

World Conference on Educational Sciences 2009

## Relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with emotional intelligence

Tugba Korkmaz<sup>a\*</sup>, Ebru Arpacı<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Avrupa Koleji, Prof.Dr. Muammer Aksoy Cad. Kazlıçeşme Zeytinburnu-İstanbul TURKEY*

Received October 25, 2008; revised December 10, 2008; accepted January 2, 2009

---

### Abstract

This manuscript examines the relationship of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) with emotional intelligence (EI) of the followers. A sample of 57 dyads of managers and their supervisors (i.e., 114 respondents) participated in this study. The reliabilities of the scales were .83 organizational citizenship behaviors and .86 emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence was significantly correlated to conscientiousness, civic virtue, and altruistic behaviors of followers. The method suggested by Barron and Kenny (1986) was used to test mediation of organizational citizenship behavior between emotional intelligence, but nothing significant was found. The results indicated that emotional intelligence of the organizational citizenship behavior of followers.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved

*Keywords:* Organizational citizenship; emotional intelligence.

---

### 1. Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Appelbaum et al. (2004) said that organizational citizenship behavior is discretionary behavior that is not part of an employee's formal job requirement, but it is that which promotes the effective functioning of the organization. Allen, Barnard, Rush, and Russell (2000) defined organizational citizenship behavior as that which embodies the cooperative and constructive gestures that are neither mandated by formal job role prescriptions nor directly or contractually compensated for by the formal organizational reward system. Bolino and Turnley (2003) identified it as an organization's ability to elicit employee behavior that goes beyond the call of duty. They found that citizenship behaviors generally have two common features: they are not directly enforceable (i.e., they are not technically required as a part of one's job) and they are representative of the special or extra efforts that organizations need from their workforce in order to be successful.

Bolino, Turnley, and Bloodgood (2002) defined organizational citizenship behavior as the willingness of employees to exceed their formal job requirements in order to help each other, to subordinate their individual interests for the good of the organization, and to take a genuine interest in the organization's activities and overall mission. Good citizenship as per Bolino and Turnley (2003) includes a variety of employee behaviors such as taking on additional assignments, voluntarily assisting people at work, keeping up with developments in one's profession, following company rules (even when no one is looking), promoting and protecting the organization, keeping a positive attitude, and tolerating inconveniences at work.

### 2. Emotional Intelligence (EI)

---

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: (0212) 547 80 10 fax: (0212) 547 79 42  
E-mail address: [tgbkorkmaz@hotmail.com](mailto:tgbkorkmaz@hotmail.com)

Salovey and Mayer (1990) first introduced the concept of emotional intelligence as a type of social intelligence, separable from general intelligence. According to them, emotional intelligence is the ability to monitor one's own and others' emotions, to discriminate among them, and use the information to guide one's thinking and actions. In a later attempt, they (Salovey & Mayer, 1990) expanded their model and defined emotional intelligence as the ability of an individual to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and 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. Research has shown that emotional intelligence is the common element that influences the different ways in which people develop in their lives, jobs, and social skills; handle frustration; control their emotions; and get along with other people. It has been found that the difference between a simply brilliant person and a brilliant manager is due to a person's emotional intelligence. Ultimately, it is emotional intelligence that dictates the way people deal with one another and understand emotions. Hence, emotional intelligence is considered important for business leaders because if they are insensitive to the mood of their staff or team, it can create frustration and, therefore, not get the best out of people (Anonymous, 2004). Turner (2004) stated that emotional intelligence is the softer component of total intelligence and that it contributes to both professional and personal lives. Traditional IQ is the ability to learn, understand, and reason. It is now thought to contribute only 20% to one's success, whereas emotional quotient (EQ), which is the ability to understand oneself and interact with people, contributes 80%. EQ is critical to effective leadership. IQ has been linked to job performance and is a key element in recruitment. However, EQ is evident in the leaders'/managers' ability to retain their positions and be successful in their roles. The fact is that most firms hire for intelligence (IQ) and sack because of attitude (EQ).

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Instruments

The 24-item scale devised by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moonman, and Fetter (1990) was used to measure the five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior of the subordinates by the managers. It is a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Using the 33-item composite emotional intelligence scale developed by Schutte et al. (1998), the superiors self-rated their emotional intelligence using a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

#### 3.2 Sample

Data were collected from dyads of 57 managers and subordinates. The respondents, totaling 114, belonged to a diverse set of industries located in Istanbul. The respondents were predominately male (75%) with an average age of 40.2 years and an average work experience of 15.2 years, holding their current position for 5.5 years on an average. The questionnaires were distributed in separate sets assuring participants of complete confidentiality. One of the authors personally distributed the questionnaires in the various organizations. She made attempts to personally collect as many responses as possible. Those who could not give their responses personally were asked to mail them directly to the author. A total of approximately 100 sets of questionnaires were distributed.

### 4. Results

All three scales were found to be highly reliable: .83 (organizational citizenship behavior scale), and .86 (emotional intelligence scale). After the reliabilities were confirmed, the correlation between the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior and the complete scale of emotional intelligence were calculated. The emotional intelligence of managers was positively correlated with the conscientiousness, civic virtue, and altruism of the subordinates as shown in Table 1. emotional intelligence were not found to be significantly correlated. Therefore Hypothesis 1 which was concerned with the positive relationship between emotional intelligence was not supported.

