CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 CHAPTER OVERVIEW

This chapter reviews the literature pertaining to the OCB and EI, their conceptualization, models, antecedents etc. have been included. This literature develops the theoretical framework for the present study. The origin of these variables and the progress made in their respective fields has been discussed. It lays down the foundation for formulation of hypotheses among the constructs included in the present study.

2.2 CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

A new construct forayed into the field of organizational sciences: organizational citizenship behaviour (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983). The concept of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) was initially conceived by Bateman & Organ (1983) based on a belief that job satisfaction affected people’s willingness to help their peers in diverse and mundane forms in order to preserve organized structures governing work. The operationalization of the construct first came from a series of events that sought to have manager’s views of those things, they would like their subordinates to engage into, but which they could not make them to do either by force, offers of rewards, or threats of reprimands. Behaviours
that surfaced through this process formed the basis of what subsequently became to be known as organizational citizenship behaviours, as they “lubricate the social machinery of organizations” (Smith et al., 1983, p. 654).

By 1988, the formal definition of OCB emerged that has since become the one that is most formally recognized and widely quoted, “Individual behaviour 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” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Organ then went on to define “discretionary” as behaviour that is not an enforceable contractual requirement of the employee by the employer, but is rather a matter of personal preference where it is generally understood that its omission is not punishable (Organ, 1988). So, this definition explains that even though OCB may not be directly or formally remunerated by the organization’s reward system, does not necessarily limit it to only those behaviours that are not rewarded in tangible returns to the individual. However, Organ adds that it is entirely possible that over a period of time these behaviours could, in fact, influence the impressions that managers have of the employees and in turn, could in part determine the future compensation of those employees. Rather, the only important issue to the concept of OCB is that these behaviours are not contractually assured a return. Hence, it is useful to consider rewards that may turn up from OCB to be at best indirect and uncertain, rather than formally rewarded as in the case of technical excellence or high productivity.

OCB are work behaviours that are defined as discretionary, not related to the formal organizational reward system, and collectively taken to promote the organizational effectiveness (Moorman, 1991; Niehoff, 2005; Podsakoff &
MacKenzie, 1994; Walz & Niehoff, 2000; Yen & Niehoff, 2004). Many problems spring up from this previous conceptualization of OCB regarding the reward issue which is not contractually guaranteed by the formal reward system (Organ, 1997). Organ (1997) also noted some difficulties with viewing OCB as extra-role behaviour. The problem arises in the definitional murkiness of the terms “role” and “job”. The progress of the leader-member exchange theory has somewhat helped to explain these difficulties, as it seems evident that roles evolved from leader-subordinate interactions (Dansereau, Graen & Haga, 1975; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). There are at least two problems cropping up from this interpretation. First, when rewards are offered, they generally follow from performance appraisal. However, research has revealed that some forms of OCB might be taken just as likely as in-role performance to lead to financial rewards (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Werner, 1994). Secondly, Organ (1997) posits that another problem lays in the fact just a few rewards for employees are contractually assured. Indeed, there are many instances in the last decade where employees have not only been denied received rewards for their productivity, but also lost their jobs due to the corporate downsizing and economic slowdown.

Although not intentionally developed as an answer to these definitional problems of OCB, Borman & Motowidlo (1993) suggested contextual performance as a construct similar to OCB that may in fact assist to clarify some of the aforesaid conceptual issues of citizenship behaviour. Nevertheless, ideas about contextual performance have a very different origin than organizational citizenship behaviour. Whereas the concept of OCB has been initially conceived as a result of an interest in
behavioural consequences of job satisfaction that is recognized as having important implications for organizational effectiveness, the concept of contextual performance developed from the question of why personnel selection research only focused on task performances of the employee and omitted those activities such as volunteering, persisting, helping, following rules, and endorsing organizational objectives which also seemed to impact organizational effectiveness (Motowidlo, 2000).

Borman & Motowidlo (1993, p 73) argued that these behaviours are organizationally valuable because they “support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function”. Thus, the idea of contextual performance was conceived in response to the questions: “What part of the performance domain is being relatively neglected by selection research and practice, and how is this part different?” For this reason, contextual performance is defined as “behaviours that do not support the technical core itself so much as they support the broader organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, p. 73). Borman & Motowidlo (1993) originally enumerate five categories of contextual performance which include volunteering for activities beyond a person’s formal job expectations, enthusiastic completion of task requirements, assisting others, following rules and prescribed procedures, and defending organizational objectives. At a glance, many of these items seem to be much like those of OCB (general compliance, altruism, courtesy). What seems different to OCB is that contextual performance as defined does not require that behaviours be extra-role or non-rewarded, only that they be non-
task in essence and contribute to the overall enhancement and maintenance of the context of work.

This new way of looking at a very similar, if not identical construct, may make more conceptual sense when trying to alleviate the traditional conceptual difficulties inherent in OCB. Organ (1997) admits that while appearing to be “cold, gray, and bloodless,” (p. 91) the concept of contextual performance may provide the much needed clean up to the construct of OCB. Moreover, Organ borrowed the similar definition of contextual performance in an attempt to redefine and refine OCB as, “contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance” (Organ, 1997, p. 91). However, he refused to replace the term “citizenship behaviour” with “contextual performance” because of the nomological constituencies inherent with the former.

Katz (1964) asserts that “an organization which depends solely on its blueprints of prescribed behaviour is a very fragile social system.” He goes on to describe five behaviours not specified by role prescriptions that, nevertheless, facilitate the accomplishment of organizational goals. It is also said to be a kind of performance which is called as non-task performance. It is also called as extra-role behaviour (Van Dyne, Cummings & Parks, 1995) / prosocial behaviour (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; George 1990, 1991; George & Bettenhausen, 1990; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986) / contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993, 1997; Borman, White & Dorsey, 1995; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994) / organizational spontaneity (George & Brief, 1992; George & Jones, 1997) as it is not prescribed by the job contract per se. Employees engage in this social exchange, a kind of
behaviour which is discretionary and over and above the job contract. Chattopadhyay (1999) suggested that the OCB had already become a crucial factor of influence on the development and survival of an organization.

