Exploring the Relative Relevance of
Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Emotional Intelligence

Ajay K Jain

Management Development Institute, Gurgaon

The present study examines the predictive ability of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Emotional Intelligence (EI) with regard to organizationally relevant criterion variables including Job Satisfaction, Personal Effectiveness, Reputational Effectiveness, General Health, Career Orientation, Perceived Job Mobility, Turnover Intention, Organizational Commitment, Vertical Trust, Work Recognition, Organizational Productivity, and Organizational Effectiveness. Sample consisted of middle level executives (*N*=250) of two wheeler-manufacturing motorbike organizations. Results of the study, based on multiple regression analyses suggested that compared to EI, OCB was found to be relatively a more powerful predictor of organizationally relevant criterion variables in Indian work context. The implications of results are discussed toward a possibility and importance of increasing the OCB and EI among employees from a strategic human resource development view to provide a competitive edge in changing work scenario.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The present research work is addressed to an examination of the relative relevance of the constructs of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Emotional Intelligence (EI) as evidenced by its relationship with some of the organizationally relevant criterion variables. The relevant criterion variables included were of two types; individual level and organizational level criterion variables. The individual level criterion variables were Job Satisfaction, Personal Effectiveness, Reputational Effectiveness, General Health, Career Orientation, Perceived Job Mobility, Turnover Intention, Organizational Commitment, Vertical Trust, and Work Recognition. The organizational level criterion variables were Organizational Effectiveness and Organizational Productivity.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Recently, OCB has been of increasing interest to both scholars and managers (Howard, 1995; LiPine, Hanson, Borman & Motowidlo, 2000; Motowidlo, Borman & Schmit, 1997; Organ & Ryan, 1995). The construct of OCB, a form of extra role behavior may hold promise for contribution to increased individual effectiveness in the service of overall organizational effectiveness. The concept of OCB was first introduced as "A Good Soldier Syndrome" (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983) that is necessary for the prosperity and effective functioning of the organization. Organ (1988) defined the concept of OCB as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization".

Regarding the dimensions of OCB, Lepine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) raised the doubt that despite the existence of three published meta-analysis (Organ & Ryan,

1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach, 2000), it is difficult to answer the fundamental question about the OCB construct itself and how it relates to its dimension. In present work, a comprehensive scale was developed to measure the dimensions of OCB by borrowing and modifying existing scales and developing new items within the Indian work context.

OCB contributes indirectly to the organization through maintenance of organization's social system (Organ, 1997). Most of the research on OCB has focused on identifying its predictors (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). The major impact of OCB have been seen on managerial evaluation of performance, and judgment regarding the pay raises, promotions etc. and on organizational performance and success (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000).

Emotional Intelligence. Besides the general and academic interest in EI (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Goleman, 1995, 1998; BarOn, 1997), EI has drawn a greater attention of the practitioners of the management to enhance the workers' and managers' skills in terms of mood control, happiness, optimism, teamwork, cooperation etc. Some recent empirical studies have found EI as an important tool related to positive criterion such as prosocial behavior parental warmth, and positive family and peer relations (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999; Rice, 1999; Salovey, Mayer, Caruso, & Lopes, 2001). In some of the recent Indian studies on EI, researchers have found that EI has direct positive impact on employee's general health, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, personal effectiveness, employee turnover, organizational effectiveness etc (e.g., Jain & Sinha 2005, Sinha & Jain, 2004). In continuation of a few published researches on the importance of the construct of EI, present study included

the construct of EI as another predictor variable for organizationally relevant criterion variables. There are two types of model discussed in the literature on EI, one is ability model (Mayer and Salovey, 1997) and another is mixed model (BarOn, 1997). In the present study, I have used BarOn's EQ-inventory to measure EI through mixed model approach. BarOn (1997) maintained that EI is an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures. He includes five major areas of skills, interpersonal skills, intra-personal skills, adaptability skills, stress management skills and general mood. Overall, BarOn (1997) noted that EI provides the potential for better performance.

