al., 2019). Another recent review, in book chapter, reveals that proactivity research has primarily focused on only two of these quadrants: activated positive and activated negative affect; with the majority of this research focused on positive (core) affect (Cangiano et al., 2016). To better examine the relationship between core affect and various proactive behaviours, the following section reviews the most relevant studies by distinguishing the two categories of proactive behaviours.

Proactive work behaviours

With a comprehensive review on 30 papers (see Table 1.2), we will summarize both the intra-personal versus interpersonal perspective and the positive versus negative affect. Intra-personally, it is well established that state positive affect is positively related to engaging in proactive behaviours, including job crafting and personal initiative (for example, Den Hartog and Belschak, 2007; Fay and Sonnentag, 2012; Fritz and Sonnentag, 2009; Kwon, Kim, and Kim, 2019). According to energy perspective, positive affect, as a kind of resource, enlarges one’s repertoire of attention, cognition, and action (Fredrickson, 2001) to go beyond routine behaviour and being proactive (Den Hartog and Belschak, 2007; Fay and Sonnentag, 2012; Fritz and Sonnentag, 2009). According to information perspective, positive affect also serves as a cue of a safety environment and leads to more initiative behaviours (for example, Fay and Sonnentag, 2012). Nevertheless, too much positive affect might indicate a signal of change that the status quo is unnecessary, which could lead to less proactive behaviour. That is, there could be an inverse effect on proactive behaviours (Lam et al., 2014).

However, the role of negative affect in predicting proactive work behaviours is much more inconclusive. Den Hartog and Belschak (2007) reported a positive association between negative affect and personal initiative behaviours (yet Study 2 received no significant support). Later on, researchers considered activation level of affect to further investigate the effect of negative affect. Still, mixed findings were found. Bindl et al. (2012) found that low-activated negative affect correlated with envisioning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proactive behaviours</th>
<th>No. of articles</th>
<th>Key references</th>
<th>Overarching theoretical framework</th>
<th>Major affect-related constructs investigated</th>
<th>Types of evidence</th>
<th>The role of the affective constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fay and Sonnentag (2012)</td>
<td>Broaden-and-build model and the mood-as-information approach</td>
<td>Positive state affect/ negative trait affect</td>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grant, Parker, and Collins (2009)</td>
<td>Attribution theory</td>
<td>Low negative affect</td>
<td>Dyadic cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jiang et al (2020)</td>
<td>Affect-as-information theory</td>
<td>Leader positive/negative affect presence</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lam, Spreitzer, and Fritz (2014)</td>
<td>Broaden-and-build and emotion-as-information theories</td>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>Dyadic cross-sectional and cross-lagged survey</td>
<td>IV (Curve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lebel (2017)</td>
<td>Discrete perspectives on emotion</td>
<td>Anger and fear</td>
<td>Theoretical paper</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2: The 30 highly relevant and frequently cited articles and book chapters during 1990–2020 of proactive work behaviour with affective constructs (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proactive behaviours</th>
<th>No. of articles</th>
<th>Key references</th>
<th>Overarching theoretical framework</th>
<th>Major affect-related constructs investigated</th>
<th>Types of evidence</th>
<th>The role of the affective constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wu and Chen (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social learning theory and conservation of resources theory</td>
<td>Collective thriving</td>
<td>Cross-lag survey</td>
<td>Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotion regulation theory</td>
<td>Emotion regulation</td>
<td>Cross-lag survey</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliken, Morrison, and Hewlin (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive behaviours</td>
<td>No. of articles</td>
<td>Key references</td>
<td>Overarching theoretical framework</td>
<td>Major affect-related constructs investigated</td>
<td>Types of evidence</td>
<td>The role of the affective constructs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid, Patterson, and Leiva (2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core affect and cognitive appraisal theories</td>
<td>High/low activated negative core affect (within-person)</td>
<td>Diary study</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlin, Newton, and Lepine (2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Meta-analysis</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey, Martinko, and Douglas (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attribution theory</td>
<td>Anger/pity/compassion</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebel (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional view of emotion</td>
<td>Fear (external threat)</td>
<td>Dyadic cross-sectional and cross-lag survey</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michalak, Kiffin-Petersen, and Ashkanasy (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affective events theory</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsiung and Tsai (2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dual-pathway model of mood and social information processing theory</td>
<td>Activated negative mood</td>
<td>Cross-lag survey</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xu et al (2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost-benefit framework</td>
<td>Manager’s positive mood</td>
<td>Cross-lag survey</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2: The 30 highly relevant and frequently cited articles and book chapters during 1990–2020 of proactive work behaviour with affective constructs (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proactive behaviours</th>
<th>No. of articles</th>
<th>Key references</th>
<th>Overarching theoretical framework</th>
<th>Major affect-related constructs investigated</th>
<th>Types of evidence</th>
<th>The role of the affective constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong et al (2016)</td>
<td>Theory of proactive motivation</td>
<td>Activated positive affect</td>
<td>Cross-lag survey</td>
<td>Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking charge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bal, Chiaburu, and Diaz (2011)</td>
<td>Psychological contract breach</td>
<td>Emotional regulation</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fritz and Sonnentag (2009)</td>
<td>Broaden-and-build theory</td>
<td>Positive and negative affect</td>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Müceldili and Erdil (2016)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Workplace fun</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: IV = independent variable; Mo = moderator; Me = mediator; DV = dependent variable; ESM = experience sampling method.
element of proactivity only, rather than other element, especially the enacting one. However, low-activated negative affect associated with silence at work, as it enhanced reflection over behaviour (Madrid, Patterson, and Leiva, 2015). More recently, Sonnentag and Starzyk (2015) found negative affect only relates to issue identification, pointing out the potential problem at work, rather than change implementation. In this sense, what matters is the specific types of proactive behaviour. Besides the main effect, negative affect may serve as a moderator. For example, activated negative affect together with voice climate jointly serve as moderators that reduce the negative impact of power distance orientation on voice (Hsiung and Tsai, 2017). Another example, employees’ expression of low negative affect helps to get credit from supervisors for performing proactive behaviours in performance appraisal (Grant, Parker, and Collins, 2009). The studies show that the effects of negative affect are more complicated and/or subtle, and need more future research.