### 2.2.1 Dimensions of OCB

Based on the conceptual definitions of OCB, different dimensions of OCB have been proposed. Though there is some overlap between these dimensions proposed by Organ (1988), Borman & Motowidlo (1993). These dimensions of OCB have been deployed in the present study to test its relationship with EI. Organ (1988) gave following forms of OCB:

1. **Altruism** includes all discretionary behaviours that have the effect of helping a specific other person with organizationally relevant task or problem.

2. **Conscientiousness** refers to organization members carrying out some of their role requirements far beyond the minimum requirement like being punctual, not taking extra breaks, doing one’s duties sincerely even when no one is watching and maintaining and conserving resources.

3. **Sportsmanship** entails avoiding complaining, petty grievances etc. It means accepting less than minimal circumstances with ease and not discussing it with outsiders.

4. **Courtesy** refers to touching the base with those parties whose work would be affected by one’s decisions or commitments, providing advance notice to someone who needs to know the schedule of work.

5. **Civic Virtue**, initially identified by Graham (1986) is the final form mentioned by Organ (1988). This form refers to responsibly participating in the political
life of the organization like attending meetings and functions, reading mails and contributing towards the political life of the organization.

Organizational spontaneity refers to extra-role behaviours that are performed voluntarily, and that contribute to organizational effectiveness. George & Brief (1992) gave five forms of organizational spontaneity namely, helping coworkers, protecting the organization, managing constructive suggestions, developing oneself and spreading goodwill.

Contextual performance is defined as “behaviours supporting organizational, social and psychological environment in which the technical core must function” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). They conceptualized the five dimensions of contextual performance:

1. **Persisting with extra enthusiasm** when necessary to complete own task activities successfully.

2. **Volunteering** to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job.

3. **Helping** and cooperating with others.

4. **Following** organizational rules and procedures even when it is personally inconvenient.

5. **Endorsing**, supporting and defending organizational objectives.

### 2.2.2 Antecedents of OCB

Most of the antecedents of OCB have been empirically investigated in western countries. In relation to this only a fewer attempts on OCB research in India have been there (Biswas & Varma, 2007; Bhatnagar & Sandhu, 2005; Chaitanya & Tripathi, 2001; Jain & Sinha, 2006; Moideenkutty, 2000; Moideenkutty, Balu, Kumar
& Nalakath, 2006; Pattnayak, Mishra & Niranjana, 2005; Singh, 2006). In a comprehensive review of the past empirical work concerning OCB, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach (2000) reported that the research has focused on four major categories of antecedents: **individual characteristics, organizational characteristics, leadership behaviours, and task characteristics** (Figure 2.1) and listed in Table 2.1. Accordingly, the following discussion will concentrate on these four branches.

**Figure 2.1: Antecedents of OCB**
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### 2.2.2.1 Individual Characteristics

Most of the empirical work has focused on this first branch of individual characteristics. Research within this first stream has usually emphasized on two main
bases of OCBs: morale factors and dispositional factors. Organizational commitment, perceptions of fairness, employee satisfaction, and perceptions of leader’s supportiveness have been viewed as core morale factors by Organ & Ryan (1995). These variables have been the most frequently examined precursors of OCB. Amongst these, satisfaction seems to be the biggest correlate with OCB in the magnitude of around .31. Based on the work of Chester Bernard to elucidate why employees are “willing to contribute,” Organ (1990) hypothesized that there could be a set of dispositional variables, traits, or temperaments that combine together to influence someone to engage in OCB or a specific kind of OCB.

Subsequently, Organ & Ryan (1995) set this premise as one of the major tenets of their study and found limited empirical support for direct associations between dispositional variables and OCB. Traits like positive affectivity, negative affectivity, conscientiousness and agreeableness perhaps predispose people to certain orientations viz-à-viz their coworkers and managers which could subsequently, enhance the chances of receiving treatment that they would identify as supportive, fair, worthy of commitment and satisfying. Results of meta-analysis carried out by Organ & Ryan (1995) did not show substantial relationships among the aforementioned dispositional variables and hence, tendered that these sets of dispositional variables could at best be viewed as indirect antecedents to OCB, rather than as direct contributors.

On the other hand, George (1991) proposed a framework that was based mainly upon the work in social psychology to propose that positive moods promote prosocial or helping behaviour in many diverse settings. Probable reasons for this
occurrence could be that externalities are perceived in a more positive way during positive moods, and most probably such people looked favourably upon incidents where their assistance is solicited (Carlson, Charlin, & Miller, 1988).

Accordingly, while explaining the reasons for the unusual findings of Organ & Ryan (1995), George (1992) concluded that researchers seeking to find dispositional relationships with OCBs actually could be measuring a positive mood as a trait rather than a state. Studies included in the meta-analysis of Organ & Ryan (1995) asked respondents to describe their typical mood at work throughout the previous six months. Generally, mood ratings of reasonably long periods of time can be adequately stable to represent trait measures of mood (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Watson & Pennebaker (1989) indicated, the trait generally represents stable individual differences in the level of positive mood experiences, while the positive mood state is inclined to capture how a person feels at any given point of time only. Thus, positive mood state is a dynamic construct which refers to moods that are experienced in the short run and amenable to change over time, whereas trait positive mood refers to steady individuals differences in positive affect levels.

George (1991) found support for the relationship between positive mood states and helpful behaviour at work, in a study where positive mood demonstrated considerably unique variance beyond that of the trait of positive affectivity. These results seem to be in tune with other studies that have found similar support between positive mood states and helping behaviour (Bachrach & Jex, 2000; Williams & Shiaw, 1999) and suggest that future studies should probe positive mood states in more depth to comprehend the association with prosocial behaviours.
Similarly, Penner, Midili, & Kegelmeyer (1997) also did not share the same pessimism concerning the value of personality variables in the prediction of OCB as Organ & Ryan (1995). Penner & his colleagues have attempted to measure people’s predisposition to feel concerned about the welfare of others by thinking about their best interests, through the development and use of a scale that measured a prosocial personality orientation. Midili & Penner (1995) applied this prosocial personality orientation scale to discover very strong and significant correlations with the altruism dimension of OCB.