OCB and EI. From literature review, it appears that EI provides a very unique kind of ability by linking cognitive and affective sphere of human personality. Hence it is more likely that EI will influence personal and organizational level outcomes positively. Compare to EI, OCB is conceptualized as a part of overall employee's performance (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002) that is influenced by attitudinal and dispositional variables (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Konovsky & Organ, 1996) rather than by employee's knowledge, skills, and ability. Hence it is thought that OCB is more influenced by the environment in which an employee is working. That is why Organ (1988) proposed social exchange explanation of OCB. It is more likely that supervisory fairness will lead to high citizenship behavior. In comparison, one can assume that OCB will affect outcome variables more significantly compare to EI. One reason may be that EI is an ability which does not get convert necessarily in a better performance outcomes, where as OCB is an extra role performance which is more closely linked with outcome variables. Another reason may be that the employees are positively evaluated for their acts of

citizenship where as EI is not a direct part of performance appraisal process. Hence it is more likely OCB will be linked better with outcome variables compare to EI.

Literature in the field of organizational behavior and human resource management shows no evidence regarding the relative importance of the constructs of OCB and EI in relation to organizationally relevant criterion variables. Therefore, framed as a research question the purpose of the research endeavor would translate as: W*hat is the relative strength of association of OCB and EI as the predictors of organizationally relevant criterion variables?*

Method

Sample:

The sample consisted of 250 middle-level executives from six plants of four two-wheeler (scooter and motorcycle) manufacturing organizations. The organizations, within the private sector, were located in five different cities of North India. The employees were male, in the 25 to 45 year age group, who had spent at least one year in the same organization. Almost all of them were married and had a graduate degree or diploma in engineering. They were working in various departments like manufacturing, finance, maintenance, IT, research and development etc.

Measures:

Questionnaire measures were used to obtain data on the following variables; OCB, EI, job satisfaction, career orientation, personal effectiveness, organizational commitment, work recognition, reputational effectiveness, general health, trust, perceived job mobility, turnover intention, organizational effectiveness and organizational productivity. All survey items were rated on a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (true to almost no extent) to 5 (true to a very great extent).

Results

Responses on the all 14 variables were subjected to exploratory factor analysis. The exploratory factor analysis is administered to see the validity and reliability of the questionnaires in the present work context of India. The factor analysis results are based on principal factoring with iterations and oblique rotations using the SPSS-X statistical analysis package program. The criterion of factor loadings equal to greater than .30 with no cross-loadings on other factors and Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient equal to or greater than .70 (Nunally, 1978) was used for the purpose of identifying the valid and reliable scales. A summary for ready reference is presented below, which shows (a) the major concepts used in the study, (b) their factor-analytically derived dimensions with (c) the number of items constituting the factors, (d) Mean Value of each dimension (e) standard deviations (SD) of each dimension and (f) the Cronbach's alpha coefficients indicating the internal consistency for the respective factors.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior: OCB was measured through the questionnaire which had 96-variables based on the work of Bateman and Organ (1983), Smith, Organ and Near (1983), Organ (1988), Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994), Moorman and Blakely (1995), and Chattopadhayay (1999), however 49-items were found to be relevant upon factor analysis which resulted into 11 significant dimensions.

Emotional Intelligence: EI was measured through the BarOn's EQ-i (1997) that was consisted of 133-item. Overall, the five factors have some similarity with those found by Goleman (1995), Salovey and Mayer (1990), and BarOn (1997). The majority of the items, however, did not appear to be relevant for measuring EI in our sample of Indian managers, as evident by the fact that

out of 133-items only 21 were found to be factor-analytically meaningful.

Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction was measured through a questionnaire consisting of three-item that was adapted from the work of Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Flesh (1983). The factor structure indicated the positive attitude of the employees towards the organization at global level.

Career Orientation: Career Orientation was measured through the five-item scale that was developed by Robinson and Rousseau (1994). The scale was measuring the possibilities of joining the job with some other organization for growth of the career.

Personal Effectiveness: Personal effectiveness was measured through a questionnaire consisting of four-item based on the work of Sutton and Ford (1982). The factor structure indicated the ability to get things done at the work place effectively.

