

The Effects of Transformational Leadership and Emotional Intelligence of Managers on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors of Employees

Ferit ÖLÇER¹
Margareta Stela FLORESCU²
Marian NĂSTASE³

Abstract

In today's turbulent environment, organizations needed leaders who were not only emotionally intelligent but those who had ability to imbibe such values in their followers that were helpful both for service climate and followers themselves. Existing literature suggested that Transformational Leadership (TL) and leader's Emotional Intelligence (EI) were likely to enhance Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in followers and significant predictors of OCBs. The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of TL and EI of managers on the dimensions of OCB employees display in manufacturing industry. A survey questionnaire was used to collect data from a sample of 60 dyads of employees and their supervisors (i.e., 120 respondents) in one large manufacturing company. SPSS was used for analyzing the data. In this study, separate regression analyses were conducted to examine the effects of TL and EI of managers on the dimensions of OCB. The results indicated that EI of managers had significant positive effects on OCB dimensions of altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, and civic virtue, but TL had no effects on the dimensions of OCB.

Keywords: Transformational leadership, emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, civic virtue

JEL classification: M10, M12

1. Introduction

OCB as a workplace construct attracted special attention in the previous studies as it has been found that OCBs make important contributions to individual, group and organizational effectiveness (Organ, et al., 2006) and help maximize the organizational performance of companies (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, et al., 2000; Organ and Ryan, 1995). OCBs are all discretionary behaviors that go beyond those measured by formal job evaluations, but are organizationally desirable because of

¹ **Ferit ÖLÇER**, Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Turkey, E-mail: folcer@hotmail.com, Tel: +9.0326.2455850, Fax: +9.0326.2455845.

² **Margareta Stela FLORESCU**, The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, E-mail: icefaceus@yahoo.com, Tel: +4.021.319.19.00, Fax: +4.021.319.18.99

³ **Marian NĂSTASE**, The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, E-mail: nastasem1@yahoo.com, Tel: +4.021.319.19.00, Fax: +4.021.319.18.99

their relationship with organizational effectiveness. So, it makes sense to investigate the variables that increase OCB in organizations (Podsakoff, et al., 2009). There has been considerable research enabling diverse understanding and interpretations of how various variables affect OCB (e.g., Podsakoff, et al., 2000). This understanding can help managers assess what kind of environment to provide their employees, and also what motivates and satisfies them. The effects of two factors, TL and EI, on develop of OCBs were examined in this study. One of the most important prediction and antecedent for followers' OCBs is TL (Podsakoff, et al., 2000; Krishnan and Arora, 2008). Several researchers (e.g., Podsakoff, et al., 1996) have argued that though the effects of TL on task performance are important, the effects of TL on extra-role behaviors, such as OCB, could be even more important. Possibly the most central tenet of TL is that it affects citizenship performance -transformational (and charismatic) leaders stimulate followers to engage in extra effort and to perform beyond expectations (Bass, 1985). On the other hand, EI of leaders enhances the OCBs of their followers (Podsakoff, et al., 2000; Modassir and Singh, 2008). So, EI is of greater significance for leaders than for other members of an organization (Goleman, 1996). Although the strong relationship between TL and OCB seems to be well-established, the underlying mechanisms of the effects of TL behaviors on OCBs have not been fully explored (Podsakoff, 2000). In addition, although academic research demonstrates the important role of EI in facilitating high employee performance and OCBs (Schutte, et al., 1998; Sitter, 2004) less is known about why an employee demonstrates OCBs. The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of TL and EI of managers on the dimensions of OCB. Thus, the following research questions were addressed with the proposed research model. (1) How do subordinate's perception of supervisor's TL relate to the dimensions of OCB? and (2) How do EI of managers relate to the dimensions of OCB? In order to fill the existing literature gap in research, this study developed a model to explain the separate effects of TL and EI of managers on the dimensions of OCB in food and beverage industry. This study can make some useful contributions to the body of knowledge on the existing OCB to theorizing about the effects of subordinates' perceptions of TL and EI of managers on OCBs in Turkish context. This study helped practitioners to adopt behavior which can help managers to increase their EI and in turn, enhance OCBs of subordinates. It is also hoped that the research findings may offer some insights to the food and beverage organizations in Turkey to better understand on how to increase EI of managers in attempting to enhance OCBs of employees.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

