



Emotional intelligence and OCB: The moderating role of work locus of control

David L. Turnipseed

To cite this article: David L. Turnipseed (2018) Emotional intelligence and OCB: The moderating role of work locus of control, The Journal of Social Psychology, 158:3, 322-336, DOI: [10.1080/00224545.2017.1346582](https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2017.1346582)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2017.1346582>



Accepted author version posted online: 10 Jul 2017.
Published online: 02 Nov 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 199



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Emotional intelligence and OCB: The moderating role of work locus of control

David L. Turnipseed ^a

^aUniversity of South Alabama

ABSTRACT

This study sought to identify linkages between Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso's (2008) four dimensions of emotional intelligence (EI) and organizational citizenship behavior, and the moderating influence of locus of control. Using a sample of 290 employed students, the present study examines the effects of the dimensions of EI on OCB directed at individuals (OCB-I) and OCB directed at the organization (OCB-O). Emotionally intelligent individuals were hypothesized to engage in more organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) than individuals with lower EI. Work locus of control was hypothesized to moderate the emotional intelligence—OCB linkage, with high internals having a stronger emotional intelligence to OCB linkage. Results indicate that the EI dimensions of perceiving, understanding, and managing emotions had positive effects on OCB-I and OCB-O. Using emotions was not linked to OCB. Locus of control strengthened the EI to OCB-I link, but had no effect on the OCB–O linkage.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 5 November 2016
Accepted 8 June 2017
Revised 1 June 2017

KEYWORDS

Desirable organization behavior; emotional intelligence; locus of control; organizational citizenship behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior and emotional intelligence may contribute to desirable behaviors in a variety of organizations. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is desirable, discretionary, non-enforceable individual behavior that is not directly linked to the formal reward system, but which, in the aggregate, promotes effective and efficient organizational functioning (Organ, 1988; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). The construct originally comprised two dimensions: altruism or helping behaviors, and generalized compliance, which is doing good for the sake of the organization. However, there have been numerous (highly intercorrelated) dimensions of OCB identified. When an individual engages in OCB, benefits accrue to the organization, with no increase in direct costs.

Emotional intelligence (EI) may provide similar organizational benefits. Emotional intelligence is a dispositional variable that comprises the ability to engage in sophisticated information processing about one's own emotions as well as those of others, and the ability to use this information to guide thinking and behavior (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008). Emotional intelligence enables individuals to manage their own emotions, directing them toward productive activities and relationships.

Organizations are social entities, comprised of individuals in constant interaction, and these interactions, by their nature, “involve and invoke” emotions which underlie human behavior (Carmeli & Josman, 2006, p. 407). Optimal social interactions depend on individuals developing their abilities to understand and manage their own emotions as well as to influence those of others. EI has been linked to the quality of social interaction (Lopes et al., 2004), job performance (e.g., Cartwright & Pappas, 2007; Hiu-Hua & Schutte, 2015), and leadership (e.g., Riggio & Reichard, 2008), suggesting that EI is an organizationally beneficial characteristic.

Individuals high in EI are predisposed to interact and work well with others, thus EI is expected to be positively linked to OCB. Individuals with high EI may engage in relatively more OCB because they are astute in the social and psychological aspects of their organizations. Their astuteness results from the ability to perceive and understand emotions correctly and to use their understanding and management of those emotions to work toward specific goals. Additionally, EI includes the ability to be aware of one's own emotions and the emotions of others, to be able to manage those emotions, and to understand the complex relationships that can occur between emotions and likely emotional transactions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The connection between EI and OCB may be strengthened if individuals believe that their actions will result in desirable outcomes, which defines locus of control.

This paper investigated the link between emotional intelligence and desirable organizational outcomes, measured as organizational citizenship behavior, and the moderating effect of work locus of control.

Emotional intelligence

Emotional intelligence theory developed along two paths, the ability and mixed models. Ability models conceptualize EI as a standard intelligence (Brackett, Rivers, & Salovey, 2011) or mental traits or abilities that can be assessed with performance tests (Brackett, Rivers, Shiffman, Lerner, & Salovey, 2006). Mixed models are the mixture of three constructs—personality traits, personal competencies (e.g., optimism, self-esteem), and perceived emotional ability—and are based in large part on Goleman's (1995, 1998) popularization of emotional intelligence. The present study uses Mayer and Salovey's (1997) ability model, which comprises four progressive dimensions or branches, and is defined as "the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thoughts, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth" (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 5).

Mayer and Salovey's (1997) construct comprised four independent branches—emotional perceptions, assimilation, understanding, and management, which in combination, constitute emotional intelligence. Mayer et al. (2008) describe the four-branch model as emotional abilities arranged on a continuum from relatively lower level to more developmentally complex. These interrelated abilities lay along a hierarchical continuum ranging from perceiving emotions, which is a basic psychological function, to the highest ability which is regulating emotions, serving one's self-management (Mayer et al., 2008). The lower level abilities are those enabling accurate perception of emotions and using those emotions to facilitate thinking. Higher-level skills are those that enable understanding of emotions and the use of emotions in self-management or goal attainment. Individuals with higher levels of emotional abilities are better able to deal with emotion-laden contexts, situations, and interactions (Farh, Seo, & Tesluk, 2012).

Mayer et al.'s four-branches of EI are defined as:

Perceiving emotion is self-awareness of emotions, the ability to identify emotions, and accurately express one's emotional needs and emotions to others (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Individuals able to accurately perceive and express their emotions are more likely to be understood by their peers and to have the potential for leading others due to their emotional perceptivity and empathy (Salovey & Meyer, 1990). A sophisticated perceiving ability enables differentiation between false and honest emotions in others (Brackett et al., 2011).

Using emotion is the ability to employ feelings that help with specific cognitive processes, including reasoning, solving problems, interpersonal communication, and making decisions (Brackett et al., 2006). Using emotions facilitates thinking, "which involves using emotions to improve thinking processes and harness the power of positive moods" (Riggio & Reichard, 2008, p. 170). A high level of using emotion is the ability to produce emotional states to promote various styles of thinking. For example, a sad mood contributes more to detailed, substantive, and focused thinking than a happy mood (Brackett et al., 2011).

Understanding emotions is the ability to understand complex emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Understanding includes the ability to recognize probable transitions between emotions, such as the movement from "feelings of betrayal to feelings of anger and guilt" (Jordan, Ashkanasy & Hartel, 2002, p. 366).

