


2016

# Predictive Ability of Emotional Intelligence Scores on Employee Self-Reported Perception of Comprehensive Organizational Credibility Inventory

Leif Allen Ford  
*Walden University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), and the [Vocational Rehabilitation Counseling Commons](#)

---

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu](mailto:ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu).

# Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Leif Ford

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,  
and that any and all revisions required by  
the review committee have been made.

## Review Committee

Dr. David Mohr, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Billy Vaughn, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Frederica Hendricks-Noble, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer  
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University  
2016

Abstract

Predictive Ability of Emotional Intelligence Scores on Employee Self-Reported

Perception of Comprehensive Organizational Credibility Inventory

by

Leif A. Ford

B.S., Northwest Christian University, 1994

M.B.A., Northwest Christian University, 2008

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Organizational Psychology

Walden University

May 2016

## Abstract

Research has shown that emotional intelligence (EQ) is positively related to beneficial outcomes in organizations. Research has also found that negative perceptions of organizational credibility (OC) can result in adverse economic and social costs for organizations and communities. To date, the existing research has failed to examine whether employee EQ might affect employee perceptions of OC. A quantitative, non-experimental study was conducted using a sample of employees in large health and medical organizations throughout the United States. The variables in the study were measured using the Assessing Emotions Scale and the Comprehensive Organizational Credibility Inventory. Multiple regression analyses and Pearson correlation examined the relationships between employee EQ and employee perceptions of OC. Results of the study showed that employees with high EQ perceived their employing organizations to have high OC for areas of accountability, goodwill, integrity, legitimacy, and power, but low OC for areas of attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, and trustworthiness. Results also showed that high employee EQ predicted high OC for areas of accountability, goodwill, legitimacy, and power, but not for areas of attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, or trustworthiness. Results supported existing research that has identified links between EQ and organizational-related factors. Results also supported existing research that showed that credibility constructs may be culturally and situationally determined. This study has provided an incentive for leaders of organizations to integrate pro-EQ hiring and training interventions that can foster positive OC behaviors and strengthen organizations both internally and externally.

Predictive Ability of Emotional Intelligence Scores on Employee Self-Reported  
Perception of Comprehensive Organizational Credibility Inventory

by

Leif A. Ford

B.S., Northwest Christian University, 1994

M.B.A., Northwest Christian University, 2008

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Organizational Psychology

Walden University

May 2016

## Dedication

I would like to begin by thanking my Father God for orchestrating the circumstances, time, and resources necessary for me to complete my academic goals. I am extremely grateful! I would also like to thank my wonderful and devoted wife, Amy, for extending encouragement, prayers, and tireless efforts toward supporting our family while I have been preoccupied with scholarly responsibilities. I am so appreciative. To my mom and dad, thanks for imparting your wisdom to me and for modeling the importance of discipline and hard work. Finally, to my three wonderful children, Holly, Avery, and Chad, I love you extravagantly, miss you immensely, and hope you will one day both understand the inspiration that you provided me, as well as share in the satisfaction of this achievement.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to both acknowledge and personally thank Dr. David Mohr, my committee chairperson, as well as Dr. Billy Vaughn, my methodologist committee member, for their assistance and dedication in helping me complete this dissertation research project. Although the journey that is now finally culminated in the completion of this assignment could not be described as easy, nor expedient, the individual feeling that now accompanies this project completion is certainly and unequivocally one of intense pride and satisfaction. I am humbled and grateful for all of the experience, wisdom, and feedback that you have extended to me over the course of this process.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	v
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Social Change Implications .....	2
Background of the Study .....	3
Emotional Intelligence Defined and Relevance to Organizations .....	5
The Research Question .....	7
Problem Statement.....	8
Purpose of the Study.....	9
Research Questions and Hypotheses .....	9
Theoretical and Conceptual Framework for the Study.....	10
Organizational Credibility and Source Credibility .....	10
Emotional Intelligence .....	12
Emotional Intelligence and Self-Determination Theory.....	12
Emotional Intelligence and Performance Theory .....	13
Nature of the Study .....	14
Definition of Terms.....	16
Assumptions.....	18
Limitations and Delimitations.....	19
Significance.....	20
Summary and Conclusion.....	21