First concept of TL was the newest styles of leadership and it was emphasized and received considerable attention in business areas because of its positive effects on employees' behaviors and outcomes such as increased in-role performance and OCB (e.g., Podsakoff, et al., 1996). Bass (1985) defined TL as superior leadership performance that occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the

interests of their employees, and inspire followers to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group. TL emphasized the way leaders develop employees and affect employees' behaviors and attitudes through idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1994). The other construct of the present study was OCB. Organ (1988, p.4) defined OCB as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization." There was a lot of discussion about the dimensions of OCB in the literature. This study adopted the repertoire of Organ's initial definition of OCB with five dimensions (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, et al., 1990). 1) Altruism is the discretionary or voluntary behaviors that have the effect of helping a specific other person with a particular problem to complete his or her task under unusual circumstances. 2) Civic virtue relates to responsible or constructive involvement and interest in the governance issues and political process of the organization. 3) Conscientiousness refers to more "impersonal contributions to the organization" such as working long hours, efficient use of work time, excellent attendance and faithful adherence to organizational rules, regulations and policies about work procedures and conduct. 4) Courtesy refers to proactive behaviors aiming to help prevent work-related problems of coworkers. 5) Sportsmanship is defined as the behavior of not complaining when faced with inconveniences or impositions (Organ and Ryan, 1995). A variable that may account for OCB link is EI. Goleman (1996) has applied the EI concept to the workplace setting. He defined EI as to "the capacity for reorganizing our own feelings and those for others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotion well in ourselves and in our relationship" (Goleman, 1996). The scientific discussion on EI was first introduced by Salovey and Mayer (1990). They presented the ability model uses emotions for solving problems. They stated that EI involves the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to generate emotions so as to assist thought; the ability to understand emotions and emotional knowledge; and the ability to reflectively regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth."

2.1 TL and OCB

There are a number of theoretical statements suggesting that TL should increase the likelihood of citizenship behaviors by followers (Purvanova, et al., 2006). Bass (1985) claimed that transformational leaders motivate and inspire their followers to go beyond the call of duty so that they are willing to put in extra effort on the job, help their co-workers, and engage in other organizationally beneficial activities. On the other hand, several meta-analyses and reviews have reached consistent conclusions on the validity of the positive relationship between TL behaviors and work attitudes and organizational behaviors (e.g., Humphrey, 2012). TL qualities would help managers motivate and inspire their subordinates and encourage OCB (Krishnan and Arora, 2008). A leader who practices TL behaviors

to build employees' trust in him/her may produce followers who tend to engage in self-sacrificial behavior in the form of OCB (Wang, et al., 2005). A transformational leader's subordinates tend to identify strongly with their leader, which encourage them to engage in extra-role behavior (Bass 1985; Podsakoff, et al., 1996; Boerner, et al., 2008). Hence, there was a strong conceptual support for the notion that transformational leaders motivate their followers to exhibit extra-role behaviors. Moreover, the importance of leadership style as predictor of OCB has been well established in Western settings. In fact, previous studies have found a positive relationship between TL and OCB of employees (Bass, 1985; Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, et al., 1990; Wang, et al., 2005; Mackenzie, et al., 2001; Boerner, et al., 2008; Podsakoff, et al., 1996; Smith, et al., 1983; Krishnan and Arora, 2008; Kent and Chelladurai, 2001). A study conducted by Podsakoff, et al. (1990) in a petro-chemical organization in USA showed a positive correlation between TL dimensions and followers OCB of conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy and altruism. Since the discovery of these promising results, Podsakoff, et al. (2000) conducted a meta-analysis examining the effects of TL on OCB across studies. Results of this study again revealed that TL behaviors had consistent effects on every form of OCB. MacKenzie, et al. (2001) reported an average correlation between TL dimensions and the OCBs of helping, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. Smith, et al. (1983) found leader supportiveness was directly related to compliance (i.e., conscientiousness) and indirectly related to altruism. Similarly, Organ, et al. (2006) reported a positive relation between supportive leadership and different forms of OCB. Wang, et al. (2005) found that TL was positively related to OCBs of followers. Purvanova, et al. (2006) in their research also approved that TL increases the likelihood of subordinates' OCBs. Another study conducted by Piccolo and Colquitt (2006) reported a direct positive effect of TL on task performance and OCB. Connell (2005) found that subordinate reports of TL significantly correlated with four of the five supervisor-reported dimensions of OCB. Moreover, a study by Babcock-Roberson and Strickland (2010) showed a significant relationship between charismatic leader and OCB. Boerner, et al. (2008) found that there was a positive relationship between TL and OCB even though when the relationship was mediated with stressors. As suggested by Podsakoff, et al. (2000), these results should not come as a shock, as the central notion of TL is to encourage employees to perform above and beyond expectations. In general, the results of these researches suggested that increased levels of TL behaviors were associated with increased citizenship performance among subordinates. Thus, in light of the above theoretical and empirical context, it could be concluded that TL had more dominant impact in setting up the OCB and the positive effects of TL on the dimensions of OCB was expected. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed: H1: Subordinates' perceptions of supervisor's TL will have positive effects on the dimensions of OCB displayed by them.