Apart from intra-personal perspective, researchers also found that positive or negative affect of others plays an important role in interpersonal influence on proactive behaviours. Yet, these are very initial efforts mainly based on information perspective. There is research that investigated how others’ affect had an impact on focal proactive work behaviours, such as leaders and peers (for example, Jiang et al, 2020; Liu et al, 2015; Liu et al, 2017, Xu et al, 2020). Specifically, they followed the affect-as-social-information perspective (van Kleef, 2009) and suggested that peers’ positive mood display offered focal employees’ psychological safety and may lead to voice. Liu et al (2017) also found that although leader’s both positive and negative affect can boost subordinates’ voice behaviour, the mechanisms are different. Such relationship in positive affect could be accounted for through employees’ psychological safety directly via emotional contagion mechanism (through employees’ own positive affect). For negative affect, both the emotional contagion mechanism and the informational perspective does not work, which is interesting to further explore. As a whole, along with our observations in intrapersonal perspective, we still know very little about how negative affect works on motivating proactivity at work.

**Proactive personal–environment fit behaviours**

The 13 researches that focus on proactive P–E fit behaviour and affect are centered on feedback-seeking behaviours and job crafting. On the one hand, the focal employee’s positive affect are shown to play an important role in promoting one’s job crafting behaviours (for example, Kwon, Kim, and Kim, 2019; Mäkikangas., Bakker, and Schaufeli, 2017;
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Rogala and Cieslak, 2019). Positive affect could also promote feedback-seeking behaviours, yet through taking the available information be perceived as useful for realistic self-assessment and potential long-term improvement afterwards (Gervey, Igou, and Trope, 2005). On the other hand, concerning feedback-seeking behaviours in particular, feedback provider’s affect state, such as leader, may also influence the proactive P–E fit behaviour of the focal employee (for example, Makikangas et al, 2017). It is easy to understand that the perceived positive affect from the feedback giver positively relates to employees’ feedback-seeking behaviours, whereas negative mood prohibits feedback-seeking behaviours (Ang et al, 1993; Trope and Neter, 1994; as shown in Table 1.3). Additionally, positive affect could be the consequence/responses to feedback (Christensen–Salem et al, 2018), which will be discussed in the ‘emotional consequence of proactivity’ section specifically. In short, consistent with our observation in quantitative review, the direct investigation on the positive/negative affect–P–E fit proactive behaviour is very much limited and we know very little in the literature, especially for negative affect.

