



Relationship of Emotional Intelligence with Transformational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Atika Modassir
Wipro Technologies

Tripti Singh
Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore

This manuscript examines the relationship of emotional intelligence (EI) with transformational leadership (TL) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) 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 (OCB), .88 (TL), and .86 (EI). EI 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 EI between TL and OCB, but nothing significant was found. The results indicated that EI of leaders enhances the OCB of followers. However, EI of the leader may not be the only factor determining the perception of TL.

Through the ages, scholars and organizational development consultants have pursued the essence of TL. This paper argues that to be truly transformational, leadership qualities must be grounded in high levels of EI. The five established components of TL (idealized influence, attitude and behavior, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) have been juxtaposed with indicators of EI to demonstrate that when led by a transformational leader, the members of an organization naturally exhibit OCB. The literature on TL, EI, and OCB are all interlinked, and an attempt has been made to study the relationship that exists between them. We begin by discussing TL.

Transformational Leadership

The past 2 decades have heralded some convergence among organizational behavior scholars concerning a new genre of leadership theory, alternatively referred to as transformational, charismatic, and visionary leadership. Kent, Crotts, and Aziz (2001) defined

TL as a process by which change or transformation is introduced to individuals and/or organizations.

Traits of Transformational Leaders

Dvir, Dov, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) said that transformational leaders exert additional influence by broadening and elevating their followers' goals and providing them with the confidence to perform beyond the expectations specified in the implicit or explicit exchange agreement. Transformational leaders exhibit charismatic behaviors, arouse admiration, inspire, motivate, provide intellectual stimulation, and treat their followers with individualized consideration. Such behaviors transform their followers by inspiring them to reach their full potential and generate the highest levels of performance. Transformational leaders evaluate the potential of all followers in terms of their ability to fulfill current commitments while also envisioning further expansion of their responsibilities.

Transforming leadership is enabling. The leader engages with people in a way that transforms their relationship; they are no longer the leader and the led in the authoritarian sense. They become partners in the pursuit of a common goal, each making their appropriate contribution and increasing their capacity to perform (Nicholls, 1994). Popper, Ori, and Ury (1992) said that the main characteristic of transformational leaders is their extraordinary effect on subordinates and their success in establishing their commitment. A transformational leader transforms and creates meaning for his or her subordinates, a meaning that enhances the subordinates' commitment. A transformational leader can relate and articulate subordinates' need for identity and does this by giving meaning and strengthening the concept of the self and by boosting their individual identity. A transformational leader is the catalyst who transforms the subordinates' motivation to commitment and their commitment into exceptional achievements.

Dimensions of Transformational Leaders

Bass and Avolio (1993) proposed that the four dimensions that comprise transformation leadership behavior are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual simulation, and individualized consideration.

Individualized influence. Individualized influence occurs when leaders earn the trust and respect of their followers by doing the right thing rather than ensuring that the subordinates do things right. When the leaders focus on doing the right thing, which they usually do by using stories and symbols to communicate their vision and their message, they serve as role models. Humphreys and Einstein (2003) have found that transformational leaders operate out of deeply held personal value systems that include qualities like justice and integrity. By expressing these personal standards, transformational leaders unite their followers. But, more importantly, they can change their followers' goals and beliefs for the better.

Intellectual stimulation. According to Shin, Shung, Zhou, and Jing (2003), inspirational motivation is related to the formulation and articulation of a vision and/or challenging goals. Intellectual stimulation promotes intelligence, rationality, and careful problem-solving abilities. It also involves engaging the rationality of the subordinates, getting them to challenge their

assumptions and to think about old problems in new ways. Leaders who engage in intellectual stimulation do not answer all their employees' questions; instead, they make them seek the answers on their own.

Individual consideration. Individual consideration is concerned with treating the employees as individuals and not just members of a group. Leaders exhibit this trait by being compassionate, appreciative, and responsive to the employees' needs and by recognizing and celebrating their achievements.

Inspirational motivation. Conger and Kanungo (1988) have found that inspirational motivation and charisma are companions. Transformational leaders inspire their followers to accomplish great feats by communicating high expectations by using symbols to focus efforts and by expressing important purposes. Transformational leaders tend to pay close attention to the interindividual differences among their followers and often act as mentors to their subordinates, typically coaching and advising the followers with individual personal attention. Since charismatic leaders have great power and influence, the employees have a high degree of trust and confidence in them and want to identify with them. Charismatic leaders inspire and excite their employees with the idea that they may be able to accomplish great things.