2.2 EI and OCB

One of the internal factors that can affect OCBs within an organization directly and indirectly was EI of leaders. Research exploring the relationship between EI of managers and OCBs of employees in only just emerging with results to date was mixed (Schmidt, 2006; Sitter, 2004). Refler (2004) found that managers having a higher EI had employees who expressed a higher OCB and also the subordinates trusted their management style more. Iranzadeh and Amlashi (2012) found that there was a meaningful correlation between managers' EI and staffs' OCB. Kappagado (2011) found that EI of managers had a significant positive effect on OCBs of employees. Moghadasi, et al. (2011) indicated that there was a meaningful relationship between managers' EI and OCB. Furthermore, they stated that managers' EI factors, social awareness and relationship management have the most influence on personnel OCB. They demonstrated that academic heads reporting higher emotional intelligence results in higher levels of lecturers' extra effort. They also found that there was a positive between the academic heads self awareness, self management, social awareness, and social skills and extra effort of lecturers. Yunus, et al. (2010) suggested that others' emotional appraisal and regulation of emotion were the dimensions of EI that predicted employees' OCBs. Likewise, Yunus (2012) found that other's emotion appraisal and regulation of emotion has a positive influence on altruism and civic virtue respectively. Modassir and Singh (2008) found that EI of leaders enhances the OCBs of their followers. They stated that EI of managers was significantly and positively correlated to conscientiousness, civic virtue, and altruistic behaviors of followers. However, the two specific OCBs of followers driven by the EI of the leader were conscientiousness and altruism. Korkmaz and Arpacı (2009) found that there was a positive and significant relationship between emotional EI of leaders and OCBs of employees in Turkey. They concluded that EI of leaders can drive three specific factors of OCB, namely conscientiousness, altruism and civic virtue. Thus, leaders who were more EI would be able to inspire followers extra effort. Based on the review of literature and these arguments we expected that: H2: EI of managers will have positive effects on the dimensions of OCB subordinates display.

3. Research Method

3.1 Sample

This study used a survey research design by means of a structured questionnaire to collect the data. The research sample of this study was 60 dyads of employees and their supervisors (i.e., 120 respondents) belonged to a food and beverage manufacturing company located in Turkey. A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed to 90 supervisors and 110 subordinates in separate sets. Participation in the study was entirely voluntary and respondents' identities were anonymous and confidentiality of responses was assured. All of the randomly

selected respondents completed the questionnaires during normal working hours on company premises. Employees rated their supervisors' TL behaviors. Managers reported on OCBs of their subordinates and self reported EI. The individual response rates were approximately 68% for the supervisors and 59% for the subordinates. A total of 63% response sets were received. Finally, 60% of the overall response sets were found to be useable. Among the respondents, a predominant 91.7% were male and 8.3% were female. The age of the respondents varied from 20 to 50 years. The average age of respondents was 32.50 ± 6.35263 in this research. Education level of the respondents indicated the fact that most of them were less educated. 15% of the respondents had bachelor degree; 83.3% of them had an education level of high school or below, with an average organizational tenure of 4.5167 ± 3.88605 years. Regarding the marital status of the respondents, it was specified that 11 persons (18.3%) were single and 49 persons (81.7%) were married.

3.2 Instruments

The researcher used two survey questionnaires consisted of existing standardized scales as the primary research instrument to collect the data pertaining to the subordinates' perceptions of TL of their managers, self-perceptions of managers' EI and the managers' perceptions of OCBs of their subordinates. The questionnaires used 5-point Likert-type scales (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree) to measure all items of the following constructs. The most recent version of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) was used to measure TL style of managers (Bass and Avolio, 2004). TL behaviors of the managers were evaluated in terms of the view of their subordinates. Since there were different views about the dimensionality of TL, for the purpose of this study, TL was considered as a single construct in the analysis. Hence, we obtained an overall measure of TL by asking subordinates to respond to 20 items corresponding to the dimensions of TL using a four-item scale for each dimension. The TL mean score was obtained by averaging the 20 items. Higher scores indicated higher TL of managers. The Cronbach's alpha reliability of the total TL for the current study was .977. The concept of EI was measured by using Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test (SREIT) developed by Schutte, et al. (1998). It was based on Salovey and Mayer's (1990) original model of EI. It was a self-report instrument with 33 items and four scales used to assess EI. It designed to measure respondents' own perceptions about their EI. Thus, the managers self-rated own EI. In this study, only the EI mean score was used, which obtained by totaling the four EI component scores and dividing them by the number of components. A higher score indicated a higher level of EI for the managers concerned. The reliability coefficient alpha for total EI was .913. OCB scale developed by Podsakoff, et al. (1990) was used to measure contextual performance. The 24-items OCB scale was designed to measure the five dimensions of OCB proposed by Organ (1988) which were altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue. All five subscales had five

items except civic virtue, which had four items. Each manager provided ratings of their subordinates' OCBs. In the present study, the subscale scores for the five constructs were calculated by the averaged scores of each five dimensions. The internal reliability coefficient alpha for altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue in this study were .887, .826, .848, .890, and .856 respectively.