A further engaging line of research relevant to the discussion on the importance of personality variables, that is appropriate to address here, is that several authors have begun to look at OCB through a functional approach to behaviour (Penner et al., 1997; Rioux & Penner, 2001). The functional approach to OCB focuses on the function or purpose of the behaviour, and assumes that much of human behaviour is motivated by a person’s unique goals and needs. The meta-analysis of Podsakoff et al. (2000) lacked the contribution of emotional intelligence, as the relationship among EI and OCB has been explored in 2002 by Charbonneau & Nicol and later on by Carmeli (2003). From this stream of research, it seems reasonable to argue that OCB could at least in part, be a proactive behaviour that is driven by individual motives.

### 2.2.2.2 Organizational Characteristics

The second branch of antecedents to OCB that have been investigated is organizational characteristics and have resulted in quite divergent outcomes.
Podsakoff et al. (2000) appear to have implied that not organizational inflexibility, organizational formalization, staff / advisory support, or spatial distance was always related to citizenship behaviours. While other empirical works differ from Podsakoff et al. by suggesting there is a strong association among organizational support and citizenship behaviour (Kaufman, Stamper, & Tesluk, 2001; Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999). These researchers found a considerable relationship between perceived organizational support and citizenship behaviour that benefits the organization as a whole and suggested that human resources intend to strike a balance in their exchanges with organizations by engaging in attitudes and behaviours almost equivalent to the amount of commitment and support they consider their employer has for them. Therefore, being an effective citizen is a means that these attitudes could become obvious in employees.

2.2.2.3 Leadership Behaviours

The third branch of precursors to OCB is leadership behaviours. These behaviours have been further classified into four categories i.e. transformational leadership behaviours (to consist of articulating a vision, high performance expectations, to foster the acceptance of group goals, providing an appropriate model, and intellectual stimulation), transactional leadership behaviours (consists of contingent reward behaviour, contingent punishment behaviour, non-contingent reward behaviour, non-contingent punishment behaviour), path-goal theory leadership (consists of role clarification behaviour and the specification of procedures, supportive leadership behaviour), and finally, leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership. Broadly, all of these leadership behaviours have been
found to be positively and significantly correlated with citizenship behaviours (Podsakoff et al., 2000). For an instance, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter (1990) put forth to study the impact of transformational leadership upon extra-role behaviour (or citizenship behaviour). Particularly, they were concerned with how transformational leadership would influence extra-role behaviours either directly to a great extent the same way that transactional leadership influences in-role behaviours, or indirectly through the combined effects of mediators like followers’ trust in their leaders and satisfaction. The results suggested that the relationship of the collective set on transformational leadership behaviours and organizational citizenship behaviours was mediated by followers’ trust in their leaders. Consequently, the relationship is indirect, rather than direct. However, as compared to transformational leadership behaviours, transactional leadership behaviours impacted OCBs directly. One probable reason for this conclusion may be that transactional leadership is based on some type of exchange between the leader and the subordinate. This swapping procedure may persuade employees to utilize OCBs as a currency to acquire rewards and recognition.

2.2.2.4 Task Characteristics

The final branch of antecedents that OCB research has investigated is task variables. Although comparatively little work has been in this area, the relevant research is mostly included into the substitutes for leadership literature and discloses that task characteristics do have reliable relationships with OCB (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1995; Podsakoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie & Williams 1993; Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Bommer, 1996). In these research efforts, task routinization, task
### Table 2.1: Antecedents of OCB

#### 1. Individual Employee Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Employee Attitudes</th>
<th>b) Dispositional Variables</th>
<th>c) Employee Role Perceptions</th>
<th>d) Employee Abilities &amp; Individual Differences</th>
<th>e) Demographic Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>Ability/ Training/ Experience/ Knowledge</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>Professional orientation</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Positive affectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need for Independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment</td>
<td>Negative affectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indifference to Rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Task Characteristics

- Task feedback
- Task routinization
- Intrinsically satisfying task

#### 3. Organizational Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Formalization</th>
<th>Organizational Inflexibility</th>
<th>Rewards Outside the Leader’s Control</th>
<th>Advisory/ Staff Support</th>
<th>Perceived Organizational Support</th>
<th>Spatial Distance from Leader</th>
<th>Cohesive Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 4. Leadership Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Core’ Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Contingent Reward Behaviour</th>
<th>Contingent Punishment Behaviour</th>
<th>Leader Role Clarification</th>
<th>High Performance Expectations</th>
<th>Fostering the acceptance of Group Goals</th>
<th>Providing an Appropriate Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>Contingent Punishment</td>
<td>Non-contingent Reward Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulating a Vision</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Non-contingent Punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Specification of Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Leader Behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader- Member Exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

feedback, and intrinsically satisfying tasks all disclosed vital correlations with OCBs in some way. For this reason it would appear that researchers should also focus on this area in the future. Specifically, researchers should investigate how task-related matters interact to produce citizenship behaviours.