Influence of Transformational Leaders on Followers

Shin et al. (2003) found that TL positively relates to follower creativity, followers' conservation, and intrinsic motivation. TL boosts intrinsic motivation and provides intellectual stimulation; the followers are encouraged to challenge the status quo and the old ways of doing things.

Kark and Shamir (2002) have found TL to be a multifaceted, complex, and dynamic form of influence in which leaders can affect followers by highlighting different aspects of the followers' social self-concept and change their focus from one level to another. This is likely to determine whether the followers see themselves primarily in terms of their relationship with the leader or in terms of their organizational group membership. They suggested that different leadership behaviors could account for priming these distinct aspects of followers' self-concept and followers' identification. Furthermore, these different forms of influence are important because they can lead to differential outcomes.

Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, and Spangler (2004) posited that by means of individualized consideration, a leader addresses issues of competence, meaningfulness and impact with each team member, and encourages continued individual development.

Kark and Shamir (2002) found that TL behavior such as intellectual stimulation increases the followers' feeling of self-worth because they transmit the message that the leader believes in the followers' integrity and ability. Followers of transformational leaders who are willing to focus on their relational self would be motivated to enhance the well-being of the leader by being cooperative, loyal, and committed. The most significant effect of TL is that of influencing followers to transcend self-interests for the sake of the welfare of the organization.

Jung, Chow, and Wu (2003) indicated that TL has significant and positive relations in terms of both empowerment and fostering an innovation-supporting organizational climate. Dvir et al. (2002) have found TL to have a positive impact on the development of followers'

empowerment in terms of their engagement in the task and specific self-efficacy. They confirmed the hypothesis that follower development can influence performance to show that TL affects development as well as performance.

Kark and Shamir (2002) suggested that transformational leaders can have a dual effect, exerting their influence on followers through the creation of personal identification with the leader and social identification with the work unit, and that these different forms of identification can lead to differential outcomes.

TL theory suggests that such leadership is likely to result in a wide range of outcomes at the personal level (e.g., followers' empowerment, extra effort) and at the group or organizational level (e.g., unit cohesiveness, collective efficacy). TL produces these effects primarily by priming the followers' relational self and promoting identification with the leader (Kark & Shamir, 2002). What distinguishes a leader is the combination of head and heart, the ability to understand and effectively apply emotions as a means of connection and influence (i.e., the emotional intelligence that a leader possesses). Therefore, we need to study how the EI of a leader is related to TL.

Emotional Intelligence (EI)

Salovey and Mayer (1990) first introduced the concept of EI as a type of social intelligence, separable from general intelligence. According to them, EI 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, 1997) expanded their model and defined EI 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 EI 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 EI. Ultimately, it is EI that dictates the way people deal with one another and understand emotions. Hence, EI 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 EI 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).

Components of EI

Barling, Slater, and Kelloway (2000) noted that EI comprises five characteristics: understanding one's emotions; knowing how to manage them; emotional self-control, which includes the ability to delay gratification; understanding others' emotions or empathy; and managing relationships. Lubit (2004) divided EI into two major components: personal competence and social competence. Personal competence refers to self-awareness and the ability to manage those feelings effectively (self-management). Personal competence is the combination of self-awareness and self-management (i.e., the ability to manage effectively the identified feelings). The components of self-awareness are awareness of emotions and their impact and the awareness of strengths and weaknesses. The components of self-management are emotional self-control, adaptability (i.e., flexibility in adapting to changing situations and obstacles), integrity, honesty, trustworthiness, drive to grow and achieve, achievement orientation, continuous learning, willingness to take initiatives, and optimism.

Social competence is comprised of social awareness (the ability to understand what others feel) and relationship management (having the skills to work effectively in teams). The ability to understand others' emotions, persuasion, motivation, conflict resolution, and reasons for cooperation are among the most critical skills identified as essential for leaders and successful managers. Social awareness involves empathy and insight, understanding others' perspectives and feelings, appreciation of others' strengths and weaknesses, political awareness, respect for others, conflict management skills, collaborative approach, sense of humor, persuasiveness, and the ability to leverage diversity. Social competence develops by paying attention to the emotions and behavior of others, seeking to understand others' behavior through reflection and discussions with third parties, thinking of various ways to deal with situations, and observing the effects of one's actions. Social competence can be enhanced by observing others, thinking about why people behave and react as they do, and identifying behavior that seems helpful in critical situations (Lubit, 2004).