Chapter 2: Literature Review .....	23
Introduction.....	23
Documentation .....	23
Theoretical Foundation .....	24
Source Credibility and Organizational Credibility .....	24
Organizational Credibility .....	25
External vs. Internal OC Focus.....	27
Emotional Intelligence (EQ).....	28
Mainstream Conceptualization of EQ.....	31
EQ as an Ability-Based Model .....	32
EQ and Self-Determination Theory .....	32
EQ and Performance Theory .....	33
Key Variables and Concepts.....	34
Dimensions of OC.....	34
EQ Utilization in Organizations.....	44
Dimension of EQ .....	44
Summary and Conclusion.....	57
Chapter 3: Methodology .....	59
Introduction.....	59
Research Design and Rationale .....	59
Methodology .....	60
Population .....	61

Sampling and Sampling Procedures .....	61
Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection .....	62
Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs .....	63
Emotional Intelligence .....	63
Organizational Credibility .....	65
Research Questions and Hypotheses .....	75
Data Analysis Plan .....	75
Threats to Validity .....	79
Ethical Procedures .....	80
Summary and Conclusions .....	80
Chapter 4: Results .....	82
Introduction .....	82
Data Collection .....	82
Descriptive and Demographic Sample Characteristics .....	83
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables .....	85
Summary and Conclusions .....	100
Chapter 5: Discussion .....	103
Introduction .....	103
Interpretations of the Findings .....	105
Self-Determination Theory Implications .....	106
Performance Theory Implications .....	107
Methodological Implications .....	108

Practical Implications.....	109
Limitations of the Study.....	111
Recommendations.....	112
Implications for Social Change.....	114
Summary and Conclusions .....	116
References.....	118
Appendix A: Demographic Information.....	171
Appendix B: Permission for Use of the Assessing Emotions Scale .....	173
Appendix C: Permission for Use of the Leader Accountability Scale.....	174
Appendix D: Permission for Use of the Celebrity Endorsers Scale .....	176
Appendix E: Permission for Use of the Corporate Social Responsibility Scale.....	176
Appendix F: Permission for Use of the Corporate Credibility Scale.....	178
Appendix G: Permission for Use of the Ethos/Source Credibility Scale.....	179
Appendix H: Permission for Use of the Ethical Leadership at Work Questionnaire .....	180
Appendix I: Permission for Use of the Organizational and Issue Legitimacy Scale.....	181
Appendix J: Permission for use of the Power Source Scale .....	182
Appendix K: Questions from the Assessing Emotions Scale and COCI Scale .....	183

## List of Tables

Table 1. Study Measures.....	71
Table 2. Study Measures Psychometric Properties.....	73
Table 3. Dimensions of Schutte et al.'s (1998) Assessing Emotions Scale and the Comprehensive Organizational Credibility Inventory.....	79
Table 4. Sample Demographics .....	84
Table 5. Number of items, Reliability, Means, and Standard Deviations for all Scales .....	86
Table 6. Bivariate Correlations Among Study Variables .....	87
Table 7. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Accountability .....	90
Table 8. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Attractiveness.....	91
Table 9. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Corporate Social Responsibility.....	92
Table 10. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Expertise.....	93
Table 11. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Goodwill.....	94
Table 12. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Integrity .....	95
Table 13. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Legitimacy.....	96
Table 14. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Power.....	97
Table 15. Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Trustworthiness .....	98
Table 16. Results of Multiple Regression for EQ Overall Predicting OC Variables Without Covariates .....	100

## Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

### **Introduction**

Research has shown that emotional intelligence (EQ) is both generally and positively related to multiple beneficial outcomes in organizations (Lekavičienė & Remeikait, 2004; Momeni, 2009; Rafiq, Naseer, & Ali, 2011; Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011). Research has also demonstrated that negative perceptions of organizational credibility (OC) can result in adverse economic and social costs for organizations and communities, making organizational image improvement an important goal (Bosetti & Victor, 2011). Although research has demonstrated that it is important for organizations to evaluate internal perceptions of organizational credibility (Davies and Chun, 2002; de Chernatony, 1999; Duncan, Ginter, & Swayne, 1998), the relationship between certain individual factors that may influence internal stakeholder perceptions is somewhat unclear. To date, the existing research has failed to examine whether the emotional intelligence of employees (appraisal and expression of emotion in self and others, regulation of emotion in self and others, and utilization of emotion in solving problems) might affect employee perceptions of the credibility of organizations (accountability, attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, integrity, goodwill, legitimacy, power, and trustworthiness). This study examines the relationship between employee EQ and their perceptions of OC.