Management of emotion is the ability to control emotions in a positive manner (Riggio & Reichard, 2008), use emotions to attain specific goals (Mayer et al., 2008), and regulate or reduce, increase, or alter an emotional response in oneself or in others, as well as the capacity to experience a range of emotions in assessing the appropriateness and usefulness of an emotion in a given situation (Eisengerg, Fabes, Guthrie, & Reiser, 2000).

Emotional intelligence and OCB

Organizational employees are in constant interaction, and the nature of human interactions includes some degree of emotionality, a basis of behavior. More effective human interactions are positively linked with the ability to understand and manage one's emotions and those of others, which is emotional intelligence (Carmeli & Josman, 2006). For example, managers who deal daily with varied emotions in their relationships with employees must understand their own emotionality to be effective. Prior studies have identified linkages between EI and leadership effectiveness (cf, Cavallo & Brienza, 2002, in Carmeli & Josman, 2006; Riggio & Reichard, 2008; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005). Individuals with the ability to understand their emotions are likely to express their emotions more accurately and be better understood by peers at work. When leaders (or any employees) with high emotional intelligence, discretionarily and altruistically make the effort to express their emotions or to communicate in an organizationally beneficial manner, their behaviors may be OCB (Carmeli & Josman, 2006).

Emotional intelligence has also been linked to individual performance (cf, Jordan et al., 2002; Lam & Kirby, 2002; Rice, 1999; Schutte, Schuettelpelz, & Malouff, 2001; van Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2004), indicating that employees with high emotional intelligence have a competitive advantage in the workplace, suggesting OCB. Traditional IQ is estimated to account for 10% (Sternberg, 1996) to at most, 25% (Hunter & Hunter, 1984) of the variance in job performance. EI may be a greater contributor to performance than IQ, (cf, Kelly & Caplan, 1993; Lam & Kirby, 2002), and it appears to differentiate and predict individual performance and rating as "stars" better than academic performance (Cartwright & Pappas, 2007), indicating citizenship behavior. Employees with high EI may be better performers in the workplace and make significant contributions to the organization (Carmeli & Josman, 2006) because of their OCB.

Perception, regulation, and utilization of emotions have been positively related to task performance (Carmeli & Josman, 2006), as well as the reduction of counterproductive developmental job experiences (Dong, Seo, & Bartol, 2014). These relationships support the notion that high EI employees have the ability to identify opportunities for discretionary, extra-role task performance, or OCB, in the workplace. OCB is linked to interpersonal interactions, and motivated by the same forces as emotional management (Erez & Isen, 2002). Employees with the ability to manage their emotions have better coping skills and more positive social relationships: These employees have increased propensity to engage in prosocial activities at work (Day & Carroll, 2004) which is a dimension of OCB. Employees with the ability to manage their emotions are more empathetic (Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000) and tend to have smoother interactions with coworkers because of their ability to exhibit suitable behavior (Mayer et al., 2008): These actions are consistent with helping OCB, or altruism.

Altruism is OCB directed at individuals, a basic dimension of OCB, and one of the most studied (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Altruistic behavior includes encouraging and assisting others in the workplace and orienting new employees (Organ, 1988; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). A link between altruism and EI has been identified (Carmeli & Josman, 2006; Charbonneau & Nicol, 2002), and Abraham (1999) argues that EI may increase altruism because of the enhanced ability to recognize and understand peers' feelings. EI enables employees to move easily from negative to positive moods: Employees having positive emotions are more prone to engage in altruistic behaviors. Further, employees with high EI are more socially interactive: Involvement in altruistic behavior is rewarding for them because it maintains their positive state of mind (Carmeli, 2003; Carmeli & Josman, 2006).

Individuals high in EI are also likely to be adept at recognizing and understanding both formal workplace requirements and the vague, indefinable informal behavioral expectations. Individuals with high EI, sensitive to the workplace environment, are more likely to engage in compliance citizenship behaviors intended to benefit the organization (Carmeli & Josman, 2006).

Day and Carroll (2004), focusing on the OCB dimensions of helping, sportsmanship, and civic virtue, found no EI—OCB relationships in an individual-based analysis, although a group-based analysis indicated linkages between EI and civic virtue and sportsmanship. Turnipseed and VandeWaa (2012) reported positive links among aggregate EI, the four dimensions of emotional intelligence, OCB directed at individuals (OCB-I), and OCB directed at the organization (OCB-O) for a sample of students. Using a sample of university professors, they also found positive relationships between OCB-I and the four EI dimensions and aggregate EI. Management of emotion was the only EI dimension linked to OCB-O in their professor sample (VandeWaa & Turnipseed, 2012).

Individuals with high EI may be uniquely attuned to others, empathetic as well as sympathetic, and consequently prone to exhibit discretionary, non-enforceable, unrewarded citizenship behaviors that benefit their peers or coworkers, or OCB-I. High emotional intelligence also appears consistent with environmental and situational awareness in an organization, including an awareness of organizational goals and behavioral needs to reach those goals. Higher EI employees are likely to have empathy for the organization as a whole, facilitating the adoption of an organizational perspective, and consequently, actions that will benefit the organization (Cohen & Abedallah, 2015). High EI individuals may have a propensity to engage in discretionary citizenship behaviors targeting the organization (OCB-O).

Thus the following hypotheses:

H₁: Emotional intelligence would be positively related to Organizational Citizenship Behavior directed at individuals.

H₂: Emotional intelligence would be positively related to Organizational Citizenship Behavior directed at the organization.

Locus of control

Trait locus of control may contribute to understanding the relationship between emotional intelligence and OCB. Rotter's (1966) personality trait, locus of control (LOC), is defined as the generalized expectancy that rewards, reinforcements, and outcomes in life are controlled by one's individual actions, (internality), or by forces in the external environment (externality). It predicts internal motivation and the ability to attain desired outcomes (Noe, 1988); OCB is by definition directed toward desired organizational outcomes.