Goleman (2002) divided the 18 competencies of EI into four main groups that encompass our understanding of people: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management.

As per Welch (2003), team EI is comprised not only of each individual's EI but also the collective competency. In addition, the social skills required of people within an emotionally intelligent team and a focused training methodology can be broken down into five areas: inclusiveness, adaptability, assertiveness, empathy, and influence.

Caruso, Mayer and Salovey (2002) proposed two alternative conceptions of EI: the ability model and the mixed model. The ability models place EI within the sphere of such intelligence, wherein emotion and thought interact in meaningful adaptive ways. Thus, EI is viewed much like verbal or spatial intelligence, except that it operates on an emotional content.

Mixed models blend various aspects of personality in a theoretical manner. The resulting conglomerate of traits, dispositions, skills, competencies, and abilities is labeled EI. These different models have also given rise to different ways of measuring EI.

Why EI is Important?

EI enables people to deal with just about anything with a measure of balance and maturity. Emotionally intelligent people have a deep rooted sense of self which helps them in understanding other people, keeping things in proportion, retaining focus, and understanding what is important. They also retain a positive viewpoint almost all of the time, are successful in whatever they choose to do, have high work performance and personal productivity levels, and consequently enjoy greater job satisfaction.

Bardzill and Slaski (2003) found that organizational leaders must recognize the importance of emotionally intelligent behavior and reward it actively. Positive reinforcement of an emotionally intelligent environment ensures the development of a service-orientated climate. Performance measures that often exclude the “soft skills” fail to reflect any positive results of EI development that may be occurring within the organization. Emotional elements underlie the dynamics of many aspects of modern organizations, and the role of EI should be considered while devising organizational policies, processes, and procedures.

Lubit (2004) considered social competence to be an important component of EI, making it very valuable for teams. Welch (2003) said that EI enables teams to boost their performance. In an era of teamwork, it is essential to figure out what makes teams work. His research has shown that just like individuals, the most effective teams are the emotionally intelligent ones and that any team can improve and attain higher levels of EI. In his study, teams with identical aggregate IQ were compared, and it was found that teams with high levels of EI outperformed teams with low levels of EI by a margin of two to one. He highlighted two key points. First, there is evidence that EI in teams is a significant factor. Second, there is the assertion that EI can be developed. He proposed that these five EI team competencies build on individual EI skills: inclusiveness, adaptability, assertiveness, empathy, and influence. However, these competencies are not enough on their own. Trust is the foundation of teamwork for it to be a truly joyous undertaking; it allows people to examine where they can improve without becoming self-critical or defensive.

Vakola, Tsaousis, and Nikolaou (2004) presented that EI contributes to a better understanding of the affective implications of a change of policy in an organization. More specifically, they claimed that employees with low control of emotions react negatively towards the proposed changes since they are not well equipped to deal effectively with the demands and the affective consequences of such a stressful, emotionally expensive procedure. In contrast, employees with the ability to use their emotions appropriately (since they are optimistic and often take initiatives) usually decide to reframe their perceptions of a newly introduced change program and view it as an exciting challenge. Attitudes toward organizational change demonstrate positive relationship with the use of emotions for problem solving and control of reactions.

Relating TL and EI

As Palmer, Walls, Burgess, and Stough (2001) stated, EI has fast become popular as a means for identifying potentially effective leaders and as a tool for nurturing effective leadership skills. Their findings indicate that EI, which is measured by a person’s ability to monitor and manage emotions within one’s self and in others, may be an underlying competency of TL.

TL is defined as “that activity which stimulates purposeful activity in others by changing the way they look at the world around them and relate to one another. It affects people’s personal beliefs by touching their hearts and minds” (Nicholls, 1994, p. 11). Gardner and Stough (2002) found that the two underlying competencies of effective leadership are the ability to monitor emotions in one’s self and in others. In fact, their research supported the existence of a strong relationship between TL and overall EI. It was found that EI correlated highly with all the components of TL, with the components of understanding of emotions and emotional management being the best predictors of this type of leadership style. Leaders who considered themselves transformational not transactional reported that they could identify their own feelings and emotional states, express those feelings to others, utilize emotional knowledge when solving problems, understand the emotions of others in their workplace, manage positive and negative emotions in themselves and others, and effectively control their emotional states. Barling et al. (2000) found that EI is associated with TL. In contrast, active and passive management and laissez faire management were not associated with EI.

