

Intrinsic Motivation, Emotional Intelligence, and Perceived Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Employees in Service Organizations

* *Sugandha Pramanik*

** *Ishita Chatterjee*

Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between intrinsic motivation, emotional intelligence, and organizational citizenship behavior of various service sector organizations ; 248 employees were selected from 35 service sector organizations (public and private) in and around Kolkata. The following tools were administered to test the hypotheses: (a) Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: What Do You Look For In A Job? by Pareek (1997); (b) Emotional Intelligence Scale by Chaddha and Singh (Singh, 2003); (c) Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist by Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, and Kessler (2012). For analysis of the data, descriptive statistics, ANOVA, correlation and regression were used. The findings revealed that significant and positive relation existed between intrinsic motivation, emotional intelligence, and organizational citizenship behavior. Intrinsic motivation and emotional intelligence together predicted 27% of the total variance of organizational citizenship behavior. Intrinsic motivation and organizational citizenship behavior were found to be better in case of private-sector employees than in case of public-sector employees. As it was found that intrinsic motivation and emotional intelligence are positively related to organizational citizenship behavior, so employers may motivate their employees intrinsically to retain them and while hiring, employers may consider candidates with high emotional intelligence who can benefit the organization.

Keywords : intrinsic motivation, emotional intelligence, organizational citizenship behavior, public sector and private sector.

JEL Classification : L200, L220, L330

Paper Submission Date : September 27, 2015 ; **Paper sent back for Revision :** November 20, 2015 ; **Paper Acceptance Date :** November 25, 2015

Today, across the globe, workers are recognized as the main source of organizational value – as human beings are the main agents who add value to other resources (Wright, McMahan, & McWilliams, 1994). Employees play the key role in the organization, and the firm's competitive advantage comes through their involvement and commitment to the organization (Hitt, Biermant, Shimizu, & Kochhar, 2001; Huselid, 1995).

With globalization, the market has expanded tremendously – both in terms of consumers and labor. Employers therefore face the dual challenge to compete effectively in a fast-changing environment as well as retain the valuable human resources in the face of competition from rival firms. To ensure productivity output and retention, managers need to keep their employees motivated for optimum output. Hence, work motivation, or the driving and pulling forces that determine persistence of efforts towards a goal at work, is one of the most widely researched and theorized field in the study of organizational behavior. (e.g., Latham & Pinder, 2005)

One of the most important theories of motivation is the motivator-hygiene factor theory by Herzberg. Herzberg

* *PhD Research Scholar*, Department of Applied Psychology, University of Calcutta, Kolkata - 700 073.

E-mail : tosugandha@gmail.com

** *Assistant Professor*, Department of Applied Psychology, University of Calcutta, Kolkata - 700 073.

(1966) proposed the Two Factor Theory of Motivation that attempts to explain satisfaction and motivation in the workplace (Pareek, 1997). Herzberg classified work-related needs and incentives into hygiene factors (those that does not lead to satisfaction when provided, but whose absence cause dissatisfaction) and motivators factors (which, when provided, cause satisfaction, but whose absence may not lead to dissatisfaction). Important hygiene factors are salary, working conditions, company policy, etc. and important motivators are advancement, recognition, responsibility, and the work itself (Herzberg, 2003; Pareek, 1997). It may be seen that the hygiene factors listed by Herzberg relate exclusively to characteristics that are supplementary to the job while the motivators relate to the core job activity. Hence, according to Pareek (1997), Herzberg's hygiene and motivator factors may also be called extrinsic and intrinsic factors of motivation, as the former needs are contextual (external or extrinsic) and the latter related to the content of the job (internal or intrinsic).

Review of Literature

(1) Intrinsic Motivation : Intrinsic motivation refers to motivation driven by an interest or enjoyment in the task itself. Intrinsic needs either exist within an individual or are derived from the task itself (an individual's interests or the nature of job). These intrinsic needs are not influenced by changes in external rewards (Mamatha & SatyaNandini, 2014). It reflects the natural human propensity to engage in a task of interest and exercises an individual's knowledge, skill and capabilities. The intrinsically motivated person is moved to perform an act for the fun or challenge involved rather than because of external prods, pressures, or rewards (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

The concept of intrinsic motivation was first introduced in the 1970s, and since then it has been recognized as an increasingly relevant source of work motivation (Dysvik, Kuvaas, & Gagné, 2013). The natural inclination to intrinsically motivated behavior is a significant feature of human nature. It plays an important role in development (Kasser & Ryan, 2001) and leads to high quality performance (Utman, 1997). Further, since intrinsic motivation does not depend on external rewards or incentives, if an employee is intrinsically motivated, he/she tends to remain so even when external outcomes are erratic or absent (Ma, Jin, Meng, & Shen, 2014). This makes intrinsic motivation highly relevant for the modern workplace - subject to extremes of market conditions, uncertainty, completion and insecurity.