Previous study of the LOC-OCB linkage has produced conflicting and inconsistent outcomes. Motowidlo and van Scotter (1994) found correlations between internal control and citizenship performance. Funderberg and Levy (1997) found intercorrelations between LOC and self-rated and peer-rated OCB, though a negative relationship between self-rated and peer-rated OCB scores implies that no inferences should be made from that study. Internal work LOC was not significantly correlated with OCB in samples of Chinese managers and U.S. students (Blakely, Srivasta, & Moorman, 2005); however, internal LOC was correlated with organizational citizenship behavior in a study of U.S. government employees (Barbuto & Bugenhagen, 2006).

Turnipseed and Bacon (2009) reported a positive correlation between work LOC and the organization-directed OCB dimension of sportsmanship, which is the willingness to tolerate the inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining, maintaining a positive attitude even when things go wrong, not taking offense when others do not follow one's suggestions, and sacrificing personal interest for the good of the group (Organ, 1990; Podsakoff et al., 2000). They found negative links with the dimensions of altruism and with peacemaking, an organization-directed dimension of citizenship behavior that involves preventing and resolving interpersonal conflict (Organ, 1988).

Individuals with high internal LOC are disposed to show prosocial behavior (Hoffi-Hostetter & Mannheim, 1999), and prosocial behavior has been used synonymously with OCB (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). Judge and Bono (2001) suggest that LOC is one of the best dispositional predictors of job performance. High internals are more likely to use initiative and engage in behavior beyond the job requirements (Withey & Cooper, 1989), consistent with OCB. Also, high internals are likely to expand their job roles to include whatever is required to control their work situation (Blakely et al., 2005).

Internal LOC is expected to strengthen the relationship between OCB and task-directed individual effort. Internals are likely to exert more effort and go beyond specified duties (Withey & Cooper, 1989). Although individual effort may be positively related to OCB, both internals and externals may engage in citizenship behavior; however, employees with high internal locus of control may discretionarily choose to pursue certain goals at work, engage in more OCB, and exert more effort because they believe they control their fate. The possible moderating effect of LOC in the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior was assessed to more fully understand the relationship between LOC and OCB.

Internals typically put forth more effort and have better job performance (Andrisani & Nestel, 1976), higher work motivation, and higher productivity (Nystrom, 1983; Spector, 1982). Locus of control is a significant predictor of work performance (Judge & Bono, 2001), and internals are more motivated and put out greater effort. Consequently, Work LOC is expected to enhance the benefits of EI. Internals believe that they can do it; therefore the advantage provided by internality is expected to increase OCB. Externals, who may be very high in EI, may not take the initiative to engage in OCB because of uncertainty in their abilities to successfully engage in OCB.

Individuals with internal LOC are more likely to be high in perceiving and expressing emotions, and in using emotions. Their tendency for pro-social behavior (Hoffi-Hostetter & Mannheim, 1999) may make them particularly attuned to their own emotions as well as those of others; it may also make them capable of using those feelings. Similarly, internals typically put forth more effort (Andrisani & Nestel, 1976) and may expend their energy and employ their can-do beliefs to understand emotions. High internals go beyond the job requirements and use personal initiative to achieve their ends (Withey & Cooper, 1989). They tend to expand their job roles to encompass anything required to control their work situation (Blakely et al., 2005). Consequently, internals are likely to employ all of their resources, including management of emotions, to attain their goals and control emotional responses in themselves and others.

The belief in the ability to control one's own fate (an internal Work LOC) is expected to increase the predisposition to engage in OCB due to confidence in obtaining desired outcomes, suggesting the following hypotheses:

H₃: Work Locus of control would strengthen the relationship between emotional intelligence and individual-directed organizational citizenship behavior.

H₄: Work Locus of control would strengthen the relationship between emotional intelligence and organization-directed organizational citizenship behavior.

Method

Participants

Voluntary participants were 290 employed students in a southern university. The average age was 24.3 years ($SD = 5.9$), and 42% were female. Ethnicity was 71% white, 17% black, 7% Asian, and 5% "other." The average grade point average was 3.0/4.0 ($SD = .54$): participants worked between 8 and 40 hours per week, with an average of 26.3 hours per week ($SD = 14.4$).

The study was approved by the university's Institutional Review Board, and all requirements for study with human subjects were carefully followed. Volunteer student participants were solicited to take part in a study on "Emotional Intelligence": There were no incentives given. Only employed students' responses were used in the analysis.

Measures

Organizational citizenship behavior

The organizational citizenship behavior construct was initially conceptualized as two dimensions: Altruism and generalized compliance (Smith et al., 1983). Since that time, the construct has been expanded to numerous, often highly intercorrelated dimensional structures. Prior research has employed OCB dimensions ranging from one to five (cf. Becker & Randall, 1994; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Smith et al., 1983). Podsakoff et al. (2000) identified about 30 potentially different forms of OCB; however, examination of these dimensions reveals that each is comprised of either altruistic, individually directed behaviors (OCB-I), or generalized compliance behaviors directed at the organization (OCB-O). Altruism and generalized compliance were the basis of the OCB construct and have remained integral to subsequent conceptualizations: Consequently, the two-dimension (OCB-I and OCB-O) model suggested by Williams and Anderson (1991) was used in this study.

Respondents self-assessed OCB with the 13-item scale adapted from Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie (1997). Responses were on a Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Respondents were asked to "Respond to the statements as objectively as possible, and indicate the degree to which each statement describes you on a typical day." This self-report method of measurement has been empirically demonstrated by Vandenberg, Lance, and Taylor (2005) to be as accurate as other methods of rating OCB.

The Podsakoff et al. (1997) scale comprises behaviors that directly benefit either the respondents' peers or other individuals (OCB-I), or the organization *per se* (OCB-O). Five items describe behaviors directed at individuals: example OCB-I items are: "I help others out if someone falls behind in his/her work", "I willingly give my time to help my fellow employees with work-related problems", and "I encourage others when they are down". There are eight items describing behaviors directed at the organization. Examples of the OCB-O items are: "I attend and actively participate in company meetings"; "I am willing to risk disapproval to express my beliefs about what is best for the company"; and "I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters" (reverse scored). The coefficient of internal consistency (Cronbach's α) was .84 for OCB—I, and .79 for OCB—O.

Work locus of control

Work locus of control (LOC) was assessed with the 16-item scale developed by Spector (1988). Work locus of control is the extent to which people attribute their work rewards to their individual behavior (Spector, 1988), and the Work Locus of Control Scale generally yields "stronger relationships with work-related criteria (e.g., job satisfaction, affective commitment, and burnout) than general locus of control" (Wang, Bowling, & Eschleman, 2010, p. 761). This well-known and widely accepted scale has been used in many studies, and "The preponderance of evidence suggests that the WLCS consists of two factors: internal and external" (e.g., Therese & Trusty, 1996, p. 349).