Chapter One will provide a definition and brief summary review of the literature on OC, including the characteristics that compose OC, and the importance of OC to the organizations. Chapter One will also provide a definition and brief summary review of

the literature on EQ, including the characteristics that compose EQ, and its relationship to organizations. In addition, this first chapter will describe an existing gap in the knowledge on the relationship between OC and EQ, and provide a justification for the research study. The chapter will provide a problem statement, describe the nature of the study, introduce the research questions and hypotheses, and show the theoretical and conceptual framework for the study. Finally, the chapter will describe the nature of the study, provide associated definitions, and address any assumptions, limitations, delimitations, and significance of the study.

### **Social Change Implications**

Individuals, families, and modern social groups are commonly influenced negatively by various types of organizations harboring low-credibility behavior. Modern military and governmental organizations on a global level continue to be associated with low-credibility behaviors such as crime, corruption, and predation (Deane, 2008). Low-credibility perceptions stemming from the behaviors of financial institutions (De Haan, Amentbrink, & Waller, 2004), health care organizations (Hackett, Glidewell, Carder, Doran, & Foy, 2014), and nongovernmental organizations (Gibelman & Gelman, 2004) have significantly undermined public trust. The integration of high levels of institutional power, low levels of public accountability, and ineffective means of confronting cognitive dissonance phenomena among private religious organizations have produced profound levels of emotional and psychological pain and low-credibility perceptions of such organizations on a societal level (O'Loughlin, 2013).

Research has suggested that increasing knowledge and awareness of low-credibility organizational issues on both individual levels (Birkinshaw, 1997) and national levels (Ulman, 2014) can help to improve or reform organizational behavior. By examining how employee EQ may affect employee perceptions of OC, this study may affect social change by helping to identify credibility issues in organizations that may have previously gone unnoticed. In the event that previously unknown credibility issues are identified, the study may incentivize leaders and trainers to develop new OC strategies or offer improved organizational training techniques that appeal to employees with high EQ. For example, workplace curricula such as the Mastering Emotional Intelligence (MEI) Program (Sala, 2002) or Williams Lifeskills Programs (Williams & Williams, 1997) have provided significant and valid measures of positive EQ change when tested on employees in organizations. By identifying effective countermeasures for any credibility-based issues in organizations that have previously been hidden, the overall credibility of organizations may be raised, which may indirectly and positively alter other organizational work factors, such as the level of employee work satisfaction experienced and the quality of work.

### **Background of the Study**

Low OC can be detrimental to the external image and financial success of an organization. Low OC has been identified as a significant indicator of corporate misconduct, and the effects of low OC in one organization may generate negative OC effects on a public level for other organizations operating within the same organizational community (Beatty, Ewing, & Tharp, 2003). Low OC has served as an indicator that

external perceptions of a company are too closely tied with profit-based motivations (Hammond, 1986). Due to the fact that OC significantly influences the nature, direction, growth, and sustainability of consumer behaviors (Richardson, 1986), low OC can jeopardize the economic wellbeing of organizations. Research has shown that negative perceptions of OC can result in adverse economic costs for organizations and communities (Bosetti & Victor, 2011), making image improvement an important organizational goal.