(2) Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) are defined as “individual behaviors that are beneficial to the organization and are discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system” (Organ, 1988). These behaviors are a matter of personal choice, such that their omissions are not generally understood as punishable. OCB is considered as one of the highly contributing factor in overall organizational performance and productivity (Tziner & Sharoni, 2014). OCB is the extra role behavior performed by employees, which is not critical to the task or the job, but serves to facilitate organizational functioning (Lee & Allen, 2002). They are above and beyond the normal call of duty, and include altruistic acts without any selfish intent, directed toward the organization as well as people in the organization.

OCB is an important indicator of employees' effectiveness in the organizations and is indicative of his/her satisfaction and loyalty. According to Zeinabadi (2010), employees who are satisfied with their jobs generally reciprocate with positive behavior, including OCBs. A meta-analysis of 55 studies conducted by Organ and Ryan (1995) showed that employee's job attitudes, especially job satisfaction and organizational commitment, may predict OCB better than dispositional variables. Various other researches also supported the relationship between job satisfaction and OCB (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983; Ngunia, Slegers, & Denessen, 2006; Organ, 1988; Schappe, 1998; Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Research in organizational behavior have indicated that organizations grow when their employees are willing to contribute to the workplace above and beyond the formal requirements from their job, that is when the employees show citizenship behavior to the organization (Bolino & Turnley, 2003). Previous researches have

shown that organizational citizenship behavior has contributed favorably to various types organizational outcomes. This can be listed as service quality (Bell & Menguc, 2002), organizational commitment (Podsakoff, McKenzie & Bommer, 1996), job involvement (Dimitriades, 2007). A number of studies have tried to identify the antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior, so as to create conditions conducive to enhancing extra role behaviors that are beneficial to the organizations (e.g., Fisk & Friesen, 2012; Organ & Ryan, 1995). It has been stated that commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors are closely related – as the committed employees engage themselves in the behaviors that enhance their value and support for the organization (Zeinabadi, 2010).

(3) Intrinsic motivation and Organizational Citizenship Behavior : The work behaviors of employees are guided by their motives. Motives may also guide an employee's discretionary, non-task and extra role behaviors (Chen & Carey, 2009; Finkelstein, 2011). Extra-role behaviors at work are said to occur when individuals implement discretionary behaviors that go beyond the formal reward system or prescribed requirements of a job to gratify some higher-order individual need, or to coordinate the work behavior in interpersonal way. These behaviors are less likely to be formally rewarded as compared to assigned job behaviors and they are presumably performed for self-generated, intrinsic reasons (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). Lee and Allen (2002), who linked "intrinsic cognitions" to some forms of organizational citizenship behavior, also supported this notion.

Based on the previous research, the following hypothesis was formed.

➤ **H1:** Intrinsic motivation of the employees will be significantly related to perceived organizational citizenship behavior of the employees.

(4) Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behavior : Ever since it was popularized by Daniel Goleman (1996), emotional intelligence has been the catchphrase for a substantial quantity of academic as well as practitioner-oriented literature in human resource management. Mayer and Salovey (1997) defined emotional intelligence as 'the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thoughts, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth.'

When an employee possesses high emotional intelligence, it may be said that he has the ability to work well with others, is endowed with self management and relationship management skills, and may play an effective role in the organization by making the right decisions (Rahim & Malik, 2010). It is trainable (Lantieri & Goleman, 2008), making it suitable for planned workplace interventions. Previous studies indicated that higher the emotional intelligence the better will be the organizational citizenship behavior (Antony, 2013). Studies were carried out to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence and dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior (Carmeli & Josman, 2006 ; Korkmaz & Arpaci 2009). The present research focuses on emotional intelligence as it has been a reliable predictor of positive work outcomes.

Based on the previous research, the following hypothesis was formed :

➤ **H2:** Emotional intelligence of the employees will be significantly related to perceived organizational citizenship behavior of the employees.

Following the H1 and H2, it was proposed that;

➤ **H3:** Intrinsic motivation and emotional intelligence will predict perceived organizational citizenship behavior of the employees.