3.3 Data Analysis

Different statistical techniques using SPSS 16 were applied to analyze the data. The reliability analysis performed to assess the internal consistency of the measurement scales and Cronbach Alpha coefficients (α) of the scales were computed. Descriptive statistics such as mean scores and standard deviations were computed according to the studied variables. Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the associations among the variables. The primary data analysis technique used to test the research hypotheses was a series of regression analysis. Specifically, simple separate regression analyses were conducted to assess the effects of TL and EI on the five dimensions of OCB. Standardized beta was used for all of these regression analyses. Statistical significance was considered for p values less than .05.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis

The descriptive statistics and correlations among the study variables were presented in Table 1 with the Cronbach's alpha for scales shown on the diagonal. The descriptive statistics showed that mean score for TL was 3.28 (SD=1.23), indicating that the managers reflected a moderate degree of TL. The level of EI of managers was relatively high (M=3.90, SD=.46). This result provided many insights especially to the areas where the managers showed a high level of EI. As illustrated in Table 1, the mean scores on five OCB dimensions suggested that the employees in Turkey were highest on civic virtue dimension (M=3.91, SD=.78), indicating that they were responsibly involved in the issues of the organization. The mean value for courtesy was 3.89 (SD=.66), indicating that the employees took action to prevent problems for fellow associates. The mean score for altruism was 3.88 (SD=.84), indicating that the employees voluntarily helped co-workers with work issues. The mean value for conscientiousness was 3.88 (SD=.78), indicating that the employees consistently demonstrated good attendance, punctuality, and make productive use of their time at work. The scale with the lowest mean score was sportsmanship (M=3.72, SD=.93), indicating that the employees were willing to ignore minor personal inconveniences in order to accomplish tasks at hand.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and correlations among the studied variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
TL	3.28	1.23	.977						
EI	3.90	.46	-.16	.913					
Altruism	3.88	.84	.06	.62**	.887				
Courtesy	3.89	.66	-.08	.59**	.54**	.826			
Sportsmanship	3.72	.93	.05	.24	.17	.31*	.848		
Conscientiousness	3.88	.78	.01	.47**	.46**	.59**	.28*	.890	
Civic virtue	3.91	.78	.01	.46**	.43**	.64**	.35**	.61**	.856

Note: All items used a 5-point Likert scale with (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree).

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$ (2-tailed). Cronbach's alphas are shown on the diagonal.

Reliability analyses were also performed for each of the study scales. Cronbach's alpha coefficients of all scales used in this study were between .826 and .977. These results indicated that the internal consistency of all scales was robust. Hence, it could be concluded that the eight measures had the sufficient reliability. After the reliabilities were confirmed, the correlation between the dimensions of OCB and the complete scale of EI and TL were calculated. A two-tailed Pearson product-moment correlation was used to test the relationships among the variables. As shown in Table 1, the correlations among the four dimensions of OCB were significant and they were positive correlations with a range of .28 to .64. The results showed that EI, in line with expectations, was significantly and positively correlated with overall OCB ($r = .64$, $p < .01$) and its four dimensions, namely altruism ($r = .62$), courtesy ($r = .59$), conscientiousness ($r = .47$), and civic virtue ($r = .46$). All of these correlations were statistically significant with $p < .01$. This meant that if their supervisors had high EI, the subordinates exhibited high OCBs. On the other hand, sportsmanship dimension was not significantly correlated with EI ($r = .237$, $p > .05$). The results provided further initial support for the positive role of EI of leaders in employee demonstration of OCBs. However, TL had no significant correlations with the dimensions of OCB. Also, the correlation between TL and overall OCB was not significant. Furthermore, the result showed that managers' TL and their overall level of EI were not found to be significantly correlated ($p > .05$).

4.2. The Effect of TL on the Dimensions of OCB

In order to test H1 concerning the effects of the subordinates' perception of their leaders as transformational (i.e. TL) on their OCBs, five separate simple linear regression analyses were conducted. Thus, regression analysis was again carried out for each dimension separately and five dimensions of OCB separately regressed on TL (Table 2). For example, the first test included TL as the independent variable and altruism as the dependent variable or outcome. Separate coefficients for each equation should be estimated and tested.