Organizational Commitment: Organizational commitment was measured through a questionnaire that was adapted from the writings of Meyer and Allen (1984) that was consisting of 20-item, 2 items were deleted based on factor analysis. It has yielded 4-factors.

Work Recognition: Work recognition was measured through a five-item questionnaire taken from Sinha (1992) and 4-items were found to be significant upon factor analysis. The scale included items for both monetary and non-monetary awards.

Reputational Effectiveness: Reputational effectiveness was measured through a 3-item questionnaire taken from the writings of Tsui (1984). The factor structure indicated the attitude of employee and the way he/she is performing his/her job according to the expectations.

General Health: The general health (lack of strain) was measured through the General Health Questionnaire–12 (GHQ-12) based on the work of Goldberg, (1988) that was consisting 12-item. The scale had yielded two useable factors.

Trust: Trust questionnaire was taken from the work of Gabarro and Athos (1976) and consisted of seven-item. The factor structure indicates the employee's positive faith and belief on employer's intentions and good will.

Perceived Job Mobility: Perceived job mobility was measured through a four-item scale that was taken from the work of Rusbalt and Farell (1983). The factor structure indicates the perception of ease and comfort in switching from one job to another job.

Turnover Intention: The three-item scale from Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1979) was used to measure the turnover intention. The factor structure indicated the intention of employees to leave the present organization.

Organizational Effectiveness: Organizational effectiveness was measured through a 22-item questionnaire taken from Sinha (1992) that was based on the work of Sutton and Ford (1982); however one item was deleted because of poor factor loading.

Organizational Productivity: Organizational productivity was measured through a scale taken from Spreitzer and Mishra (1999) consisting five-item. Only four items were found to be relevant for the purpose. The factor structure indicated the innovation and morale of the employees for better organizational performance.

It was hypothesized that OCBs and EI will have significant impact on relevant criterion variables. Stepwise multiple regression analysis is used to see the relative relevance of OCB and EI with all the organizationally relevant criterion variables. The MRA results appear in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis with the dimensions of organizational Citizenship Behavior Predicting the different dimensions of Organizationally Relevant criterion Variables

No. Predictor Variables (Dimensions of OCB)	Criterion Variables	â	t	Adj. R²
1 Organizational Pride	Job Satisfaction	.20**	3.25	.04
2 Social and Functional Participation	Personal Effectiveness	.29**	4.44	.26
3 Emotional Support	Personal Effectiveness	.26**	3.79	.33
4 Individual Initiative	Personal Effectiveness	.16*	2.44	.34
5 Individual Initiative	Reputational Effectiveness	.22**	3.59	.05
6 Organizational Pride	Sense of Accomplishment and Contribution	.20**	2.91	.12
7 Social and functional Participation	Sense of Accomplishment and Contribution	.20**	2.98	.20
8 Concern for Organizational Resources	Sense of Accomplishment and Contribution	.14*	2.21	.21
9 Sportsman Spirit	Botheration Free Environment	.21**	.3.16	.09
10 Concern for Organizational Resources	Botheration Free Environment	.47**	3.03	.12
11 Emotional Support	Career Orientation	.19**	2.64	.06
12 Sportsman Spirit	Career Orientation	-.19**	-3,18	.09
13 Social and Functional Participation	Career Orientation	.10*	2.01	.10
14 Social and Functional Participation	Perceived Job Mobility	.25**	4.09	.04
15 Sportsman Spirit	Perceived Job Mobility	-.19**	-3.20	.08
16 Sportsman Spirit	Turnover Intention	-.23**	-3.72	.06
17 Emotional Support	Turnover Intention	.25**	3.57	.09
18 Organizational Pride	Turnover Intention	-.23**	-3.21	.12
19 Concern for Organizational Resources	Sense of Attachment	.18**	2.86	.03
20 Concern for Organizational Resources	Conditional Continuance Commitment	-.18**	-2.95	.03
21 Altruism	Normative Commitment	.24**	3.89	.05
22 Organizational Pride	Organizational Attraction	.31**	4.66	.06
23 Work Mindedness	Organizational Attraction	-.16*	-2.42	.07
24 Organizational Pride	Vertical Trust	.19**	3.03	.05
25 Sportsman Spirit	Vertical Trust	.19**	3.03	.09
26 Work Mindedness	Work Recognition	-.15**	-2.45	.02
27 Conservation of Time	Profit and Growth related Organizational Effectiveness	-.13*	-2.01	.01
28 Emotional Support	Resource Acquisition related Organizational Effectiveness	.14**	2.35	.02
29 Organizational Pride	Perceived Overall Organizational Effectiveness	.18**	2.89	.03
30 Social and Functional Participation	Human Resource Acquisition related Organizational Effectiveness	.13*	2.09	.01
31 Sportsman Spirit	Organizational Productivity	.33**	5.62	.09
32 Emotional Support	Organizational Productivity	-.18**	-2.94	.12