Hackman & Oldham (1976) tendered a model that could lend support for further research on the associations between task related variables and citizenship behaviours. Their *job characteristics model*, mentions the conditions under which individuals develop internal motivation to perform effectively in their jobs. Particularly, Hackman & Oldham set down three types of variables and their interaction consequently: (1) the psychological states of human resources that must be there for internally motivated work behaviour to develop, (2) the characteristics of jobs that can build these psychological states, and (3) the attributes of individuals themselves that decide how positively a person will respond to a complex and strenuous job. The model recommended that the job characteristics of autonomy, task significance, skill variety, task identity, and feedback would cumulatively come together to create the three psychological states of experienced responsibility for the outcomes of the work, experienced meaningfulness of the work, and knowledge of the actual results of the work. Henceforth, these three psychological states would combine to enhance an employee’s work satisfaction, internal work motivation, work performance, while reduce their rate of absenteeism and turnover. The outcomes of a meta-analysis of the job characteristics literature by Fried & Ferris (1987) lends credibility to the model and suggests that job characteristics certainly impact employee responses like overall satisfaction and absenteeism.
2.2.3 Consequences of OCB

Earlier empirical research has focused on the consequences of citizenship behaviour on two major areas i.e. individual and organizational level outcomes (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff & Blume, 2009): (1) the impact of OCBs on managerial evaluations of performance and decisions regarding pay hikes, promotions, variety of withdrawal-related criteria (e.g. employee turnover intentions, actual turnover and absenteeism) etc., and (2) the impact of OCBs on organizational performance and success (e.g. productivity, efficiency, reduced costs, customer satisfaction, and unit level turnover).

Certainly, even the core definition of OCB suggests that the behaviours in aggregate support the effective functioning of organizations. Numerous researchers have suggested that managers both subconsciously or intentionally value OCBs in their people and consider these behaviours in addition to other objective methods to evaluate their employee’s performance (Avila, Fern, & Mann, 1988; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991, 1993; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Paine, 1999; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000).

Indeed, Podsakoff et al. (2000) reported that in-role performance accounted for nearly 9.3% of the overall variance in performance evaluations across eight samples in a meta-analysis, while OCBs accounted for 12% of the this variance. Together OCBs and in-role performance accounted for a total of 42% of the variance in overall performance evaluations. Hence, these data imply that OCBs accounted for considerably more variance in performance evaluations than in-role performance,
lending credibility to the proposition that managers do become aware of OCBs and take them into consideration when evaluating their employees.

As per Organ’s original concept, these citizenship behaviours collectively enhance organizational effectiveness (Organ, 1988). Theoretically, it is plausible that citizenship behaviours would influence organizational effectiveness for various reasons including: improving coworker and managerial yield, serving to synchronize activities both within, and across work groups, sparing up resources, so they can be used for more productive purposes, enhancing the stability of the organization’s performance, solidifying the organization’s ability to attract and retain the best talent, and enabling the organization to become adaptable to cope with environmental changes easily (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Several researchers have examined and qualified these statements with outcomes that support the assumption that OCBs positively impact organizational effectiveness (Podsakoff et al., 1997; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Walz & Niehoff, 1996). Hence, the overall pattern of these results provides general support that organizational citizenship behaviours are related to organizational effectiveness. It is noteworthy that some different types of OCBs such as helping behaviour and civic virtue appears to impact distinct measures of organizational effectiveness in their own ways.

2.3 EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

The theory of emotional intelligence has evolved from several areas of research. Exploration in the area of intelligence, cognition and affect has laid a solid foundation for the development of this construct. In early nineteenth century a great
deal of interest was seen in the area of intelligence. During this time, it was felt that there was more to the realm of intelligence than just academic intelligence. Theorists at this time began to research on the idea that there are certain abilities other than academic intelligence that can predict success in life.

Emotional intelligence has its roots in the concept of “social intelligence” that was first recognized by Thorndike in 1920. Thorndike defined social intelligence as “the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls—to act wisely in human relations”. Subsequent to Thorndike, Gardner (1983) included social intelligence as one of the seven intelligence domain in his theory of multiple intelligences. According to Gardner, social intelligence comprised of a person’s interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences. Intrapersonal intelligence relates to one’s intelligence in dealing with oneself, and is the ability to “symbolize complex and highly differentiated set of feelings”. In contrast, interpersonal intelligence relates to one’s intelligence in dealing with others and is the ability to “notice and make distinctions among other individuals and, in particular, among their moods, temperaments, motivations and intentions.”

By the later part of the Twentieth century, the field of intelligence had various theories that Sternberg (1985a) reasoned was the cause of a great deal of inconsistency within the field. Sternberg’s (1985b) triarchic theory of intelligence was proposed as an integrated framework of intelligence theory. His effort was proposed to include all of these apparently conflicting or competing theories, and to show the complementary nature of these theories in order to proceed forward in the field of intelligence beyond the problems created by warring factions of theorists. The
triarchic framework segregated intelligence into three realms of information-processing: (1) the mental processes which are internal to the individual; (2) the use of internal mental processes in the interaction with one’s external environment; and (3) the acquisition of experience used to reconcile the relationship between internal mental states and external displays of one’s mental functions.

In Sternberg’s (1988) book, *The Triarchic Mind: A New Theory of Human Intelligence*, he explained that these intelligence realms were adaptive in the individual’s life experience. He proposed that adaptive skill is an important ability afforded by intelligence, and criticized the fact that traditional tests of intelligence lacked to measure adaptive skill. He described this adaptive function of intelligence as the means by which intelligence serves one’s mental self-management. This concept of mental self-management provides one with the ability to adapt to, select out of, and shape environments in which one interacts.

Moreover, in addition to these radical theories in the field of intelligence, there were other movements that led to the development of emotional intelligence theory. Mayer (2001) attributed the emergence of the emotional intelligence construct partly to the emergence and evolution of research in cognition and affect, which became popular in the late 1970’s. Mayer (2001) cited several key articles that brought emotions research to the forefront and caught attention of behavioral theorists. He mentioned Isen, Shalker, Clark & Karp’s (1978) idea of a “cognitive loop” that demonstrated an interaction between cognition and mood. Another such notion, by Ajzen & Fishbein (1974), proposed that attitudes are formed from three
components: cognition, affect, and behaviour. These components interact to influence how one will respond to diverse stimuli.

These theorists, as well as Thorndike (1920), Gardner (1983), Sternberg (1985), and many others, refined the ideas from which emotional intelligence developed. In 1990, Salovey & Mayer coined the term emotional intelligence in the United States academic literature. They first proposed emotional intelligence as “the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (p. 189). This definition integrates the ideas of Thorndike, Gardner, and others into a coherent list of abilities that constitutes the emotional intelligence construct. Further, these abilities put affect as a main stimulus that influences social interaction.