Table 2. The results of the effects of TL on the dimensions of OCB

Independent Variable	Dependent Variables (Dimensions of OCB)				
	Altruism	Courtesy	Sportsmanship	Conscientiousness	Civic Virtue
TL	.06	-.08	.05	.01	.01
R	.060	.082	.052	.012	.013
R ²	.004	.007	.003	.000	.000
Adj. R ²	-.014	-.010	-.014	-.017	-.017
F	.211	.389	.160	.008	.010

Note: Standardized coefficients (β) are shown, * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

As shown in Table 2, overall, the results of separate five regression analyses indicated that TL had not significant effects on the five dimensions of OCB. In the separate simple linear regression, all models for predicting the dimensions of OCBs of employees based on TL were insignificant ($p > .05$). Therefore, H1 was totally rejected. Surprisingly, the results suggested that TL did not have significant relationships with the dimensions of OCB contrary to hypothesized relationship in this study. These results did not support the findings of previous studies that found significant positive relationship between TL and OCBs (Boerner, et al., 2008; Wang, et al., 2005; Mackenzie, et al., 2001; Podsakoff, et al., 1990, 1996, 2000; Bass, 1985; Organ, 1988; Purvanova, et al., 2006; Krishnan and Arora, 2008; Humphrey, 2012; Piccolo and Colquitt, 2006; Organ, et al., 2006). Nevertheless, this result was very consistent with some past studies (Modassir and Singh, 2008; Maharani, et al., 2013; Singh, 2007; Kent and Chelladurai, 2001; Yaghoubi, et al., 2010). They also found that TL did not predict the OCBs of followers. For example, Kent and Chelladurai (2001) investigated assistant directors of universities' athletic departments and did not find a relationship between TL and OCB. Modassir and Singh (2008) found that subordinate's perception of supervisor's transformational leadership was not related to the level of OCB displayed by them and they stated that perceived TL was not directly related to the OCBs of followers. Maharani, et al. (2013) suggested that TL has no direct effect on OCB. In study of Singh (2007), TL and OCBs of followers show no significant relationship, instead, results showed significant relationship of leaders' anchors with the OCBs of the followers. Consequently, the evidence of this study suggested that TL less effect on behavior in contributing a subordinate extra role. It should not be understood only in context of subordinates deficiency or weakness. TL implementation has not given assurances that subordinates effect to superiors automatically will be realized. It occurs because leadership will be effective if supported by behaviors competent as attention to subordinates, establishing good communication, empowering and developing employees, and motivating employees (Maharani, et al., 2013).

4.3 The Effect of EI of Managers on the Dimensions of OCB

Five separate simple regression analyses were performed on the five dimensions of OCB as dependent variables and EI of managers as independent variable to see if EI of managers enhances OCBs of the employees. As shown in Table 3, the results of first regression indicated that the managers' EI had a positive effect on altruism ($\beta=.62$, $p<.001$). EI of managers could significantly explain 38.3% of variances in the level of altruism behaviors of employees. Moreover, the model for predicting altruism based on EI was significant ($F=35.947$, $p<.001$). The results revealed that EI of managers had a positive effect on courtesy ($\beta=.59$, $p<.001$). This second regression model was also significant ($F=15.632$, $p<.001$), accounting for 34.8% of the variance of courtesy behaviors of employees. In the third regression equation, the results indicated that the EI of managers had not a significant effect on sportsmanship ($\beta=.24$, *ns*). This regression model was not significant and EI did not contribute significant amount of variance in sportsmanship behaviors of employees ($R^2=.056$, $F=3.442$, $p>.05$). Fourthly, conscientiousness regressed on EI of managers. According to the results, EI of managers had positive effect on conscientiousness ($\beta=.47$, $p<.001$) and could significantly explain the variance in conscientiousness behaviors of employees ($R^2=.222$, $F=16.597$, $p<.001$). Finally, we explored the effect of EI of managers on civic virtue. The final regression model indicated that EI of managers had positive effect on civic virtue ($\beta=.46$, $p<.001$). EI of managers contribute significant amount of variance in civic virtue behaviors of employees ($R^2=.212$). This regression model was also significant ($F=15.632$, $p<.001$).

Table 3. The results of the effects of EI of managers on the dimensions of OCB

Independent Variable	Dependent Variables (Dimensions of OCB)				
	Altruism	Courtesy	Sportsmanship	Conscientiousness	Civic Virtue
EI	.62***	.59***	.24	.47***	.46***
R	.619	.590	.237	.472	.461
R ²	.383	.348	.056	.222	.212
Adj. R ²	.372	.337	.040	.209	.199
F	35.947***	31.023***	3.442	16.597***	15.632** *

Note: Standardized coefficients (β) are shown, * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$.