Analysis by Sivanathan and Fekken (2002) showed that the followers perceived leaders with high EI as more effective and transformational. They found that EI conceptually and empirically linked to TL behaviors. Hence, they concluded that having high EI increased one’s TL behaviors.

Barling et al. (2000) asserted that EI is associated with the three aspects of TL (i.e., idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration) and the contingent reward. The subordinates see individuals with higher EI as displaying more leadership behaviors. Controlling for attribution style, they also demonstrated that those three aspects of TL and constructive transactions differed according to level of EI.

Leaders who can identify and manage their own emotions and who display self-control and delay gratification, serve as role models for their followers, thereby earning followers’ trust and respect. This would be consistent with the essence of idealized influence.

In fact, Gardner and Stough (2002) found that leaders with a high EI component of understanding emotions were able to perceive accurately the extent to which followers’ expectations can be raised. This is related to the TL’s subcomponent of inspirational motivation. Consistent with the conceptualization of idealized influence (the component of TL), leaders are able to understand and manage their emotions and display self-control, thus acting as role models for followers, earning their followers’ trust and respect. They found that the ability to monitor emotions within oneself and others correlated significantly with the TL components of idealized attributes and behaviors.

With emphasis on understanding other people’s emotions, leaders with high EI would be able to realize the extent to which they can raise followers’ expectations, a sign of inspirational motivation.

Gardner and Stough (2002) found that a major component of individualized consideration is the capacity to understand followers’ needs and interact accordingly. With emphasis on empathy and the ability to manage relationships positively, leaders having EI are likely to manifest individualized consideration.

Palmer et al. (2001) found that the inspirational motivation and individualized consideration components of TL are significantly correlated with the ability to both monitor and manage emotions in oneself and others. The ability to monitor and manage emotions is one of

the underlying attributes that characterize the individual consideration component of effective TL.

Gardner and Stough (2002) found that the ability to manage emotions in relationships allows the emotionally intelligent leader to understand followers' needs and to react accordingly (related to the component of individualized consideration). The ability to monitor and manage emotions in oneself and others were both significantly correlated with the inspirational motivation and individualized consideration components of TL. Barling et al. (2000) found that individuals high in EI use transformational behaviors. With EI being instrumental for TL behavior, one can hypothesize the following:

H₁: Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence are positively related.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Appelbaum et al. (2004) said that OCB 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 OCB 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 OCB 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.

Dimensions of OCB

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000), in a meta-analytic study found that researchers have identified almost 30 different forms of citizenship behaviors. However, there exists conceptual overlap between the constructs; therefore, they grouped these behaviors into seven dimensions: helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development. Moorman (1991) and Organ (1988) identified five dimensions of OCBs: altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue. Later, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) developed a scale that showed evidence for the five-factor model. Schnake and Dumler (2003) also highlighted that

the *same* five OCB dimensions that have been most frequently examined by researchers. These five factors include the following:

1. Altruism is a voluntary action, like helping another person with a work problem, which ultimately benefits the organization (e.g., helping a coworker who has fallen behind in work).
2. Courtesy involves treating others with respect, preventing problems by keeping others informed of one's decisions and actions that may affect them and passing along information to those who may find it useful.
3. Sportsmanship is a citizen-like posture of tolerating the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without whining and grievances.
4. Conscientiousness is a pattern of going well beyond the minimum required levels of attendance, housekeeping, conserving resources, and related matters of internal maintenance.
5. Civic virtue is a responsible, constructive involvement in the political process of the organization. It includes not just expressing opinions but reading one's mail, attending meetings, and keeping abreast of larger issues involving the organization.

As per Farh, Zhong, and Organ (2000), the five dimensions of OCB are self-learning, social welfare participation, protecting and saving company resources, preserving interpersonal harmony at the workplace, and compliance with social norms existing in the society.

Factors Influenced by OCB

Some recent empirical studies have found that employee citizenship was positively associated with indicators of both product quantity and product quality (Bolino & Turnley, 2003). Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) identified eight positive outcomes enhanced by OCB including coworker productivity, managerial productivity, and the organizational ability to attract and retain the best people by making it a more attractive place to work and a stable organizational performance.