Discrete emotions and proactivity

In understanding the role of discrete emotion in proactivity, researchers mainly adopt the functional perspective (as shown in Tables 1.2 and 1.3), which concentrates more on the nature and functions of emotions. Unlike the dimensional approach to affect, which oversimplifies as positive and negative dimensions (for example, Russell and Carroll, 1999; Watson, Clark, and Tellegen, 1988), the discrete approach appreciates the complexity of discrete emotions and addresses their nuanced meanings (for example, Arnold, 1960; Lazarus, 1966, 1968; Roseman, 1984; Roseman, Spindel, and Jose, 1990). They argue that emotion is not a general subjective feeling, but instead that each emotion bears a unique functional, adaptive and relational meaning (for example, Izard, 1991; Izard, Ackerman, Schoff, and Fine, 2000; Lazarus, 1991). As a result, each emotion should link to specific functions and thus lead to specific behavioural tendencies (for example, Fredrickson, 2001; Frijda, 1987; Frijda, Kuipers, and Ter Schure, 1989; Izard, 1991; Izard et al, 2000; Lazarus, 1991; Levenson, 1994; Oatley and Jenkins, 1996; Tooby and Cosmides, 1990). In application in the emotion–proactivity link, interestingly, the functional perspective is twisted with either energy or informational perspective, or both. Some (discrete) emotion may serve as energy (for example, joy, vitality, etc), some may serve as information (for example, fear, shame, etc) or social cues (for example, leaders’ anger) to show their differential functions.
Table 1.3: The 13 influential articles during 1990–2019 of proactive P–E fit behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proactive behaviours</th>
<th>No. of articles</th>
<th>Key References</th>
<th>Overarching theoretical framework</th>
<th>Major affective constructs investigated</th>
<th>Types of evidence</th>
<th>The role of the affective construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trope and Neter (1994)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Feedback provider’s positive/negative affect</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ang et al (1993)</td>
<td>Control theory</td>
<td>Feedback provider’s affect</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pettit and Joiner (2001)</td>
<td>Self-verification theory</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christensen-Salem et al (2018)</td>
<td>Affective events theory</td>
<td>Activated positive affect</td>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>van Hooff and van Hooft (2014)</td>
<td>Job demands–resources model</td>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>DV, Mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job crafting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Makikangas, Bakker, and Schaufeli (2017)</td>
<td>Job demands–resources theory</td>
<td>Team members’ positive affect</td>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kwon, Kim, and Kim (2019)</td>
<td>Affective event theory</td>
<td>Daily positive affect</td>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.3: The 13 influential articles during 1990–2019 of proactive P–E fit behaviours (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proactive behaviours</th>
<th>No. of articles</th>
<th>Key References</th>
<th>Overarching theoretical framework</th>
<th>Major affective constructs investigated</th>
<th>Types of evidence</th>
<th>The role of the affective construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pekaar, Bakker, van der Linden, Born, and Sirén (2018)</td>
<td>EI theory</td>
<td>Self/other-focused emotional regulation</td>
<td>Weekly diary</td>
<td>IV and Me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: IV = independent variable; Mo = moderator; Me = mediator; + = significantly positively correlated; n.s. = non-significant; DV = dependent variable; ESM = experience sampling method.
We now review findings on discrete emotions and the two types of proactive behaviour. In particular, for proactive P–E fit behaviours, as included in Table 1.3, two researches focused on discrete emotions in this category – depressed and boredom – which are related to feedback-seeking behaviour (Petti and Joiner, 2001) and job crafting respectively. They take discrete emotion, say depression and boredom respectively, as consequence. In this case, the detailed review will be shown in the next section specifically. We will only focus on proactive work behaviour to review as below.