The results of the separate regression analyses revealed that EI of managers had significant positive effects on the altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, and civic virtue behaviors of the employees. Based on the results, H2 was accepted, except for sportsmanship. The result of this study was in line with the finding of previous research (Iranzadeh and Amlashi, 2012; Modassir and Singh, 2008; Moghadasi, et al., 2011; Yunus, et al., 2010; Yunus, 2012; Refler, 2004; Korkmaz

and Arpacı, 2009). They unambiguously indicated a positive relationship between EI of managers and OCBs of employees. Similar results were also observed by Solan (2008) who has found that leader's EI had positive impact on employees' OCBs. On the contrary, a study conducted by Sitter (2004) disagrees with the results of current study. Based on the research, Sitter (2004) stated that the level of EI had a positive but did not have a much significant factor to OCB. The differing results could be due to the nature and size of the sample. The results of this study revealed that the more positive relationship of EI of managers with altruism, the higher the level of helping behaviors between the employees. This finding implied that employees who have emotionally intelligent managers will display higher levels of altruistic behavior. Indeed, EI helps the managers to comprehend and perceive their employees' emotions and subsequently express more suitable response than managers with lower EI because of their ability to easily shift from negative to positive moods. The result also revealed that EI of managers increased the level of courtesy of the employees in the organization. Thus, when the managers had high level of EI in the workplace their employees' courtesy behaviors increased and the employees treated their colleagues with more respect and avoided making problems in the workplace. The results further indicated that employees do care for their colleagues and will lend a helping hand as and when required. This would affect the work environment in a positive way where the problems would increase between the staff and the productivity would decrease. In addition, the results revealed that EI of managers was found to have a positive relationship with the conscientiousness of employees. This meant that when the level of EI of managers was high in any organization the level of employees' adherence to rules regarding attendance, punctuality, use of time, and respect for organizational assets and resources will increase. Accordingly, employees who have managers with high EI tend to think carefully before acting and highly adhere to the organization's rules and regulations. The results suggested that the higher the level of EI of managers, the better would be the level of civic virtue of employees in the organization. Accordingly, the employees who have emotionally intelligent managers do care for their organizational assets and try to safeguard them at their utmost. On the other hand, the results of this study indicated that EI of managers had not a effect on the sportsmanship of the subordinates. It could be said that sportsmanship behaviors of the employees will not be affected by the level of EI of their managers. This was a unique finding of the subordinates of organization that further need to be explored in depth. Generally, the present study suggested that increased levels of EI of managers were associated with increased citizenship performance among subordinates. Managers who can identify and manage their own emotions and those of others create more sincere and helpful followers in their organizations. It is important to try to increase the level of security and stability as much as possible by increasing the EI of leaders and build trust in their employees.

Conclusions

This study aimed to display and address the effects of TL and EI of managers on OCBs of the employees in manufacturing industry. The results of this study suggested that subordinate's perception of supervisor's TL had not significant effects on the level of OCBs displayed them. Thus, this finding implied that TL was not an important variable for predicting and understanding OCBs of employees. In addition, this finding provided important evidence for the notion that the relationship between perceptions of TL and OCB may not be direct in nature. Accordingly, this study succinctly suggested that dispositional variables, and not leadership behavior, related significantly to followers' OCBs. Further research was required to confirm this deduction. On the other hand, the study presented empirical evidence on EI of managers had significant positive effects on several OCBs of the employees. Specifically, the findings suggested that the four specific OCBs of employees' driven by the EI of managers were altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, and civic virtue. This finding implied that EI of managers made significant separate contributions to the prediction of OCBs. Accordingly, the managers with high EI tended to have subordinates who were more willing to help others, care for other, adhere to rules, and exhibit civic virtue. This was also because the emotionally intelligent leader was able to monitor his or her own behavior and understood those of his or her followers, thus enhancing the extra role behavior of the employees of the organization. Only when they felt that the leader understood their needs would the followers be willing to give their best to the organization. As a result, the current study supported this idea that organizations should focus on those managers who have high level of EI traits. The literature suggested that the managers can develop and strengthen EI and in doing so, can more likely increase the OCBs of employees. Ultimately, whatever the managers' emotional capabilities are increased in individual and social dimensions will be followed by promotion of extra-role behaviors of employees in the organization. Indeed, individuals with high EI have the capability of recognizing their sensations and perception of their impact, identification of themselves' strengths and limitations, and also more appropriate understanding of individual values and capabilities. Moreover, high EI strengths the accuracy in self-evaluation in managers so that they cause the development of appropriate communications with the others, appropriate control of behavior, comfort with working conditions and consequently promotion of extra-role and citizenship behaviors of employees in organization. Thus, if leaders are trained in EI and those skills are fostered, they will be more likely to increase the OCBs, further resulting in organizational effectiveness. Managers may develop their skills for effective leadership by acquiring knowledge of their own weakness and strengths regarding the EI field along with improving TL style. So, organizations can benefit from this knowledge in their favor and by persuading the EI, promote the purposeful behavior of their organization. Accordingly, organizations need to give importance to EI of managers for enhancing positive outcomes like OCBs of employees. Many