Respondents indicated their degree of agreement with each item on a 1–6 Likert-type scale, with 1 = "Disagree very much", and 6 = "Agree very much." Example work locus of control items include "People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded," and "Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort." Scores on the individual items were summed to compute the WLOC score; higher scores indicate internality, and lower scores indicate an external WLOC. Cronbach's α was .86.

Emotional intelligence

The “*Self-Rated Emotional Intelligence Scale*” (Brackett et al., 2006) was used to measure the four dimensions of EI described by Mayer et al. (2008), with 19 items—perceiving (4 items), using (3 items), understanding (4 items), and managing (self-management—4 items, and social management—4 items). Respondents were asked to describe how accurately each of the 19 items described themselves: Responses were on a 1–5 Likert-type scale anchored by 1 (very inaccurate) and 5 (very accurate). Example items were “I know the strategies to make or improve other people’s moods”; “I am able to handle most upsetting problems”; and “When making decisions, I listen to my feelings to see if the decision feels right.” Cronbach’s α for the EI dimensions ranged from .74 to .85, all within acceptable values.

Control variables

For the most conservative test of our hypotheses, respondents’ age, gender, average hours worked per week, and grade average were entered as control variables. OCB has been linked with age (e.g., Ng, Lam, & Feldman, 2016) and gender (Kidder, 2002; Ng et al., 2016). Emotional intelligence has been shown to vary with age and gender (Fernández-Berrocal, Cabello, Castillo, & Extremera, 2012; Grewal & Salovey, 2005). Average hours worked per week was included to identify any variance due to time spent at work, and grade point average was included as a proxy for ability and effort to detect any variance due to those factors.

Analytical procedure

Descriptive statistics and correlations among the study variables were calculated. Hierarchical multiple regressions were used to test the hypotheses that emotional intelligence would be related to OCB. The control variables (age, gender, average work hours, and grade point) were entered in step 1. To assess the incremental contribution of the emotional intelligence dimensions to the variance in OCB, the EI dimensions were entered into the model in subsequent steps, consistent with Mayer et al. (2008) who described their four-branch model as emotional abilities arranged on a continuum from relatively lower level (perceiving emotions) to more developmentally complex (use of emotions in self-management and goal attainment). Perceiving emotion, the most basic level, was entered in step 2, using emotion in step 3, understanding emotion in step 4, managing emotion (self) in step 5, and managing emotion (social) in step 6.

Moderator analysis, using multiple regression analysis, was used to test the hypothesis that LOC would strengthen the link between EI and OCB. If the cross-product (EI dimension $\times$ LOC) was significant, the interaction between EI and LOC moderated the link between emotional intelligence and OCB.

Following Sharma, Durand, and Gur-Arie (1981) and Childers, Dubinsky, and Skinner (1990), LOC (hypothesized moderator variable) was categorized as a “pure moderator” if it replaced the effect of the EI on OCB, and a “quasi-moderator” if it supplanted or altered the effect of emotional intelligence. Locus of control may not moderate the effect of each of the EI abilities on OCB, but may still influence OCB as an antecedent variable.

Results

Means, standard deviations, and coefficients of reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) for the scaled variables are provided along with correlations in Table 1.

Emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior directed at individuals

H_1 predicted a positive link between EI and OCB directed at individuals (OCB—I). Controlling for the effect of age, gender, work hours, and grade point average, perceiving emotion ($B = .83$; $p < .001$; $\Delta R^2 = .06$); understanding emotion ($B = .57$; $p < .001$; $\Delta R^2 = .03$); managing

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, and correlations.

	M	SD	α	Cronbach's											
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Age	24.3	5.9	—	—											
2. Gender	—	—	.04	—											
3. Workhours/wk	26.3	14.4	.26t	-.09	—										
4. Grade point	3.0	.54	-.03	.15t	-.11	—									
5. OCB-I	29.2	3.3	.84	.08	.05	.13*	.12*	—							
6. OCB-O	36.3	5.9	.79	.15t	.05	.12*	.10	.48t	—						
7. EI-perceiving	5.2	.9	.85	-.12*	.02	.06	.11	.25t	.19t	—					
8. EI-using	4.4	.7	.74	-.10	.09	-.10	.14*	.12*	.01	.15t	—				
9. EI – understanding	4.3	1.1	.78	-.09	-.04	.14*	.20t	.28t	.21t	.33t	.20t	—			
10. EI – management (self)	5.1	1.1	.82	.09	-.19t	.20t	.09	.38t	.48t	.33t	-.05	.37t	—		
11. EI-Management (social)	5.2	.9	.80	-.05	.09	.13*	.11	.43t	.36t	.48t	.04	.42t	.42t	—	
12. Locus of control	59.6	7.8	.86	.04	.12	.03	.02	-.13*	-.03	-.11	-.18t	-.01	-.05	-.08.	

*p < .05; t p < .01; t p < .001

emotion—self ($B = .93$; $p < .001$; $\Delta R^2 = .07$); and managing emotion—social ($B = .98$; $p < .001$; $\Delta R^2 = .06$) produced a model with an adjusted R^2 of .26 (Table 2), supporting H_1 .

Emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior directed at the organization

H_2 predicted a positive linkage between EI and OCB directed at the organization (OCB—O). Including the control variables, perceiving emotion ($B = 1.17$; $p < .001$; $\Delta R^2 = .04$); understanding emotion ($B = .87$; $p < .007$; $\Delta R^2 = .02$); managing emotion—self ($B = 2.46$; $p < .001$; $\Delta R^2 = .16$); and managing emotion—social ($B = 1.15$; $p < .002$; $\Delta R^2 = .03$) produced an adjusted R^2 of .29, supporting H_2 (Table 2).

Table 2. Hierarchical multiple regression results: organizational citizenship behavior by emotional intelligence.