* p<.05, **p ≤.01.

The results of Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA) showed that the dimensions of OCB have turned out to be the significant predictors of the dimensions of the organizationally relevant individual level and organizational level criterion variables.

Table 2. Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis with the dimensions of EI Predicting the different dimensions of Organizationally Relevant criterion Variables

No. Predictor Variables (Dimensions of EI)	Criterion Variables	â	t	Adj. R ^{2}
1 Controlled Problem Solving	Job satisfaction	.22**	3.59	.05
2 Assertiveness and Positive Self Concept	Personal Effectiveness	.23**	3.79	.08
3 Reality Awareness	Personal Effectiveness	.23**	3.75	.13
4 Assertiveness and Positive Self Concept	Reputational Effectiveness	.21**	3.35	.07
5 Reality Awareness	Reputational Effectiveness	.19**	3.02	.09
6 Positive Attitude about Life	Sense of Accomplishment and Contribution	.32**	5.33	.10
7 Positive Attitude about Life	Botheration Free Existence	.32**	4.75	.16
8 Assertiveness and Positive Self Concept	Botheration Free Existence	.16**	2.38	.18
9 Controlled Problem Solving	Turnover Intention	-.15**	-2.32	.02
10 Reality Awareness	Sense of Attachment	.15**	2.46	.02
11 Assertiveness and Positive Self Concept	Conditional Continuance Commitment	-.22**	-3.47	.04
12 Reality Awareness	Normative Commitment	.15**	2.40	.02
13 Controlled Problem Solving	Vertical Trust	.15**	2.08	.07
14 Reality Awareness,	Vertical Trust	.19**	3.00	.10
15 Impulse Control	Vertical Trust	.13*	1.99	.11
16 Controlled Problem Solving	Resource Acquisition related Organizational Effectiveness	.19**	2.70	.01
17 Assertiveness and Positive Self Concept	Resource Acquisition related Organizational Effectiveness	-.14**	-2.01	.02
18 Controlled Problem Solving	Perceived Overall Organizational Effectiveness	.13*	2.05	.01
19 Controlled Problem Solving	Organizational Productivity	.20**	3.23	.04

* p<.05, **p<.01.

The results of Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA) with the organizationally relevant criterion variables as the criterion and EI as the predictor showed that the dimensions of EI turned out to be significant predictors of the dimensions of the organizationally relevant individual level and organizational level criterion variables.

Discussion

The present work sought to examine the differential strength of association of the constructs of OCB and EI with organizationally relevant variables. The result pertaining to Table 1 and Table 2 revealed that the different dimensions of OCB and EI were found to be highly associated with organizationally relevant variables in general. More specifically, OCB was observed relatively a more powerful predictor of outcome variables compared to EI.

The regression results from table 1 showed that Job satisfaction, Personal Effectiveness, Reputational Effectiveness, Sense of Accomplishment and Contribution, Botheration Free Existence, and Vertical Trust were positively predicted by different dimensions of OCBs. An important reason may be that OCBs enhance the openness in communication, level of cooperation, and a will to contribute between individual members in an organization (Barnard, 1938) that may increase these individual level outcome variables. Another reason may be OCBs help in creating an informal network of relationship (Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002; Nahapiet & Ghosal, 1998) by going beyond

the task requirements and expectations of the job, but indirectly these informal networks help in successful performance of one's role and responsibilities in organizational context.