practitioners and scholars believe that EI can be improved upon through development and training programs. The current study provided important theoretical contributions extending the OCB literature in a non-Western context. The study provided scope for further research on the relationship between TL, EI of managers and OCBs of followers in the context of manufacturing industry in a developing country, Turkey. Essentially, the study demonstrated the enormous effect the EI of managers had on follower behavior at the work place, hence providing support for a key theoretical proposition of EI theory. In other words, the study confirmed the importance of EI in enhancing OCB and supported literature. The findings of this study were important because they provided a better understanding of how EI of managers may facilitate positive and prevent negative employee OCBs in manufacturing organizations. On the other hand, the current study had a number of practical implications for managers, leaders and organizations. From a practical perspective, this study provided some considerable insights and guidelines to help managers to better understand how to enhance OCBs of employees by increasing the EI of their managers. In organization mostly managers are not aware about effect of EI that leads toward job performance. This research would help understand this missing link. It was thus learned that EI was required to be possessed at least to enhance extra role behaviors of employees. Organizations can use this knowledge to their advantage. Further, it would be useful for academicians and corporate managers; they would be able to use the finding to understand employees' behaviors towards organization and involvement in in-role and extra-role performances. Accordingly, organizations should choose individuals with higher EI to be managers because it affects managers' success and the questionnaires designed in the field should be used to accomplish it. Organizations should use EI as an index to alter managers or promote them in the organization. It was recommended that management should enhance EI of leaders and organizations should embrace EI to bring about OCBs of employees. Also, it is suggested that organizations' managers to pay more attention to recognition and reinforcement of their own EI. On the other hand, managers need to employ several strategies that would move employees into OCB. By encouraging EI, they could enhance the desirable role behavior in the employees of their organization. Managers who are involved in social interaction need EI competency to work effectively in a social setting. Therefore, developing those competencies might help staff to improve work performance, such as, maintaining high standards in the organization and producing not only the brightest employees but also those sought and employable for the industry. Accordingly, management who want to increase OCBs of employees need to take steps to understand factors influencing EI of the managers. Organizations concerned with raising the level of OCBs in their employees could start by educating organization managers about the importance of EI of leaders to OCBs of employees. Thus, organizations should develop programs for the managers' EI ability and employees' OCB. Organizations tried to design EI training courses for their managers, as well as by organizations wishing to increase their staff OCBs. Thus, organizations can use EI to increase and emerge OCB by

staffs which results in achieving the effective organizational performance. There were some limitations in the study. This study designed two separate questionnaires to collect data from multiple sources in order to reduce the risk of common method variance. The researchers suggest EI may be better suited to self-evaluation since only an individual knows his/her own true feelings, however, the evaluation of TL characteristics, which are primarily visible to others though observation may be best suited to others rating a leader's ability. Therefore, in this study, the ratings for TL were the subordinates' perceptions while OCBs of subordinates were the perceptions of the superiors. Thus, the present findings did not affected by common method variance. However, the small data sample of only 60 dyads of managers and their supervisors (i.e., 120 respondents) was an area of caution. Thus the sample size was not adequate to get more significant results. It may limit the ability to generalize the results. Therefore, future researchers should use larger sample size in order to receive more precise and also accurate results. The study cannot be generalized because the sample was chosen only from a particular organization. Further, the research conducted in Turkey may differ from different countries with different cultural environment. This study was purely quantitative using questionnaires and statistical evidence. More experimental approaches should also be used, allowing more insight regarding the issue of causality. Longitudinal research design provided additional and stronger support for the effects tested in this study. In addition, the study adopted the overall TL and EI and did not include the dimensions of them in research model. In other words, there were many styles of leadership but this study only take TL style. This study should be viewed as a first step for future research that would be extended to employ different facets of TL. Thus, future research should employ a multi-dimensional measure of TL and EI and evaluate the possible effects of the different dimensions of TL and EI on OCBs of employees, which would contribute to the existing literature. Consequently, the model proposed here was an initial step, which need to be improved by future researches. It further suggested that additional research was needed to ascertain the relationship between TL and OCBs.

References

1. Babcock-Roberson, M.E. and Strickland, O.J., 2010. "The relationship between charismatic leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors". *Journal of Psychology*, 144(3), pp. 313-326.
2. Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J., 2004. *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (3rd ed.), CA: Mindgarden, Redwood.
3. Boerner, S., Dutschke, E. and Wied, S., 2008. "Charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: Examining the role of stressors and strain". *Human Resource Development International*, 11(5), pp. 507-521.
4. Connell, P.W., 2005. *Transformational leadership, leader-member exchange, and OCB: The role of motives*. Doctorate dissertation, University of South Florida.