**Proactive work behaviour**

Among various discrete emotions, anger and fear are two emotions at the centre stage in this field. From a functional perspective, anger serves as a sign of cheating and of harm being inflicted (Levenson, 1999). It also reveals a response to a loss or lack of reward that is contributed to another target, usually due to the target doing something wrong (Schwarz, 2011). That is, individuals who experience anger usually tend to show eagerness to revise or to change the status quo. Empirically, anger is positively related to whistleblowing and voice (Harvey, Martinko, and Douglas, 2009; Lebel, 2017). Fear serves as a sign of danger and threat from the environment and others (Levenson, 1999). High intensity fear tends to lead to an immediate act, for example, speaking up, whereas low intensity fear is prone to link with silence (Mar, Newton, and Lepine, 2017, Kish-Gephart Detert, Trevino, and Edmondson, 2009, Michalak, Kiffin-Petersen, and Ashkanasy, 2019; Milliken, Morrison, and Hewlin, 2003). The targets of the (discrete) emotion also (such as fear of within group threat or outgroup threat) may lead to differential behaviours. For instance, Lebel (2016) suggested that fear of external threat (for example, economic downturn) increases the employee’s voice, whereas fear of being viewed and labelled in a negative way may lead to silence (Milliken, Morrison, and Hewlin, 2003).

Apart from anger and fear, other discrete emotions have differential effect on various proactive behaviours. Such as, anxiety that is generated by unfair events triggers problem prevention behaviours as a response (Barclay and Kiefer, 2019); happiness elicits proactivity towards team (Liu et al, 2020); collective positive emotion related to proactive customer service behaviour positively (Wu and Chen, 2019). There is some research that pays attention to some less studied emotion and its effect on different proactive behaviours, such as workplace fun positively related to taking charge (Müceldili and Erdil, 2016).
The emotional consequences of proactivity

Proactivity is not only shaped by affective experience but can also shape one’s affective experience afterwards. Research on emotional consequences of proactivity has been rare but started attracting scholars’ attention recently. In understanding affective consequence of being proactive, energy perspective provides a useful theoretical lens. Proactive behaviours also work as an approach to create resources or energy into the affective process afterwards through differential mechanisms. For example, job crafting as a tool could boost employees’ affective well-being by accumulating job resources through relational mechanisms (for example, the increasing of leader–member exchange), cognitive mechanisms (for example, increasing self-efficacy (Van Den Heuvel, Demerouti, and Peeters, 2015) or reducing self-discrepancy (Hardin, Weigold, Robitschek, and Nixon, 2007)) and affective mechanisms (for example, positive affect (Van Den Heuvel et. al, 2015), such as reducing boredom (Van Hooff and Van Hooft, 2014), and increasing job passion (Teng, 2019)).

Meanwhile, being proactive may also lead to loss of resources or energy, as the actions cost extra efforts and result in more job demands. Two recent articles show that the affective consequences of proactivity could be in dual process, namely change both positive and negative affect afterwards, yet in different ways. Zacher et al (2019) found change in personal initiative negatively predicted change in positive mood directly (independent of perceived organizational support) and, whereas it positively predicted change in negative mood only when perceived organizational support was low. Cangiano, Parker, and Yeo (2019) propose there is energy-generating pathway and strain pathway to explain how proactive work behaviours induced both positive and negative emotional consequences respectively. In the same pattern, daily proactivity will directly and independently fuel daily vitality, while it leads to more end-of-workday anxiety only when employees reported a high level of punitive supervision. Interestingly, for feedback-seeking behaviours, such dual process may depend on the contents of the sought feedback or the coping strategy towards them. Specifically, a diary study suggests that the negative ones among sought feedbacks increase one’s depression level (Pettit and Joiner, 2001), while the acceptance of sought feedback can give rise to positive affect and in turn increased creativity (Christensen-Salem et al, 2018). As a whole, it is very likely that the energy-generating pathway towards positive affective consequence will be more salient, while the energy-depletion (strain) pathway towards negative affective
consequence is more complicated and more contextual constraints should be taken into consideration.

*Emotional regulation and proactivity*

For both proactive work behaviour and proactive P–E fit behaviours, other than the direct test of the emotion–proactivity link, it is worth noting the role of the ability of using and managing one’s emotions, which mostly play as moderator (for example, Bal, Chiaburu, and Diaz, 2011). More specifically, Lebel (2017) proposed that emotional regulation is an important moderator that may determine whether fear and anger could be transformed as motive into proactivity. Emotional regulation may also serve as an important antecedent. For example, it fosters job crafting and in turn earns higher level of weekly energy (Pekaar et al, 2018); or it predicts to seek more feedback from both supervisors and subordinates (Qian et al, 2016). Although this research is not directly relevant to the affect–proactivity link, it would inform the topic that such ability could also works as resources in being proactive, or help to better utilize the emotional resources to be proactive.