Later on, Mayer & Salovey (1997) refined this definition to better elucidate how emotional intelligence represents cognitive abilities. They suggested that previous definitions, were not clear enough or inclusive of all abilities that represented by emotional intelligence. The most current definition offered by these theorists lists the actual components or abilities that they suppose comprise the construct. Mayer & Salovey (1997) stated, “Emotional intelligence involves the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (p. 10). Not only this definition is more
comprehensive and clear in defining the construct, it also excludes extraneous factors that have been determined to be more representative of personality constructs.

2.3.1 Theoretical Framework

Since the outset of this theory, emotional intelligence enjoyed limited notice in the academic and professional literatures. It grabbed the attention and became prominent in 1995 when Daniel Goleman published a book called *Emotional Intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. His first book on the subject, made the term emotional intelligence quite popular in the corporate arena, as well as generating further interest in the area of academics also. The book explained his concept of emotional intelligence based on Salovey & Mayer’s (1990) original model. Goleman’s alleged that emotional intelligence is equivalent to, if not more valuable, than IQ as a vital indicator to gauge one’s professional and life success. Goleman’s (1998) second book, *Working with Emotional Intelligence*, further delved on the notions in his previous work by elucidating how an individual’s emotional intelligence can influence one’s work situation. He also applied his conceptual understanding to the organization as a whole.

In one of his most recent works, *Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence*, Goleman, and his co-authors, Boyatzis & McKee (2002), assert that the effective use of emotion is central to the function of successful leadership. They state that leaders are emotional guides influencing not only follower emotions, but their actions too through the emotional influence they carry. Leaders affect this influence through relationship management, goal setting, motivational
appeals, and the leader’s own level of emotional intelligence is a pre-requisite to effectively engross in these efforts. The popularity of Goleman’s publications, led to the interest of professionals and academics in the theory, and how it can make a difference for individual as well as organizational success. Several theoretical questions have emerged from the pursuit of research in the emotional intelligence area to consider emotional intelligence as a set of abilities or traits. These issues have been discussed on models of emotional intelligence in the coming section.

In less than a decade, researchers have built a considerable body of evidence to demonstrate that EI is a valid construct that has discriminant, criterion and incremental validity when compared with existing personality dimensions (Petrides & Furnham, 2001; Pérez, Petrides, & Furnham, 2005). With respect to discriminant validity, researchers have shown that EI is correlated with existing personality dimensions, but not so highly as to be redundant (Petrides et al., 2007), and is unrelated to intelligence (Schutte et al., 1998). EI has also been shown to have good criterion validity. For instance, it is positively correlated with happiness (Furnham & Petrides, 2003), life satisfaction and adaptive coping styles (Petrides et al., 2007), physical, mental, and psychosomatic health (Schutte, Malouff, Thorsteinsson, Bhullar, & Rooke, 2006), and skill at identifying emotional expressions and mood management behaviour in adolescents (Ciarrochi et al., 2001).

Researchers have also demonstrated that EI has incremental validity, such that it predicts unique variance in life satisfaction (Petrides et al., 2007; Petrides, Pita, et al., 2007), happiness (Furnham & Petrides, 2003), coping and musing (Petrides et al., 2007), and school absenteeism in adolescents (Petrides, Frederickson, & Furnham, 2007).
Clinically, EI has been shown to predict personality disorders and depression (Petrides et al., 2007). In experimental studies, EI has predicted recognition of facial expressions and sensitivity to mood induction tasks (Petrides & Furnham, 2003). Thus, there is evidence to demonstrate that EI is an important effective personality construct.

### 2.3.2 Models of Emotional Intelligence

Three conceptual models of emotional intelligence have been prominent in EI literature: the so-called ability model, trait model and the mixed model. The ability models posit emotional intelligence as a type of emotional intelligence (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruzo, 2000), a competing model of emotional intelligence i.e. blend of ability and trait model, labeled as the mixed model (Mayer et al., 2000) or the trait model (Petrides & Furnham, 2001), does not classify EI as an intelligence but rather as a combination of intellect and various measures of personality and affect. There are three main types of EI models available in the literature based on the conceptualization: ability, trait and mixed (traits with abilities) model.

#### 2.3.2.1 Ability Models

Emotional intelligence is “the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). They proposed the ability based model of EI, which considers emotions as a source of information which aids our understanding of the social environment. Mayer & Salovey (1993) suggested that there are individual differences in EI relating to differences in our ability to appraise
our own emotions and those of others. They further suggested that individuals higher in EI might be more open to internal experience and better able to label and communicate those experiences.

Ability Models, originally conceptualized by Mayer et al. (2000), propose that EI is a type of intelligence or aptitude and therefore should overlap with cognitive ability. Ability models posit EI as “the ability to carry out accurate reasoning about emotions and the ability to use emotions and emotional knowledge to enhance thought” (Mayer, Roberts & Barsade, 2008, p. 511). Ability EI, sometimes known as performance EI, is concerned with one’s ability to recognise and process emotional information. Ability EI is tested using performance tasks with correct and incorrect responses, and as such is related to cognitive ability. The measurement of Ability EI is often difficult given the necessity of devising items which can objectively be scored as incorrect or correct, whilst maintaining sufficient ambiguity to divide participants effectively.

Another ability EI test is the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS; Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999), based on the four branched ability model of EI (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The measure also assesses elements of career interests and social behaviours. The measure produces an overall Ability EI score and 4 subscores which correspond to the 4 branches of the model proposed by Mayer & Salovey (1997).