Some other outcome variables like Career Orientation, Perceived Job Mobility, Turnover Intentions, Work Recognition and Organizational Commitment were also found to be significantly predicted by OCBs. More specifically, the results from table 1 showed that some dimensions had positive impact and other had negative impact on these outcome variables. For example, Sportsman Spirit and Organizational Pride dimensions of OCB was found to be a negative predictors which means that an attitude of acceptance towards all nuisances, and a feeling of pride both together helps in precluding the movement of employees to other organizations. They feel more contented in working for the present organization. However, Emotional Support and Social and Functional Participation dimensions of OCB were found to be the strong positive predictors. The reason might be that people who provide greater emotional support to their coworkers may feel satiated after putting so much effort towards organizational issues. That feeling of satiation may propel them to leave the organization for further personal development.

An interesting finding is that Concern for Organizational Resources dimension of OCB was found to be a positive predictor of Sense of Attachment and a negative predictor of Conditional Continuance Commitment. It means OCBs helps in relating to organization in a truer sense. It means that OCB not only reduces the chance of leaving one's present organization but also increases one's true commitment. However, Work Mindedness dimension of OCB is reducing the feeling of attachment. The reasons may that Work Mindedness citizenship behavior may increase one's stress level due to higher work load that may eventually lead to lower emotional commitment.

The results from Table 1 shows that Organizational Pride, Sportsman Spirit and Social and Functional Participation dimension of OCB predicted organizational performance. The reasons why OCBs contributes to organizational performance may be summarized in the words of Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) in the following points; (a) enhancing coworkers and managerial productivity; (b) freeing up resources so that they can be used for more productive purposes (c) reducing the need to devote scarce resources to purely maintenance functions; (d) helping to coordinate activities both within and across work groups (e) strengthening the organization's ability to attract and retain the best employees; (f) increasing the stability of the organization's performance; and (g) enabling the organization to adapt more effectively to environmental changes.

The regression results from table 2 showed that Job satisfaction, Personal Effectiveness, Reputational Effectiveness, Sense of Accomplishment and Contribution (dimension of general health), Botheration Free Existence, (dimension of general health), Turnover Intention, Organizational Commitment, and Vertical Trust were positively predicted by different dimensions of EI in an expected manner. The reasons may well be explained by the nature of factor structure emerged from the factor analysis of 21 items and five dimensions in Indian work context. The reason might be that emotional intelligence as represented by Assertiveness and Positive Self Concept, Positive Attitude about Life, Impulse Control, Reality Awareness, and Controlled Problem Solving reflects one's ability in handling all intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships in an effective manner. These EI skills might help an employee to get the cooperation from others and in turn enable one to get the team effort in support of one's goals at work. In a study, the best performing recruiters scored

high on assertiveness, empathy, interpersonal relations, problem solving and optimism (BarOn, 1998). Hence it means these dimensions of EI might increase the employees' personal worth as a cooperative and team member of his/her organization which helps in gaining the trust and makes him/her proactive member in all organizational affairs. EI skills make people to be happy, confident, capable and satisfied in his/ her surroundings. These results are consistent with the theory of "*Learned Optimism*" and with the assumptions of "*positive psychology*" (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) which shifted the focus from repairing the worst things in life to also building good positive qualities. It means that EI skills provide us positive energy to work harder even in adverse conditions that may lead to better satisfaction, effectiveness, health etc.

Results (Table 2) also revealed that EI skills may make employees more genuine and honest about the organizational needs. The results showed that, on the one hand, Reality Awareness increases affective and normative commitment positively that consist affective component. On the other hand, Assertiveness and Positive Self Concept precludes Conditional Continuance Commitment that consist cognitive component to a greater amount. The true commitment is emotional one. Thus Emotional intelligence may contribute towards a greater organizational commitment. Consequently, emotional intelligence skills might preclude Turnover Intention. Research studies showed that competencies such as initiative, self-confidence, and leadership play crucial role in the retention of employees (Goleman, 1998).

