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Abstract

The concept of emotional intelligence (EI) proposes that intelligence and emotion act in interactive and integrated way. People can solve technical problems far easier than human problems in their personal, home and professional lives, which illustrates the vital role of EI in their lives in general and at workplace in particular. The current dissertation investigated the moderating role of job characteristics in relation to emotional intelligence and performance. Employees’ EI was measured by utilizing a 33 items scale, while performance was assessed through a 16 items scale that measured their organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The study comprised of two phases; a pilot study and the main study. For the main study, questionnaires were completed by 444 participants employed in private sector organizations. The moderating role of job characteristics was assessed by applying general linear model analysis and step-wise multiple regression analysis. Results showed a positive association between emotional intelligence and performance. It was established that employees’ performance can be significantly predicted based upon their EI scores. It was established further that job characteristics like autonomy and internal interaction moderate the EI-performance relationship. The predictive ability of EI for performance suggests the use of the EI measure as a selection tool by the human resource managers and its potential as a proactive measure to reduce employee turnover.

Key words: Occupational Psychology, Organizational Behavior, Human Resource Management, Employee Selection, Moderating Role, Emotional Intelligence, Job Performance, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Job Characteristics, Autonomy, Internal Interaction, External Interaction
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION
Introduction

Besides the ability of people to receive external stimuli through the five senses, human bodies respond internally by receiving and understanding information through affective states like emotions and feelings. Accessing internal reactions and combining them with intellect makes one more engaged and authentic. People are more confident to take decisions because they are not relying solely on judgment, intellectual ability or memory (Fuimano, 2004). For instance, in addition to one’s understanding and knowledge in a field, the selection of a research topic is usually based upon the emotions of joy, happiness and excitement that one goes through while working at the task. So, emotional intelligence (EI) is the ability to synthesize cognition and emotion in order to facilitate thinking, understanding, and behavior to comprehend and deal with the environmental/situational demands.

Generally, people can solve technical problems far easier than human problems they face in home as well as professional life (Mayer & Ciarrochi, 2006, p. xiii). At the workplace, human resource managers have started assessing employee performance not only by the outputs delivered (‘what’ performance), but also how effectively they deal with colleagues and staff (the ‘how’ of performance). It may be common for managers to have ‘what’ but not ‘how’ skills. For example, an architect may design complex structures very persistently and manage to produce business outputs, but may be ineffective at managing the subordinates, leading to staff turnover, dissatisfaction and poor performance (Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005). To realize the full range of capabilities and core competencies of human resources, strategic human resource managers should not focus narrowly on task performance while designing employee performance
management systems. They should emphasize the employee development rather than control, and should consider judgments from all sides about employees’ actual and potential contributions in the supporting performance domains of citizenship, emotions, and ethics (Wong & Snell, 2003). Branham (2005, p. 19) categorized the comments of 3,149 employees who voluntarily left their employers and found that very few of the ‘reasons’ for turnover were based on reasoned thinking—they were mostly rooted in strong feelings.

The most important dependent variable in industrial/organizational psychology is job performance. In the work setting, employees pursue organizational goals in a logical and rational manner, and emotional behavior is seldom incorporated into this equation. But emotions like anger and jealousy often push aside logic and rationality in the work environment. Managers use fear, pride and other emotions to both treat and motivate their subordinates (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2004, p. 171). Research has shown that 36% of variance in individual success in organizational setting is explained through emotional intelligence (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000). The EI-Performance link also seems logical because increasingly, the employers are considering the applicants’ EI during the recruitment and selection processes (Cadman & Brewer, 2001).

Job characteristics theory is a popular and important tool for designing the jobs to enhance employee performance, motivation and satisfaction; and to reduce absenteeism, stress and turnover by enriching jobs (Martocchio, 2007, p. 25).

Service businesses have to face a challenge of tremendous operational variability that is foreign to manufacturers, because customers are directly involved in ongoing operations. In large part, customers judge the quality of their experience part by how
much of the variability they introduce is accommodated, so the choice to reduce or rule out the variability is eliminated (Frei, 2006). Such dynamics of service firms makes it necessary for employees to be capable of handling the customers by accommodating the wide variety of requests made to the company. For service firms, the only strategy to retain their intellectual capital is to hire and keep good employees (McShane & Glinow, 2005, p. 25) who can serve the varying demands of customers.

According to Oginska-Bulik (2005) the incorporation of the EI questionnaires into a battery of tests used in recruitment and selection procedures might be a promising tool to improve the predictive validity of the selection method. Carmeli (2003) found a direct and significant relationship between emotional intelligence and withdrawal intentions from the organization; this intensifies the important role that emotional intelligence may have in retaining valuable organization members.

The ability to effectively deal with emotions and emotional information in the workplace helps employees to manage occupational stress and maintain psychological well-being (Ciarrochi & Scott, 2006). Thus the objective of stress reduction and health protection can be achieved not only by decreasing work demands (stressors) but also by increasing the personal resources of employees, including emotional intelligence (Oginska-Bulik, 2005). In a sluggish economy, get smart techniques like quality management, re-engineering and customer relationship management have reached maximum effectiveness. Careers that develop solely on the use of logical and analytical skills have a difficult time in this volatile business environment (James & LaMotta, 2002). Myers and Tucker (2005) concluded that as a theoretical model EI promotes both intrapersonal and interpersonal communication skills as a means for understanding the
role of emotions in the workplace. An organization can reap the benefits of having emotionally intelligent employees in two ways. The managers will have a workforce willing to work with passion and employees will have managers very receptive and open to their needs (Johnson & Indvik, 1999).

The above discussion highlights the importance of employees’ emotional intelligence to understand and deal with work related problems, to perform effectively; and to succeed in the fast changing work environment. On the other hand, employers require their employees to be emotionally intelligent to serve customers in a better way and to create and maintain a lively work environment. They need to assess employees’ EI to facilitate their recruitment, selection, promotion and retention decisions. Employers can also opt to reduce employees’ occupational stress by enhancing their EI; this suggests that emotional intelligence is an important construct to be studied in relation to performance. Moreover, job characteristics can be used as an important motivational approach for work design particularly for individual based jobs that involve higher interaction with internal or external customers; for instance jobs in telecom, banking, leasing and insurance industries. Research suggests that job characteristics moderate the personality-performance relationship and are found to be directly linked with performance. Hence, in the current study the moderating role of job characteristics for emotional intelligence and performance was examined.

The following section addresses in detail the nature of emotions, intelligence, emotional intelligence and historical perspective on EI. It also describes the dynamics of job performance and job characteristics and closes with a statement of the problem, the objectives of the study and its significance.
Emotions

Usually, people like to think of themselves as rational beings while satisfying their motives in an intelligent way. To a certain extent that is true, but humans are also emotional beings. Most of the affairs of everyday life are colored with feelings, moods and emotions like joy and sorrow, love and fear, happiness and sadness, without which life would be monochrome and monotonous (Morgan, King, Weisz, & Schopler, 1988, p. 310). In addition, people vary in their natural ability to express intensity of emotional states; there are individuals who never show their feelings whereas some people seem to be on an emotional roller coaster (Robbins, 2001, p. 109).

The word emotion has been derived from motere, the Latin verb ‘to move’ plus the prefix ‘e’ to imply ‘move away’, suggesting that a drive to act is implicit in every emotion (Goleman, 1995, p. 6). Research shows that emotions, as much as or more than mind, contain one’s history – every chapter and verse of every experience, deep understanding and relationship in one’s life (Cooper, 1997, p. 35). The brain has two memory systems: one for ordinary facts and one for emotionally charged ones. The hippocampus is crucial in identifying a face, such as that of one’s cousin. But it is the amygdala that signals that one doesn’t like him/her. It seems to imprint in memory most moments of emotional arousal with an added degree of strength - that is why people retain detailed information about their first date, a crucial match, a fearful event and the like. This makes sense and ensures that we have particularly clear memories of what makes us happy, excited and threatened (Goleman, 1995, pp. 23-24). Emotions are psychological and physiological episodes experienced toward an object, person or event that create a state of readiness (McShane & Glinow, 2005, p. 110). Psychologists draw a
distinction between felt and displayed emotions (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2004, p. 172). For instance, a person may feel angry (felt emotion) toward a rude colleague but does not pass a severe remark in return (displayed emotions).

Emotions are distinct from moods. Emotions are brief events or episodes directed toward someone or something and are felt both psychologically and physiologically, while moods are less intentional states that are not directed toward anything particular (McShane & Glinow, 2005, p. 110). Emotions can turn into moods when one loses focus on the contextual object (Robbins, 2001, p. 106). Indeed the helplessness experienced at the hands of emotions and moods is due, in part, to the fact that feelings occur after the fact. What is felt is the outcome of changes that have already begun, and continue to unfold. Feeling emotions and moods gives one back a measure of control and provides information about what is going on in the body and brain (Sizer, 2006).

A variety of emotions are experienced in work, as well as routine, settings. However, scholars have clustered all emotions into six primary categories; namely, anger, fear, joy, love, sadness and surprise. For example, alarm and anxiety cluster together to form the primary emotional category called fear (McShane & Glinow, 2005, p. 111).

**Intelligence**

Intelligence may be defined as the capacity to understand the world, think rationally, and use resources effectively when faced with challenges (Feldman, 2003, p. 229). A principal question addressed by researchers is whether intelligence is a unitary factor or it is made up of multiple components. Early psychologists interested in intelligence assumed that there was a single general factor for mental ability known as ‘g’, or the ‘g-factor’. This general intelligence factor was deemed to underlie
Moderating Role of Job Characteristics

performance on every aspect of intelligence (Feldman, 2003, p. 235). However, more recently, some psychologists have proposed that there are certainly two different kinds of intelligence namely fluid intelligence and crystallized intelligence. Fluid intelligence reflects information processing capabilities, reasoning and memory. While crystallized intelligence is the accumulation of information, skills and strategies that people have learned through experience and that they can apply in problem solving situations (Feldman, 2003, p. 235).

**Emotional Intelligence**

People might take the term Emotional Intelligence (EI) as oxymoron because intelligence implies rational thinking which is devoid of emotions (Caruso, Dulewicz, Higgs, & Chapman, 2001). On the other hand, the concept of emotional intelligence conveys a quite different meaning. In understanding the relation between cognition and emotion, the distinct contribution of emotional intelligence is to see thought and emotion adaptively, intelligently and as intertwined. The concept of emotional intelligence proposes that intelligence may understand emotion, and that emotion may facilitate intelligence (Mayer & Ciarrochi, 2006, p. xv). Intelligence may understand emotions of others through their emotional expressions because there is a subjective element to emotions. What is felt and displayed is a feature of emotion; it is what people show (Fineman, 2003, p. 8). A manager who often expresses hostility towards subordinates but flatters his boss is perceived in a certain way by the subordinates (Morgan et al., 1988, pp. 310-311). People identify emotions in others from many sources such as voice, tone, context, verbal language and non verbal body language especially facial expressions. For example, screams indicate fear or excitement, groans denote unhappiness, weep denotes
sorrow, and laughter denotes enjoyment. Many emotions that are not so expressive can be judged easily; for example, anxiety shown through body language such as clenched hands, arms held across the abdomen, or hunched carriage and facial expressions (Lieberman, n.d.). Several studies have shown that people can make accurate judgments of the emotions being expressed by actors in posed photographs (Morgan et al., pp. 311-313). Additionally, Elfenbein (2006) concluded that training in recognizing emotions in facial expressions improves the accuracy of judgments.

On the other hand, emotions may facilitate intelligence. A research study asserted that emotions such as happiness, anger and disgust encourage more heuristic processing, such as relying on the expertise of a source of communication when evaluating arguments, while emotions like sadness and fear promote more careful, systematic styles of thinking (Tiedens & Linton, 2001). Barsade (2002) concluded that emotional contagion does occur in groups and one can influence and thus change the moods of others and, consequently, their judgments and behaviors. The study also showed that positive emotional contagion lead to greater cooperativeness, less group conflict and greater individual task performance.

Our bodies are means for receiving and comprehending information, and emotionally intelligent people are good at acknowledging, processing, and responding to their bodies and emotions efficiently and effectively. Accessing the knowledge in body and marrying it with mind makes people more engaged, authentic and confident (Fuimano, 2004). Therefore, emotional information plays an essential role in their business, home and personal lives, since the relationships people form are regulated by the rules of behavior that are triggered by the emotions (Mayer & Caruso, 2002).
The history of emotional intelligence can be traced back to the work of Aristotle who identified such ability and described it in these words: “Anyone can get angry – that is easy. But to be angry with the right person, to the right degree, at the right time, for the right purpose, and in the right way – this is not easy” (Goleman, 1995, p. ix). Also, it can be traced back to social intelligence theory expounded by Throndike (1920, p. 228) who defined social intelligence as “the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls - to act wisely in human relations”.

**Gardner’s Theory of Multiple Intelligences**

Howard Gardner, a Harvard psychologist, claimed that instead of asking “How smart are you?” it is better to ask a different question “How are you smart?” (Feldman, 2003, p. 235). To answer the latter question, Gardner proposed the model of multiple intelligences in his book *Frames of Mind* (Gardner, 1983). He floated the idea that there was not just one kind of intelligence that was crucial for life success, but a wide spectrum of intelligences with seven key varieties (Goleman, 1995, p. 40). The spectrum of intelligences is given as under (as cited in Feldman, 2003, p. 236):

**Verbal/Linguistic Intelligence**

It covers the production of language, abstract reasoning, symbolic thinking, conceptual patterning, reading and writing.

**Logical/Mathematical Intelligence**

It is the capacity to recognize patterns, work with abstract symbols and perceive relationships or see connections between separate and distinct pieces of information.

**Visual/Spatial Intelligence**

This intelligence includes visual arts, navigation, mapmaking, architecture and games requiring the ability to visualize objects from different perspectives and angles.
**Bodily/Kinesthetic Intelligence**

It is the ability to use body to express emotion, to play a game and to create a new product.

**Musical/Rhythmic Intelligence**

It deals with the capacities such as recognition and use of rhythmic and tonal patterns and sensitivity to sounds from the environment, human voice and musical instruments.

**Interpersonal Intelligence**

It is the ability to work cooperatively with others in a small group, as well as the ability to communicate verbally and nonverbally with other people.

**Intrapersonal Intelligence**

It deals with the internal aspects of the self, such as knowledge of feelings, range of emotional responses, thinking processes, self-reflection, and a sense of intuition about spiritual realities.