The model suggests that there are individual differences in the ability to perceive, process and relate this information to one’s wider cognition. The model states that EI encompasses 4 types of abilities. The first is emotion perception, the
ability to read emotion from voices, pictures, faces, symbols and within oneself. This is the base of EI, as it makes the rest of the process possible. The second type of ability is the ability to *use emotions* within cognitive processing, including problem solving and logical thinking. The third ability is that of *understanding emotions*, including an appreciation of emotional ‘language’, and understanding how emotions transform over time and act together. The final ability is that of *managing emotions*, being able to regulate and control our own emotions, limiting their potentially harmful effects over our actions, it may also include conscious use of emotions to aid in achieving goals. This ability also extends to being able to manipulate the emotions of others to achieve own ends (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

### Table 2.2: Mayer & Salovey’s (1997) model of Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Intelligence Dimension</th>
<th>Emotional Abilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perception, appraisal and expression of Emotion</td>
<td>The accuracy with which individuals can identify emotions and emotional content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emotional facilitation of thinking</td>
<td>Describes emotional events that assist intellectual processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Understanding and analyzing emotions and employing emotional knowledge</td>
<td>The ability to recognize, label and interpret emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reflective regulation of emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth</td>
<td>Conscious, reflective regulation of emotions to enhance growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ability EI is assessed using a range of performance tasks, depending on the Model. Mayer & Salovey’s model (Table 2.2) of EI is measured using the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT). This is 141 item measure involving a series of emotion related problem-solving and recognition items (Caruso, Mayer & Salovey, 2002). The test is modelled on ability based IQ tests. It measures ability on each of the four EI components laid out by the model, discussed above (Salovey & Mayer, 1997), to produce a score for each as well as an overall score.
Rather than having objectively correct or incorrect answers to items, responses are scored in relation to a worldwide sample of participants. This results in high scores indicating awareness and adherence to social norms (Salovey & Grewal, 2005).

2.3.2.2 Trait Models

Trait EI (or trait emotional self-efficacy) is defined as a constellation of emotional self-perceptions located at the lower levels of personality hierarchies (Petrides, Pita, & Kokkinaki, 2007). In essence, trait EI concerns people’s self-perceptions of their emotional abilities. Trait EI (or emotional self-efficacy) is operationalized through self-report questionnaires, whereas ability EI (or cognitive-emotional ability) is operationalized through performance tests, that is, tests comprising items that may be answered correctly or incorrectly. The operationalization of ability EI is considerably complicated by the fact that emotional experiences are inherently subjective (e.g., Spain, Eaton, & Funder, 2000) and, therefore, not amenable to objective scoring criteria. Trait EI is a constellation of emotion-related self-perceived abilities and dispositions located at the lower levels of personality hierarchies (Petrides & Furnham, 2001). Individuals with high trait EI scores believe that they are “in touch” with their emotions and that they can regulate them in a way that promotes well-being.

There are a number of self-report measures for Trait EI; the Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT), the Six Seconds Emotional Intelligence Assessment (SEI) or the Schutte Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test (SSEIT) to name a few. These are all measures of emotional self-efficacy (Petrides, Furnham, Mavroveli, 2007). The Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire
(TEIQue) was designed to operationalize the Trait EI model proposed by Petrides et al., 2003, it is an 144-item, open-access measure consisting of four factors which is available in over 15 languages.

The *distinction between Trait and Ability EI* is extremely important, as the areas of EI they are testing are distinct (Warwick & Nettelbeck, 2004), and as such, the operationalisation of each is different. Trait EI and Ability EI are often poorly correlated with one another because of this distinction in measurement and meaning (Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Brackett & Mayer, 2003). When formulating theories on EI, this distinction, must be kept in mind. Based on the work of Salovey & Mayer (1990); Schutte and her colleagues model developed in 1998 (SSEIT) as indicated in Table 2.3; Ciarrochi, Chan & Caputi (2000); Ciarrochi et al., (2001) found the support for four distinct dimensions of EI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Intelligence Dimension</th>
<th>Emotional Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Perception of Emotions</em> (<em>POE</em>)</td>
<td>This relates to the ability to distinguish one’s own and others’ emotions based on situational and meaningful non-verbal cues. It is based on the individual’s ability to understand his innate emotions and expressing them naturally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Managing Own Emotions</em> (<em>MOE</em>)</td>
<td>This involves the capacity for regulating one’s own distressful emotions by using self-regulatory strategies, which will enable more rapid recovery from psychological distress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Managing Others’ Emotions</em> (<em>MOtE</em>)</td>
<td>This implies arranging events that others will enjoy and coping with negative emotions in order to avoid hurting others’ feelings and making others feel better when they feel low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>Utilization of Emotions</em> (<em>UOE</em>)</td>
<td>This relates to the ability of individuals to channelize their emotions by directing them towards beneficial activities and personal performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This four factor model of emotional intelligence has been used in the present study to test the hypothesized relationships.

2.3.2.2 Mixed Models

In contrast to ability models, mixed EI models do not classify EI as intelligence but rather is it more dispositional or trait-based in nature (Petrides & Furnham, 2001) with less of a cognitive emphasis. Mixed EI models encompass factors which are directly concerned with EI, as well as factors which may be outcomes of EI, such as happiness or achievement. The Emotional Competencies Model of EI (Goleman, 1998), introduced by Daniel Goleman, examines EI in terms of competence and performance, particularly in the workplace. Another Mixed EI model is the Emotional-Social Intelligence (ESI) model, developed by Bar-On (2006).

Table 2.4: Goleman’s (1998) model of Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Intelligence Dimension</th>
<th>Emotional Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Competencies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-awareness</td>
<td>Emotional awareness, accurate self-assessment and self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-regulation</td>
<td>Self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Motivation</td>
<td>Achievement drive, commitment, initiative and optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Competencies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Empathy</td>
<td>Understanding others, developing others, service orientation, leveraging diversity and political awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social skills</td>
<td>Influence, communication, conflict management, leadership, change catalyst, building bonds, collaboration and cooperation and team capabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goleman claimed EI was the strongest predictor of workplace success, more so than IQ or other intelligence measures. In 1995, Goleman adopted Salovey & Mayer’s definition, and proposed that EI involves abilities (Table 2.4) that can be categorized as self-awareness, managing emotions, motivating oneself, empathy and handling relationships.