The results from table 2 show that Controlled Problem Solving dimension was found to be a positive predictor for organizational effectiveness and productivity. Where as Assertiveness and Positive Self

Concept was found to be the negative predictor of Resource Acquisition related Organizational Effectiveness. The reason may be that Controlled Problem Solving helps employee to control their negative emotions and impulsiveness at the work. It may act like a chain reaction in controlling negative emotions that increases overall organizational effectiveness and productivity. However, in case of resource acquisition related organizational effectiveness, it is a matter of macro-level operation and top echelon decision making rather than a matter pertaining to EI skills in terms of assertiveness and positive self concept at the individual level.

Overall, the results showed that OCB have a unique contribution in predicting *Career Orientation, Perceived Job Mobility, and Work Recognition* and found a very strong predictor of *Personal Effectiveness, Turnover Intention, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Productivity* compared to EI. OCB and EI were found to be the commonly relevant predictors of *Job Satisfaction, General Health, Vertical Trust, and Organizational Effectiveness.* EI was found to be a relatively stronger predictor of *Reputational Effectiveness* compared to OCB.

Implications, Suggestions and Limitations. In today's business environment, organizations are undergoing changes at various levels rapidly because of social and economic changes. People behavior and skills like, OCB and EI skills may help in the survival and the growth of the organization in competitive and turbulent environment by controlling the negative emotions like anger, aggression, conflict etc. and by enhancing positive behavior at work place. OCB and EI will enhance organizations' inner strength to preclude negative behavior and to promote positive behavior at work place. In a new world of organizations, OCBs and EI types of behavior and skills may play more crucial role

to enhance one's satisfaction, health, commitment, confidence, and happiness. Therefore, it may be suggested that organizations need to focus upon these "people" (OCBs and EI) aspects together with the material aspects for increased effectiveness in face of ever changing environment and mounting external pressures as a careful handling of such issues may provide an effective buffer to face future challenges.

There are some interesting findings regarding the concept of EI that require further elaboration. Overall, the results of present study supported the theoretical framework propounded by Salovey and Mayor (1990), Mayer and Salovey (1997), BarOn (1997) and Goleman (1995, 1998). The results showed that EI might have a significant impact on the organizationally relevant criterion variables but have less impact compared to OCB as it was thought earlier. The results contained in Table 1 and 2 suggest that though the prediction results were significant, the amount of variance shared between the predictor and criterion was more in favor of OCBs than EI. It seems that EI has not evolved and taken roots in population, which the sample of the study represented. Hence, the idea needs to be examined further with more varied samples and inclusion of more culturally relevant items in EI measure.

An important limitation of the study may be that present study used the self-report measure of OCB that may inflate the results because of high social desirability effect. However, results showed the relative relevance of OCB over EI in predicting organizationally relevant criterion. OCB was found an important predictor with 49-items and 11-dimensions.

Despite these limitations, the results have direct implication for the field of Human Resource Development, Strategic HRD and marketing of services. People can be trained and developed on citizenship behaviors and EI skills. The profit through product is not the only important element of business; rather the service has gained the importance in case of new economy. Therefore, organizations are involved in getting customer delight through their after sale service. In providing services to internal or external customers, employees with better OCBs and EI skills may play a crucial role. They may be termed as "Emotionally Intelligent Organizational Citizens".

References

Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior. 49*, 252-276.

Barnard, C. (1938). *The functions of executive.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

BarOn, R. (1997). *The Emotional quotient inventory* (EQ-i): Technical Manual. Toronto: Multi Health Systems.

Bateman, T.S., & Organ, D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 299-322.

Bolino, M.C., Turnley, W.H., & Bloodgood, J.M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. Academy of Management Review, 27, 505-522.

Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W.C. Borman & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations:* 71-98, San Francisco, C.A.: Jossey-Bass

Camman, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). *The Michigan organizational assessment questionnaire.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, Jr., D. & Flesh, J.R. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S.E. Seashore, E. Lawler, P.H. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds), *Assessing*

organizational change: pp 71-138. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Chattopadhyay, P. (1999). Beyond Direct and Symmetrical Effects: The Influence of Demographic Dissimilarity on Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Academy of Management of Journal*, *42, 273-287.*

Gabarro, J.J. & Athos, J. (1976). *Interpersonal relation and communication.* Prentice all, New York.

Goldberg, D. (1972). *The detection of psychiatric illness by questionnaire.* London: Oxford Press.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence.* New York. Bantam Books

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence.* New York Bantam Books

Howard, A. (1995). *The changing nature of work.* San Francisco: Jossy Bass.

Jain, A.K. & Sinha, A.K. (2005). General health in organizations: Relative relevance of emotional intelligence trust and organizational support. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *12,* 257-273

Konovsky, M.A., & Organ, D.W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *17,* 253-266

Lepine, J.A., Erez, A. & Johnson, D.E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 52-65.

LiPine, J.A., Hanson, M., Borman, W., & Motowidlo, S.J. (2000). Contextual performance, team-work: Implication for staffing. In G.R. Ferriss & K.M. Rowland, (Eds.) *Research in personnel and human resource management*, *19*, Satmford CT: JAI Press

MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M, & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinant of managerial evaluation of salesperson's performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50*, 123-150.

MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluation of sales performance. Working Paper, Indiana University.

Mayer, J.D. & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Ed.) *Emotional development and emotional intelligence*: Implications for educators. New York: Basic Books.

Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets for traditional standards for intelligence. *Intelligence, 27,* 267-298.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Competing Models of Emotional Intelligence. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Human Intelligence*. New York: Cambridge.

Moorman, R.H., & Blakely, G.L. (1995). Individualism-Collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior, *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16,* 127 -142.

Motowidlo, S.J., Borman, W.C., & Schmit, M.J. (1997). A theory of individual differences and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, *10,* 71-83

Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review, 23,* 242-266.

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

Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*, Lexington, MA Lexington.

Organ, D.W. (1997). 'Organizational citizenship behavior: Its construct clean up time', *Human Performance, 10,* 85-98.

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*, 513-563.

Rusbut, C.E., & Farrell, D. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The impact on job satisfaction, job commitment, and

turnover in rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68,* 429-438.

Rice, C.L. (1999). A quantitative study of emotional intelligence and team performance. Unpublished master's thesis Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA

Rotundo, M, & Sackett, P.R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy capturing approach, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 66-80.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence, *Cognition, and Personality*, *9,* 185-211.

Salovey, P., Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D., & Lopes, P.N. (2001). Measuring emotional intelligence as a set of mental abilities with the MSCEIT. In S.J. Lopez, & C.R. Snyder (Eds.) *Handbook of positive psychology assessment.* Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

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

Sinha, A.K. & Jain, A.K. (2004). Emotional Intelligence: Imperatives for organizationally relevant outcome variables. *Psychological Studies*, *49*.

Sinha, A.K. (1992). *Measures of some organizational variables.* Unpublished manuscript. Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology- Kanpur, India.

Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68,* 653-663.

Spreitzer, Gretchen M., & Mishra, Aneil K. (1999). Giving up control without losing control: Trust and its substitutes' effects on managers' involving employees in decision making. *Group and Organization Management, 24,* 155-187.

Sutton, R.I., & Ford, L.H., (1982). Problem solving adequacy in Hospital subunits. *Human Realtions, 35,* 675-701.

Tsui A.S. (1984). A role set analysis of managerial reputation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *34,* 64-96.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J.A. (1998). Helping and voice extra role behavior: Evidence of construct and predictive validity, *Academy of Management Journal*, *37,* 108-109.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W. & Dienesch, R.M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct Redefinition, Measurement, and Validation, *Academy of Management Journal, 37,* 765-802.

Ajay K Jain, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Human Behavior and Organizational Development, Management Development Institute, Gurgaon-122 001, India. Phone 91 124 4560303, Mobile 098685 91848. Email: akjain@mdi.ac.in