In his theory of multiple intelligences, Gardner included the concept of social intelligence or personal intelligence as one of the seven intelligence domains and asserted that it encompasses a person’s interpersonal intelligence and intrapersonal intelligence. Gardner and his associates could not catch the idea of emotional intelligence in this theory, as they failed to pursue in great detail the role of feelings in these intelligences and focused more on cognitions about feeling. This focus left unaddressed the rich sea of emotions that makes the inner life and relationships very complex and compelling. The area remained unexplored both in the sense in which there is intelligence in the emotions and the sense in which intelligence can be brought to emotions (Goleman, 1995, p. 43).
Salovey and Mayer’s Theory of Emotional Intelligence

Gardner’s preconception of cognitive elements in the personal intelligences manifests the zeitgeist of psychology that shaped its prospects. Psychology’s overemphasis on cognition is due to its importance in the development of that science. In the mid of 20th century, academic psychology was being dominated by behaviorists like B. F. Skinner who felt that only behavior that could be seen objectively, from the outside, could be studied with scientific accuracy. Such presumption of behaviorists made inaccessible for study all inner life, including emotions. With the arrival of the cognitive revolution in 1960s, the focus of psychological science turned to how the mind registers and stores information, and the nature of intelligence. However, emotions still were not studied. The cognitive scientists represented the idea that emotions have no place in intelligence and it only mixes up the mental life. They could not recognize that rationality is guided by, and can be swamped by, feelings that bring flavor to the intellect. Now psychology has started to accept the essential role of feelings in thinking and it recognizes the power and virtues as well as dangers of emotions in mental life (Goleman, 1995, pp. 43-44).

Salovey and Mayer (1990, p. 189) coined the term emotional intelligence, describing it as “the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and action”. Later they accommodated the four abilities of perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions in the definition (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The four branch model of emotional intelligence (Salovey & Grewal, 2005) is described as under:
Perceiving Emotions

It is the ability to detect and decipher emotions in faces, pictures, voices and cultural artifacts. Also it incorporates the ability to identify one’s own emotions; an ability that may represent the most basic aspect of emotional intelligence as it makes all other processing of emotional information possible.

Using Emotions

It is the ability to harness emotions to facilitate various cognitive activities; for instance, thinking and problem solving. A slightly sad mood helps people conduct careful, methodical work, while a happy mood can stimulate creative and innovative work; so, the emotionally intelligent person can make the best use of his/her changing moods in order to best fit the task at hand.

Understanding Emotions

It includes the ability to comprehend emotion language and to appreciate complicated relationships among emotions. It includes the ability to sense the slight variations between emotions like the difference between happy and ecstatic. It also covers the ability to recognize and describe how emotions evolve over time, such as how shock can turn into grief.

Managing Emotions

It covers the ability to regulate emotions in both ourselves and others. For example, an emotionally intelligent politician might raise his own anger and use it to deliver a powerful speech to stimulate righteous anger in others.

Goleman’s Theory of Emotional Intelligence

The psychologist Daniel Goleman synthesized diverse models and ideas about emotional intelligence in his book “Emotional Intelligence” in 1995. He conceptualized
emotional intelligence in terms of personal and social competencies (Goleman, 1998, pp. 32-34) described as under:

**Personal Competencies**

These competencies determine how people manage themselves. They include self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation.

*Self-awareness.*

It is the ability to know one’s internal states, preferences, resources and intuitions. This competency encompasses emotional awareness, accurate self-assessment, and self-confidence.

*Self-regulation.*

Self-Regulation is the ability to manage one’s internal states, impulses and resources. It includes self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability and innovation.

*Motivation.*

These are the emotional tendencies that guide or facilitate reaching goals. It covers achievement drive, commitment, initiative and optimism.

**Social Competencies**

These competencies determine how people handle relationships. It includes empathy and social skills.

*Empathy.*

Empathy is the ability to be aware of others’ feelings, needs and concerns. This competency incorporates the sub competencies like understanding others, developing others, service orientation, leveraging diversity and political awareness.
Social skills.

It is one’s adeptness at inducing desirable responses in others. It includes influence, communication, conflict management, leadership, change catalyst, building bonds, collaboration and cooperation and team capabilities.

Bar-On’s Theory of Emotional Quotient

Bar-On developed his concept of emotional intelligence in the context of personality, health and well-being. He defined it as “an array of non cognitive capabilities, competencies and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures” (Bar-On, 1997, p. 14). In essence, it includes any ability that is not specifically cognitive. The definition encompasses a number of areas like emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization, independence, empathy, interpersonal relationship, social responsibility, problem solving, reality testing, flexibility, stress tolerance, impulse control, happiness and optimism (Bar-On, 1997).

Dulewicz and Higgs (1999) (as cited in Higgs, 2001) presented a model where emotional intelligence was defined in terms of its seven sub-scales that are discussed as under:

Self-Awareness

It is the awareness of one's own feelings and ability to recognize and manage these feelings in a way to achieve results. This factor includes a degree of self-belief in one's ability to manage emotions and to control their impact in a work environment.

Emotional Resilience

It reflects the ability to perform consistently in different situations under pressure and to adapt behavior appropriately. The facility to balance the needs of the situation and
task with the needs and concerns of the individuals involved; and the ability to retain focus on a course of action or need for results in the face of personal challenge or criticism are also covered by emotional resilience.

**Motivation**

It covers the drive and energy to achieve clear results and make an impact; and to balance both short- and long-term goals with an ability to pursue demanding goals even under difficult circumstances.

**Interpersonal Sensitivity**

It relates to the facility to be aware of, and take account of, the needs and perceptions of others for decision making and offering solutions to problems/challenges. The ability to build from this awareness and achieve ‘buy in’ to decisions and action ideas; the willingness to keep personal thoughts on solutions open and actively listen to, and reflect on, the reactions and inputs from others are also aspects of this scale.

**Influence**

The ability to persuade others to change a point of view, based on the understanding of their positions and the recognition of the need to listen to this standpoint and provide a rationale for change, are core elements of this scale.

**Decisiveness**

It concerns with the ability to arrive at clear decisions and drive their implementation when presented with incomplete or unclear information, using both rational and emotional perceptions of key issues and implications.

**Conscientiousness**

It is the ability to show clear dedication to a course of action in the face of challenge and to match words and deeds in encouraging others to support the chosen
direction. It also includes personal commitment to pursue an ethical solution to a difficult business issue/problem.

Higgs and Dulewicz (1999) (as cited in Higgs, 2001) proposed that, the seven subscales of EI can be further classified into three as follows:

Drivers

These are the core drivers of an individual’s behavior in a work context like motivation and intuitiveness.

Constrainers

These are the elements which constrain or limit an individual’s behaviors and actions for example conscientiousness and emotional resilience.

Enablers

The elements which facilitate achievement of results and goals are enablers that include interpersonal sensitivity, influence and self-awareness.

Job Performance

Job performance is considered to be an important multidimensional construct in industrial/organizational psychology and organizational behavior. The traditional view of performance restricts it to task performance only, while, the recent research has recognized the role of employee work behaviors that don’t fall into the domain of task performance. A research study asserted that such behaviors are important because they “shape the organizational, social and psychological context that serves as the catalyst for the task activities and processes” (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). The three broad performance domains suggested by research are (a) task performance, (b) organizational citizenship behavior and (c) counterproductive work behavior.
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Task Performance

“Goal directed behaviors under the individual’s control that support organizational objectives are known as task performance”. These include physical behaviors as well as mental processes leading to behaviors (McShane & Glinow, 2005, p. 42).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) known as extra-role behavior or contextual performance is “the discretionary behavior that is not part of an employee’s formal job requirements, but that nevertheless promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Robbins, 2001, p. 21). It includes helping others without selfish intent, being actively involved in organizational activities, avoiding unnecessary conflicts, performing tasks beyond normal role requirements and tolerating impositions (McShane & Glinow, 2005, p. 43). Employees exhibiting such behaviors would certainly be liked by their respective managers and companies as well (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2004, p. 213).

According to the Sheffield Effectiveness Study report, human relationships in an organizational culture contributed more to productivity than any other factor, including financial management (Sardo, 2004). Scholars have identified several dimensions of OCB, and it is believed that some of the dimensions are conceptually related (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). However, the service-oriented conceptualization based on the work of Bettercourt, Gwinner, and Meuter (2001) is being adopted in this study. The construct for service-oriented citizenship behavior has three facets: (a) loyalty, which is employees’ faithfulness to the organization by promoting its interests and image to the outsiders; (b) employee participation, it is their willingness and the need to be
involved in the development and governance of the organization; and (c) service delivery, is their conscientious role performance in the organization (Bettercourt et al., 2001).

**Counterproductive Work Behavior**

It includes the voluntary behaviors that have the potential to harm organization by directly affecting its functioning or property, or by hurting employees in a way that will reduce their effectiveness. Counterproductive work behaviors encompass both acts of commission and acts of omission, such as abuse of others, threats, work avoidance, work sabotage and overt acts (McShane & Glinow, 2005, pp. 42-43).

**Job Characteristics**

Work design is the process of creating jobs and work groups to generate high levels of employee fulfillment and productivity. There are three approaches to work design: (a) engineering approach, (b) motivational approach and (c) socio-technical systems approach. The engineering approach focuses on efficiency and simplification and results in traditional job and work group designs. The socio-technical systems approach seeks to optimize both the social and technical aspects of work systems and gives rise to self managed teams comprised of multi-skilled members performing interrelated tasks. The motivational approach views the effectiveness of organizational activities primarily as a function of member needs and satisfaction, and seeks to improve employee performance and satisfaction by enriching jobs (Cummings & Worley, 2001, p. 343-344). The motivational approach is most applicable to individual based jobs that involve higher interaction with internal or external customers; for instance, jobs in education, banking and insurance industries. The approach usually rests upon the research of Herzberg (1959) and of Hackman and Oldham (1980). Herzberg’s two factor theory of motivation
was criticized, because its implementation and evaluation is difficult and it ignores certain characteristics of workers. Consequently, a well researched approach to job enrichment that focuses on attributes of the work itself the “Job Characteristics Model” (JCM) was presented (as cited in Cummings & Worley, 2001, p. 344-345).

**Job Characteristic Model**

Hackman and Oldham (1975) proposed a job characteristic model (JCM) that addressed the motivational potential of the job itself. The model identifies five core job dimensions and three critical psychological states.

**Core Job Characteristics**

The core job characteristics of JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) are summarized as under:

*Skill variety.*

It refers to the extent to which the job requires an employee to draw from a number of different skills and abilities as well as upon a range of knowledge.

*Task identity.*

This refers to whether the job has an identifiable beginning and end or how complete a module of work the employee performs.

*Task significance.*

Task significance is the degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the organization and/or larger society.

*Autonomy.*

It refers to job independence. How much freedom and control employees have to perform their job, like schedule their work, make their own decisions rather than to take
instructions or determine the means to accomplish the objectives.

*Feedback.*

This refers to objective information about progress and performance that can come from the job itself, from supervisors or from any other information system.

**Critical Psychological States**

The five core job characteristics produce three critical psychological states. Employees who experience these psychological states tend to have higher level of internal work motivation, job satisfaction and work effectiveness (McShane & Glinow, 2005, p. 186-187). The three psychological states (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) are summarized as follows:

*Experienced meaningfulness.*

This cognitive state involves the degree to which employees perceive their work as making a valued contribution, being important and worthwhile. Skill variety, task identity and task significance directly contribute to the job’s meaningfulness.

*Experienced responsibility.*

The degree to which the employees feel personally accountable for the results of the work they do. Autonomy directly contributes to the feeling of experienced responsibility. Work motivation and performance increase when employees feel personally responsible for the outcomes of their efforts (McShane & Glinow, 2005, p. 188).

*Knowledge of results.*

It is the degree to which the employees know and understand, on a continuous basis, how effectively they perform their jobs. Knowledge of results comes from feedback originated from co-workers, supervisors or clients.
Some Other Job Characteristics

The five core job characteristics of JCM largely pertain to an individual’s experience of the job, independent of other parties such as subordinates, coworkers, supervisors or customers. The level and nature of interpersonal interaction with internal and external customers required by some jobs is not represented in the model. Since the proposed study intends to check the moderating role of job characteristics on emotional intelligence and performance and the majority of the tasks to be performed by the employees working in marketing, sales, customer service, front office and human resource departments pertain to interacting with others, therefore, two additional characteristics were adopted to represent the people-oriented and interactive nature of some jobs (Ehrhart, 2006). These are summarized as under:

Customer Interaction (External Interaction)

It involves the frequency and quality of interactions with customers as part of the job. This characteristic refers to whether the job is people-oriented and interactive with regard to dealing with customers.

Organizational Interaction (Internal Interaction)

It pertains to the frequency and quality of interactions among members of the organization. This reflects the extent to which the work environment is friendly and involves interactions with co-workers.

Identification of Knowledge Gap

In the developed world, the EI–Performance link has been checked with the help of different EI models and performance domains. In Pakistan, research studies have measured the relationship of emotional intelligence with academic performance (Farooq,
2004), conflict management (Kiani, 2003) and occupational stress (Aslam, 2004). But the relationship of EI with performance at workplace has so far remained unexplored. A number of studies have checked the EI–Performance link while introducing several situational factors as moderating variables, but none of the studies has measured the link by taking job characteristics as moderating variable. The proposed study will be conducted to fill the gap for EI–Performance link within Pakistani business context and measure the moderating role of job characteristics for the said relationship.

**Statement of the Problem**

Empirical studies suggest that emotional intelligence is related with every day life, marital life, academic life, and the work life (Carmeli, 2003; Farooq, 2004; Fatima, 2005; Tsaousis & Nikolaou, 2005; Winters, Clift, & Dutton, 2004). Studies reveal that EI is associated with performance with respect to both task performance and organization citizenship behavior (Lam & Kirby, 2002; Langhorn, 2004; Rozell, Pettijohn, & Parker, 2006; Slaski & Cartwright, 2002). However, situational factors on task, social, and organizational level moderate the dependent-independent relation. In this regard, research suggests that job characteristics moderate the personality-performance relation and are directly linked with employee performance measured on both domains. Job characteristics like job autonomy, customer interaction, and organizational interaction seem particularly important to improve performance and satisfaction of employees. Hence, for the proposed EI-Performance relation, the moderating role of job characteristics will be investigated.
Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of the study are to:

1. Establish and measure the relationship of employees’ emotional intelligence with job performance measured through organizational citizenship behavior.
2. Establish and measure the prediction of organizational citizenship behavior (criterion variable) on the basis of emotional intelligence (predictor variable).
3. Establish and measure the moderating role of job characteristics (Job Autonomy, External Interaction, and Internal Interaction) for the relationship between emotional intelligence and performance.
4. Establish the moderating role of gender for the relationship of emotional intelligence and performance.