*A short outlook*

Taking all the above together, we may see that employees should experience an emotional journey in being proactive at work. By understanding affective experiences throughout the full engagement in proactivity at work, we could have rich understandings on the affect–proactivity link. Drawing from qualitative accounts of employees, Bindl (2019) identified three emotional journeys in the process of proactivity (issue identification, implementation, and reflection): proactivity-as-frustration; proactivity-as-growth; and proactivity-as-threat. Across three journeys, employees typically started with negative emotions, such as anger and frustration, induced by the identification of a dysfunctional work situation. However, while employees in the threat journey stopped their proactive efforts due to experienced fear, and employees in the frustration journey remained negative in their accounts of proactive efforts, and reduced their engagement in future proactive behaviours, employees in the growth journey began to experience a shift from negative to positive emotions, such as feeling happy, proud and excited, which helped to boost future proactive behaviours. Such dynamic process should be of great interest and deserves further exploration with different empirical efforts in the future.
Conclusion

Before drawing conclusion from this review, we would also like to note that our review may be limited in two major ways. First, we constrained our database of this review from the year 1990 to 2020 (July), which does not include papers that were published either before 1990 or later than 2020. Hence, it is also important for future researchers to keep up to date if they need to capture the dynamic trend of the affect–proactivity literature. Second, according to our purpose of this review, we separated different types of proactive behaviours into two general categories and reviewed them separately. Hence, this review may lack of knowledge of the connections, links, and interactions between these two categories. For future researchers, an overall review is recommended to show the overall development of the proactivity literature.

Despite these limitations, we are confident to draw several conclusions based on our review. First, there are two major theoretical perspectives guiding research on the affect–proactivity link. The more dominant one is the energy perspective (Quinn and Dutton, 2005): affective experiences, especially positive ones, serve as energy/resource that is a strong motivator for individuals being ‘energized to’ be proactive at work. Meanwhile, being proactive may also bring affective consequences through dual-process – either energy-generating or energy-depletion pathway. The other one is the information perspective: it indicates that positive versus negative affect and various discrete emotions convey differential information to self and others, and in turn conveys different ‘signals’ to proactive behaviour. Basically, this perspective is mainly adopted to explain how negative affect or discrete emotions works for proactive behaviours. Second, the quantitative result indicates that affective experiences, including positive and negative affect/mood, and discrete emotions (for example, fear, anger, and anxiety), began to receive attention from researchers in the last two decades. And, in each category, voice and feedback-seeking behaviour are two behaviours that have been studied most in the affect–proactive link, respectively. The other types of proactive behaviours and overall proactivity, taking as work performance (Griffin et al, 2007), are lacking of investigation in the literature. Third, the qualitative review shows that the valence and activation level of affect shows effects on proactivity differently. Comparably, the valence dimension (positive versus negative) is more salient in affecting proactivity than the activation dimension. Meanwhile, negative affect is still inconclusive no matter as antecedents or consequences of proactivity. Fourth, as
both quantitative and qualitative reviews show, discrete emotions and proactivity link is an under-investigated topic, with very limited knowledge. According to the functional perspective of emotion, each discrete emotion should link to specific functions and thus lead to specific behavioural tendencies. Although we have known that anger and fear may lead to voice with boundary conditions, we still know very little about the other emotions and their link with various proactive behaviours.

**Future research**

Based on our review and major conclusions above, future research is called to expand and advance our knowledge on the role of affect in shaping and being shaped by proactivity. As the above short outlook noted, gaining rich understandings on the affective/emotional journey in dynamic ways will be the final goal of the topic. Here we provide several specific directions for future empirical explorations to contribute and attain the final goal. First, future research in the affect–proactivity link may involve the role of discrete emotion more. Take guilt as an example: in organizations, injustice, work–family conflict, and negative feedback make employees feel guilty, if they believe that they are the cause of the problems, and they may repair the condition by initiating changes (Ilies et al, 2013). In this sense, it will expand our understandings of the motivational process of the affect–proactivity link by going beyond anger and fear, which have been the most widely studied in proactivity research, to gain a more comprehensive insight into human motivation, and its link with proactivity at work. It is also echoed in the ‘affective revolution in organizational behaviour’ that there should be ‘a shift in emphasis to balance the interest in moods with an interest in discrete emotions’ (Brief and Weiss, 2002, p 298) and ‘the focus would be on what is driving each of the processes and the different outcomes resulting from that particular discrete emotion’ (Ashkanasy and Dorris, 2017, p 70). In addition, we also found that there are mixed and inconclusive results of negative affect and negative–natured discrete emotions (the majority in the discrete emotion family) in the literature. This may also imply the necessity for more detailed research into each kind of discrete emotion.