Predictor Variables	Organizational Citizenship: Individuals			Organizational Citizenship: Organization		
	B	R ²	ΔR^2	B	R ²	ΔR^2
Step 1:						
Control Variables:						
Age	.03			.13*		
Gender	.25			.47		
Work Hours	.03*			.04		
Grade Point	.98*	.04	—	1.40	.04	—
Step 2:						
Emotional Intelligence Factors						
Perceiving Emotion	.83***	.10	.06	1.17	.08**	.04
Step 3:						
Using Emotion	.45	.11	.01	-.12	.08	—
Step 4:						
Understanding Emotion	.57***	.14	.03	.87	.10**	.02
Step 5:						
Managing Emotion (Self)	.93***	.21	.07	2.46	.26***	.16
Step 6:						
Managing Emotion (Social Management)	.98***	.27	.06	1.15	.29**	.03
Overall Model: R ² (adjusted)			.27***			.29***

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .0011

Table 3. Moderator analysis: emotional intelligence, OCB- I linkage by locus of control (H-3).

Predictor Variables:				
E I Dimension	Potential Moderator: Locus of Control	Interaction	R ²	Test Result
B	B	B		
Perceiving		Perceiving X LOC		
–2.9*	–.35**	.06**	.08***	Supported †
Using		Using X LOC		
–5.1**	–.42**	.09**	.04**	Supported†
Understanding	Understanding X LOC			
–3.1**	–.30***	.06**	.10***	Supported†
Managing – self		Managing – self X LOC		
–2.0	–.29**	.05**	.16***	Supported ‡
Managing – social		Managing- social X LOC		
–1.1	–.24**	.04*	.18***	Supported ‡

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; † Quasi-moderator ‡ Pure Moderator

Locus of control moderation of the emotional intelligence—OCB-I linkage

The hypothesized moderation of the linkage between EI and OCB-I (H_3) was supported (Table 3). Locus of control increased the strength of the linkage between OCB-I and perceiving emotion, using emotion, understanding emotion, self-management of emotion, and social management. LOC functioned as a quasi-moderator for perceiving, using, and understanding EI, altering the effect of the EI variables, and as a pure moderator for self-management and social management, replacing the effects of the EI variables on OCB-I.

The beta coefficients for the EI dimensions changed from positive in the hierarchical regression models to negative in the moderator analysis. In unmoderated regression, the regression coefficients are averaged across levels of the other predictor variables; however, in moderated regression relationship, they are separate from the other predictor variables. To determine moderator effect significant, only the incremental effect is measured, not the significance of individual variables (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). Another explanation for the reversal of the regression coefficients may be the Yule-Simpson effect, a statistical paradox in which a trend (beta coefficient) appears in separate groups of data but reverses (or disappears) when the groups are combined (see Good & Mittal, 1987; Wagner, 1982).

Locus of control moderation of the emotional intelligence—OCB-O and linkage

The hypothesized moderation of the linkage between emotional intelligence and OCB-O by locus of control (H_4) was not supported (Table 4).

Table 4. Moderator analysis: Emotional intelligence, OCB-O linkage by locus of control (H-4).

Predictor Variables:				
E I Dimension	Potential Moderator: Locus of Control	Interaction	R ²	Test Result
B	B	B		
Perceiving		Perceiving X LOC		
–.85	–.14	.03	.03*	Not Supported
Using		Using X LOC		
–6.4	–.44	–.10	.01	Not Supported
Understanding		Understanding X LOC		
–2.2	–.21	.05	.04*	Not Supported
Managing – self		Managing – self X LOC		
2.7	.04	–.01	.16***	Not Supported
Managing – social		Managing - social X LOC		
–.07	–.22	.05	.12***	Not Supported

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Discussion and implications

The focus of this study was to assess the linkage between EI and OCB-I and OCB-O, and to examine the effect of work locus of control as a moderator. This study contributes to the literature by supporting the hypothesized positive link between EI and OCB, and illustrating the moderating effect of WLOC on the link between EI and OCB-I.

As hypothesized, (H_1), EI was positively linked with OCB-I, which is an intuitively appealing conclusion, as emotionally adept individuals are likely to be attuned to the emotions of coworkers and managers and to use that ability to act and react positively with them. When employees act altruistically by helping others at work, those behaviors are considered OCB. Also, as hypothesized (H_2), EI was positively linked to OCB-O. High EI individuals are more proficient at identifying and understanding the formalized organizational requirements as well as the nebulous informal behavioral expectations. High EI individuals, sensitive to the organizational climate, will tend to engage in compliant citizenship behaviors which they intend to benefit the organization (Carmeli & Josman, 2006).

The relationships between emotional intelligence, and OCB-I and OCB-O, were similar, which is not surprising given the correlation (.48) between the two OCB dimensions. The EI dimensions of perceiving, understanding, self management, and social management were significant predictors in each model. Interestingly, using emotion was not a predictor for OCB-I or OCB-O. Using emotion is the ability to utilize feelings such as reasoning, problem-solving, decision-making, and interpersonal communication (Brackett et al., 2006). Perhaps using emotion contributes to longer-term benefits than other EI abilities and thus does not have a strong perceptual link to OCB. The ability to identify emotions (perceiving) and analyze them (understanding) while making decisions about the optimal way to use those emotions to manage emotional responses (managing) in oneself and others may trigger immediate behaviors that are recognized as the OCB measured by the instrument used in this study.

Self-management of emotion contributed the largest amount to the variance for both OCB-I and OCB-O. This may reflect the value of relative tranquility in favorable interpersonal relations with coworkers and managers, which results from personal emotional control and the ability to project that control to others.

The moderation of the relationship between EI and OCB-I by work locus of control suggests that internals who believe that their rewards, reinforcements, and outcomes in life are controlled by their personal actions are able to amplify the impact of EI in citizenship behavior directed at individuals. Our results showed that WLOC was negatively correlated ($r = -.13$) with OCB-I, consistent with the locus of control construct: A focus on personal rewards and outcomes, rather than altruism. However, when guided and augmented by emotional intelligence ability to perceive emotions, facilitate thinking, and to understand and use emotions in self-management and goal attainment, internals engage in higher levels of OCB-I.

High internals believe that they can control events around them (Barbuto & Bugenhagen, 2006). Internals with high EI may consciously or subconsciously select more individual-directed behaviors, because peers offer a richer, more emotion-laden source of behavioral cues, as well as a more certain outcome than organization-directed behaviors. Discretionary behavior directed at the organization may be well intended and believed to contribute positively to the organization. However, managers or others may block or deflect the behaviors, or the behaviors may not have the intended organizational outcome. Consequently, an individual may learn that OCB-O, even if indicated by emotional intelligence, does not follow as certain a path as OCB-I.