Significance of the Study

Filling the existing knowledge gap regarding the potential moderating role of the job characteristics, EI and performance, the study will highlight the importance of emotional intelligence for job performance in the Pakistani business environment. It will establish the importance of the job characteristics in moderating the EI – Performance link. On the applied frontier of knowledge, emotional intelligence can be introduced in educational systems as it can be developed in childhood as well (Zeidner, Matthews, Roberts, & MacCann, 2003). Courses of emotional intelligence can also be taught at a professional level to better train the managers and workers for work life (Freshwater & Stickley, 2004; Reilly, 2005). A far reaching contribution of the study can be in human resource development using the EI-Job Characteristics understanding as an effective tool for individuals and teams to evaluate and make choices for growth in emotional intelligence.
intelligence (Burgess, 2005). Emotional intelligence can be utilized as a tool for
selection, retention, and promotion decisions made by the management (Watkin, 2000).
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW
It is a common belief that employees should leave their emotions at the door when they enter the work environment. However, research has revealed that this practice may not be possible or desirable; people with high levels of personal mastery cannot afford to choose between reason and intuition, or head and heart, anymore than they would choose to walk on one leg or to see with one eye (Cooper, 1997, p. 33). Reports about the unavoidable influence of emotions on behavior and decision-making have emerged from a variety of academic disciplines like psychology, organizational behavior, sociology, anthropology, and human resource management. It is argued that emotions provide a unique source of information about the environment and facilitate thoughts and actions (Sala, 2005, p. xxvii). Employees enthusiastically may take on organizationally prescribed roles but they also make friends, experience frustrations and have to present themselves differently to customers or clients, which implies that there are no definite divides between the public and private worlds of emotions (Bolton, 2005, pp. 2-3).

Emotional intelligence (EI) is an individual’s ability to cope effectively with environmental demands and pressures, so it is argued that EI is an important factor in determining life success. According to Goleman (1995) it plays a central part in our daily life as well as work life. If you don’t have it, you will make poor choices throughout your life. Research (Cooper, 1997, p. 32) suggests that people with high level of emotional intelligence experience more career success, build stronger personal relations, lead more effectively, and enjoy better health than those with low emotional intelligence.

Research has substantiated the importance of emotional intelligence for every day life (Ciarochi & Scott, 2006; Fatima, 2005; Furnham & Petrides, 2003; Lopes et al., 2004; Schutte, Malouff, Simunek, McKenley, & Hollander, 2002; Tsaousis & Nikolaou,
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2005;), marital life (Brackett, Warner, & Bosco, 2005; Fitness, 2006; Schutte et al., 2001; Winters, Clift, & Dutton, 2004), language learning (Aki, 2006) and academic life (Farooq, 2004; Jaeger, 2003; Liau, Liau, Teoh, & Liau, 2003; Liff, 2003; Zee, Thijs, & Schakel, 2002). Subsequent discussion proposes a link between emotional intelligence and performance. Next the moderators of EI-Performance link, moderating role of job characteristics, and job characteristics’ direct effect on performance is presented. Finally, the derivation of the problem is discussed.

Work Life

The significance of emotional intelligence in work life can be illustrated by a real life example of the management and use of one’s and others’ emotions. Think about the situation that Kenneth Chenault faced just 10 months after becoming the CEO of American Express when the September 11, 2001, attacks claimed the lives of 11 employees and the firm’s headquarters building had to be abandoned for repair for 8 months. To fix this complicated situation, in May 2002 he gathered 5000 American Express employees for a highly emotional meeting to begin the healing process. During the session, he demonstrated the poise, compassion and decisiveness that took him to the top; where he disclosed that he had been filled with such despair, sadness and anger that he had seen a counselor. Twice he rushed spontaneously to embrace grief-stricken employees. He announced the donation of $ 1 million of the company’s profits to the families of victims. He said, “I represent the best company and the best people in the world, in fact you are my strength, and I love you”. Thus, Chenault masterfully made use of positive emotions to cope up with profound negative emotions (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2004, p. 173).
The introduction of emotional intelligence in the corporate sector primarily can be attributed to the apparent inability of traditional measures of ‘rational thinking’ (IQ tests, SAT scores, grades) to predict who will succeed in professional and practical life. According to Goleman (1995, p. 36) research indicates that IQ at best contributes about 20 percent of the factors that determine success in life. Empirical studies have substantiated that, at work, emotional intelligence is associated with work behavior, teamwork, team satisfaction, customer satisfaction, job satisfaction, work-family conflicts, job stress and concern for quality of goods and services.

Dulewicz, Higgs, and Slaski (2003) examined the relationship of emotional intelligence with quality of work life and morale. The results revealed that managers’ emotional intelligence was positively correlated with quality of work life and morale. Brackett, Mayer, and Warner (2004) concluded that low scores on EI were associated with poor quality peer relations. In a study conducted by Martin, Easton, Wilson, Takemoto, and Sullivan (2000), the association between emotional intelligence and counseling self-efficacy was examined. The Emotional Judgment Inventory and Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory were used to measure emotional intelligence and counseling self-efficacy. The research findings revealed that emotional intelligence was associated with counseling self-efficacy. Suliman and Al-Shaikh (2007) revealed that employees with higher levels of EI were found to report higher levels of readiness to create and innovate.

Employees’ emotional intelligence affects the behavior and attitude they usually hold within their organizations. Carmeli (2003) investigated the relationship of emotional intelligence with work attitudes, behavior and outcomes. Emotional intelligence was
measured by a self-report measure developed by Schutte et al. (1998). Hierarchical regression results indicated that emotionally intelligent managers tend to develop high commitment towards their careers and high affective commitment for the organizations where they work. According to Suliman and Al-Shaikh (2007), employees with higher levels of EI tended to report lower levels of intra-individual conflict.

Being capable of participating effectively in a team environment is an important consideration for success in work life. Sue-Chan and Latham (2004) investigated whether emotional intelligence mediated the relationship of situational interview with managers’ team playing skills. Emotional intelligence was measured by using the Workgroup Emotional Intelligence Profile (WEIP-5). The results indicated a high positive correlation between emotional intelligence and team playing behavior. Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel, and Hooper (2002) studied the relationship of emotional intelligence with team performance employing (WEIP-3). Results showed a significant positive correlation between average team WEIP and team goal focus. Rapisarda (2002) investigated as to how team members’ EI competencies influence team effectiveness specifically cohesiveness and performance using the Self-Assessment Questionnaire, the External Assessment Questionnaire and the Emotional Competence Inventory. Results indicated that EI competencies are positively correlated with team cohesiveness. Empathy, influence, and achievement orientation positively correlated with cohesiveness, while only empathy showed a positive correlation with team performance. According to Sardo (2004), a workforce in touch with the emotional world of others was more able to achieve organizational outcomes through high level workplace relationships. Welch (2003) proposed that teams high on EI are likely to have far more initiative in dealing with
organizational challenges and are sensitive to change. Langhorn (2004) explored whether managerial emotional intelligence was related to team satisfaction. The study was done with 161 general managers in the restaurant sector of leisure industry. Their emotional intelligence was measured with Bar-On’s EQi. The results showed that managerial emotional intelligence was able to predict team satisfaction with a reasonable degree of accuracy.

The impact of employee emotional intelligence can be observed even on their job stress, job satisfaction and the satisfaction of customers they serve. Oginska-Bulik (2005) tested the relationship of emotional intelligence with perceived job stress. With a sample size of 330 human service professionals, the results indicated a significant negative relationship between emotional intelligence and perceived stress in the workplace. Dulewicz, et al. (2003) also found strong negative correlation of managers’ emotional intelligence with stress and distress at work. On the same lines, Aslam (2004) found a negative relation between emotional intelligence and occupational stress among IT professionals in the Pakistani work environment.

Sy, Tram, and O’Hara (2006) investigated the impact of employees’ emotional intelligence on job satisfaction and the effect of the interaction between managers’ emotional intelligence and employees’ EI on job satisfaction. Hierarchical regression analyses implied that employees’ EI predicted job satisfaction. Also, it was found that the managers’ emotional intelligence associated more positively with job satisfaction for employees with low EI than for employees with high EI. Carmeli (2003) explored the association of emotional intelligence with job satisfaction and work-family conflict. Emotional intelligence was found positively correlated with job satisfaction and work-
family conflicts.

In a study by Kernbach and Schutte (2005) the influence of service providers’ emotional intelligence on customer satisfaction was experimentally examined. The scale developed by Schutte et al. (1998) was used to assess service providers’ emotional intelligence. The study results revealed that higher emotional intelligence in service providers lead to greater customer satisfaction.

In a complex and dynamic business environment, continuous improvement in quality has become a preferred strategy for organizations and EI appears to exert its influence on quality conscious behavior of employees. Rahim and Minors (2003) studied the relationship of emotional intelligence with concern for quality of products and services and subordinates’ problem solving behavior during conflict. The findings revealed that the main effects of self awareness and self regulation on problem solving behavior and self awareness and empathy on concern for quality were positive and significant.

Carmeli (2003) examined the relationship of emotional intelligence with withdrawal intention from organization. Hierarchical regression results asserted that emotional intelligence was negatively related to withdrawal intention from the organization.

In summery, employees’ emotional intelligence has been found to be positively related to work behavior, career commitment, team playing behavior, job satisfaction, and customer satisfaction; and negatively related to employees’ withdrawal intensions and occupational stress. Hence it is claimed that, in their work lives employees’ emotional intelligence confers traits, attitudes and behaviors that help them to be high
performers.

**Job Performance**

The most important dependent variable in industrial or organizational psychology is job performance. Studies have revealed that performance in the workplace is influenced by a number of variables like motivation (Suh & Shin, 2005), satisfaction with job security (Yousef, 1998), personality (Berry, Page, & Sackett, 2007), general intelligence (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000), and emotional intelligence (Higgs, 2004; Langhorn, 2004). However, research has shown that EI is responsible for greater variance in performance than any other factor. According to Goleman (1995, p. 36), research indicates that at best general intelligence contributes about 20 percent of the factors that determine success in life. A study indicated that 16% variance in individual success in organizational setting is explained through managerial intelligence, 27% by IQ, and an even higher 36% by emotional intelligence (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000). The relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance also seems logical, because, increasingly the employers are considering the EI of the applicants during the recruitment and selection process (Cadman & Brewer, 2001) and employee development programs. The subsequent discussion is dedicated to establish a link between emotional intelligence and job performance.

According to Bagshaw (2000), emotional intelligence is being able to harness emotions effectively; hence, it plays a significant role in business success. Based on a considerable body of research, Cherniss (2000) suggested that a person’s ability to perceive, identify and manage emotions provides the basis for the kinds of social and emotional competencies that are important for success in almost any job. It implies that
job performance is determined largely by the competencies pertaining to emotional intelligence. Research shows that emotional intelligence is associated with managerial performance, task performance and organizational citizenship behavior.

Traditionally, cognition and emotion have been considered as two distinct and separate abilities having their own intelligences and areas of influence. Cognitive based performance that was thought to be a function of general intelligence only, is influenced by emotional intelligence. A study by Lam and Kirby (2002) investigated that whether emotional intelligence and its distinct emotional reasoning abilities contribute positively to individual cognitive-based performance over and above the level explained by general intelligence. The sample size comprised of 304 undergraduate university students. The Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) was used to assess participants’ emotional intelligence. The regression results indicated that, overall emotional intelligence and its sub-components namely perceiving emotions and regulating emotions all contributed positively to individual cognitive-based performance. Nonetheless, understanding emotions could not add to the explanation of variance in individual cognitive-based performance over and above the level attributable to general intelligence.

Rosete and Ciarrochi’s (2005) study investigated the relationship between EI, cognitive intelligence and leadership effectiveness. Participants’ leadership effectiveness was assessed through performance management systems that evaluated performance in achieving agreed business outputs (What has been achieved?), and how they demonstrate the expected leadership behaviors in achieving those outputs (How has it been achieved?). According to results, EI was related to a leader’s effectiveness in being able to achieve organizational goals. Additionally, it was revealed that EI may be useful in
identifying who is and is not likely to deal effectively with colleagues and staff.

In studies by Slaski and Cartwright (2002) and Dulewicz, et al. (2003), the relationship of employees’ emotional intelligence with management performance was examined. It was found that emotional intelligence was positively correlated with managerial performance. A related study by Langhorn (2004) also found that managers’ emotional intelligence was able to predict their performance with a significant degree of accuracy.

Dulewicz and Higgs (2000) investigated the association of individual success in organizational setting with emotional intelligence and rational intelligence. Regression analysis revealed that 36% of variance in level advancement was explained by emotional intelligence.

Emotional intelligence contributes to employee performance measured through their goal achievements in respective functional departments like sales, accounts, customer service and the like. Deeter-Schmelz, and Sozka (2003) undertook a qualitative exploratory study to find a possible link between emotional intelligence and sales success. The findings suggested that emotional intelligence might be an important characteristic for sales success. Rozell, et al. (2006) measured the association of salesperson performance with salesperson emotional intelligence. A kit consisting of measures for emotional intelligence (Schutte et al., 1998), and performance measurement was mailed to salespeople employed by a nationwide company. Analysis of variance indicated that the mean emotional intelligence scores of salespeople in the highest emotional intelligence category were significantly greater than the scores of sales people in the lowest performance category. Moreover, factors of emotional intelligence like
emotional awareness and emotional self/other control were also found to be significantly related to performance. Bachman, Stein, Campbel, and Sitarenios (2000) compared the emotional intelligence scores of successful and less successful accounts officers. The analysis strongly suggested that higher levels of emotional intelligence lead to increased cash goal attainment. Officers with high cash collections displayed well-developed skills in the areas of independence, self-actualization and optimism. In another study, Higgs (2004) examined the association between emotional intelligence and call center agents’ performance. The sample size consisted of 289 call centre agents from three organizations. Emotional intelligence was measured by using the EIQ-G scale developed by Dulewicz and Higgs (2000). Individual performance was evaluated by the personnel department in the organization and was converted to a five-point rating scale. Correlation analysis indicated that emotional intelligence was significantly related to call center agents’ performance.