Bolino et al. (2001) found that when a firm is comprised of good organizational citizens, it is likely to accumulate higher levels of social capital. OCB assists the development and maintenance of social capital within the firm, which in turn produces higher levels of organizational performance. OCB may also contribute to the development of trust, mutual obligations, expectations, and identification among the employees in organizations. Now that we understand the importance of OCB in increasing organization performance (effectiveness by enhancing product quality, social capital, employee productivity, etc.), it is important that we know the factors that determine or affect OCB.

The Determinants of OCB

Shapiro, Kessler, and Purcell (2004) have two explanations for why employees engage in OCB. The first explanation views OCB as a form of reciprocation where employees engage in OCB to reciprocate fair or good treatment from the organization. The second view is that employees engage in OCB because they define those behaviors as part of their job. We discuss a few other determinants of OCB.

Job satisfaction. Shapiro et al. (2004) have found that the relationship between job satisfaction and employee citizenship behavior is strong. It was seen to be more than twice as strong as the relationship between job satisfaction and employee productivity.

Interesting work and job involvement. Shapiro et al. (2004) have found that citizenship levels are markedly lower when employees are engaged in very repetitive and highly standardized tasks. Individuals who are highly involved in their work, in fact, are more likely to engage in OCB.

Trust, organizational justice, and psychological contract fulfillment. As per Shapiro et al. (2004), employees who trust their supervisors and their organizations are also likely to exhibit higher levels of citizenship. Conversely, employees who perceive a violation of their psychological contracts often respond by decreasing their citizenship behavior and do not believe in working beyond enforceable standards.

Chen, Lam, Naumann, and Schaubroeck (2005) have found that OCB emerges, transmits, and persists through the actions of members of the group. Thus, organizational justice is one of the key determinants of OCB.

Organizational support. The extent to which employees feel supported and taken care of by their employers, they are likely to repay the organization by engaging in constructive behaviors. As per Shapiro et al. (2004), OCB is perceived as organizational support, which captures an employee's perception of how well he or she feels of having been treated by the organization.

Employee characteristics. Highly conscientious individuals are generally more likely to engage in citizenship behaviors (Shapiro et al., 2004). In addition, employees who are outgoing and generally have a positive outlook on life are often more inclined to exhibit citizenship in the workplace. Likewise, individuals who are empathetic and altruistic are also more inclined to initiate citizenship behaviors at work. Finally, certain individuals tend to define their jobs more broadly than others do. For these individuals, engaging in citizenship behavior is simply an integral aspect of their jobs.

Other factors. Chen et al. (2005) have found that highly cohesive groups are more likely to exhibit high levels of OCB. Shapiro et al. (2004) have found that individuals who are team oriented engage in more citizenship behaviors. As per Bolino and Turnley (2003), the findings of several studies indicate that TL is especially relevant in eliciting employee citizenship behaviors. That is, employees who work for transformational leaders are frequently motivated to go beyond the call of duty for the benefit of their organization.

According to Paine and Organ (2000), factors affecting OCB are organizational structure, power distance, cultural group norms, nature of work, collective contextual factors, and the level of commitment. A rigid mechanistic structure might constrain spontaneous, extra-role behavior while the more open organic structures actually foster initiatives beyond job descriptions. Power distance influences the perception of OCB as well as whether other employees are inclined towards demonstrating OCB.

Relating TL and Followers' OCB

As per Paine and Organ (2000), human resource managers can play a critical role in encouraging OCB by designing perceivably effective appraisal systems that are equitable by carefully making management development programs, establishing fair compensation systems, and designing jobs towards increased employee satisfaction and commitment. Bolino and Turnley (2003) have found that firms may be able to elicit more citizenship in their organizations by establishing (a) formal human resource management practices that emphasize good citizenship and (b) informal systems that encourage good citizenship. The formal human resource management practices would be recruitment and selection, training and development, performance appraisal, and compensation/ benefits. Similarly, firms may elicit more OCB from the followers of transformational leaders.

Having bright, talented people is necessary but not sufficient to facilitate effectively the creating, sharing, and exploiting of knowledge. According to Bryant (2003), transformational leaders inspire workers on to higher levels of innovation and effectiveness. Transformational leaders with EI create an atmosphere conducive to knowledge creation, sharing, and exploration. Employees are much more productive when they have the freedom to create new ideas, share those ideas with coworkers, and test out their new ideas. Through charisma, encouraging intellectual development, and paying individual attention to workers, transformational leaders motivate their workers to create and share knowledge. Also, by clearly articulating a challenging vision and strategic goals for the organization, transformational leaders attract talented individuals and are able to generate higher levels of innovation from all workers. EI is an underlying competency of transformational leaders (Palmer et al., 2001). Abraham (2004) found that EI interacts with organizational climate to influence performance. The traits of EI (social skills, conscientiousness, reliability, and integrity) promote trust which in turn may build cohesiveness among the members of the work groups. The EI traits of emotional honesty, self-confidence, and emotional resilience promote superior performance and increased OCBs.