5. Goleman, D., 1996. *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam, USA libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria, pp.1-16.
6. Humphrey, A.M., 2012. *Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors: The role of organizational identification*. Master Thesis, Emporia State University.
7. Iranzadeh, S. and Amlashi, M.K., 2012. *Managers' emotional intelligence and its role in improving organizational citizenship behavior of staffs* (Case study: Eastern Azerbaijan State Water and Waste Water Company, 9(2), 54-63.
8. Kent, A. and Chelladurai, P., 2001. "Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics". *Journal of Sport Management*, 15(2), pp. 135-159.
9. Korkmaz, T. and Arpacı, E. (2009). "Relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with emotional intelligence". *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), pp. 2432-2435.
10. Krishnan, V.R. and Arora, P., 2008. "Determinants of transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior". *Asia-Pacific Business Review*, 4(1), pp. 34-43.
11. MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. and Rich, G.R., 2001. "Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance". *Academy of Marketing Science Journal*, 29(2), pp. 115-134.
12. Maharani, V., Troena, E.A. and Noermijati, 2013. "Organizational citizenship behavior role in mediating the effect of transformational leadership, job satisfaction on employee performance". *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(17), pp. 1-12.
13. Mayer, J., Salovey, P. and Caruso, D., 2004. "Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications". *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), pp. 197-216.
14. Mayer, J.D. and Salovey, P., 1997. "What is emotional intelligence?" In P. Salovey and D. Sluyter (Eds). *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Implications for Educators* (pp. 3-31), New York: Basic Books.
15. Modassir, A. and Singh, T., 2008. "Relationship of emotional Intelligence with transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior". *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(1), pp. 3-21.
16. Moghadasi, M., Hamidizadeh, A. and Chavoshi, S.M.H., 2011. "Emotional intelligence factors role in forecasting personnel: Organizational citizenship behavior". *Police Human Development*, 8(34), pp. 89-120.
17. Organ, D.W., 1988. *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
18. Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M. and MacKenzie, S.B., 2006. *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences* (1st ed.). USA: SAGE Publications Inc. California.
19. Organ, D. and Ryan, K., 1995. "A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior". *Personal Psychology*, 48, pp. 775-802.

20. Piccolo, R.F. and Colquitt, J.A., 2006. "Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics". *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), pp. 327-340.
21. Podsakoff, N.P., Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P.M. and Blume, B.D., 2009. "Individual - and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, pp. 122-141.
22. Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B. and Bommer, W.H., 1996. "Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational behavior citizenship behaviors". *Journal of Management*, 22(2), pp. 259-298.
23. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H. and Fetter, R. 1990. "Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors". *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), pp. 107-142.
24. 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), pp. 513-563.
25. Purvanova, R.K., Bono, J.E. and Dzieweczynski, J., 2006. "Transformational leadership, job characteristics, and organizational citizenship performance". *Human Performance*, 19(1), pp. 1-22.
26. Refler, S.V., 2004. *The effects of a leader's emotional intelligence on employees trust in their leader and employee organizational citizenship behavior*, Doctorate Thesis, Regent University.
27. Salovey, P. and Mayer, J., 1990. "Emotional intelligence". *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9(3), pp. 1185-1211.
28. Schutte, N., Malouff, J., Hall, L., Haggerty, D., Cooper, J. and Golden, C., 1998. "Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence". *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25(2), pp. 167-177.
29. Singh, T., 2007. *Relationship of leaders' career anchors with transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior of followers*, Working Paper No.261, Indian Institute of Management Bangalore.
30. Sitter, V.L., 2004. *The effects of a leader's emotional intelligence on employees' trust in their leader and employee organizational citizenship behaviors*, (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
31. Smith, C.A., Organ D.W. and Near J. (1983). "Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), pp. 653-663.
32. Solan, A.M., 2008. *The relationships between emotional intelligence, visionary leadership, and organizational citizenship behavior in continuing higher education*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Regent University, Virginia.

33. Wang, H., Law, K.S., Hackett, R.D., Wang, D. and Chen, Z.X., 2005. "Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior". *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), pp. 420-432.
34. Yaghoubi, N.M., Moghaddami, M., Kaikha, A., 2010. "A Survey of the relationship between transformational leadership and staff organizational citizenship behavior". *Transformational Management Journal*, 2(4), pp. 64-96.
35. Yunus, N.H., 2010. *The influence of supervisors' emotional intelligence on non bank supervisory employees' organizational citizenship behavior*. Paper Presented in International Conference (CSSR) on 5-7 December, pp. 663-667.
36. Yunus, N.H., 2012. "Displaying employees' organizational citizenship behaviour: The impact of emotional intelligence and leader-member exchange in development bank in Malaysia". *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 2(4), pp. 344-349.