Sy et al. (2006) examined the impact of employees’ emotional intelligence on job performance. Job performance was measured by a three items instrument. Results of hierarchical regression analysis revealed that employees’ EI positively predicted job performance. A meta-analytic study (Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2004) investigated the association between emotional intelligence and performance. Results of three separate meta analyses showed that emotional intelligence measures have an operational validity of .24, .10, and .24, for predicting performance in employment, academic and life settings, respectively. Deshpande, Joseph, and Shu (2005) examined the impact of emotional intelligence on counterproductive behavior of students and managers in China. The study revealed a significant difference in aggregate counterproductive behavior
between high and low emotional intelligence groups; thus, suggesting that high emotionally intelligent people tend to be better corporate citizens and hold better ethical attitudes toward their firm and work.

Most of the studies assessing the EI-Performance link had operationalized job performance in two dimensions; that is, task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. The preceding discussion revealed that emotional intelligence is related with the task performance measures. As the current study employs organizational citizenship behavior as a measure of employee performance, the subsequent paragraph highlights the studies that used OCB as a measure of performance. Carmeli (2003) and Carson, Carson, Fontenot, and Burdin (2005) investigated the relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with emotional intelligence. The results revealed that organizational citizenship behavior was positively correlated with emotional intelligence. Additionally, it was found that emotional intelligence dimensions of empathy and internal motivation were significantly correlated with organizational citizenship behavior.

Cote and Miners (2006) investigated the compensatory effect of cognitive intelligence on the relationship of emotional intelligence and performance. The sample size comprised of 175 full time employees of a university. Emotional intelligence was assessed by using the Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) and cognitive intelligence by the Culture Fair Intelligence Test. The hierarchical regression results demonstrated that emotional intelligence and cognitive intelligence are compensatory with respect to task performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior directed at the Organization (OCBO). It asserts that employees having a low cognitive intelligence score perform tasks correctly and engage in OCBO repeatedly if they are emotionally intelligent.
Moderators of EI-Performance Link

Moderating variables exert a strong contingent effect for a given independent-dependent relation. Discussion in the previous section stresses the existence of the EI-Performance link, because, emotional intelligence has been found to be positively correlated with variables that measure performance in different domains. Tett and Burnett (2003) identified that, the sources of situational variables comprise of the three broad categories: task, social and organizational that moderate the personality performance relationship. According to Mischel (as cited in Gellatly & Irving, 2001), situations are characterized as either strong or weak with respect to conveying behavioral expectations and 'directing' individual behavior.

Warr, Bartram, and Martin (2005) investigated the differences between situations involving personality and sales performance relationship. The personality-performance relation was found to be dependent upon the situations; for instance, the personality (agreeableness)-performance link was affected by interdependent versus individualistic situations. Also, openness to experience showed a positive correlation with sales performance in door-to-door sales jobs and a negative correlation in show room based sales jobs.

Similarly, the EI-Performance association varies in relation to the situational features. The results of Rooy and Viswesvaran’s (2004) study suggest that emotional intelligence measures have a predictive validity for performance in more than 90% of the situations, but the exact magnitude varies by situation.
Job Characteristics as Moderating Variable

Diefendorff, Richard, and Gosserand (2006) examined job characteristics (job autonomy and task routine-ness) and job attitudes as the moderators of the relation between hesitation and job performance. Job autonomy was tapped through a self-report measure consisting of 4 items, while task routine-ness was assessed with three self-reported items. Participants’ performance was rated by supervisors through a seven items scale of in-role behaviors. The findings revealed that task routine-ness moderated the relation between hesitation and performance.

Gellatly and Irving (2001) investigated whether the personality–contextual performance relationship depended on the nature of the job situation, in particular the level of autonomy. A three-item measure for job autonomy was developed by the researchers based on its traditional definition and discussion with managers, while contextual performance was assessed through supervisory ratings by applying a relative percentile method. The study results showed that the personality-contextual performance relationship was moderated by job autonomy. Positive relations of both extroversion and agreeableness with contextual performance were found when autonomy was high rather than low.

Abraham (2000) studied the moderating role of job control on the relationship between emotional intelligence and its outcomes of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. For a sample size of 79 professionals, job control was assessed through a 3-item measure of job autonomy developed by Hackman and Oldham (1975) and emotional intelligence by using a scale developed by Schutte et al. (1998). Findings revealed that job control moderated both EI-job satisfaction and EI-organizational commitment
relationships. So, it is not sufficient to hire emotionally intelligent employees; for them to thrive, the environment must offer autonomy in decision making.

**Job Characteristics’ Direct Effect on Performance**

Job characteristics theory is a popular and important tool for designing the jobs to enhance employee performance, motivation and satisfaction as well as to reduce absenteeism, stress and turnover. Kahya (2007) investigated the effect of job characteristics on job performance. Job characteristics were studied in terms of job grade and physical effort. Job grade reflected the level of complexity in terms of job knowledge, responsibility, ability and effort requirements. The results showed that job grade had a strong positive correlation with task, as well as contextual performance. Another study (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006) asserted a significant positive relation of job characteristics perceptions with task, as well as contextual performance.

Cappelli and Rogovsky (1998) studied how employee involvement affected individual performance as measured through organizational citizenship. The findings indicated that autonomy, task significance and task variety were positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior. Purvanova, Bono, and Dzieweczynsky (2006) explored the link between employee job perception and organizational citizenship performance. The employees’ job perception was measured through a 14-item version from Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) Job Diagnostic Survey. The results indicated that perceived job characteristics were significantly and positively related to citizenship performance.

Farh, Podsakoff, and Organ (1990) studied the relative effects of task characteristics, leader-fairness and job satisfaction on Organizational Citizenship
Behavior (OCB). The results indicated that job characteristics consistently acted as a strong predictor for the both altruism and compliance dimensions of OCB. The job characteristics, especially autonomy, appeared to be a stronger predictor of OCB than satisfaction.

In a study conducted by Chen and Chiu (2005), the sample size consisted of 260 employees of electronic companies. Job characteristics were measured in terms of job interdependence and five core job characteristics of Hackman and Oldham’s Job Characteristics Model (1975). It was found that task variety, task significance, job feedback and job interdependence were positively related with organizational citizenship behavior. In the study by Evans et al. (2002) autonomy, task significance and skill variety were found to be significantly positively related with salespersons’ performance measured on quantitative and qualitative dimensions.

Morgeson, Delaney-Klinger, and Hemingway (2005) explored the relationships of job autonomy and job related skill with job performance. Job autonomy was measured with three items adapted from Hackman and Oldham (1975). Employees’ job performance was assessed by their respective supervisors across seven performance aspects involving work quality, problem solving and learning. The results demonstrated that job autonomy was positively related with job performance.

The preceding discussion suggests that situational variables do play their part to moderate the EI-Performance relationship. Job Characteristics have been studied as significant moderating variables for the personality performance associations. Additionally, empirical studies have found that job characteristics are significantly and positively related to organizational citizenship behavior, task performance and overall job
Moderating Role of Job Characteristics

So, as a situational variable, job characteristics are thought to moderate the relationship of emotional intelligence and performance.

**Derivation of Research Problem**

Emotional intelligence is the ability to make an efficient use of emotional and cognitive intelligences to cope with environmental demands and pressures. The existing literature emphasizes that emotional intelligence is associated with success in everyday life, marital relations, academics and work life. It is quite obvious that emotional intelligence contributes positively to performance especially in the workplace. This has been validated by a number of empirical studies that measured performance in terms of task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. However, the extent of relationship will be moderated by situational factors that characterize the job; for instance, autonomy, customer interaction and organizational interaction. As research has shown that job characteristics moderate the link between personality and performance and are directly related with performance, it can be safely assumed that:

1. Employees’ emotional intelligence (EI) is related with performance/Organizational Citizenship Behavior/extra role behavior/contextual performance
2. Autonomy moderates the emotional intelligence and performance relationship
3. External Interaction (Customer interaction) moderates the EI-Performance link
4. Internal Interaction (Organizational interaction) moderates the EI-Performance link
5. Employee’s gender moderates the EI-performance relationship

Hence, the researcher intends to work on ‘The Moderating Role of Job Characteristics on the Relationship of Emotional Intelligence and Performance’.
CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
Theoretical Framework

The dependent variable for the study is job performance found to be affected by personal characteristics like motivation, personality, general intelligence and emotional intelligence. However, the review of literature has identified that emotional intelligence explains a greater variance in the dependent variable than any other variable (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000; Goleman, 1995). Empirical research indicates that emotional intelligence is associated with managerial performance (Langhorn, 2004; Slaski & Cartwright, 2002), performance in functional areas/in role behavior (Bachman et al., 2000; Higgs, 2004; Rozell et al., 2006), and finally organizational citizenship behavior/extra role behavior (Carmeli, 2003; Carson et al., 2005).

For the current research, only emotional intelligence is taken as the independent variable. Emotional intelligence is positively related with performance, because, it is an individual’s ability to cope with environmental demands and pressures. EI equips a person to identify and manage his/her own emotions and the emotions of others. An individual’s personal capacity to perform is increased if s/he is able to identify and regulate his/her own emotions. Simultaneously, by identifying and managing the emotions in others, the person will be able to get the things done/approved through subordinates, peers, customers and suppliers in an effective manner. Besides increasing individual performance, EI is especially responsible for achieving superior results for a person occupying a managerial position. For example, a person’s ability to create happiness amongst employees for a creative session and a tense environment to meet a deadline certainly increases his/her job performance. Thus, the higher the EI of an employee, the higher will be the performance.
Employee performance is not only assessed by the outputs delivered but the effectiveness with which they deal with colleagues and staff. For instance, an employee can be very good at technical skills but very ineffective at managing the subordinates (Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005). So, job performance will be measured through organizational citizenship, because, some previous studies have adopted OCB as a measure of employee performance (Carmeli, 2003; Carson et al., 2005; Cote & Miners, 2006; Kahya, 2007). Organizational citizenship behavior is associated with emotional intelligence as EI is the ability to manage emotions to succeed in life. So it helps employees to build and maintain positive relationships with other employees, and to have and promote a positive image of the company. Thus, the higher the EI scores of employees, the higher will be the organizational citizenship behavior measured in terms of loyalty behavior, employee participation, and conscientious behavior.

The personal characteristic-performance relationship cannot produce the same results all the time, because, situations do affect such a relation. Different situational factors can act as moderating variables for the proposed EI-performance link. According to Tett and Burnett (2003) three broad categories of situational variables (task, social and organizational) moderate the personality-performance relation. Hence, task/job related factors in this case 'job characteristics' that exert a contingent effect by constituting strong situations, will be studied as moderating variables for the proposed relation.

The applicability of employees’ EI is constrained by the extent they have job autonomy in terms of work scheduling, decision making and work methods. The more autonomous jobs let the employees manage/accommodate their own, as well as the emotions of others. An emotionally intelligent employee will be able to manage/regulate
emotions in a job having considerable autonomy, while the same employee will be unable to make use of his EI in a job with no or little autonomy. Acting as a moderating variable, autonomy exerts its strong contingent effect for the EI-Performance relation. Thus in an organizational setting, autonomy will play its moderating role for the EI-Performance link.

EI, being the ability to manage the emotions of other people, will yield high performance for employees doing jobs that involve higher interpersonal interaction. Higher external interaction is a characteristics of service sector organizations, because, customers are directly involved in the design, operations and delivery of the services. An emotionally intelligent employee will show high performance in the jobs requiring extensive interaction with people outside the organization like the working of public relations, customer service, sales and distribution departments, while the same person will be unable to improve his performance by applying EI in the jobs having less or no external interaction like the jobs in finance, accounts and operations departments (Barth, 2001; Rosete, 2007, p. 161). Thus, for the suggested EI-Performance relation, external interaction acts as a moderating variable.

Along the same lines, internal interaction such as contact with peers, subordinates and other employees within an organization also exerts a contingent effect. An Employee will be able to achieve high performance only for the jobs involving higher organizational interaction; for instance, the jobs in human resources, administration and marketing departments. Employees working on jobs with less or no organizational interaction like engineering, legal and technical jobs will have less ability to increase their performance by using their EI. Thus, internal interaction acts as a moderating
variable for the EI-Performance relationship.

To summarize, three variables namely autonomy, external interaction, and internal interaction will operate as moderating variables for the relationship of emotional intelligence and job performance.
Figure 1. Schematic diagram of theoretical framework.

Source: Developed by author
As a result of reviewing extant literature on the research topic, a hypothetical model was developed (see Figure 1, p. 49). The model provides a schematic framework of the current research theory to serve as basis for developing a set of research hypotheses to be tested on participants in Pakistan.

**Hypotheses**

In the light of preceding theoretical framework, the researcher has formulated following hypotheses:

- **H1:** Employees’ emotional intelligence (EI) is positively related with their job performance/ organizational citizenship behavior
- **H2:** Employees’ scores on EI significantly predict their job performance
- **H3:** Job Autonomy moderates the EI–performance relationship
- **H4:** External interaction moderates the EI–performance relation
- **H5:** Internal interaction moderates the EI–performance relation
- **H6:** Employee’s gender moderates the EI-performance relation
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH DESIGN
In this chapter, the researcher has presented the research methodology adopted for the study. The objectives of the proposed study were achieved in two phases. In the first phase, a pilot study was conducted to pre-test the instruments used. In the second phase, the main study was executed.

**Pilot Study**

The research design included the pilot study on account of the following:

1. To develop a comprehensive research design to be followed for the main study.
2. To check the reliability of the scales adopted for the measurement of emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, job autonomy, external interaction and internal interaction.
3. To identify aspects of the relationship between independent and dependent variable; that is, emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior.
4. To improve the questionnaire in terms of sentence structure and phrasing of items, if needed.
5. To observe the respondents’ reaction to the given 5-point rating scale (Likert scale), readability and understandability of questions asked and to gain useful feedback on the research instrument.

**Population**

The population of the pilot study was comprised of employees (holding job positions where at least graduation is required) working in for-profit organizations only.
Public sector and not-for-profit organizations were ignored, because, these sectors are not market oriented. Public enterprises focus on employment generation and provision of service to the masses, while non-governmental organizations emphasize the execution of projects and utilization of funds.