Goleman’s EI model comprises of four main constructs; self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management. Each construct involves a set of ‘emotional competencies’ learned social capabilities which aid social performance. Goleman also suggests that individuals have an innate, heritable emotional intelligence which determines one’s potential for picking up these emotional competencies (Goleman, 1998). Self-report measures based on Goleman’s model included the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (Bradberry & Greaves, 2005) and the Emotional Competency Inventory (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000).

Table 2.5: Bar-On’s (1997) model of Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Intelligence Dimension</th>
<th>Emotional Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intrapersonal skills</td>
<td>Being aware of and understanding oneself and one’s emotions, expressing one’s feelings and ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Being aware of, understanding and appreciating other’s feelings, establishing and maintaining satisfying relationships with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adaptability</td>
<td>Verifying feelings with external cues, sizing up immediate situations, being flexible in altering feelings and thoughts with changing situations and problem solving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stress management</td>
<td>Coping with stress and controlling impulses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General mood</td>
<td>Being optimistic and being able to feel and express positive emotions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goleman (1995; 1998) popularized the concept of EI with the publication of two books. In his first book, Goleman describes EI to include “self-control, zeal and persistence and the ability to motivate oneself” (1995, p.xii); and as being able to “control impulse and delay gratification,” to “keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to empathize and to hope” (1995, p.34). He later defined EI in his second book as “the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and our relationships” (1998, p.317).

Apart from the above models given by Mayer & Salovey’s and Daniel Goleman; another model of EI has been proposed by Bar-On (1997), who defines EI as “an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures.” Bar-On defines EI in terms of effective understanding of oneself and others, and adaptation to one’s environment to achieve one’s aims. Similar to Goleman’s model, Bar-On refers to EI in terms of success. He suggests that EI develops over time, and can be improved using training and therapy. Poor EI will lead to an inability to cope and adapt to one’s environment, resulting in low achievement. He also refers to EI as an important factor in coping with stress. This relationship was identified by Ciarrochi et al. (2002), who discovered that emotional intelligence, measured using a 33-item questionnaire developed by Schutte et al. (1998) could moderate the relationship between mental health and stress. Bar-On considers cognitive and emotional intelligence to be equal contributors to a person’s general intelligence and success (Bar-On, 2006). Bar-On’s model (Table 2.5) is measured by the Emotion
Quotient Inventory (EQ-i), a 133-item self-report measure designed to assess an individual’s ability to cope with environmental pressures and demands (Bar-On, 2006).

2.3.3 Measures of Emotional Intelligence

There have been numerous attempts to create measures to gauge emotional intelligence for the purposes of scientific research. The emotional intelligence measures now available include measures made for magazine articles, consultant measures, as well as formal measures produced from scientific research.

For the purposes of this investigation, most of the measures reviewed here have been used or reported in the academic literature. An extensive search of the organizational behaviour and management literatures, as well as other related literatures, was performed in order to identify all available emotional intelligence measures that might be applicable and useful to this investigation. An Indian measure, Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS) developed by Hyde, Pethe, and Dhar (2002) a 34-item scale measures ten components of EI: self awareness, empathy, self-motivation, emotional stability, managing relations, integrity, self development, value orientation, commitment and altruistic behaviour. There is overlap of this construct with other measures like altruistic behaviour; and reliability and validity have not been available. Hence, this instrument has not been used in present study.

This extensive review of the literature (Table 2.6) revealed measures that have been used to evaluate subjects’ global emotional intelligence levels. Numerous measures were found that measured particular aspects or components of emotional intelligence. The fact that there are several apparently reliable and valid scales with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ test</td>
<td>Goleman’s 1995 EQ test is a self-report measure that offers ten different scenarios, and participants are supposed to respond by choosing from four alternative choices of action. Weak psychometric properties, α = .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI)</td>
<td>ECI is a self/other reported, degree measurement tool designed to measure individual emotional competencies. Developed by Boyatzis, Goleman, &amp; Rhee, 2000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ Map</td>
<td>Consulting tool sold by Q Metrics, comprised of five dimensions: current environment, emotional literacy, EQ competencies, EQ values and attitudes, and EQ outcomes (Orioli et al. 2000). Not a measure to be used for scientific research in the academic arena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence Inventory (EII)</td>
<td>Tapia (2001) based this scale on the model developed by Salovey &amp; Mayer (1990; 1997). Sub-dimensions of four areas include: (1) Perception, appraisal and expression of emotion; (2) Emotional facilitation of thinking; (3) Understanding and analyzing emotions, employing emotional knowledge; (4) Reflective regulation of emotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong &amp; Law 16-item measure</td>
<td>Attempt to create a psychometrically sound self-report measure for use in organizational research. Based on the model developed by Salovey &amp; Mayer (1990; 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i)</td>
<td>Bar-On (1997) designed EQ-I, 133 item self-report measure to assess EI and social intelligence. The 5 composite subscales (including 15 subscales) are titled: intrapersonal EQ, interpersonal EQ, stress management EQ, adaptability EQ, and general mood EQ. This measure is not mainly focused on EI construct, but equally divided between EI and social intelligence, and peripheral facilitators of the two intelligences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan Emotional Quotient Inventory</td>
<td>J-EQ-i is 65-item self-report measure of EI was developed in Japan, and is based on the EQ-i scale created by Bar-On (1997). Includes measures of personal attributes that are beyond the scope of the dimensions that characterize EI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Meta Mood Scale (TMMS)</td>
<td>30 item self-report measure, devised to index the reflective mood experience having 3 factor structure i.e. attention to feelings, clarity of feelings, and mood repair, it has been used extensively as a measure of perceived EI. It does not measure all of the abilities and skills encompassed by the EI construct, (α=.82) (Salovey et al., 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Survey of Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>WSEI of Tett, Wang, Fisher, Martinez, Griebler and Linkovich (1997) originally compiled a scale based on Salovey &amp; Mayer’s (1990) model. Altogether, 10 components were garnered from Salover &amp; Mayer’s model to create original measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer-Salovey-Caruzo Emotional Intelligence Test</td>
<td>MSCEIT is a 141 item measure assesses ability on EI, produces an overall Ability EI score and 4 subscores which correspond to the 4 branches of the model proposed by Mayer &amp; Salovey (1997). Rather than having objectively correct or incorrect answers to items, responses are scored in relation to a worldwide sample of participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS-20</td>
<td>Toronto Alexithymia Scale-20 (TAS-20) is a 20 item scale to measure alexithymia, not suitable for the present study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT)</td>
<td>The Work-place SUEIT comprises 64 items, gives a global score as well as scores on five, empirically determined, subscales: “emotional recognition and expression”, “understanding emotions”, “emotions direct cognition”, “emotional management”, and “emotional control”. SUEIT is relatively new and its reliability and validity are currently under investigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
none being defined by consensus in the academic arena as the best measure available, makes choosing one a complicated task. Compounding this decision further, the measures discussed are based on different conceptualizations and interpretations of the emotional intelligence construct. Therefore, the purpose of this section is to summarize different instruments and evaluate measures, according to the theoretical content, reliability, validity, and applicability in the form and content to this study.