(5) Impact of Industrial Types on Organizational and Employee Outcomes : There are several studies showing that variation in types of organizations play a significant role in organizational and employee work outcomes. Organizations have been classified in various ways. One of these classifications is based on the ownership of the organization - public sector organizations are private sector organizations. The public sector consists of governments and all publicly controlled or publicly funded agencies, enterprises, and other entities that deliver public programs, goods, or services. And the part of the economy that is not state-controlled, and is run by private individuals and/or companies for profit are called private sector organizations. It can be said that, private sector encompasses all for-profit businesses that are not owned or operated by the government.

In the post independence era, India emerged as a country with mixed economy with co-existence of both public and private sectors. But unfortunately government-aided industries, that is, public sector took over the market until the waves of globalization and liberalization arrived in India. Since 1995, with the commencement of various progressive industrial laws, the Indian government took initiative to focus on privatization. And gradually privatization of state-owned enterprises, especially that of different service organization, play a very crucial role in unfolding various economic policies for the growth and development of a developing country like India. Literature show that employees and manager from public sector do differ from that of their private sector counterparts (Ambrose & Kulik, 1999; Buelens, & Van den Broeck, 2007 ; Rainey & Bozeman, 2000).

Considering the previous research in relation to public sector and private sector dichotomy the hypotheses were formulated.

↳ **H4:** Intrinsic motivation of the employees will differ significantly across different types of service organizations.

↳ **H5:** Emotional intelligence the employees will differ significantly across different types of service organizations.

↳ **H6:** Organizational citizenship behavior of the employees will differ significantly across different types of service organizations.

The present study aims at finding the relationships among intrinsic motivation, emotional intelligence and perceived organizational citizenship behavior of employees. It also explores whether intrinsic motivation, emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior of employees differ significantly across different types of service organizations.

Method

The present research was aimed at finding the role of intrinsic motivation, emotional intelligence in perceived organizational citizenship behavior and finding if the factors considered here vary across sectors. To test this, data was collected using the cross-sectional survey research method from employees working in public and private service organizations in Kolkata. The data collection procedure took 4 months (March - June 2015) followed by analyses for 1 month. The employees were approached through their organizations. The organizations were selected by the Multistage Stratified Random sampling method by considering 5 zones of Kolkata city (north, south, east, west and central). Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

The age of the participants ranged between 25 years and 55 years. We considered only those employees who are designated as first-line supervisors or above and those who have served their present organization for at least 2 years. Only male employees were considered as participants. All the employees those who have participated in this present study are graduates and above.

The final sample was comprised of 248 employees. Employees working in different types (public/private) of

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics Values for the Variables

VARIABLES	PUBLIC SECTOR N = 120		PRIVATE SECTOR N = 128	
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD
Intrinsic Motivation	55.25	8.17	52.85	9.74
Emotional Intelligence	217.62	29.75	219.84	27.06
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	55.19	10.89	64.18	9.61

service organizations were selected. 120 data was collected from employees from 15 public sector organizations and 128 collected from employees from 20 private sector organizations.

➤ **Measures Used :** Intrinsic Motivation was measured by a scale named Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: What do you Look for in a job? The scale was developed by Pareek (1997). It measures perceived importance of intrinsic and extrinsic motivators, or what Herzberg called motivators and hygiene. The instrument contains fourteen items, seven related to intrinsic and seven to extrinsic motivation. It is a self administered questionnaire and respondents are asked to rank on the fourteen items depending on their importance to them – from 1 (highest rank) to 14 (lowest rank). The reliability was found to be 0.88 for this scale. Emotional Intelligence was measured using the Emotional Intelligence Scale was developed by Chaddha and Singh (Singh, 2003). The scale has 15 questions with 4 options for each question. This scale measures emotional reactions of the respondents in different situations. The gross score on emotional intelligence was used for the present study. The scale yielded the reliability of .89.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior was measured using the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist was designed by Fox, Spector, Goh, Bruursema, and Kessler (2012). This scale constitutes of 20 items. This instrument is designed to assess the frequency of organizational citizenship behaviors performed by employees. The OCB-C uses a Likert type 5-point frequency scale ranging from 1 to 5. This scale reports the reliability of .86. Prior to collecting data, informed consent was taken from the participants. Only willing participants were involved in the study. The data was analyzed using Analysis of variance and pearson's product moment correlation and multiple regression analysis.