Sample

Participants for the pilot study were a convenience sample from different profit driven organizations in the private sector. A total of 120 questionnaires were distributed, out of which 45 questionnaires were returned, providing a response rate of 37.5%. Five carelessly filled questionnaires were excluded from the analysis to improve the reliability and validity of measures/results, which gave rise to an actual response rate of 33.3%. Out of the 40 participants, 17 were from Islamabad and 23 from Multan. The sample was comprised of 36 male and 4 female employees. Their ages ranged from 22 to 43 years (M = 29.4, SD = 5.2). Most respondents held graduate (12) and masters (27) degrees. The participants represented different functional departments (14 sales, 10 customer service, 7 technical/production and 4 finance/accounts) from varied industries such as banking, telecom and information technology.

Instrument

The questionnaire for the pilot study was comprised of three parts: The first part served as an introductory/covering letter that described the objectives of the study, along with the instructions on how to complete the questionnaire; the second part attempted to assess the main variables of the study; the third part measured the demographic variables. The subsequent discussion provides the details of the second and the third parts.

Second Part
The second part measured employees’ emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, job autonomy and external and internal interaction. To seek genuine responses, slight changes were introduced to some items to make the questionnaire more understandable and easier to comprehend. To achieve this, a panel of 6 PhDs from subjects such as management sciences, psychology and sociology was consulted and their suggestions and comments were invited. Consequently, sentences were restructured to improve comprehension as the respondents did not speak English as their first language.

All the items were listed continuously, with no separators for various measures because the same 5-point rating scale (Likert scale) was used to identify responses for the main variables. Items were listed to hold participants’ attention from start to finish and to get responses in a natural flow without any distraction.

*Emotional intelligence.*

Emotional intelligence was assessed through a scale developed by Schutte et al. (1998). It was based on an original emotional intelligence model developed by Salovey and Mayer (1990). The tool contains 33 items using a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 represents ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 ‘strongly agree’. Three of the 33 items (5, 28 and 33) were reverse coded. Thus, the total score of the 33 items ranged from 33 to 165; the high score indicating employees’ higher ability to recognize and manage the emotions of themselves and of others.

The panel’s valuable suggestions were included in the survey; for instance, the item ‘When I am in a positive mood, solving problems is easy for me’ was changed to ‘When I am in a positive mood, it is easy for me to solve problems’. To achieve uniformity in responses, examples were given in brackets for some terms such as ‘I find it
hard to understand the non-verbal messages (facial expressions, hand gestures etc.) of other people’. In a few items, difficult words were replaced with easier words; for instance, ‘I compliment others when they have done something well’ was changed to ‘I praise others when they have done something well’. After introducing the changes, the new version of the emotional intelligence scale was mailed to the chief author of the original instrument, who after reviewing approved it for reliability testing (N. Schutte, personal communication, November 25, 2007).

**Organizational citizenship behavior.**

Organizational citizenship behavior was measured by employing a service-oriented OCB scale (Bettercourt et al., 2001). It is a 16-item scale (items 34 to 49) that used the same 5-point Likert scale. Four of the 16 items were negatively worded (46, 47, 48 and 49). The total score of the 16-items can range from 16 to 80. The higher the scores indicated on the scale, the higher the levels of employees’ OCB behavior.

The panel recommended few changes for the OCB measure. For example, the item ‘I regularly attend and participate in meetings regarding the organization’ was changed to ‘I regularly attend and participate in my organizational meetings’. The item ‘I conscientiously follow my organization's regulations and procedures while nobody is watching me’ was reworded as ‘I carefully follow my organization's regulations and procedures while nobody is watching me’.

**Job autonomy.**

The job autonomy scale developed by Morgeson and Humphrey (2006) was used to measure the level of employees’ autonomy on the jobs they hold. The autonomy includes three interrelated aspects centered on freedom in work scheduling, decision
making and work methods. The measure comprised of 9 items (items 50 to 58) asked on the same scale. The possible total score for the measure ranged from 9 to 45, where high scores indicated a higher level of autonomy on the job. On the panel’s recommendations, the sentence structure for all the items was improved. For example the item ‘The job allows me to plan how I do my work’ was changed to ‘My job allows me to plan how I do my work’.

External interaction.

Employees’ external interaction was tapped through a scale developed by Morgeson and Humphrey (2006). The scale consisted of 4 items asked on the 5-point Likert scale. The possible total score for external interaction ranged from 4 to 20, and higher scores represented a higher level of interaction with the people who are not the members of that organization. For this measure, all items were rephrased in the fashion adopted for the job autonomy scale. For instance, the item ‘The job involves interaction with people who are not members of my organization’ was reworded as ‘My job involves interaction with people who are not members of my organization’.

Internal interaction.

Internal interaction (job characteristic) was measured by adopting a scale (Ehrhart, 2006) that was originally developed to measure job characteristic beliefs. After consulting the panel, the sentence structure of the items was changed to use it as a measure for job characteristics. The subject of the items was changed in accordance with the other measures of job characteristics like autonomy and external interaction. For instance, ‘You would have frequent interactions with other people in the organization’ was changed to ‘My job involves frequent interactions with other people in the
organization’. Originally, the job characteristic belief items were tapped through a five-point scale (1 = to little or no extent to 5 = to a great extent). For the sake of uniformity and easy comprehension of the instrument, the same five-point Likert scale was used to measure employees’ internal interaction. The total score for this 4-item scale ranged from 4 to 20, where high scores indicated a higher level of interaction with other organizational members.

Third Part

In addition, the demographic information was sought from the participants on variables such as age, gender, education, job level, functional department, organization and work experience with in the organization.

Procedure

Participants were approached in their respective organizations/offices either by the researcher or through research facilitators. The research facilitators were working with participants at middle management positions in various organizations. They were asked to collect data from their respective organizations only. The researcher had detailed sessions with them on subject matter and had trained them on how to instruct the respondent to fill in the questionnaire, how to explain the items asked and how to check the completeness of the data collection tool.

After having established rapport with the participants, they were asked to respond to each statement in the second part of the questionnaire about the way they feel, think or act in their lives or organizations by encircling the number that most appropriately matched their answer, by using the given scale. To promote the importance of genuine responses, participants were assured of confidentiality of responses as all data were
collected anonymously (respondent’s name was not asked). Also, the participants were also allowed to take time in completing the questionnaire. Most participants were able to fill the questionnaire at their ease and returned it at a later time to the researcher or research facilitators.

**Results and Conclusion**

The main purposes of the pilot study were to check the reliability of the scales, to establish the relation between independent and dependent variables and to gauge the suitability/understandability of the demographic items asked.

To achieve this, SPSS sheets were prepared first with the missing values for individual items of major variables replaced with the means calculated for the 40 participants of the pilot study. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the variables employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Descriptive Statistics of Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Interaction</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Interaction</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from pilot study

To measure the internal consistency reliability, Chronbach’s alpha and Split-half reliability tests were applied. First, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated for the research variables. A value of .65 or more was considered sufficient to estimate the reliability of a scale, though reliabilities as high as .70 or more have been recommended
by certain experts (Bakeman & Gottman, 1986). The alpha values along with the number of items for the main variables are presented in Table 2. Alpha scores for these variables range from .77 to .91, so it is asserted that all the scales are internally consistent.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from pilot study

Reliability of scales was also checked by applying the Split-half reliability test. Table 3 shows that split half correlation coefficients for the variables range from .54 to .91, which are quite significant.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
<th>Guttman Split-Half coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from pilot study

The next purpose of the pilot study was to establish the relationship between independent and dependent variable; for this, Pearson bivariate correlation coefficient was calculated. From Table 4, the correlation coefficient value of .6 indicates a
significant relationship between the independent and dependent variable.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation between Independent and Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.604(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.
Source: Data from pilot study

The final purpose of the study was to improve the questionnaire in terms of its visibility, flow and comprehension by respondents. The same panel of PhD holders was consulted in this regard. Taking into account the respondents’ educational level, language barrier and other factors, the panel recommended some changes in terms of sentence structure, phrasing of items and replacement of difficult words. To avoid biased/inclined responses, the different measures and items were listed without any title or separator. Finally, the rating scale was repeated on each page to secure true and quick responses.

Main Study

The second phase of the research comprised of the main study.

Objectives

The objectives of the main study were four fold. Firstly, the research intended to establish and measure the relationship of employees’ emotional intelligence with job performance measured through organizational citizenship behavior. Secondly, to establish and measure the prediction of employees’ organizational citizenship behavior based upon their scores on emotional intelligence. Thirdly, to establish and measure the moderating role of job characteristics (Job Autonomy, External Interaction, and Internal
Interaction) for the relationship of EI and performance. Finally, to establish the
moderating role of gender for the relationship of EI and performance.

Sample

To generate relevant data, a total of 1200 questionnaires were distributed
conveniently to respondents, out of which 481 questionnaires were returned; i.e., with a
response rate of 40 %. A total of 17 questionnaires were excluded from the study for
various reasons, including incompleteness. So the data from the remaining 464 usable
questionnaires was entered into an SPSS sheet, and a further 20 respondents were
dropped on account of following reasons:

1. Two questionnaires had missing values for more than 10% of the total
   number of items.
2. 18 participants turned out to be outliers (11 univariate outliers and 7
   multivariate outliers).

Consequently, the final usable sample size turned out to be 444 participants that
gave rise to an actual response rate of 37 %. Participants ranged from 21 to 62 years of
age with a mean age of 30 years and standard deviation of 6.6 years. For the usable
sample, a vast majority was male participants (see Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants’ Gender</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from main study
From now onwards all tables are based on the data collected in main study.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 indicates that there was almost an equal representation of single and married participants. Table 7 shows that the majority of respondents (67.8%) had been awarded master degree.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS &amp; Above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Equivalence Not Known</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the selected participants, 61% represented middle management, 31% lower management and 8% top management. The respective functional departments for the employees are shown in Table 8. The highest proportions of respondents were working in sales and HRM/HRD departments.
Table 8

*Functional Departments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM/HRD</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Accounts</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Production</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9, below, indicates a mean experience of 3.7 years with the current organization and a mean of 6.8 years of total job experience of the participants.

Table 9

*Descriptive Statistics showing Experience with Current Organization and Total Job Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience with this Organization</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Job Experience</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spatial distribution of the participants indicates that they represent three provinces of Pakistan, namely the Punjab, the Sind and the NWFP. They belong to different cities such as Lahore, Multan, Rawalpindi, Karachi and Peshawar. The city wise distribution of the sample is represented in Table 10.
Table 10

City wise Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawalpindi</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multan</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karachi</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faisalabad</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujranwala</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahawalpur</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller Cities</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scales

The scales to measure Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Job Autonomy, External Interaction and Internal Interaction adopted as a result of the pilot study were found reliable and understandable to the participants. No subsequent changes were introduced to the scales beyond the results of the pilot study. However, after consulting the supervisor some changes were introduced in the items for collection of the demographic data. For the better classification of respondents, some items like marital status, mother tongue/first language, total length of job experience, and star (horoscope) were added to the questionnaire.

Reliability of the Scales

The subsequent section will highlight the reliabilities of the scales used for the study.

Emotional intelligence.

According to Schutte et al. (1998) internal reliability and a two week test-retest
reliability of EI measure (33 items) resulted in $\alpha$ values of 0.90 and 0.78 respectively. Additionally, the internal reliability of the scale has been checked and proven to be optimal by a number of studies. The internal consistency in the pilot study also confirmed the reliability results with .91 values for Cronbach’s alpha and Split-Half coefficient as well.

*Organizational citizenship behavior.*

Organizational citizenship behavior was best defined through a three-factor model (Bettercourt et al., 2001). The alpha values for the OCB sub-scales of loyalty behavior, employee participation and conscientious behavior were reported as 0.82, 0.72, and 0.54 respectively (Ladebo, 2004). The pilot study showed a comparable value of .77 for Cronbach’s alpha and a slightly lower value of .54 for Guttman Split-Half coefficient.

*Job autonomy.*

According to Morgeson and Humphrey (2006) the job autonomy scale was best described by a three-factor model. The internal reliabilities for the job autonomy sub-scales of work scheduling autonomy, decision making autonomy and work methods autonomy resulted in alpha values of .85, .85, and .88 respectively. For job autonomy, highly reliable values of .90 for alpha and .89 for Split-Half were shown in the pilot study.

*External interaction.*

The alpha value for internal consistency reliability of the external interaction scale was .91 (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). The pilot study showed a slightly lower alpha value of .81 and Guttman Split-Half coefficient .85.

*Internal interaction.*
For the four items internal interaction scale, Ehrhart (2006) reported the internal consistency value of $\alpha$ ranging from .71 to .76 for the three service jobs. The pilot study showed an alpha value of .77 and Guttman Split-Half coefficient .76.

**Data Collection**

*Data Entry*

Before entering the data, editing was performed to identify the missing values, wrong entries and classification of demographic data. A comprehensive code book was developed for all the variables. The main variables of the study tapped on 5-point Likert scale were given the values ranging from 1 to 5. While missing values for the variables were bifurcated into ‘Not Answered’ and ‘Checked Twice’ that were given separate codes. Next, for the purpose of data entry all the main (66) and demographic variables (15) of the study were defined in SPSS. Thus, all questionnaires received from relevant respondents were entered into an SPSS sheet.

*Data Verification*

After entering all the data into an SPSS sheet, accuracy of data was ensured through following steps:

1. Generating the frequencies for all the variables and checking the values to be within the stipulated range of values that was specified in the preparation of code book. Thus, if any variable found to have some unspecified value, the correction was made by referring to the original questionnaire.

2. Selecting randomly 10% of the total respondents and checking for every item entered. So, the data entry for 59 participants was confirmed. A total of 4 errors were found against 4779 (59 * 81 variables) entries that represented an error rate of 0.0837 %.
Missing Value Data

After verifying the data entry process, missing values were counted for each participant against the main variables of the study. As a rule, questionnaires were dropped for which 7 and above items (10% of total items) were found as missing. Consequently, 2 questionnaires were omitted from the analysis. Missing data were also counted against each item in order to explore any relation of missing data with some other variable or with the value of that item. For the main variables of the study, it was found that missing data occurred at random because:

1. No one item was found to have missing values for considerably high number of respondents, and the maximum frequency for a single item to have missing values was 8.