Equally important, OC is important to the internal health of an organization. For internal stakeholders (employees), low OC is a key indicator that a crisis environment has existed within an organization and an indicator that poor communication strategies have been used with employees within a crisis environment (Barrett, 2005; David, 2011). Falcione (1974) has noted that employees demonstrate significantly higher levels of motivation and satisfaction and a higher degree of willingness to collaborate in decision-making processes within their organization when the organization provided supervisors who were deemed credible. Employees assess the credibility of corporate social responsibility programs of their organization by evaluating whether the programs are authentic, whether such programs are justice-based, and whether the programs have been extended significant levels of funding (McShane & Cunningham, 2012). Employees perceive coworkers in their organizations to be more credible when they have demonstrated honesty in their communication (Dunleavy, Chory, & Goodboy, 2010). Comparatively higher levels of OC have been associated with job seekers who are



exposed to first-hand testimonials of current or former employees of organizations (Walker, Feild, Giles, Armenakis, & Bernerth, 2009).

Research has also showed a link between positive internal stakeholder perceptions of their organization and external stakeholder perceptions of that same organization. For example, employees that demonstrated more trustworthiness in their organization (David, 2011; Nan & Qin, 2009) and possessed more expertise (Baker, 2010; Majchrzak, Jarvenpaa, & Hollingshead, 2007) positively influenced external stakeholder perceptions of that organization. Organizations with optimal levels of credibility possessed internal and external stakeholder perceptions of OC that aligned with each other (Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Hatch & Schultz, 2001).

### **Emotional Intelligence Defined and Relevance to Organizations**

Emotional Intelligence (EQ) was first defined in the academic literature in 1990 as “the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s own thinking and actions” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 189, para. 2). EQ is thus a human characteristic that moderates cognition and behavior.

EQ is positively related to multiple beneficial outcomes between employees and their organizations, such as employee commitment in organizations (Khalili, 2011; Rangriz & Mehrabi, 2010), employee motivation in organizations (Adyasha, 2013), and employee performance in organizations (Allam, 2011; Aydin, Leblebici, Arslan, Kilic, & Oktem, 2005); Gondal & Husain, 2013; Othman, Abdullah, & Ahmad, 2008; Rangriz & Mehrabi, 2010; Ravichandran, Arasu, & Arun Kumar, 2011). Furthermore, EQ has been

positively related to employee retention behaviors (Harrison-Walker, 2008), employee work climate (Sathya Kumar & Iyer, 2012; Momeni, 2009), employee work creativity (Othman et al., 2008), employee favorable learning capability (Rafiq, Naseer, & Ali, 2011), employee citizenship behavior (Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011), and employee sociopsychological climate (Lekavičienė & Remeikait, 2004).

There is evidence that EQ is a characteristic that is learned or developed. Schutte et al.'s (1998) EQ model or framework is comprised of three core dimensions including appraisal and expression of emotion in the self and others, regulation of emotion in the self and others, and utilization of emotions in solving problems (Schutte et al., 1998). Each dimension is based upon certain learned competencies (Goleman, 1995; Schutte et al., 1998). EQ is not a fixed trait; instead, EQ is linked to humans' ability to learn. The human ability to learn determines much of the executive functioning, including cognitions and behavior.

According to Salovey and Mayer (1990), when high EQ individuals have monitored and discriminated emotions (their own and others), they also have modified their cognitions. Thus human perceptions, which are synonymous to cognition, have been altered by improving EQ. Because OC is a human perception of the value of an organization, organizations interested in improving OC would desire to recruit and retain high EQ individuals. Organizations interested in strengthening OC also might strive to develop higher EQ within their workforce.

The available research has indicated that internal stakeholder perceptions are important for gauging the credibility of organizations, and that when changes to

organizations have occurred as a result of any changes in internal perceptions, the organization has been strengthened (de Chernatony, 1999; Davies & Chun, 2002). Research has also indicated that both EQ and OC are measurable constructs (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Schutte et. al, 1998; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001), and that OC scales can be used to determine credibility in organizations (Due & Jorgensen, 2011; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Balboni, 2008).

The perceptions of internal stakeholders can influence the external perceptions, or OC, of an organization (de Chernatony, 1999). To date, the research has focused more on external factors and has not investigated in depth the variables that potentially influence or lead to development of positive perceptions with internal stakeholders about their organization. Organizations should then seek to understand and positively influence the perceptions of their employees (de Chernatony, 1999) in order to improve the credibility of that organization, which, in turn, improves that organization's financial success, attractiveness, and influence. The logical research question then becomes: How do we improve the perceptions about an organization with its internal stakeholders? This question may be answered by a study that examines the perceptions that employees have of their organization.