Analysis and Results

Table 1 shows that the mean values of intrinsic motivation, emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior scores for the employees working in service organizations both public and private organizations. The Table 2 shows the results of ANOVA, used to test hypotheses 1 to 3. Regarding hypothesis 1, the F value 4.353 (.038) shows that there exists significant difference between the employees of the private sector organizations and public sector organizations in terms of intrinsic motivation. Since the lower score indicates higher inclination to intrinsic motivation, so it can be said that the employees of private sector organizations are more inclined to intrinsic motivation than the employees of public sector organizations. Hence the hypothesis H4 is accepted here.

Regarding H5, it can be seen that in case of emotional intelligence the F value 0.378(0.539) is not significant even at 0.05 level. So it can be said that there is no significant difference between the employees working in public sector and private sector organizations. Hence the H5 is rejected here. Regarding H6, the F value 47.723(0.000) is significant at 0.01 level of significance which indicates that there exists significant difference between the employees of the private sector organizations and public sector organizations in terms of organizational citizenship behavior. Hence the hypothesis H6 is accepted here. Mean values of organizational citizenship behavior states that the employees of private sector organizations possessed significantly higher organizational

Table 2. Summary of the Results of Analysis of Variance of Intrinsic Motivation, Emotional Intelligence, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scores

VARIABLES		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intrinsic Motivation	Between Groups	353.967	1	353.967	4.353	.038
	Within Groups	20003.969	246	81.317		
	Total	20357.935	247			
Emotional Intelligence	Between Groups	304.899	1	304.899	.378	.539
	Within Groups	198395.000	246	806.484		
	Total	198699.899	247			
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Between Groups	5012.130	1	5012.130	47.723	.000
	Within Groups	25836.092	246	105.025		
	Total	30848.222	247			

Table 3. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Values Between Variables

	Intrinsic Motivation	Emotional Intelligence	Organizational Citizenship Behavior
Intrinsic Motivation	-	-.472**	-.452**
Emotional Intelligence		-	.444*
Organizational Citizenship Behavior			-

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

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Intrinsic Motivation results are in negative direction because of reverse scoring.

Table 4. Results of Multiple Regression among Intrinsic Motivation, Emotional Intelligence, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Variables	Beta	T	Sig.	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Sig.
Intrinsic Motivation	-.313	-5.057	.000	.522	.273	.267	45.940	.000
Emotional Intelligence	.296	4.790	.000					

Intrinsic Motivation results are in negative direction because of reverse scoring.

citizenship behavior than the employees of public sector organizations.

The Table 3 shows significant positive correlation between organizational citizenship behavior and motivation, emotional intelligence. Hence, the hypotheses H1 and H2 are accepted here. The Table 4 reveals that intrinsic motivation and emotional intelligence predict organizational citizenship behavior [45.940 (.000)]. So the hypothesis H3 is accepted. Organizational citizenship behavior is positively related to intrinsic motivation and emotional intelligence. Intrinsic motivation and emotional intelligence have significant relationships with OCB. They predict 27% of the total variance of Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate the role of intrinsic motivation and emotional intelligence in organizational citizenship behavior. In addition, this study also contributes to understanding whether different types of service organization differ in terms of above mentioned variables.

The demonstrated role of intrinsic motivation in organizational citizenship behavior is consistent with prior findings. Hackman and Oldham (1976, 1980) pointed to the prominence of intrinsic motivation in the study of

organizational behavior, indicating that the employees would prove to be more effective if their vigor to accomplish any work were energized by self-generating, internal rewards. Piccolo and Colquitt (2006) reported that the findings of their study on Transformational leadership and job behaviors support this assertion, as intrinsic motivation was significantly associated with task performance. They also claim that their study is among the first to link intrinsic motivation to OCB, as 'individuals driven by self-generating rewards were more likely to perform discretionary behaviors that are rarely associated with external rewards'. The present study reported that there is a positive relation between intrinsic motivation and organizational citizenship behavior.

The present results also suggest that there is a significant positive relation between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior. This finding is in line with prior findings in this year (e.g., Antony, 2013). A study done by Charbonneau and Nicol (2002) found a positive correlation between emotional intelligence and both altruism and compliance which are dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior. According to Carmeli, (2006) altruistic behavior may be elevated by emotional intelligence as it capacitates employees to recognize and understand their coworkers' feelings and as they are able to shift easily from negative to positive moods, simultaneously, they respond in a more appropriate manner than the employees with low emotional intelligence. When an individual is possessing positive state of mind and have a more positive outlook on life can engage himself in altruistic behavior which in turn makes the altruistic behavior more rewarding (Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Staw, Sutton, & Pelled, 1994). Emotionally intelligent employees are equipped with the abilities to understand, regulate, and alter emotions of own-self and those of others (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), better prepared to perceive the need for help (Abraham, 1999) and more prone to offer empathic responses to their colleagues at both personal and occupational level (Carmeli, 2006). Employees with high emotional intelligence are tend to comply with organizational policies and aim at helping the overall organization as they understand organizational norms and rules, and display high levels of sensitivity toward informal behavioral expectations prevail in the workplace (Carmeli, 2006).