2. The probability for each item to have missing values was nearly the same as the range of missing values for all the items varies from 0 to 8. So, no item was deleted on account of a high frequency of missing values.

3. The missing values for all the main variables in the study were replaced by the mean of that item calculated for the entire sample.

Data Normality

After checking the missing data, the reverse coded items were recoded. Normality of data was ensured by identifying the univariate and multivariate outliers. Univriate outliers were highlighted by calculating the z-scores for independent, dependent and moderating variables. Resultantly, 11 respondents were found to report high values that represented outliers and were deleted from the analysis. While multivariate outliers were identified by measuring their residual values. Table 11 indicates that 7 respondents were
omitted from the analysis because of high residual values.

Table 11
Case wise Diagnostics for Multivariate Outliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Std. Residual</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Predicted Value</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>-3.022</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.3016</td>
<td>-1.11407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>-3.210</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.7456</td>
<td>-1.18310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>-3.074</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.3468</td>
<td>-1.03425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>-3.057</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>4.0644</td>
<td>-1.12686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>-3.046</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.3727</td>
<td>-1.12273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>-3.057</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>4.0644</td>
<td>-1.12686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>-3.078</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.8221</td>
<td>-1.13463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior

**Statistical Methodology**

To validate the research results, the statistical techniques to be applied are discussed here. To check the reliability of the measures used in the study, Cronbach’s alpha and the Guttman Split-Half coefficient were calculated. The relationship between dependent and independent variable was measured by applying the bivariate Pearson correlation test. To predict the value of the dependent variable (performance) based upon the value of the independent variable, linear regression analysis was performed.

The moderating role of job characteristics on EI and performance was calculated following the procedure narrated in the following paragraph. Firstly, the independent and moderating variables were centered; that is, the mean was subtracted from the each value for that variable for all the participants, which resulted in the mean for these variables to be 0. Secondly, the interaction term was calculated by taking the product of the centered variables. The moderating effect was measured by applying General Linear Model (GLM) analysis. After entering OCB as a dependent variable, the custom model was configured by treating the independent and the moderating variable as the main effect and
the product of centered variables as the interaction term. Based upon the values calculated for each term/variable for multiple regression equation, the ANOVA table indicates the significance values for the different models constructed. It indicated the significance value for the entire model, intercept, first independent variable (IV), second IV (moderating variable) and finally for the interaction term (the presence of moderating role of the second IV). However, the general linear model could not produce the $R^2$/$R^2$ change, so step-wise multiple regression analysis was run to assess the strength of moderating role for second IV. Again, OCB as dependent variable, first IV, second IV as the main effect and the interaction term as covariate were entered. Resultantly, the model summary table presents the values for $R^2$ and $R^2$ change. So the acceptance/rejection of any model was substantiated by the correspondent change in coefficient of determination for that model.
CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS
This chapter presents the outcome of the statistical analysis of the research data. As discussed in the previous chapter, the statistical procedures applied included alpha reliabilities, Pearson correlation, linear regression analysis and multiple regression analysis. Reliabilities of the scales were computed by calculating the Cronbach’s alpha and Guttman’s Split-half coefficients. The relationship between EI and performance (measured through organizational citizenship behavior) was assessed by calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient. Linear regression analysis was applied to predict the value of the dependent variable ‘OCB’ on the basis of independent variable ‘EI’. The moderating role of job characteristics (job autonomy, external interaction and internal interaction) was checked by constructing a general linear model and applying step-wise multiple regression analysis.

The tabled results present the descriptive statistics, alpha values, R-values, p-values and regression equations for the tests applied. The current study employed a .05 level of significance to determine the significance of most of the conclusions; a p-value less than .05 indicated the presence of a significant relationship between the two variables.

**Descriptive Statistics**

For all the measures used in the study, Table 12 shows the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation values calculated for the sample participants (444). The mean scores and standard deviation calculated for the scales were somewhat comparable to the results secured in the pilot study (see Table 1, p. 58).
Table 12  
*Descriptive Statistics for Measures*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>3.8145</td>
<td>.34778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9605</td>
<td>.44391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.7008</td>
<td>.69027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Interaction</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4417</td>
<td>.87407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Interaction</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0861</td>
<td>.57831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal Consistency Reliabilities**

The internal reliabilities of the measures (subcomponents) employed were checked by calculating their alpha reliability coefficients as presented in Table 13.

Table 13  
*Alpha Reliabilities of Variables*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty Behavior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Participation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious Behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Scheduling Autonomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making Autonomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Methods Autonomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 indicates that moderate to high internal reliability coefficients were observed for all the scales used, and the alpha value scores from 0.64 (internal interaction) to 0.89 (job autonomy) that are quite acceptable in social sciences research.

The consistency reliability of 0.82 for EI was slightly lower than 0.90 reported by Schutte et al. (1998). Overall reliability calculated for OCB was 0.78; however, alpha coefficients for the individual factors of OCB were quite comparable to the results achieved in a study.
conducted by Ladebo (2004). The overall internal consistency reliability for job autonomy was 0.89. The alpha values calculated for individual factors of job autonomy were found to be slightly lower than that of the original study (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). The reliability coefficient for external interaction was measured as .86 which validated the alpha coefficient value of .91 reported by Morgeson and Humphrey (2006). The alpha value for internal interaction was .64 while in original study it is reported to range from .71 to .76 across the three service jobs (Ehrhart, 2006).

To further validate the reliabilities of the scales employed in the research, Split-half reliability analysis was performed. Table 14 illustrates that the Guttman Split-half coefficient values for all the measures range from .51 to .87 that is quite satisfactory for social sciences research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
<th>Guttman Split-Half Coefficients for Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable Name</td>
<td>N of Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity of Measures

Validity of the measures was checked by applying factor analysis and comparing the factors achieved with those produced for the same measure in the original or other comparable studies. Factor analysis was conducted for EI, OCB and job autonomy as these measures were proposed to be multidimensional by the developers or some later researchers. The analysis was not performed for internal and external interaction because
of their uni-dimensional nature. Factor analysis was conducted using the maximum likelihood extraction with a varimax rotation of extracted factors. The number of factors was specified on account of theoretical grounds for each construct. The results were evaluated statistically to determine goodness-of-fit by applying chi-square test. Furthermore, scree plots were presented to decide about the number of factors underlying a particular construct.

**Emotional Intelligence**

The EI scale has been presented as uni-dimensional by its proponents (Schutte et al., 1998). Since then a number of research studies have been conducted on the scale and a varying number of factors have been suggested. Bastian’s (2005) study indicated that a single factor solution or a four factor solution fits just well; however, the construct was considered as a single factor following the recommendations of its developers. Factor analysis of the current study also supported a single factor and a four factors solution. The results produced by a goodness-of-fit test for the single factor solution [chi square (495) 1318.8; p > .001] explained 16.3% variance and the four factor solution [chi square (402) 800.5; p > .001] explained 32.3% variance in total score for EI. The current researcher adopted it as a single factor construct as advocated by the developers. The decision was further supported by presenting the scree plot in Figure 2 for factor analysis of EI.
Figure 2. Scree plot showing factor analysis for EI.

Source: Generated
Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Bettercourt et al. (2001) developed the OCB scale to identify three distinct factors; namely, loyalty behavior (measured through the first six items), employee participation (next six items) and conscientious behavior (the last four items). Factor analysis was run by applying the maximum likelihood extraction method. Based upon their theory, the number of factors was specified as three, and the results were rotated by varimax method. The goodness-of-fit statistic in the current research confirmed a three factor model [chi-square (75) 140.02; p < .001] (46.1% variance explained) which was consistent with the three factors identified by the developers of the measure. Ladebo (2004) also confirmed the results where the same three factors were found to explain 39% of variance. The conclusion (three factor solution) received further support from the scree plot shown in Figure 3.
Figure 3. Scree plot showing factor analysis for OCB.
Scale validity was confirmed by the rotated factor matrix as shown in Table 15, which indicates that nearly the same items give rise to the same three factors (loyalty behavior, employee participation and conscientious behavior) that underlie the OCB construct developed by Bettercourt et al. (2001).

Table 15
Rotated Factor Matrix for OCB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Friends and Family Members</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate Favorable Goodwill</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Organization's Products/Services</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say Good Things</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Place to Work</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionally Courteous</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Suggestions</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Coworkers</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive Suggestions</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly Attend</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Colleagues</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Bother to Read</td>
<td></td>
<td>.525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Developments</td>
<td></td>
<td>.448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Product</td>
<td></td>
<td>.631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Follow Work Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.
Source: Generated


**Job Autonomy**

The job autonomy scale was proposed by Morgeson and Humphrey (2006) as a three-factor construct comprising of work scheduling autonomy (measured through the first three items), decision making autonomy (next three items) and work methods autonomy (last three items). Based upon theory, the three factors were extracted by applying maximum likelihood extraction method and the results were rotated through varimax method. The Goodness of fit statistic suggested a three factor model [chi-square (12) 29.5; p < .001] (71.5 %). Visual examination of the scree plot (see Figure 4) also supports the three factor model for job autonomy.
Figure 4. Scree plot showing factor analysis for job autonomy.

Source: Generated
The results presented in Table 16 (rotated factor matrix) indicate that almost the same items were responsible for yielding the same factors proposed by Morgeson and Humphrey (2006). Thus, it validates the construct adopted for job autonomy.

Table 16
Rotated Factor Matrix for Job Autonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Scheduling</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Things</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan My Work</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Initiative</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Decisions</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making Autonomy</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Methods</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Independence</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing My Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.
Source: Generated

Emotional Intelligence and Performance

To test the first hypothesis that employees’ EI is positively related with performance as measured through organizational citizenship behavior, Pearson correlation analysis was applied as both variables are measured on interval level. Table 17 indicates the presence of a significant correlation between total EI scores and OCB (p < .01). Employees’ scores on emotional intelligence exhibit a strong positive association (r = .63) with their organizational citizenship behavior. The results of the current research support the first hypothesis.
Table 17

**Showing Correlations between Dependent and Independent Variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

To measure the association between EI and subcomponents of OCB, correlation analysis was performed. Table 18 asserts the presence of a significant correlation between IV and the sub-components of dependent variable. The independent variable EI was found to have a moderately high and positive association with employee participation ($r = .60, p < .01$), a moderate positive correlation with loyalty behavior ($r = .54, p < .01$) and a low positive correlation with conscientious behavior ($r = .27, p < .01$). So, no subcomponent of the DV was found to show high correlation with IV than the overall OCB measure.

Table 18

**Correlations between IV and Subcomponents of DV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Loyalty Behavior</th>
<th>Employee Participation</th>
<th>Conscientious Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.539(**)</td>
<td>.607(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Predicting Employee Performance**

The presence of a strong positive association between employees’ EI and performance suggested that employees’ future performance could be predicted on the basis of their EI scores. The second hypothesis of the study implies that employees’ EI
scores significantly predict their organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). A simple linear regression analysis was applied, because, OCB as a single continuous dependent variable and EI as a single continuous independent variable are involved in this case. The test produced the significance values for hypothesis testing regarding individual regression parameters. Results in Table 19 show a significant F value (less than .05) for the prediction relation between EI and OCB. Thus, the hypothesis asserting that employees’ scores on emotional intelligence significantly predict the future performance measured through organizational citizenship behavior is supported.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>35.220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.220</td>
<td>298.928</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>52.077</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87.297</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Intelligence

Table 19 proves only the presence of a prediction relation between EI and the dependent variable (OCB). The strength of the relationship is shown in Table 20 with the help of the values of intercept and slope for EI; the table indicates the constant value of .86 and a slope of .81 for the regression line. This suggests that for a one unit increase in emotional intelligence, the respective manager can significantly predict a .81 increase in employee’s organizational citizenship behavior, whereas a slope of .63 for EI is produced when the test utilizes standardized independent and dependent variables.
Table 20

Regression Coefficients\(^{(a)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Un-standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(a)}\) Dependent Variable: Organizational Citizenship Behavior

To measure the strength of a prediction relation through ‘Beta’ may indicate some inflated results. Consequently a conservative measure ‘coefficient of determination’ was calculated. Table 21 indicates an ‘R square’ value of 0.40 that asserts that 40% of the variance in OCB can be accounted for by employee’s score on EI. This result supports the second hypothesis of the study that employees’ EI score significantly predict their job performance (OCB).

Table 21

Model Summary Showing Simple Regression for EI and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.635(a)</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.34325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(a)}\) Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Intelligence

**Moderating Role of Job Characteristics**

The presence of the moderating role of job characteristics (autonomy, external interaction and internal interaction) for the EI-performance relationship was assessed by applying General Linear Model analysis and the amount of incremental variance explained to predict the dependent variable (R square change) was determined through step-wise regression analysis. Before going to measure the moderating role or the interaction effect of two or more independent variables, the variables were centered; that
is, each variable (independent and moderating) was treated in a way that the mean value for that variable was subtracted from each participant’s score on that variable. Centering the variables does not affect their relationship with the dependent variable, but decreases the collinearity between the main effects and the interaction term (DeCoster & Claypool, 2004). Table 22 indicates that centered variables result in the mean values of zero but bring no change in standard deviations for these variables. Next, the interaction terms were calculated by multiplying these centered variables.