Turnipseed and Bacon (2009) suggest that participation and loyalty OCB, which are organization-directed behaviors, may be perceived and intended as banal social support actions, independent of the influence of the trait of locus of control. This may further explain why locus of control did not moderate the link between EI and OCB-O. Another explanation may be that employees believe that their efforts on behalf of the organization have a relatively weaker relationship to their rewards or situation at work and thus exert less effort on OCB-O.

Although a link between work locus of control and OCB-O is intuitively appealing, our results indicate limited relationships between these constructs. The small negative correlation between WLOC and OCB-O can be explained by their behavioral definitions. Trait locus of control predicts internal motivation and the belief in one's internal ability to achieve desired goals (Ng, Sorensen, & Eby, 2006). An individual with a high internal locus of control would be unlikely to accept the necessity of rules and regulations, and would not be disposed to discretionarily engage in compliance behaviors, or OCB-O.

Individuals with high internal locus of control tend to be involved in pursuing personal goals and improving their own lives (Rotter, 1966). By their resourcefulness and perseverance, they find ways to exert control even in situations with limited opportunities and many constraints (Bandura, 1990). Individuals with high WLOC would have weaker relationships between effort at work and compliance citizenship behaviors than those with lower levels of WLOC. Work locus of control is the extent to which people attribute their work rewards to their individual behavior (Spector, 1988). Consequently, a high internal work locus of control is inconsistent with acceptance of the necessity and desirability of rules and regulations governing organizational structure, job descriptions, and personnel policies, or the compliance aspect of OCB-O when they interfere with the internal's goal directed behavior. High internals may not engage in the OCB-O behaviors such as following work rules with extreme care, always coming to work on time, and always producing highest quality work, and thus, organization-directed effort may be reduced.

Managers should be aware that employees with high EI are generally better employees (Jordan et al., 2002; Lam & Kirby, 2002; Rice, 1999; Schutte et al., 2001; van Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2004). Therefore, as the EI measures are improved, screening appears to be a prudent organizational practice for placement as well as hiring decisions (for relevant jobs). Screening and development of emotional intelligence appears especially relevant for organizations with high interpersonal contact or for employees with significant contact with external constituencies. The desirability of screening for LOC cannot be addressed from the results of this study. Although high WLOC strengthened the link between EI and OCB-I, which appears positive for management, the empirical evidence suggests that WLOC is not positively linked with OCB-O.

As an ability, EI can be enhanced to some degree (cf. Boyatzis, 2000; Chamorro-Premuzic, 2013). Carefully developed training programs can increase leaders' emotional awareness and contribute to employees' involvement on the job (Zammuner, Dionisio, Prandi, & Agnoli, 2013). EI training can also develop meaningfulness at work (Thory, 2016), improve employees' service quality (Beigi & Shirmohammadi, 2011), and improve coping skills, stress management, and wellbeing (Vesely, Saklofske, & Nordstokke, 2016). Because of the wide range of benefits that EI can provide to employees and the organization, training to enhance EI levels could be a prudent investment.

The constructs of work locus of control, emotional intelligence, and organizational citizenship behavior have potential for the theory and practice of management. However, their value cannot be realized until the definitional and measurement issues are resolved. When measurement of the constructs has improved and can provide accurate results, screening for EI and locus of control may enable better employee and manager selection.

The robust linkages between emotional intelligence and citizenship behavior indicate value in EI development programs. Also, the moderating effect of locus of control on the EI to OCB-I linkage elucidates the value of an internal locus of control in discretionary citizenship behavior. As emotional intelligence development methods are perfected, managers should consider the potential organizational benefit of EI. In cases where organizational citizenship is desirable behavior, a cost-benefit analysis of EI development may argue for attempting to develop that intelligence.

Limitations

Several potential limitations may constrain the generalizability of this study. Common-source variance could possibly have inflated the correlations. The cross-sectional data precludes

identification of causal relationships; however, EI and LOC are personality traits, and thus it is doubtful that they will be affected by citizenship behavior. Although LOC and EI are considered traits, the sample comprised of employed students may limit the generalizability of the study, as students may represent no population other than their own.

Salovey and Meyer (1990) and Mayer et al.'s (2008) conceptualization of ability emotional intelligence was used in this study. There are other EI constructs that may have provided different results. There is a possibility that some personality traits or cognitive abilities included in this study may overlap EI. Although psychologists have been working to perfect the measurement of cognitive intelligence for over 100 years, EI assessment is less than 20 years old (Cherniss, 2010). Some scholars argue that EI is not related to IQ but rather is a distinctive construct (e.g., Ciarrochi et al., 2000), while others argue that there is an overlap between personality factors and EI (e.g., van der Linden, Tsaoasis, & Petrides, 2012). Answers to that debate lie in large part with the instruments chosen to measure the constructs, which are beyond the scope of this study. However, a limitation to this study may be the measurement instruments.

There are concerns with the psychometric properties of the traditional one-factor model of locus of control, and Oliver, Jose, and Brough (2006) suggest that a two- or three-factor model may be superior to the unidimensional model. There are similar concerns with the organizational citizenship behavior construct and the measurement of EI. There is the possibility that if this study was replicated using different measures, the results might vary. The promising results of this study are a call to focus on resolving the dimensional questions, measurement, and inconsistencies surrounding the three constructs, so that the practice of management can benefit.

Future study

The results suggest several interesting directions for further study. First, replication studies should be conducted with a more homogeneous sample to avoid potential cross-organizational contamination. Second, the intriguing absence of a moderating effect of locus of control for the linkage between EI and OCB-O should be investigated. Third, the effect of the industry and organization on the relationships among EI, OCB, and LOC should be examined. Companies with higher levels of interpersonal interaction (e.g., service) may have different linkages than those with limited interaction (e.g., continuous process manufacturing). Also, the type and degree of technology utilized may have an influence on the linkages. Possibly the lack of a link between EI and OCB-O may be explained by the homogeneous sample: Future study should attempt to replicate this study with different populations. A glaring need for future study is refinement of the construct and the measurement of EI. Finally, research efforts should be directed toward “helping” disciplines such as education and nursing. Successful teachers and nurses rely on emotional intelligence and internal locus of control to deal with an increasingly diverse population of students and care recipients. Disposition is an important variable in the selection of teachers, and specific information about a candidate's emotional intelligence would be beneficial to both teacher and nurse applicants, as well as potential employers.