### **The Research Question**

Existing research about OC has primarily focused on external variables. Research efforts have been driven by marketing and structural-based issues such as consumer and external stakeholder perceptions (Jin & Yeo, 2011; Moussa & Touzani, 2008; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001), advertising and brand (Goldsmith, Lafferty, & Newell, 2000; Lafferty

& Goldsmith, 2004; Sallam, 2011; Sojung & Sejung Marina, 2010), purchase intention (Lafferty & Goldsmith, 1999; Sallam, 2011), sponsor motivation (Rodgers & Bae, 2005), and emerging markets (Zhang & Rezaee, 2009). Perceptions of OC also vary by organization (Due & Jorgensen, 2011), suggesting that OC can be unique to a specific organization and influenced by a variety of factors.

Furthermore, there is evidence that internal stakeholders' perceptions of OC have influenced external stakeholder perceptions (de Chernatony, 1999). Internal stakeholders' perceptions have improved credibility gaps in organizations (Davies and Chun, 2002). de Chernatony (1999) found that leaders of organizations overemphasized the importance of external perceptions of credibility while minimizing or ignoring internal perceptions of credibility. Davies and Chun (2002) have suggested that researchers or leaders in organizations examine the significance of internal stakeholder perceptions, particularly when credibility gaps have existed between internal and external stakeholders. Thus, a valid argument may be made that it is necessary for organizations to focus their attention on improving the perceptions of internal stakeholders such as employees.

### **Problem Statement**

There is a lack of historical research on internal stakeholder perceptions of the credibility of their organization. Due to the significant influence of the corporate advertising, branding, and marketing culture, the majority of research has focused on external stakeholder perceptions of credibility in organizations (e.g., Kazeolas & Teven, 2009). The few research articles that have examined the impact of emotional intelligence within organizations have examined general organizational constructs, such as leadership

(Hahn, Sabou, Toader, & Rădulescu, 2012), organizational climate Momeni, 2009), and employee turnover rate (Njoroge & Yazdanifard, 2014). None of the existing research studies have examined the influence of EQ on OC.

Research has indicated that the study of OC and EQ is current, relevant, and significant to the field of psychology. Continued and increasing emphasis on self-awareness and social awareness behaviors in organizations are heightening the demand that organizations develop a broader understanding of how EQ may affect perceptions of various organizational dynamics (Momeni, 2009). The body of research on EQ and OC has provided reliable and valid measurement scales that may be utilized in contemporary study to draw conclusions regarding the relationship between the two variables (Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Schutte et. al., 1998).

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between EQ and employee perceptions of OC within an organization. The study will measure the levels of EQ and OC within the sample, and then determine the strength and direction of a relationship between the two variables. If a relationship does exist, this study will examine the predictive ability of EQ on OC by regressing the specific dimensions of each variable on each other. When this information is known, it will help organizational consultants to tailor-design credibility interventions specific to an organization.

### **Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The following research questions and hypotheses were developed to determine if EQ may be correlated to OC, and also to determine whether EQ may predict OC .

RQ1: What is the relationship between employee self-report of EQ, as measured by Schutte et al.'s (1998) Assessing Emotions Scale, and employee self-report of the perception of organizational credibility, as measured by the Comprehensive Organizational Credibility Inventory?

*H<sub>0</sub>1*: There is no relationship between self-report measures of EQ and OC.

*H<sub>1</sub>1*: There is a positive relationship between self-report measures of EQ and OC.

RQ2: Do high scores on EQ dimensions predict high scores on OC dimensions?

*H<sub>0</sub>2*: High scores on EQ will be accompanied by high scores on OC.

*H<sub>1</sub>2*: High scores on EQ will not be accompanied by high scores on OC.