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centered EI</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Job Autonomy</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered External Interaction</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centered Internal Interaction</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the general linear model, the centered variables (independent and moderating) were considered to measure the main effect while the corresponding interactions were generated to assess the variables’ moderating/contingent role to predict the value of the dependent variable. The resultant model addressed the presence of a significant prediction relationship between independent and dependent variable, but not the power/strength of the model to predict the resultant change in the criterion variable. In order to measure the strength of the prediction relationship, step-wise regression analysis was run to measure the amount of incremental variance explained (R square change) for each model.
To test the third hypothesis that the EI – job performance relationship is moderated by job autonomy, the general linear model was applied. After entering the OCB as dependent variable, centered (EI and Job Autonomy) were taken as the main effect along with their interaction term. Table 23 indicates that F values are significant (less than .05) for the entire model, the first independent variable (centered EI), the second IV (Centered Job Autonomy) and the interaction term. The significant F value for the interaction term validates that there is a moderating role of job autonomy for the EI-performance relationship; a result that supports the hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>38.442(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.814</td>
<td>115.404</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6590.722</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6590.722</td>
<td>59357.445</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cent. EI</td>
<td>27.792</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.792</td>
<td>250.300</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cent. Job Autonomy</td>
<td>2.715</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.715</td>
<td>24.452</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (Cent. EI * Cent. Job Autonomy)</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>5.084</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>48.855</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7051.769</td>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>87.297</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared = .440 (Adjusted R Squared = .437)

To assess the change in R square corresponding to these effects, step-wise multiple regression analysis was applied. Taking OCB as the dependent variable, the two centered variables were entered as independent variables plus the interaction term of the two variables and a step wise method multiple regression analysis was run. The analysis
produced three different models and F values are significant (less than .05) for all the models as shown in Table 24. Model 1 indicates that a significant prediction in OCB can be made on the basis of employees’ EI scores (R square change = .403), Model 2 asserts a significant prediction in DV on the basis of EI and Job Autonomy (R square change = .03), while Model 3 specifies a significant prediction in OCB on account of EI, Job Autonomy and the interaction term for the two variables (R square change = .006). This indicates that introduction of the interaction term to the model significantly adds to the amount of incremental variance explained to predict the value of dependent variable. The prediction power of the interaction term for DV holds that slope coefficient for first IV (EI) depends on the level of other predictor variable (job autonomy as moderating variable) in the model. Thus, the third hypothesis that there is a moderating role of job autonomy for the EI-performance relation is also supported by research data findings.

Table 24

| Model Summary Showing Moderating Role of Job Autonomy for EI-Performance Relation |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------------|
|                                 | R Square        | Change | F      | df1    | df2    | Sig.   |
|                                 | Change         |        | Change |        |        |       |
| 1                               | .635(a)         | .403   | .402   | .34325 | .403   | 298.928 | 1    | 442 | .000 |
| 2                               | .659(b)         | .434   | .431   | .33476 | .030   | 23.711  | 1    | 441 | .000 |
| 3                               | .664(c)         | .440   | .437   | .33322 | .006   | 5.084   | 1    | 440 | .025 |

a Predictors: (Constant), Centered EI  
b Predictors: (Constant), Centered EI, Centered Job Autonomy  
c Predictors: (Constant), Centered EI, Centered Job Autonomy, Interaction EI and Job Autonomy

External Interaction

The fourth hypothesis of the study, that external interaction moderates the EI – job performance relationship was checked by running the general linear model analysis.
Table 25 shows the significant F values (less than 0.05) for the overall model, intercept and first IV (EI); it indicates that F values are not significant for the second IV (external interaction) or for the interaction term (EI and external interaction). Thus, there is no significant impact of second IV and the interaction term. Therefore, because the model fails to show any moderating role of external interaction to predict the value of the DV (OCB), the hypothesis was not supported.

Step-wise regression was run to assess the R square change due to the first IV (EI) and second IV (external interaction). Model 1 is the same as in table 24 as it measures change in R square value due to first IV (EI), while the test showed no significant results (F values higher than 0.05) for Models 2 and 3 as evident in Table 26. Model 2 indicated that there was no significant change in R square on account of EI and external interaction (R square change = .002), while Model 3 specified that R square change was insignificant due to the first IV, second IV and their corresponding interaction term (R square change
= .003). Thus, results do not support the fourth hypothesis of the study that external interaction moderates the relationship between EI and performance.

Table 26
Model Summary Showing Moderating Role of External Interaction for EI-Performance Relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.635(a)</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.34325</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.637(b)</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.34300</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.639(c)</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.34257</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Centered EI
b Predictors: (Constant), Centered EI, Centered External Interaction
c Predictors: (Constant), Centered EI, Centered External Interaction, Interaction EI and External Interaction

Internal Interaction

The fifth hypothesis, that internal interaction moderates the EI-performance relationship, was checked by conducting the GLM procedure. The results (see Table 27) indicate the presence of a prediction relationship for the overall model, intercept, first IV (EI), second IV (internal interaction) and for the interaction term of the two variables (F values less than .05). The significant F value for the interaction term validates the presence of a moderating role of internal interaction for EI-performance relation. This provides support for the fifth hypothesis.
Table 27
Showing Tests of Between-subjects Effects for EI-Performance Relation Moderated by Internal Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>41.246(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.749</td>
<td>131.365</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6338.561</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6338.561</td>
<td>60563.141</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cent. EI</td>
<td>19.954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.954</td>
<td>190.655</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cent. Internal Interaction</td>
<td>4.370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.370</td>
<td>41.753</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (Cent. EI * Cent. Internal Interaction)</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>8.950</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>46.051</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7051.769</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>87.297</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .472 (Adjusted R Squared = .469)

The strength of prediction relation was assessed through change in R square values by applying the same step-wise regression method. Table 28 indicates that the significant change in R square value is observed for Models 1, 2, and 3. Model 1 has been discussed earlier, however Model 2 shows a .058 R square change value (F value less than .05) and Model 3 indicates a .011 R square change value (F value less than .05). The results indicate that to predict DV, the interaction term significantly adds to the amount of incremental variance explained. So, the results signify the existence of the moderating role of internal interaction for the relationship between EI and performance, which validates the fifth hypothesis of the study.
Table 28
Model Summary Showing Moderating Role of Internal Interaction for EI-Performance Relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 .635(a)</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.34325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 .680(b)</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.32642</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 .687(c)</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.32351</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Centered EI
b Predictors: (Constant), Centered EI, Centered Internal Interaction
c Predictors: (Constant), Centered EI, Centered Internal Interaction, Interaction EI and Internal Interaction

Moderating Role of Gender

The sixth hypothesis, that employees’ gender moderates the EI-performance relationship, was checked by applying the general linear model, where OCB was taken as the DV and EI as the independent variable with gender as a fixed variable. The results in Table 29 show significant F values (less than .05) for the overall model, intercept, IV (emotional intelligence) and for gender as the main effect. But to predict OCB, the model does not produce a significant amount of incremental variance (F value > .05) for the interaction term (gender and EI), which refutes the presence of gender as a moderating role in the said EI-performance relationship. Thus, the sixth hypothesis is not supported.
Table 29
*Showing Tests of Between-subjects Effects for EI-Performance Relation Moderated by Employees’ Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>34.995</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.665</td>
<td>99.606</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3515.664</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3515.664</td>
<td>30020.032</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>3.888</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cent. EI</td>
<td>26.281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.281</td>
<td>224.414</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Cent. EI</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>51.294</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7024.707</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>86.289</td>
<td>441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS
In the study, the association between employees’ emotional intelligence and job performance was examined. Also, the moderating role of different job characteristic and demographic variables for the EI-performance relationship was assessed. In the light of relevant research studies available, in this final chapter the results of the study presented in previous chapters are discussed so as to reach conclusions based upon the analysis made. An important part of this chapter is demonstrating the theoretical and practical contribution of the study. The current findings are related to the extant literature discussed in Chapter 2. The limitations of the study and directions for future research are highlighted in the chapter.

**Discussion**

**Correlation between EI and OCB**

Based on the findings of previous research, a significant positive correlation was expected between EI and performance. In the current study, it was hypothesized that employees’ emotional intelligence is positively correlated with job performance. Pearson bivariate correlation coefficient was calculated to measure the association between emotional intelligence and performance as measured through organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). The results indicated a moderately high positive correlation ($r = .635$) between the independent (EI) and dependent (OCB) variables. Although the association measured in the pilot study, which employed a significantly smaller sample, was slightly low ($r = .604$), the results of the main study confirmed the results of the pilot study.

Nearly, similar results were found by Harmer’s (n.d.) study that indicated the value for the correlation coefficient as $.53$ for the relationship of emotional intelligence
and organizational citizenship behavior. However, some previous studies had shown weak EI-performance relationships. Carmeli’s (2003) study indicated the value for the correlation coefficient to be .38, a figure considerably less than reported in the current study. EI was measured through Schutte et al.’s (1998) research tool and OCB (altruistic behavior) by using three items only. The low correlation in previous research might be the result of using a single aspect of OCB (altruistic behavior) that measure employees’ behavior towards coworkers only whereas the current study measures OCB on three factors; loyalty behavior, employee participation and conscientious behavior. Carson et al. (2005) reported a correlation coefficient of .33 between emotional intelligence and OCB. Their study measured EI through a 15-item scale and OCB through a 13-item scale. The weak correlation in their study might have resulted because the measures employed were different, short and less used by other researchers. Bastian (2005) found the majority of correlations between the life skills much higher for self-report EI measures than for ability-based measures. Hence, the high association found in the current study (r = .635) may be attributed to its reliance on self-report scales for the independent and dependent variables; that might have led to a more common method variance.

**Predicting Employee Performance**

The second hypothesis in this study implies that employees’ score on EI significantly predicts their job performance. The results proved that EI reserves the ability to predict significantly employees’ performance. The regression equation produced the slope value for EI to predict the value of DV (OCB) as .81, consequently, the coefficient of determination calculated as .40.

Previous research had reported somewhat less predictability power of emotional
intelligence for OCB than was established by the current study. According to Harmer (n.d.), only 28% of the variance in OCB was found to be accountable due to emotional intelligence. EI was measured through Schutte et al.’s self-report inventory and OCB through a 34 item scale having subcomponents of loyalty, obedience, social participation, advocacy participation and functional participation. Possible reasons for the low R square value might be due to different culture and environment (Harmer’s study was conducted in Australia) and potentially different aspects of the OCB measure being employed. Rosete (2007, p. 144) asserted that ability based EI measure significantly predicted the performance of interpersonal behaviors (R square change = .18) and business outcomes achieved (R square change = .05). Less predictive power may be attributed to use of ability-based measure of EI and actual performance measures for managers/leaders. Chia (2005) revealed that recruiters look for applicants’ soft skills and competencies to select candidates for further interview as well as for final job offer. This orientation of recruiters also validated the prediction result of the current study.

**Moderating Role of Job Autonomy**

The third hypothesis, that job autonomy moderates the relation between emotional intelligence and performance. The results of general linear model analysis showed that job autonomy significantly predicts the value of DV (OCB) as the main effect and as the interaction term (EI and Autonomy). Furthermore, the step-wise regression model indicated that job autonomy significantly adds to the incremental variance explained for OCB as a second independent variable (R square change = .03) and as an interaction term (R square change = .006).

No previous empirical work was found to study the moderating role of job
autonomy in the EI-performance relationship. However, Abraham (2004) theorized that under high levels of job autonomy employees with emotional competencies will show improved performance and reported that, it was only ‘autonomy in task selection’ (a dimension of job autonomy) that interacted significantly with emotional intelligence. According to Gellatly and Irving (2001), autonomy was observed as a moderating variable for personality and contextual performance relationship. Morgeson et al. (2005) showed that ‘role breadth’ was acting as a mediating variable in the autonomy-performance relationship. As job autonomy offers incumbents the opportunity to perform more tasks, so Morgeson et al. concluded that the opportunity to expand one’s role is important for the performance of additional work tasks. The existence of a moderating role of autonomy might be argued with the help of Hackman and Oldham’s job characteristics model. Jobs that provide autonomy lead to experienced responsibility for work outcomes, which leads to increased job performance (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).

**Moderating Role of External Interaction**

The fourth hypothesis of the study maintains that external interaction moderates the relationship between emotional intelligence and performance. The general linear model failed to show a significant F value to regress the value of the criterion variable on the basis of external interaction as a main effect, and as an interaction term (EI and external interaction). The current results were validated through step-wise regression analysis that produced insignificant values (R square change) for external interaction as a second independent variable or as an interaction term.

The current study could not establish the moderating role of external interaction for the said relationship and no research could be found that has examined this particular
phenomenon. So, an alternate explanation may be made based upon somewhat relevant work. Kernbach and Schutte (2005) concluded that higher emotional intelligence of service providers leads to greater customer satisfaction. However, service providers’ EI interacted with level of difficulty of transaction in a way that for high transaction difficulty conditions, there were no significant difference in satisfaction between the high and medium levels of service providers’ EI. Langhorn (2004) concluded that general managers’ emotional intelligence contributes about 13% to customer satisfaction. So, low or no direct relation of EI with customer satisfaction might be argued to substantiate the current results that failed to show any moderating role of external interaction.

**Moderating Role of Internal Interaction**

The fifth hypothesis in the current research asserts that internal interaction moderates the EI-performance relationship. General linear model indicated that internal interaction can significantly predict OCB as a main effect and as an interaction term (EI and internal interaction). The multiple regression analysis confirmed the conclusions drawn. Significant change in R square was observed for internal interaction as the second independent variable (R square change = .058), and the interaction term (R square change = .011).

Internal interaction was found to moderate the said relationship just as some studies have found EI to be associated with interaction. Rosete (2007, p. 161) discussed that emotional intelligence is needed more in jobs that involve substantial social interaction. Lopes, Grewal, Kadis, Gall, and Salovey (2006) showed a significant positive correlation (r = .31) between EI and positive interaction that measured their relationships with other members in workplace settings. The same results were shown by Lopes et al.
(2004) for the relationship between EI and positive interaction measured through self-report and friends’ report. Langhorn (2004) and Carmeli (2003) have found EI to be significantly and positively correlated with team satisfaction and job satisfaction. As extant research has shown a positive association of internal interaction with EI, and of EI with team and job satisfaction, the finding of this study that internal interaction moderates the EI-performance relation have been shown to replicate the earlier studies.

**Moderating Role of Gender**

The last hypothesis in the current study says that employees’ gender moderates the EI-performance relationship. The results of the general linear model analysis indicated a prediction relation for gender as an independent variable but no prediction relation was found for the interaction term of gender and EI. The absence of a moderating role of gender has been substantiated by research conducted by Farooq (2004, p. 77) who could not establish any significant difference between the academic performance of both adolescent boys and girls.

**Conclusions**

In a slowed economy, get smart techniques like quality management, re-engineering and customer relationship management have reached a maximum effectiveness. Careers that rose solely on the use of logical and analytical skills are having a difficult time in this volatile business environment (James & LaMotta, 2002). People can solve technical problems far easier than human problems they face in their home, as well as in their professional lives (Mayer & Ciarrochi, 2006, p. xiii). Traditionally, organizations were not inclined to improve their employees’ abilities pertaining to emotional intelligence. Only recently, organizations are concentrating on the
deficiency of their employees’ emotional intelligence. According to Slaski and Cartwright (2003), emotional intelligence can be taught and learnt. Similarly, McQueen (2004) proposed that EI should be included in nurse education to enable them for better patient care. Organizations are taking this move by improving their employees’ skills related to customer handling, negotiation, conflict management and communication. Employees’ negative emotions are being controlled by introducing anger/aggression management classes. Thus, the current study offers important and relevant conclusions for the business world; it can be concluded that findings and results are strong on account of following grounds:

1. The research was not limited to a single sector; rather it involved participants from manufacturing as well as services sectors.