The present findings also showed that employees of public sector organization and private sector organization significantly differ in terms of intrinsic motivation and organizational citizenship behavior. In both the cases, employees from private sector scored better than the employees belong to public sector organizations. This difference might be the result of different organizational settings. In public sector employees usually do not get ample opportunity to grow themselves according to their individual preferences, as they are bound to conform to their immediate supervisors. Public sectors are more stringent in the implementations of government rules, regulation and policies and that often lead the employees not to practice their creative potentialities with required accountability in achieving their targets. And hence the employees lack several intrinsic motivating factors like responsibility, interesting works or doing something worthwhile.

Despite dissonance or constraints, some employees are compelled to carry on their job in public sector organizations in order to get job security and additional fringe benefits. It has been found that there is a body of literature which portrays that public sector employees are motivated by job security and stability and the same studies also confirm that, private sector employees are motivated by status, opportunity to advance and autonomy that is, the intrinsic factors of motivation and not much concerned about job security (Jurkiewicz, Massey, & Brown, 1998). The private sector managers reported greater autonomy and challenge in their job than the public sector managers and further, the private sector managers consider autonomy as an important factor to elicit effective and efficient performance in their job and higher level of organizational commitment might take place if this perception coincides with the existence of autonomy in the present job. Since emotional intelligence has been considered here from the perspective of trait approach, therefore no significant difference was found between the employees of public sector and private sector.

Implications

Motivated employees are one of the greatest assets in the organizations. If the employees are intrinsically

motivated they tend to show greater involvement to their present job and they require less extrinsic factors to be motivated, which is actually the comes from the organizations' or from the employers' part. The organization takes minimum liability to retain those employees who are intrinsically motivated. This study is highlighting the relationship between intrinsic motivation, emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior in perspective to developing countries as they have significant implications for HR managers and policy makers. It has been found from the study that intrinsic motivation is positively related to organizational citizenship behavior; hence employers or managers should focus to motivate employees intrinsically so as to improve the organizational citizenship behavior on part of the employees. On the other hand it has also found that emotional intelligence is positively relayed to organizational citizenship behavior, hence employers can select the employees with high emotional intelligence and undertake training to emotional intelligence for the existing employees in order to enhance the organizational outcome.

Conclusion

The findings of this study point out the importance of intrinsic motivation and emotional intelligence in relation to organizational citizenship behavior in service sector organizations. The study revealed the intrinsic motivation and emotional intelligence have found to be significant predictors for organizational citizenship behavior. The study also revealed that employees of private sector organizations scored better than the public sector employees in terms of intrinsic motivation and organizational citizenship behavior. Whereas employees from private sector organizations did not differ than the public sector counterpart in case of emotional intelligence. Considering only male respondents is one of the major limitations of this study. Given the importance of the context, future research may be carried out considering the female counterparts.

Limitations of the Study and Scope for Further Research

Since it is a cross sectional study the long term consequences of the variables under the study were not explored. Taking sequential study of variables may to some extent highlight the long term effect of the variables. Since this study was limited only to the male respondents, further studies might be carried out considering both the genders. In the present study, only intrinsic motivation and emotional intelligence have been considered as the predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. The study can be expanded by including other relevant organizational and individual related variables. The present research has studied organizational citizenship behavior grossly. Further research can be carried out considering various dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior.

References

- Abraham, R. (1999). Emotional intelligence in organizations: A conceptualization. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 125, 209 - 224.
- Ambrose, M. L., & Kulik, C. T. (1999). Old friends, new faces: Motivation research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25 (3), 231-292.
- Antony, J. M. (2013). The influence of emotional intelligence on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Social Science & Interdisciplinary Research*, 2 (3), 110-115.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal*, 26 (4), 587-595.