Transformational leaders provide intellectual stimulation and challenging jobs to their followers (Kark & Shamir, 2002) who experience greater job satisfaction. Through individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and exemplification, these leaders build trust and may increase the level of intrinsic motivation and willingness for extra role behavior. Therefore, one can hypothesize the following:

- H₂: Subordinate's perception of supervisor's transformational leadership is positively related to the level of OCB displayed by them.

Literature has suggested that EQ is an underlying characteristic of transformational leaders (Gardener & Stough, 2002; Palmer et al., 2001). EQ helps in providing the capacity to give individualized consideration and understand followers' needs (Gardner & Stough, 2002). The ability to understand self and others and have control of one's own emotions are the requirements for a transformational leader to provide inspirational motivation or individualized influence.

Abraham (2004) found that the traits of EI, a combination of superior social skills and conscientiousness, enhance the self-sacrifice of benevolent employees to heightened levels of dependability and consideration. Resilience, the emotional competency that is the basis of self-

control, harnesses angry reactions when workers are confronted with the vicissitudes of corporate life and suppresses personal needs for organizational goals. EI is directly related to work group cohesion. The emotional competency of social skills strengthens work group cohesion, resulting in superior performance. It has the capacity to monitor and evaluate others' feelings and emotions and to use that knowledge to guide actions. The emotional competencies of heightened conscientiousness, reliability, and integrity enhance feelings of trust in the group by arousing positive moods and positive perceptions. Unconditional trust is the sharing of values between group members that leads to their investment in long-term relationships and greater interpersonal cooperation and teamwork.

According to Brief and Weiss (2002), transformational leaders feel excited, enthusiastic, and energetic, thus energizing their followers. Transformational leaders use strong emotions to arouse similar feelings in their audiences.

Masi and Cooke (2000) have found that transformational behaviors on the part of leaders promote empowering cultural norms, high levels of subordinate motivation, commitment to quality, and enhanced productivity. It was seen that empowering cultural norms of OCB promotes constructive and achievement-oriented behaviors by members. Such norms are associated with basic values and shared assumptions emphasizing the significance of organizational members' roles and collaboration through motivation rather than by competition. Motivation in this context is the extrinsically stimulated "extra effort" on the part of subordinates inspired by transformational leaders.

Transformational leaders enhance the OCB of followers through motivation. The inspirational motivation provided by transformational leaders by building shared assumptions and trust may be the result of the emotional intelligence of the leaders. Therefore, one can hypothesize the following:

- H₃: The EQ of a leader is likely to mediate the relationship between perceived transformational leadership and the OCB of the followers.

Methodology

Instruments

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) 45X was used to measure TL. Dimensions of TL (attributed and behavioral idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual motivation, and individualized consideration) were measured using 20 items. Subordinates rated their managers TL behaviors.

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

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

Sample

Data were collected from dyads of 57 managers and subordinates. The respondents, totaling 114, belonged to a diverse set of industries located in Goa and Daman. 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. The author was based in Goa and had traveled to Daman for a week. 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. The response rate was approximately 67% for subordinates' rating of TL of their leader and 65% for the leaders' ratings on EQ of self and OCB of subordinates. A total of 59% response sets were received. Finally, 57% of the response sets were found to be useable.

Results

All three scales were found to be highly reliable: .88 (TL scale), .86 (EI scale), and .83 (OCB scale). After the reliabilities were confirmed, the correlation between the dimensions of OCB and the complete scale of EQ and TL 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. TL and EI were not found to be significantly correlated. Therefore Hypothesis 1 which was concerned with the positive relationship between TL and EQ was not supported.