### **Theoretical and Conceptual Framework for the Study**

#### **Organizational Credibility and Source Credibility**

The psychological framework for OC may be traced to early studies of source credibility, which examined the attitude and perceptions of the audience toward the communicator (Hovland & Weiss, 1951). Within these formative studies, the attitude and perceptions of the audience was found to be shaped by the degree of acceptance of the material that was presented by the communicator (Hovland & Weiss, 1951). Later research identified various dimensions of source credibility, including character, competence, composure, extroversion, and sociability (McCroskey & Teven, 1975). Contemporary research has recognized other dynamics of source credibility, including surface credibility (initial judgments based on surface traits), initial credibility (perceptions of credibility that are generated before a communicator is exposed to an

audience), transactional credibility (perceptions of credibility that are generated while a communicator is exposed to an audience), and terminal credibility (perceptions of credibility that are generated after the communicator has concluded exposure to an audience), each of which has identified a chronological effect of source credibility (Bühlmann & Gisler, 2005; Fogg, 2003). Other contemporary research has expanded earlier individual-based source credibility studies through the development of a reliable and valid measure of perceived organization-based source credibility, including various dimensions of OC (Newell & Goldsmith, 2001).

A review of the literature indicates that a majority of the foundational research involving source credibility and OC has focused on the developed consumer advertising and marketing strategies and, as such, has emphasized external influences of credibility. For example, McCroskey and Teven's (1975) five dimensions of credibility were linked to the external behavior of the communicator. Another example is apparent in Ohanian's (1990) research, which has examined celebrity product endorsers and their perceived attractiveness. Further examples include Fogg's (2003) research of surface credibility, which examined ways in which the physical characteristics of sources that are visible to audiences may affect perceptions of credibility. Lafferty and Goldsmiths' (1999) research into organizational credibility examined consumer attitudes and purchase intentions.

This research project will examine internal influences of OC, such as EQ. EQ is the best independent variable for this study because Schutte et al.'s (1998) research has suggested that human emotions influence human perceptions. Examining the effects of

EQ on perceptions of OC may provide insight into how certain internal influences may affect OC.

### **Emotional Intelligence**

Schutte et al.'s (1998) EQ model or framework is comprised of three core dimensions including appraisal and expression of emotion in the self and others, regulation of emotion in the self and others, and utilization of emotions in solving problems (Schutte et al., 1998). Each dimension is based upon learned competencies (Goleman, 1995; Schutte et al., 1998). Research has suggested that individuals possess an innate level of EQ that fosters their ability to learn emotional competencies (Goleman, 1995).

### **Emotional Intelligence and Self-Determination Theory**

Schutte et al.'s (1998) EQ model or framework has maintained fundamental roots within self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Self-determination theory is related to intrinsic motivation and has suggested that individual growth tendencies influence personality development and integration as well as behavioral regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Self-determination theory has posited that the identification and satisfaction of three innate needs (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness) provide the means by which humans achieve optimal functionality and growth (Deci & Ryan, 2002). The presence of certain social conditions are believed to regulate the motivation to attain autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Self-determination theory has also suggested that human motivations may vary according to time and situation (Deci & Ryan, 2002) and that the development of both intrinsic and extrinsic



motivations have resulted in varying effects upon psychological health and performance (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

### **Emotional Intelligence and Performance Theory**

Shutte et al.'s (1998) EQ model or framework is tied to performance theory (Goleman, 1994; Goleman, 1998; Utman, 1997; Trafimow & Rice, 2008; Sonnentag & Frese, 2002). Performance theory is a dynamic and multidimensional construct that has described the complex relationship that exists between individual objective task performance and the subjective contextual performance (Sonnentag & Frese, 2002). Similar to EQ models, performance theory has emphasized the development of individually-based intrinsic motivations that foster task performance (Goldman, 1995; Goleman, 1998; Utman, 1997) as well as significant emphasis on the unique learning processes that individuals must adopt and model when engaging task performance (Goldman, 1995; Trafimow & Rice, 2008). As EQ models and social learning theory posit, performance theory has emphasized the importance of external feedback and self-regulation on performance activity outcomes (Bandura, 1971; Sonnentag & Frese, 2002).