ORCID

David L. Turnipseed  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9949-2134>

References

- Abraham, R. (1999). Emotional intelligence in organizations: A conceptualization. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychological Monographs*, 125, 209–224.
- Andrisani, P. J., & Nestel, G. (1976). Internal-external control as contributor to and outcome of work experience. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, 156–165. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.61.2.156
- Bandura, A. (1990). Reflections of non-ability determinants of competence. In R. Sternberg, & J. Kolligan Jr. (Eds.), *Competence considered* (pp. 315–362). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Barbuto, J. E. Jr., & Bugenhagen, M. J. (2006). Preliminary relation between followers' locus of control and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Psychological Reports*, 98, 882–884. doi:10.2466/pr0.98.3.882-884
- Becker, T. E., & Randall, D. M. (1994). Validation of a measure of organizational citizenship behavior against an objective behavioral criterion. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 54, 160–167. doi:10.1177/0013164494054001021
- Beigi, M., & Shirmohammadi, M. (2011). Effects of an emotional intelligence training program on service quality of bank branches. *Managing Service Quality*, 21, 552–557. doi:10.1108/09604521111159825
- Blakely, G. L., Srivasta, A., & Moorman, R. H. (2005). The effects of nationality, work role, and work locus of control on role definitions of OCB. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 12, 103–117. doi:10.1177/107179190501200109
- Boyatzis, R. E. (2000). Developing emotional intelligence. In C. Cherniss, R. E. Boyatzis, & M. Elias (Eds.), *Developments in emotional intelligence* (pp. 2–33). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional intelligence: Implications for personal, social, academic, and workplace success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5, 88–103. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00334.x
- Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Shiffman, S., Lerner, N., & Salovey, P. (2006). Relating emotional abilities to social functioning: A comparison of self-report and performance measures of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 780–795. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.4.780
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 710–725.
- Carmeli, A. (2003). The relationship between emotional intelligence and work attitudes, behavior and outcomes: An examination among senior managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18, 788–813. doi:10.1108/MRR-10-2013-0238
- Carmeli, A., & Josman, Z. E. (2006). The relationship among emotional intelligence, task performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Human Performance*, 19, 403–419. doi:10.1207/s15327043hup1904_5
- Cartwright, S., & Pappas, C. (2007). Emotional intelligence, its measurement and implications for the workplace. *Journal of Management Reviews*, 10, 149–171.
- Cavallo, K., & Brienza, D. (2002). Emotional competence and leadership excellence at Johnson and Johnson: the emotional intelligence leadership study. Website: <http://www.eiconsortium.org>.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2013). Can you really improve your emotional intelligence? *Harvard Business Review*, 91, 37–41.
- Charbonneau, D., & Nicol, A. A. (2002). Emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviors in adolescents. *Psychological Reports*, 90, 361–370. doi:10.2466/pr0.2002.90.2.361
- Cherniss, C. (2010). Emotional intelligence: New insights and further clarifications. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3, 183–191. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2010.01222.x
- Childers, T. L., Dubinsky, A. J., & Skinner, S. J. (1990). Leadership substitutes as moderators of sales supervisory behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 21, 363–382. doi:10.1016/0148-2963(90)90022-6
- Ciarrochi, J. V., Chan, A. Y. C., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 539–561. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00119-1
- Cohen, A., & Abedallah, M. (2015). The mediating role of burnout on the relationship of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy with OCB and performance. *Management Research Review*, 38, 2–28. doi:10.1108/MRR-10-2013-023
- Day, A. L., & Carroll, S. A. (2004). Using an ability-based measure of emotional intelligence to predict individual performance, group performance, and group citizenship behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 1443–1458. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00240-X
- Dong, Y., Seo, M.-G., & Bartol, K. M. (2014). No pain, no gain: An affect-based model of developmental job experience and the buffering effects of emotional intelligence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57, 1056–1077. doi:10.5465/amj.2011.0687
- Eisengerg, N., Fabes, R. A., Guthrie, I. K., & Reiser, M. (2000). Dispositional emotionality and regulation: Their role in predicting quality of social functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 136–157. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.78.1.136
- Erez, A., & Isen, A. M. (2002). The influence of positive affect on the components of expectancy motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 1055–1067. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.6.1055
- Farh, C. I. C. C., Seo, M.-G., & Tesluk, P. E. (2012). Emotional intelligence, teamwork effectiveness, and job performance: The moderating role of job context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 890–900. doi:10.1037/a0027377
- Fernández-Berrocal, P., Cabello, R., Castillo, R., & Extremera, N. (2012). Gender differences in emotional intelligence: The mediating effect of age. *Behavioral Psychology*, 20, 77–89.
- Funderberg, S. A., & Levy, P. E. (1997). The influence of individual and contextual variables on 360-degree feedback system attitudes. *Group & Organization Management*, 22, 210–235. doi:10.1177/1059601197222005
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. P. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ for character, health and lifelong achievement*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Good, I. J., & Mittal, Y. (1987). The amalgamation and geometry of two-by-two contingency tables. *The Annals of Statistics*, 15, 694–711. doi:10.1214/aos/1176350369
- Grewal, D., & Salovey, P. (2005). Feeling smart: The science of emotional intelligence. *American Scientist*, 93, 330–339. doi:10.1511/2005.54.969