Table 1: Correlations

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
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	.07	.34*	.32*	.57**	(.77)		
6. TL	2.55	.67	.10	.17	.22	-.03	.08	(.88)	
7. EI	3.58	.46	.28*	.25	.50**	.20	.44**	.20	(.86)

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Simple multiple linear regressions were used to study Hypothesis 2 concerning the effect of the subordinates' perception of their leaders as transformational on their OCB. Four out of five OCBs as dependent variables were regressed on TL as independent 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 OCBs as dependent variables and EI of a leader as independent variable to see if EQ of a leader enhances OCBs of the followers. The results indicated that while TL did not predict the OCB of

followers, the EI 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
TL	.05 (.06)	.13 (.22)	-.07 (-.10)	-.00 (-.01)
EI	.28 (.55)*	.23 (.23)	.22 (.48)	.44(1.13)**
r^2	.83	.80	.05	.19
F	2.43	2.35	1.28	6.42

Note. Unstandardized coefficients with SE are in parentheses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Three 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. Three regression equations were used to test the hypothesized role of EQ of leader as a mediator between perceived TL and OCBs of followers. First, EQ was regressed on TL ($\beta = .20$). Secondly, OCB was regressed on TL ($\beta = .15$). Finally, OCB was regressed on both TL ($\beta = .05$) and EQ ($\beta = .50$, $\alpha = .01$). Table 3 presents the regression coefficients. Although in the third equation mediator EQ did affect the dependent variable OCB, in the first two equations, the independent variable (TL) did not affect either the mediator (EQ) or the dependent variable (OCB). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Discussion

The results show that while perceived TL was not directly related to the OCBs of followers, EI of leaders had significant relationship with several OCBs of the followers. The two specific OCBs of followers driven by the EI of the leader were conscientiousness and altruism. TL did not relate to the EI of leaders. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was not supported. EI was not mediating between TL and OCBs of followers. Since the EI of leaders did affect the OCBs of followers, the results indicate that EI is an important component for being an effective leader. However, whether EI is an important characteristic to be perceived as a transformational leader is a question that these findings raise.

Table 3: Regressions for Mediation Analysis

Dependent variables	Emotional quotient (1st equation)	OCB (2nd equation)	OCB (3rd equation)
TL	.20 (.13)	.15 (.15)	
TL			.05 (.05)
EQ			.50 (0.78)**
r^2	.04	.02	.26
F	2.19	1.17	9.43

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

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The EI 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 EI 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 EI of a leader plays a significant role in determining the two specific OCBs 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 OCBs. Interestingly, TL was not found to be affecting the OCBs of the followers even though the effects of TL and OCBs 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 TL behavior and OCBs. 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 TL and OCB in contextual terms also.

Implications of the Study

This study shows that EI in leaders encourages conscientiousness and altruism in followers. Thus, leaders who can identify and manage their own emotions and those of others create more sincere and helpful followers in their organizations. It also demonstrates the enormous impact the EI of a leader has on follower behavior at the work place. Organizations

can use this knowledge to their advantage. By encouraging EQ, they can enhance the desirable role behavior in the members of their organization.

Limitations and Conclusion

The study has some strengths. The data have been collected from several sources, circumventing spurious relationships emanating from the same source variance (Deluga, 1994). The ratings for TL were the subordinates' perception while the subordinates' OCBs were the perception of the superiors. However, the small data sample of only 57 dyads of managers and their supervisors (i.e., 114 respondents) is an area of caution. This study provides scope for further research on the relationship between TL and OCBs of followers in different context.

The importance of OCB cannot be emphasized enough while creating competencies for organizations in today's world. EI plays a big role in enhancing the OCBs of followers, specifically qualities such as conscientiousness and altruism. Organizations need to give importance to EI for enhancing positive outcomes like OCB.

About the Authors

Atika Modassir received a post graduate diploma in management from the Goa Institute of Management. She is currently working with Wipro Technologies in talent engagement and development. Prior to this she worked as an HR business partner in Nicholas Piramal India Ltd. She has been actively involved in research since 2003 and is currently pursuing her doctoral studies. Her research interests are in the areas of emotional intelligence, leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and gender Issues. She has also worked on the role of employee involvement in job satisfaction with perceived organizational support as moderator. Email: atika_modassir@yahoo.com

Tripti Singh, Ph.D. received a doctorate degree in 2005 from XLRI School of Management, Jamshedpur, India (www.xlri.ac.in). Her specialization is in the area of organizational behavior and human resources. Currently, Dr. Singh is a faculty at Indian Institute of Management in Bangalore, India (www.iimb.ernet.in), and her research interests are in areas of leadership, emotional intelligence, power, identity, knowledge workers, gender, and spirituality. Presently, she is validating a scale to measure spiritual orientation at work. After her post graduate in human resource management in 1996, she worked in industry as an HR practitioner and consultant. Email: triptisinghxl@gmail.com