The aforementioned theories have provided a rationale for the use of Schutte et al.'s (1998) EQ model in that the EQ dimensions of appraisal and expression of emotion in the self and others, regulation of emotion in the self and others, and utilization of emotions in solving problems collectively have supported the concepts of self-learning, self-awareness, and socially-informed learning. The EQ model has been used extensively in organizational psychology to predict the level of performance and success within organizations (Cherniss, Extein, Goleman, & Weissberg, 2006). This model has helped to

positively affect organizational climate: credibility is an identified factor of organizational climate (Momeni, 2009). Individual studies have supported using dimensions of accountability, attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, goodwill, integrity, legitimacy, power, and trustworthiness as measures of credibility (Balboni, 2008; Berlo, Lermert, & Mertz, Due & Jorgensen, 2011; 1970; Kazoleas & Teven, 1992; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Suchman, 1995; Underwood, 2003).

### **Nature of the Study**

This will be a quantitative study in which data will be collected using a cross-sectional survey (Creswell, 2009). Data analysis will include examining bivariate associations among measures as well as regressing individual dimensions of organizational credibility on dimensions of emotional intelligence. The use of a quantitative study is consistent with previous research on organizational credibility (Newell & Goldsmith, 2001) and a nonexperimental study should provide the relationships between the IV of employee EQ and the DV of perceptions of OC. A cross-sectional survey is associated with single-data collection procedures (Trochim, 2006). A quantitative design is the most appropriate design to address the research question because it tests the relationship between an independent variable on a dependent variable at one point in time (Mann, 2003). Because EQ is a fixed trait, understanding the relationship of EQ with fixed perceptions such as trustworthiness and expertise within organizations will help to validate the nature of the study.

A meta-analysis of 126 studies of organizational work settings and employee attitudes was utilized to estimate the effect size (Lipsey & Wilson, 1993; Neuman, Edwards, & Raju, 1989). Using a power of 0.80 ( $1-\beta = 0.80$ ), an alpha level of .05 ( $\alpha = .05$ ), an estimated effect size of .32 ( $d = 32$ ) was predicted (Lipsey & Wilson, 1993; Neuman et al., 1989). Using this estimated effect size of .32 in conjunction with the Correlation Necessary Sample Size Table (Laureate Education Inc., 2013), a convenience sample of approximately 75 participants would be minimally required to complete the survey. However, to allow for any significant attrition, a sample size of 103 participants was obtained.

I selected large organizations that staffed a variety of employment positions to include in the study. Studies of large organizations provide a level of participant homogeneity and help to minimize concerns regarding external validity (Weinberger, 2003). Understanding how any dimensions of employee EQ and perceptions of OC differ among employees within large organizations may help to explain fundamental value and operational differences in areas such as hiring practices, management practices, and retention.

The participants used in the study were contacted via SurveyMonkey. Representatives of SurveyMonkey forwarded the link to the prepared SurveyMonkey questionnaire to the participant sample. The study assessed demographic variables of age, education level, and occupational tenure. Equal numbers of men and women were sought for inclusion, but the study did not limit or restrict responses by gender. Employees from any willing organizations were first be invited to participate, and then they voluntarily

self-selected for inclusion. The perceived benefit to participation was explained as an opportunity for SurveyMonkey to contribute a \$0.50 donation to a chosen charity. There were no negative consequences as a result of declining to participate in the study. Only employees who completed the survey in full were eligible to have SurveyMonkey contribute a donation on their behalf. Only surveys that were completed in full were included in the study and data analysis.

### **Definition of Terms**

*Accountability*: “Stewardship with responsibility for creation and use of resources with a public reckoning of how they are used” (Hubbell, 2007, p. 6, para. 6).

*Attractiveness*: “The envisioned benefits that a potential employee sees in working for a specific organization” (Berthon, Ewing, & Hah, 2005, p. 8, para. 1).

*Benevolence*: “The extent to which a trustee is believed to want to do good to the trustor aside from an egocentric profit motive” (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995, p. 718, para. 2). Therefore, organizational benevolence is defined as the extent to which an organization is believed to want to do good to its stakeholders aside from an egocentric profit motive.