2.4 ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR & EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Just a few handfulls of empirical studies have been there to examine the relationship between the EI and outcome variables. Attempts to empirically test the relationship between EI and other outcome variables have however, been limited and require further input to examine and establish the relationship. Charbonneau & Nicol (2002) explored the relationship between emotional intelligence & prosocial behaviours in adolescents. The study was conducted in an army camp and findings indicated that EI & Altruism were positively correlated ($r = 0.25, p < 0.01$), EI & Civic virtue ($r = 0.25, p < 0.01$) also shared a positive and significant correlation, while sportsmanship did not correlate significantly with EI. However, age did not correlate with any of the variables. Girls scored higher than boys (t- test) on EI. Therefore, EI correlated with altruism, conscientiousness & civic virtue but not with courtesy & sportsmanship.

Carmeli (2003) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behaviour. Emotional intelligence and altruistic dimension of OCB was strongly supported ($\beta =0.54, p< 0.001$) in this study conducted in Israel.
Further Carmeli & Josman (2006) investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence, task performance and OCB. There were significant correlations between emotional intelligence and task performance ($r = .47$, $p < .001$), altruism ($r = 0.26$, $p < .01$) and compliance ($r = .21$, $p < .01$). Women displayed higher scores on emotional intelligence than men. Positive relations between emotional intelligence and employee’s work outcomes were established.

In India, study was carried out by Garg & Rastogi (2006) to assess the significant differences in the climate profile and OCBs of teachers working in private and public schools of India. Female teachers exhibited higher levels of OCB as compared to male teachers. Teachers who were above 36 years tend to exhibit higher levels of OCBs in comparison to teachers who were upto the age of 35 years. The study of Singh (2007) dealt with two important variables, emotional intelligence (EI) and organizational leadership in an Indian context in a software organization. Further, Modassir & Singh (2008) investigated the relationship of emotional intelligence with transformational leadership and OCB. EI was significantly correlated to conscientiousness, civic virtue, and altruistic behaviour (dimensions of OCB) of followers. The results indicated that EI of leaders enhances the OCB of followers. This study tested mediating role of EI between transformational leadership and OCB of followers. The predictive ability of OCB and EI were examined by Jain (2009) with regards to organizationally relevant criterion variables including job satisfaction, personal effectiveness, general health, reputational effectiveness, career orientation, perceived job mobility, turnover intention, organizational commitment, vertical trust etc. Results indicated that OCB was relatively more powerful predictor of outcome
variables compared to EI in Indian work context. Limitation of this study is that self report measure of OCB used that may inflate the results because of high social desirability effect. Singh & Srivastava (2009) investigated the relationship between certain individual determinants of interpersonal trust and its impact on organizational citizenship behaviour.

Through a web based survey Cichy, Kim & Cha (2009) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and contextual performance. The objective of the study was to investigate which dimension of EI contributed to which dimension of contextual performance. Results indicated that there is a positive relationship between EI scores and contextual performance. Moreover, the relationship dimension of EI is the most important independent variable, while both interpersonal facilitation and job dedication are important dependent variables for this positive relationship between these two sets of variables. A major limitation of this study was reliance on self evaluation of both EI and contextual performance.

James, Velayudhan & Gayatridgevi (2010) explored the relationship among OCB and EI of sixty corporate executives at Coimbatore in India. But the study failed to discuss about the rating source of the instruments applied in this research. Boyle and colleagues (2011) carried out meta-analysis of relationships between emotional intelligence and job performance by including personality variables and cognitive ability. In their study they included 43 total studies out of which 7 studies have used self-report trait measures of EI. It has not been made clear in this paper what is meant by job performance as this term is has expanded to conceptually include task performance, organizational citizenship behaviour and counter-productive behaviours.
(Ng & Feldman, 2009). Moreover, whether the studies included also tested for OCB have been left to be a quagmire. Still, there is a lot of scope for research in this field as cultural backgrounds in which these studies have been conducted are totally different to that of India. India is considered to be a collectivist nation while western countries are mostly individualistic in nature.

2.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY

Development and conceptualization of OCB and EI have been discussed in the present chapter laying down the theoretical framework for the present research study. The different conceptualizations of OCB, dimensions of OCB, antecedents of OCB and consequences have been included. Four antecedents of OCB i.e. individual characteristics, task characteristics, organizational characteristics and leadership behaviour have been discussed. While for EI, its origin and conceptualization, different models i.e. ability, trait and mixed have been included. In the present study, EI has been conceptualized as a trait measured through SSEIT. Different measures available in the literature have also been included in Table 2.6 and in the last empirical studies related to OCB and EI have been discussed to understand its contribution and lacunas.