Table 1: Correlations

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Conscientiousness	5.38	.91	(.60)					
2. Sportsmanship	4.90	1.15	.39**	(.75)				
3. Civic virtue	4.64	.86	.11	.26*	(.20)			
4. Courtesy	5.16	1.01	.21	.51**	.36**	(.70)		
5. Altruism	4.76	1.18	.34	.34*	.32*	.57**	(.88)	
6. Emotional intelligence	3.58	.46	.25	.25	.50**	.20	.20	(.86)

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

Simple multiple linear regressions were used to study Hypothesis 2 concerning the effect of the subordinates' perception on their organizational citizenship behavior. Four out of five organizational citizenship behavior s as dependent variables were regressed on

variables. Civic virtue was not taken into consideration as the reliability of the scale was found to be very low. The results did not support the hypothesis. Further regression analysis was performed on the four organizational citizenship behaviors as dependent variables and emotional intelligence of a leader as independent variable to see if emotional intelligence of a leader enhances organizational citizenship behaviors of the followers. Emotional intelligence of leaders did predict the conscientiousness and altruism behaviors of the subordinates. Table 2 presents the regression coefficients.

Table 2: Regression Table

Dependent variables	Conscientiousness	Sportsmanship	Courtesy	Altruism
Emotional intelligence	.28 (.55)*	.23 (.23)	.22 (.48)	.44(1.13)**
<i>r</i> <sup>2</sup>	.83	.80	.05	.19
<i>F</i>	2.43	2.35	1.28	6.42

Note. Unstandardized coefficients with *SE* are in parentheses.

\**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01

Regression models as suggested by Barron and Kenny (1986) were tested for mediation analysis. According to them, a variable functions as a mediator when it meets the following conditions: (a) variations in levels of independent variable significantly account for variations in the presumed mediator (i.e., path a); (b) variations in the mediator significantly account for variations in the dependent variable (i.e., path b); (c) and when path a and b are controlled, a previously significant relationship between independent and dependent variables is no longer significant. They further suggested the method given by Judd and Kenny (1981) for testing mediation. According to the method suggested, one should estimate following regression equations: (a) regress the mediator on the independent variable, (b) regress the dependent variable on the independent variable, and (c) regress the dependent variable on both the independent variable and the mediator. Two regression equations were used to test the hypothesized role of emotional intelligence of leader as a mediator between perceived organizational citizenship behaviors of followers. Organizational citizenship behavior was regressed on both emotional intelligence ( $\beta = .50, \beta = .01$ ). Table 3 presents the regression coefficients. Although in the third equation mediator emotional intelligence did affect the dependent variable organizational citizenship behavior, in the first two equations, not affect either the mediator or the dependent variable organizational citizenship behavior. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Table 3: Regressions for Mediation Analysis

Dependent variables	Emotional quotient (1st equation)	OCB (2nd equation)	OCB (3rd equation)
EI			.50 (0.78)**
<i>r</i> <sup>2</sup>	.04	.02	.26
<i>F</i>	2.19	1.17	9.43

Note. Unstandardized coefficients with *SE* are in parentheses.

\**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01

### 5. Discussion

The two specific organizational citizenship behaviors of followers driven by the emotional intelligence of the leader were conscientiousness and altruism. Since the emotional intelligence of leaders did affect the organizational citizenship behaviors of followers, the results indicate that emotional intelligence is an important component for being an effective leader.

The emotional intelligence of managers had a positive correlation with the conscientiousness of the subordinates. When understood and appreciated by their leaders, the subordinates may feel motivated and satisfied with their jobs and may reciprocate by being conscientious. In addition, the emotional intelligence of managers was found to have a positive correlation with the altruism of the subordinates. Since the superior believes in creating a work family, holding up a vision that benefits all, the followers are motivated to attain the organizational objectives as a team, thus helping one another to accomplishment.

Therefore, the emotional intelligence of a leader plays a significant role in determining the two specific organizational citizenship behaviors of followers. This is also because the emotionally intelligent leader is able to monitor his or her own behavior and understand those of his or her followers, thus enhancing the extra role behavior of the members of the organization. Only when they feel that the leader understands their needs will the followers be willing to give their best to the organization. By understanding their subordinates, leaders can motivate them and direct them in exhibiting organizational citizenship behaviors. Organizational citizenship behaviors of the followers even though the effects of organizational citizenship behaviors are well established (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). Both direct (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000) and indirect (Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990) relationships have been found between organizational citizenship behaviors. Most of the research has been performed in contexts different from the present study. This study seems to indicate that we need to establish the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior in contextual terms also.

## References

- Allen, T., Barnard, S., Rush, M., & Russell, J. (2000). Ratings of organizational citizenship behavior: Does the source make a difference? *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(1), 97-114.
- Anonymous. (2004). Leading by feel. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(1), 27-28.
- Appelbaum, S., Bartolomucci, N., Beaumier, E., Boulanger, J., Corrigan, R., Dore, I., Girard, C., & Serroni, C. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior: A case study of culture, leadership and trust. *Management Decision*, 42(1), 13-40
- Barron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychology research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical consideration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173-1182.
- Bolino, M., & Turnley, W. (2003). Going the extra mile: Cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(3), 60-71.
- 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(4), 505-522
- Judd, C. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1981). Process analysis: Estimating mediation in evaluation Research, *Evaluation Research*, 5, 602-619.
- Piccolo, R. E., & Colquitt, R. J. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics, *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 327-340.
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fair perceptions and trust as mediator for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897-933.
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Moorman, R., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, cognition, and personality*, 9(3), 185-211.
- Schutte, N., Malouff, J., Hall, L., Haggerty, D., Cooper, J., Golden, C., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 167-177.
- Turner, L. (2004). Emotional intelligence –our intangible asset? *Chartered Accountants Journal, of New Zealand*, 83(3), 29-31.