- Bell, S. J., & Menguc, B. (2002). The employee-organization relationship, organizational citizenship behaviors, and superior service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 78 (2), 131-146.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2003). Going the extra mile: Cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 17(3), 60-71.
- Buelens, M., & Van den Broeck, H. (2007). An analysis of differences in work motivation between public and private sector organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 67 (1), 65-74.
- Carmeli, A., & Josman, Z. E. (2006). The relationship among emotional intelligence, task performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Human Performance*, 19(4), 403-419.
- Charbonneau, D., & Nicol, A. A. (2002). Emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviors in adolescents. *Psychological Reports*, 90 (2), 361-370.
- Chen, S. X., & Carey, T. P. (2009). Assessing citizenship behavior in educational contexts: The role of personality, motivation, and culture. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 27 (2), 125-137.
- Dimitriades, Z. S. (2007). The influence of service climate and job involvement on customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior in Greek service organizations: A survey. *Employee Relations*, 29 (5), 469-491.
- Dysvik, A., Kuvaas, B., & Gagné, M. (2013). An investigation of the unique, synergistic and balanced relationships between basic psychological needs and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(5), 1050-1064.
- Finkelstein, M. A. (2011). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and organizational citizenship behavior: A functional approach to organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, 2 (1), 19-34.
- Fisk, G. M., & Friesen, J. P. (2012). Perceptions of leader emotion regulation and LMX as predictors of followers' job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23 (1), 1-12.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition*. New York: Random House.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. R. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85 (1), 199-220.
- Goleman, D. (1996). Emotional intelligence. Why it can matter more than IQ. *Learning*, 24(6), 49-50.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16 (2), 250-279.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Herzberg, F. (2003). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 81(1), 87-96.
- Herzberg, F. I. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland : World Pub. Co.
- Hitt, M. A., Biermant, L., Shimizu, K., & Kochhar, R. (2001). Direct and moderating effects of human capital on strategy and performance in professional service firms: A resource-based perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1), 13-28.
- Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (3), 635-672.

- Jurkiewicz, C. L., Massey Jr, T. K., & Brown, R. G. (1998). Motivation in public and private organizations: A comparative study. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 21 (3), 230-250.
- Kanfer, R. 1991. Motivation theory and industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 75-170). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (2001). Be careful what you wish for: Optimal functioning and the relative attainment of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. In S. Peter & M. Kennon (Eds), *Life goals and well-being: Towards a positive psychology of human striving*. Ashland, OH, US: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Korkmaz, T., & Arpacý E. (2009). Relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with emotional intelligence. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1 (1), 2432-2435.
- Lantieri, L., & Goleman, D. P. (2008). *Building emotional intelligence: Techniques to cultivate inner strength in children*. Boulder, Colorado : Sounds True Inc.
- Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review Psychology*, 56, 485-516.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 131 - 142.
- Ma, Q., Jin, J., Meng, L., & Shen, Q. (2014). The dark side of monetary incentive: how does extrinsic reward crowd out intrinsic motivation. *Neuroreport*, 25 (3), 194-198.
- Mamatha, J., & Satyanandini, A. (2014). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivational aspirations of IT and ITES employees in Bangalore. *Journal of Business and Management*, 16 (9), 34 -44.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence: Implications for educators. In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development, emotional literacy, and emotional intelligence* (pp. 3 - 31). New York: Basic Books
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17 (2), 145-177.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48 (4), 775-802.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Pareek, U. (1997). *Training instruments for human resource development*. New Delhi : Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.
- Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49 (2), 327-340.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22 (2), 259-298.
- Rahim, S.H., & Malik, M.I. (2010). Emotional intelligence & organizational performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (10), 191-197.

- Rainey, H. G., & Bozeman, B. (2000). Comparing public and private organizations: Empirical research and the power of the a priori. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10 (2), 447-470.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25 (1), 54-67.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9 (3), 185-211.
- Schappe, S. P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, 132 (3), 277-90.
- Singh, D. (2003). *Emotional intelligence at work: A professional guide*. New Delhi: Response Books.
- Staw, B. M., Sutton, R. I., & Pelled, L. H. (1994). Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organization Science*, 5, 51 - 71.
- Tziner, A. & Sharoni, G. (2014) Organizational citizenship behavior, organizational justice, job stress, and work family conflict: Examination of their interrelationships with respondents from a non-Western culture. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30, 35-42.
- Utman, C. H. (1997). Performance effects of motivational state: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 1 (2), 170-182.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17 (3), 601-617.
- Wright, B. E. (2001). Public-sector work motivation: A review of the current literature and a revised conceptual model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART*, 559-586.
- Wright, P. M., McMahan, G. C., & McWilliams, A. (1994). Human resources and sustained competitive advantage: A resource-based perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5 (2), 301-326.
- Zeinabadi, H. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 998-1003.