2. The study was not limited to a single industry but focused on a variety of industries such as banking, education, technology/communication, cement and electrical goods.

3. Respondents were representing different functional departments within an organization; for instance sales, HRM/HRD, marketing, finance/accounts and technical departments.

4. The sample was not drawn from a single city or a smaller region; rather it covered three provinces and big cities such as Lahore, Multan, Rawalpindi, Karachi and Peshawar were included.

5. Three different managerial levels lower, middle and top management were studied to draw data and conclusions.

6. A considerably large sample size (444) was employed to collect reliable data
The preliminary findings of the study support the notion that emotional intelligence of employees has a significant and positive correlation with performance as measured through organizational citizenship behavior. Moreover, on account of a large sample size some degree of generalizability of results may be made to similar environments in Pakistan. Also it was concluded that employee performance in terms of organizational citizenship behavior can be predicted on the basis of his/her score on emotional intelligence. Additionally, the inquiry validated the moderating role of job autonomy and internal/organizational interaction for the proposed EI-performance relationship. Even so, the moderation of the external interaction and the employees’ gender for the EI-performance relationship could not be established.

As a result of the research, it can be argued that a clear understanding of the importance of EI in work setting may help the managers to develop human resources into a more positive and committed work force by developing and enhancing their emotional intelligence abilities.

An understanding of the exact role of situation/environment may guide managers and employees in terms of making better decisions in relation to employee selection, placement, training, development, transfer, promotion and retention by making a proper match between each employee and his/her workplace situation.

**Contribution of the Study**

The present study contributes to the existing body of knowledge on both theoretical and practical fronts.
Theoretical Implications

A number of measures for dependent (OCB), independent (EI), and moderating variables (Job Autonomy, External Interaction and Internal interaction) have been employed by the current study. The reliability coefficients for different scales measured provide the basis for future research to be conducted in general and corporate world in particular. The establishment and measurement of the association between EI and OCB extends its validity to the business environment of a developing country like Pakistan. The predictability power of EI to explain the corresponding change to the value of OCB is an important contribution of the study to the existing body of knowledge. None of the three moderating variables have been studied previously with respect to the proposed EI-performance link. Therefore, the important addition to available research is the establishment and measurement of the moderating role of different variables to predict the incremental variance explained for the dependent variable. The study validates the moderating role of job autonomy and internal interaction for the EI-performance relationship.

Practical Implications

Surveying the reasons for 3149 employees who voluntarily left their organizations, Branham (2005, p. 19) found that very few of the reasons for exiting were based on thinking; mostly they originated out of strong feelings/emotions like disappointment, frustration, anger and resentment. The cost to the company of a leaving employee was calculated to be at least the cost of his/her annual salary (Branham, 2005, p. 3). Earlier, a personality measure was used to predict OCB to select employees and it
offered merits (Borman, 2004). However, the relevance of emotions to turnover (Carmeli, 2003) makes it imperative for organizations to have employees that score high on emotional intelligence to curtail the high costs of employee leaving. Cadman and Brewer (2001) have suggested the use of EI as a criterion for the selection of students to be future nurses; they concluded that clinical efficiency and professional readiness can be promoted by emotionally intelligent nurses. Farooq (2004, p. 95) suggested facilitating the selection process by identifying the soft skills required for a particular job. Fatt (2002) argued that managers should measure applicants’ EI to evaluate their competencies before hiring them. In this regard, the current study has produced strong results by proving that employees’ performance can be predicted on the basis of their scores on EI, which also has suggested the use of emotional intelligence measures as a selection tool by human resource managers. This strategy will work as a proactive measure to reduce turnover. Furthermore, employees with high EI will be fine-tuned to the needs, responses, attitudes and behavior of colleagues, customers, public and media; thus, improving their performance qualitatively.

Studies (Barth, 2001; Dulewicz & Higgs, 2004; Slaski & Cartwright, 2003) have shown that emotional competencies can be increased and developed through training courses. Fatt (2002) recommended that managers should consider the contributions of EI as an important factor for the development of staff. The current study indicated a high and positive association of EI with employee performance. Hence, organizations can design EI interventions to train and develop human resources to get work performance improved.

Studies suggested that EI measures can be used as a placement tool by
organizations (Rosete, 2007, p. 164; Farooq, 2004, p. 95). The current study has validated that EI is more important for jobs offering interpersonal settings than positions that require little interpersonal contact. On the same lines, human resource managers may use EI as a base and support for their decisions related to transfer, promotion and retention of employees.

Studies have proved that emotional intelligence is associated negatively with stress, depression, anxiety and conflict; and positively with health and well being (Fernandez-Berrocal, Alcaide, Extremera, & Pizzaro, 2006; Slaski & Cartwright, 2003; Suliman & Al-Shaikh, 2007; Tsaousis & Nikolaou, 2005). So, management may develop employees’ EI skills as an indirect tool to improve their health and reduce stress and conflict.

The focus of the current study was on OCB, which stresses the need for contextual performance/extra role behaviors to be included in performance management systems of the organizations. Wong and Snell (2003) claimed that employee performance management systems should consider judgments from all sides about employees’ actual and potential contributions in the supporting performance domains of citizenship, emotions and ethics. Rosete and Ciarrochi (2005) asserted that employees must be able not only to deliver outputs (‘what’ performance), but also deal effectively with colleagues and staff (the ‘how’ of performance). Thus executives having ‘what’ but not ‘how’ skills may lead to staff turnover and low performance.

The validation of the moderating role of job characteristics like autonomy and internal interaction suggests that the EI-performance relationship can be strengthened further by improving a particular situation. So link can be made stronger for highly
emotionally intelligent employees by creating more autonomous work designs and
placing them in positions requiring high social interaction.

**Limitations of the Study**

All empirical studies have limitations and this study is not an exception. The very first limitation of the study is its reliance on the self-report questionnaire as compared to ability based measure. MacCann, Matthews, Zeidner, and Roberts (2003) concluded that performance based tests for EI appear more promising than self-report questionnaires. Self-report measures are vulnerable to possible distortions and response biases. As the study was done in private sector organizations, where emphasis remains on efficiency/productivity and job insecurity prevails pervasively, so the respondents (employees) may go for impression management while responding to all the items in general and to the items pertaining to OCB, job autonomy, external and internal interaction in particular. The participants’ inclination for impression management may exaggerate the mean values for variables and thereby strengthen the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Another shortcoming of self-report data is that the subjects may choose to respond in a socially desirable way. Here, respondents may conceal their actual responses for ones they consider are more desirable or acceptable by the society. Under socially desired behavior, the respondents may avoid extreme options on the rating scales. Potentially, such behavior contaminates the scales and distorts the mean values for variables and thus leads to inaccurate results.

For the current study, data for all the measures have been sought from the same source, which is employees, so any inefficiency in that source may pollute all the measures and give rise to imprecise results for the study.
Collectivism is a characteristic of the Pakistani culture, so the attitudes of the people in such a culture may be a possible limitation of the study. Participants may respond to the questionnaire items even when they do not understand them. This leads to imprecise data for the research, which may be taken to the extremes.

The measures used for the study may possess their own limitations. Brackett and Geher (2006) discussed that independent factor analyses for the measure developed by Schutte et al. (1998) have produced one-, three-, and four-factor solutions which indicated that the measure did not directly converge on to Salovey and Mayer’s original model of EI.

Another limitation might be the assessment of performance because it measured only one aspect of performance; that is, organizational citizenship behavior. It ignored job specific/task performance and counterproductive behavior which are important determinants of employees’ performance.

Finally, certain limitations pertain to sampling techniques and population. The reliance of the study on convenience sampling to select participants may be a limitation as the results can only be generalized to a wider population with a degree of caution.

The population for the study comprised of executives/officers working in different functional departments of for-profit organizations in the private sector; therefore, results or findings of the study cannot be generalized to public sector or social sector organizations.

**Recommendations**

The current research leaves certain areas unexplored. The study relates and predicts performance only on the basis of emotional intelligence. Future research may
investigate as to why EI leads to higher performance. The study conceives an EI-performance relationship where EI was taken as an independent variable and OCB as a dependent variable. In order to study such a phenomenon further, longitudinal studies using OCB as an independent variable and EI as dependent variable can be undertaken.

The current study constructs a model with EI as an independent variable, job characteristics as a moderating variable and performance as a dependent variable. The model suggests that it is the environment/situation that exerts its contingent impact for the person characteristics and performance relation (EI-performance). But future research may cast a model where instead, EI may be considered as a moderating variable and job characteristics as an independent variable which implies that it is the person characteristics that perform the moderating role for the proposed environment/situation relation with performance.

The study measures the moderating role of job characteristics for EI-performance relation and checks for job autonomy, external interaction and internal interaction. Other job characteristics of Hackman-Oldham’s model (skill variety, task identity, task significance, and feedback) may also be examined.

The current study measures only the association and prediction relation for EI-performance relationship in the corporate sector. Future studies may validate the relation by researching in the public and social sectors. Further research may be conducted also by applying a more formal probability sampling method to enable the generalization of the results.

The study relied on a self report measure of EI that correlates with the existing measures of personality. Future researches may go for an ability based EI measure
(MSCEIT). The research employs only a single aspect of performance (OCB) to validate the association and prediction relations between EI and performance. Future studies may base these relations on a combined measure for employee performance (Task performance, OCB, and Counter productive behavior).
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APPENDICES
Appendix A: Questionnaire
Dear Participant,

This questionnaire is designed to study “The Moderating Role of Job Characteristics on Emotional Intelligence and Performance” for my doctoral dissertation. The information you provide will help better understand the said research question, as you are the only one who can give a correct picture as to how you experience job characteristics at your job and the way you feel for your organization. The objective is to have your views on the issue. There is no “right” or “wrong” answer. So, please respond to all questions.

I will be greatly thankful for sparing some time in filling up the enclosed questionnaire in a frank manner. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and used only for academic purposes.

Thanking you, in advance, for your help in furthering this research endeavor.

Researcher
Amjad Ali
Ph.D Scholar

Research Supervisor
Prof. Dr. M. Iqbal Saif
Head, Management Sciences Department
Foundation University, Islamabad
The following statements ask about the way you feel, think, or act in your life/organization. For each statement, please encircle the number that most appropriately matches your answer, by using the scale given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I know when to speak about my personal problems to others
2. When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them
3. I expect that I will do well on most things I try
4. Other people find it easy to confide in me for their personal problems
5. I find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages (facial expressions, hand gestures etc.) of other people
6. Some of the major events of my life have led me to re-evaluate what is important and not important
7. When my mood changes, I see new possibilities
8. Emotions are one of the things that make my life worth living
9. I am aware of my emotions as I experience them
10. I expect good things to happen
11. I like to share my emotions as I experience them
12. When I experience a positive emotion, I know how to make it last
13. I arrange events others enjoy (treats, trips, social gatherings)
14. I seek out activities that make me happy
15. I am aware of the non-verbal messages (facial expressions, hand gestures etc.) I send to others
16. I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others
17. When I am in a positive mood, it is easy for me to solve problems
18. I recognize the emotions people are experiencing by looking at their facial expressions
19. I know why my emotions change
20. When I am in a positive mood, I am able to come up with new ideas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 I have control over my emotions
22 I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them
23 I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on
24 I praise others when they have done something well
25 I am aware of the non–verbal messages other people send
26 When another person tells me about an important event in his/her life, I almost feel as though I have experienced this event myself
27 When I feel a change in emotions, I tend to come up with new ideas
28 When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail
29 I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them
30 I help other people feel better when they are down
31 I use good moods to help myself keep trying in the face of obstacles
32 I can tell how people are feeling by listening to the tone of their voice
33 It is difficult for me to understand why people feel the way they do
34 I encourage friends and family members to patronize my organization
35 I try to generate favorable goodwill for my company
36 I actively promote my organization's products and services to people
37 I always say good things about my organization to others
38 I tell outsiders my organization is a good place to work
39 Regardless of circumstances, I am exceptionally courteous and respectful to clients
40 I sometimes make creative suggestions to coworkers about work problems
41 I tend to encourage coworkers to contribute ideas and suggestions for service improvements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I sometimes make constructive suggestions for work improvements
2. I regularly attend and participate in my organizational meetings
3. I do consult with colleagues before initiating actions
4. I carefully follow my organization's regulations and procedures while nobody is watching me
5. I sometimes don't bother to read the organization's memos and announcements
6. I rarely bother to keep up with developments in my organization
7. I sometimes don't give thought to the quality of the product of my work
8. I sometimes don't follow work rules and instructions while working
9. My job allows me to make my own decisions about how to schedule my work
10. My job allows me to decide on the order in which things are done on the job
11. My job allows me to plan how I do my work
12. My job gives me a chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work
13. My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own
14. My job provides me with significant autonomy in making decisions
15. My job allows me to make decisions about what methods I use to complete my work
16. My job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work
17. My job allows me to decide on my own how to go about doing my work
18. My job requires spending a great deal of time with people outside my organization.
19. My job involves interaction with people who are not members of my organization
20. On my job, I frequently communicate with people who do not work for the same organization as I do
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. My job involves a great deal of interaction with people outside my organization

63. My job involves frequent interactions with other people in the organization

64. At my job, I have satisfying interactions with other people in the organization

65. My job offers me a friendly work environment

66. I have good co-workers

Please respond to the following items.

Age: ___________ (in years)  Gender:  
- Male
- Female

Marital Status:  
- Single
- Married
- Other

Degree:  
- MBA
- MCS
- BSc Engineering
- Other (specify) ____________

Job Level:  
- Top Management
- Middle Management
- Lower Management

Department:  
- Sales
- Customer Service
- HRM/HRD
- Finance/Accounts
- Technical/Production
- Other (specify) ____________

Mother Tongue/First Language:  
- Urdu
- Pashto
- Punjabi
- Sindhi
- Siraiki
- Other (specify) ____________

Organization: ______________________________________________

Number of years worked in this organization: ________________

Total length of job experience: ____________________ (in years)

Your star (horoscope), if you don’t know your star then please mention your date of birth

Star: ___________________/Date of birth: Day ___ ___ Month ___ ___