- Hair, J. F. Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hui-Hua, Z., & Schutte, N. S. (2015). Personality, emotional intelligence and other-rated task performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 87, 298–301. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2015.08.013
- Hoffi-Hostetter, H., & Mannheim, B. (1999). Managers' coping resources, perceived organizational patterns and responses during organizational recovery from decline. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 665–685. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199909)20:5<665::AID-JOB920>3.0.CO;2-V
- Hunter, J. E., & Hunter, R. F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternate predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 76, 72–93. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.96.1.72
- Jordon, P. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Hartel, C. E. J. (2002). Workgroup emotional intelligence: Scale development and relationships to team process effectiveness and goal focus. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 195–214. doi:10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00046-3
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluation traits — self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability — with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 80–92. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80
- Kelly, R., & Caplan, J. (1993). How Bell Labs creates star performers. *Harvard Business Review*, 71(4), 128–139.
- Kidder, D. L. (2002). The influence of gender on the performance of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 28, 629–648. doi:10.1177/014920630202800504
- Lam, L. T., & Kirby, S. L. (2002). Is emotional intelligence an advantage? An exploration of the impact of emotional and general intelligence on individual performance. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 142, 133–143. doi:10.1080/00224540209603891
- Lopes, P. N., Brackett, M. A., Nezlek, J. B., Schütz, A., Sellin, I., & Salovey, P. (2004). Emotional intelligence and social interaction. *Personality and Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1018–1034. doi:10.1177/0146167204264762
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey, & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3–31). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, 63, 503–517. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.63.6.503
- Motowidlo, S. J., & van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 475–480. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.475
- Ng, T. W. H., Lam, S. S. K., & Feldman, D. C. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behaviors: Do males and females differ? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 93, 11–32. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2015.12.005
- Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Eby, L. T. (2006). Locus of control at work: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 1057–1087. doi:10.1002/job.416
- Noe, R. A. (1988). Women and mentoring: A review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 65–78.
- Nystrom, P. C. (1983). Managers' salaries and their beliefs about reinforcement control. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 120, 291–292. doi:10.1080/00224545.1983.9713228
- Oliver, J., Jose, P. E., & Brough, P. (2006). Confirmatory factor analysis of the work locus of control scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 835–851. doi:10.1177/0013164405285544
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 43–72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 157–164. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.74.1.157
- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 262–270. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.82.2.262
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107–142. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513–563. doi:10.1177/014920630002600307
- Rice, C. L. (1999). *A quantitative study of emotional intelligence and its impact on team performance* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.
- Riggio, R. E., & Reichard, R. J. (2008). The emotional and social intelligences of effective leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23, 169–185. doi:10.1108/02683940810850808
- Rosete, D., & Ciarrochi, J. (2005). Emotional intelligence and its relationship to workplace performance of leadership of leadership effectiveness. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 26, 388–399. doi:10.1108/01437730510607871

- Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external locus of control of reinforcement. In J. Rotter, J. Chance., & E. J. Phares (Eds.), *Applications for a social learning theory of personality* (pp. 260–295). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Salovey, P., & Meyer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9, 185–211. doi:[10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG](https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG)
- Schutte, N. S., Schuettelpeiz, E., & Malouff, J. M. (2001). Emotional intelligence and task performance. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 20, 347–354. doi:[10.2190/J0X6-BHTG-KPV6-2UXX](https://doi.org/10.2190/J0X6-BHTG-KPV6-2UXX)
- Sharma, S., Durand, R. M., & Gur-Arie, O. (1981). Identification and analysis of moderator variables. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28, 291–300. doi:[10.2307/3150970](https://doi.org/10.2307/3150970)
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 655–663. doi:[10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.653)
- Spector, P. E. (1982). Behavior in organization as a function of employee's locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 482–497. doi:[10.1037/0033-2909.91.3.482](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.91.3.482)
- Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of work locus of control scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61, 335–340. doi:[10.1111/j.2044-8325.1988.tb00470.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1988.tb00470.x)
- Sternberg, R. J. (1996). *Successful intelligence*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Therese, H. M. L., & Trusty, S. K. T. (1996). Spector's Work Locus of Control Scale: Dimensionality and validity evidence. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56, 349–357. doi:[10.1177/0013164496056002016](https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164496056002016)
- Thory, K. (2016). Developing meaningfulness at work through emotional intelligence training. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 20, 58–77. doi:[10.1111/ijtd.12069](https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12069)
- Turnipseed, D. L., & Bacon, C. M. (2009). Relation of organizational citizenship behavior and locus of control. *Psychological Reports*, 105, 1–8. doi:[10.2466/PRO.105.3.857-864](https://doi.org/10.2466/PRO.105.3.857-864)
- Turnipseed, D. L., & VandeWaa, E. A. (2012). Relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 110, 899–914. doi:[10.2466/01.09.20.21.PRO.110.3.899-914](https://doi.org/10.2466/01.09.20.21.PRO.110.3.899-914)
- van der Linden, D., Tsaousis, I., & Petrides, K. V. (2012). Overlap between general factors of personality in the big five, giant three, and trait emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53, 175–179. doi:[10.1016/j.paid.2012.03.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.03.001)
- van Rooy, D. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (2004). Emotional intelligence: A meta-analytic investigation of predictive validity and nomological net. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 71–95. doi:[10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00076-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00076-9)
- Vandenberg, R. J., Lance, C. E., & Taylor, S. C. (2005). A latent variable approach to rating source equivalence: Who should provide ratings on organizational citizenship dimensions? In D. L. Turnipseed (Ed.), *A handbook on organizational citizenship behavior: A review of 'good soldier' activity in organizations* (pp. 291–330). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishing.
- VandeWaa, E. A., & Turnipseed, D. L. (2012). Emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior of university professors. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Science*, 6, 1–6. doi:[10.18848/1833-1882/CGP/v06i07/52115](https://doi.org/10.18848/1833-1882/CGP/v06i07/52115)
- Vesely, A. K., Saklofske, D. H., & Nordstokke, D. W. (2016). Program evaluation: Building teacher resilience through emotional intelligence training. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 101, 523–542. doi:[10.1016/j.paid.2016.05.336](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.05.336)
- Wagner, C. H. (1982). Simpson's paradox in real life. *The American Statistician*, 36, 46–48. doi:[10.1080/00031305.1982.10482778](https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.1982.10482778)
- Wang, Q., Bowling, N. A., & Eschleman, K. J. (2010). A meta-analytic examination of work and general locus of control. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 761–768. doi:[10.1037/a0017707](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017707)
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 601–617. doi:[10.1177/014920639101700305](https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305)
- Withey, M. J., & Cooper, W. H. (1989). Predicting exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 521–539. doi:[10.2307/2393565](https://doi.org/10.2307/2393565)
- Zammuner, V. L., Dionisio, D., Prandi, K., & Agnoli, S. (2013). Assessing and training leaders' emotional intelligence, and testing its influence on leaders' employees. *Journal of Management and Change*, 30, 145–165.