References

- Abraham, R. (2004). Emotional competence as antecedent to performance: A contingency framework. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 130(2), 117-143.
- 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.
- Bardzill, P., & Slaski, M. (2003). Emotional intelligence: Fundamental competencies for enhanced service provision. *Managing Service Quality*, 13(2), 97-104.
- Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: an exploratory study. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 21(3), 157-161.
- 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.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17(1), 112-121.
- 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
- Bolino, M., & Turnley, W. (2003). Going the extra mile: Cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(3), 60-71.
- Brief, A., & Weiss, H. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review Psychology*, 53, 279-307.
- Bryant, S. E. (2003). The role of transformational and transactional leadership in creating, sharing, and exploiting organizational knowledge. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(4), 32-44.
- Caruso, D., Mayer, J., & Salovey, P. (2002). Relation of an ability measure of emotional intelligence to personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 79(2), 306-320.
- Chen, X. P., Lam, S. S. K., Naumann, S. E., & Schaubroeck, J. M. (2005). Group citizenship behaviour: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of its antecedents and consequences. *Management and Organization Review*, 1(2), 273-300.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. (1988). *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Deluga, R. J. (1994). Supervisor trust building, leader–member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 315-326.
- Dionne, S., Yammarino, F., Atwater, L., & Spangler, W. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(2), 177-193.
- Dvir, T., Dov, E., Avolio, B., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 735-744.

- Farh, J. L., Zhong, C. B., & Organ, D. (2000). Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Toronto, Ontario, Canada).
- Gardner, L., & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(2), 68-78.
- Goleman, D. (2002). Leaders with impact. *Strategic HR Review*, 1(6), 3-4.
- Humphreys, J., & Einstein, W. (2003). Nothing new under the sun: Transformational leadership from a historical perspective. *Management Decision*, 41(1), 85-95.
- Judd, C. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1981). Process analysis: Estimating mediation in evaluation Research. *Evaluation Research*, 5, 602-619.
- Jung, D., Chow, C., & Wu, A. (2003). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4-5), 327-344.
- Kark, R., & Shamir, B. (2002, August). The influence of transformational leadership on followers' relational versus collective self-concept. *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Denver, Colorado).
- Kent, T., Crofts, J., & Aziz, A. (2001). Four factors of transformational leadership behaviour. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(5), 221-229.
- Lubit, R. (2004). The tyranny of toxic managers: Applying emotional intelligence to deal with difficult personalities. *Ivey Business Journal Online*, March/April, 1-8.
- Masi, R. J., Cooke, R. A. (2000). Effects of transformational leadership on subordinate motivation, empowering norms and organizational productivity. *The International Journal of Organizational Analyses*, 8(9), 16-47.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.
- Nicholls, J. (1994). The heart, head and hands of transforming leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 15(6), 8-15.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Paine, B. J., & Organ, D. (2000). The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship behavior: Some preliminary conceptual and empirical observation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(1), 45-59.
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(1), 5-10.
- 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 mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897-933.
- Podsakoff, P., & MacKenzie, S. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 133-152.

- 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.
- Popper, M., Ori, L., & Ury, M. G. (1992). The Israeli defense forces: An example of transformational leadership & organizational development. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 13(1), 3-8.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, cognition, and personality*, 9(3), 185-211.
- Schnake, M., & Dumler, M. (2003). Levels of measurement and analysis issues in organizational citizenship behavior research. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76, 283-301.
- 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.
- Shapiro, C. J., Kessler, I., & Purcell, J. (2004). Exploring organizationally directed citizenship behavior: reciprocity or 'it's my job'? *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(1), 85-106.
- Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational leadership, conservation, and creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6), 703-714.
- Sivanathan, N., & Fekken, G. C. (2002). Emotional intelligence, moral reasoning and transformational leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 23, 198-204.
- Turner, L. (2004). Emotional intelligence –our intangible asset? *Chartered Accountants Journal, of New Zealand*, 83(3), 29-31.
- Vakola, M., Tsaousis, I., & Nikolaou, I. (2004). The role of emotional intelligence and personality variables on attitudes toward organizational change. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(2), 88-110.
- Welch, J. (2003). The best teams are emotionally literate. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 35(4), 168-171.