Second, the affective consequences of proactivity need more exploration. The route could be multidirectional; as a very recent attempt by Bindl (2019) has suggested, there are routes to experiencing feelings of growth, frustration, and threat. On the one hand, we need more sense of when and why we will choose a certain route rather
than others. Note that, although proactivity has overall been found to be beneficial for organizations, the extent to which any of these implications are relevant for a particular organization may well depend on how ready the organization is to welcome employee initiative. On the other hand, we may focus on the various discrete emotions to disclose the variety and dynamics of the affective consequences of proactive behaviour within various natures and contexts. For example, anxiety may be highly salient in the initial phase of proactivity, in the context of issue identification; while pride may be very salient in the completion phase of proactivity, in the context of issue selling. In this vein, investigating employees’ affective experiences of proactivity across behaviour natures and contexts is important.

Third, besides the further investigation of the affective antecedents and consequences of proactivity, we cannot overlook the potential in a reciprocal process of the affect–proactivity link. The hedonic contingency theory (Wegener and Petty, 1994, 1996) is a theory about mood management that suggests that happy individuals are interested in sustaining their positive affect state, whereas sad individuals are interested in affective repair. Employee proactive behaviours as we discussed above could bring about positive or negative results, which may prompt the process to go in different directions. If employees are ‘energized to’ be proactive by positive affect or a certain positive emotion, they may be more likely to keep feeling happy. Nevertheless, if employees are ‘informed by’ negative affect to find something wrong, they may resort to proactive behaviour to make change, which may either neutralize or transform the feelings afterwards. In this way, we may outline various affective journeys through a reciprocal perspective. It will be of great value in the within-person context to understand a dynamic process of the affect–proactivity link, rather than the current dominant static view in the literature.

Last but not the least, a multilevel process of the affect–proactivity link would be a promising and important direction. Based on the current review, the energy perspective is becoming a dominant perspective for examining the link. Combined with the recent development in this theoretical perspective, emotion could contribute to individual, team, and organizational level energy (for example, Baker, 2019), which, in turn, could ‘energize to’ proactivity at various levels. Currently, focus has been very much on the individual level, but team-wide affective processes, or even emotional climate or culture at the organizational level, could all affect this link in different ways. Although multilevel efforts have been made in the proactivity literature (for example, Hong et al, 2016), there is a lack of focus on this in the affect–proactivity
link and this perspective will also inform the understanding of the affective/emotional journey of proactivity by including contextual and individual factors at different levels as mentioned.

Notes
1 Based on our search, we found that articles that focus on mood distinguished into positive and negative mood, and using the PANAS scale as a measurement (for example, Liu et al, 2015; Tsai, Chen, and Liu, 2007, Zacher et al, 2019); for an exception, see Bindl et al (2012) who focused more comprehensively on affective quadrants of the circumplex (Russell, 2003). Therefore, in this chapter, we combined the searching results here and the following quantitative literature review work throughout. As a result, we adopted affect hereafter to include (core) affect and mood.

2 Innovation and creativity are excluded in this review as they are relatively independent from proactive literature.

3 Proactive strategic behaviours including issue selling and strategic scanning, refers to taking control of and causing change in the broader organization’s strategy and its fit with the external environment (Parker and Collins, 2010), which is excluded in this review due to the limited quantity of research.

4 It is worthwhile to note, although job performance and job satisfaction are two frequently mentioned outcomes in the figure, the former construct closely linked with OCBS in the years 1995–2000 and co-occurred with voice; the latter one is a more recent studied outcome of voice behaviour. That is, they are not directly related to the relationships of affect and proactivity.

5 Burst refers to the sharp increase of keywords or references in a specific area, which suggests the emerging trend in the field (Kim and Chen, 2015).

6 Activation concerns a person’s ‘state of readiness for action or energy expenditure’ (Russell, 2003), and represents ‘motivational intensity’ or ‘the impetus to act’ (Gable and Harmon-Jones, 2010). Combinations of activation and valence result in four distinct quadrants (see Table 1.1).
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