*Corporate social responsibility*: “A commitment to improve community well-being through discretionary business practices and contributions of corporate resources” (Kotler & Lee, 2005, p. 3, para. 2).

*Emotional intelligence*: “The ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s own thinking and actions” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, pp. 189, para. 2).

*Expertise*: “Displayed behavior within a specialized domain and/or related domain in the form of consistently demonstrated actions of an organization that are both optimally efficient in their execution and effective in their results” (Herling, 2000, p. 20, para. 1).

*Goodwill*: “Perceived caring” (McCroskey & Teven, 1999, p. 92, para. 3).

*Integrity*: “Combinations of attributes and actions that makes organizations coherent, consistent, and potentially ethical” (Young, 2011, pp. 1, para. 1).

*Legitimacy*: “A generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed view of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions” (Suchman, 1995, pp. 574, para. 1).

*Organizational climate*: “Employees’ perceptions and attitudes toward their organization at a given time” (Momeni, 2009, pp. 35, para. 2).

*Organizational commitment*: “A psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1996, pp. 252, para. 3).

*Organizational competence*: “The state and internal qualities of an organization and the means and mechanisms that an organization holds in order to show competence as required by a set goal” (Tautila, 2004, pp. 17, para. 1).

*Organizational credibility*: “How positively or negatively an institution and those representing it are perceived by its stakeholders” (Springer, 2008, pp. 2, para. 2).

*Organizational culture*: “The patter of shared values and beliefs that help members of an organization understand why things happen and thus teach them the behavioral norms of the organization” (Desphande & Webster, 1989, pp. 4, para. 8).

*Power*: “The ability to get things done the way one wants them to be done” (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977, pp. 4, para. 3).

*Source credibility*: “Judgments made by a perceiver concerning the believability of a communicator” (O’Keefe, 1990, pp. 130-131, para. ).

*Trustworthiness*: “The willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party” (Mayer et al. 1995, pg. 712, para 1).

### **Assumptions**

This study assumed that the EQ and OC scales and questionnaires that were used both accurately and appropriately measured the designated variables described. This study also made the assumption that the EQ and OC questionnaires were of reasonable length so that the participants were able to complete them in full and to the best ability of each individual participant. This study additionally assumed that the participants responded to the EQ and Comprehensive Organizational Credibility Inventory (COCI) survey questionnaires in an honest and straightforward manner without psychological or cognitive bias.

### **Limitations and Delimitations**

One limitation of the study involved threats to internal validity, which is the ability of a study to measure what it claims to measure (Kelley, 1927). Threats to internal validity for this study included the potential for natural selection bias or response bias. Although fully random sampling procedures were used, the characteristics of employee participants in any cross-sectional survey are likely to differ somewhat from those employee participants who have chosen not to participate.

A second limitation of the study involved any threats to external validity, which is the ability of a study to effectively apply its findings to populations or settings outside of the study sample (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). Due to the fact that the study used a cross-sectional survey, and therefore single-data collection procedures, it was difficult for this study to draw causal inferences about the relationship of EQ and OC among employees of other organizations (Trochim, 2006). The selected participant sample was comprised of participants of medical and/or health care organizations employing 500 or more, and therefore cannot be considered a representative sample of the target population of all employees of hospitals. The study utilized a single data collection point in order to avoid the potential identification of varying relationships between the same dimensions of EQ and OC among employees in organizations.

A third limitation of this study involved the characteristics commonly associated with self-report data. Participants engaged in self report questionnaires may not have shared the same level of understanding of the concepts used in the questionnaire, they may have been intentionally deceptive in providing their questionnaire responses, or

they may have unintentionally disengaged from the questionnaire process due to a variety of environmental factors and as a result may not have completed the questionnaire accurately (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997)

### **Significance**

The study was significant because the knowledge made available in this study provided employees, managers, and trainers a broader and more accurate understanding of how individual employees perceived the credibility of organizations. Employees who demonstrate high EQ through the ability to effectively appraise and express their own emotions as well as the emotions of others (Schutte et al., 1998) may perceive the credibility of their organization differently than low EQ employees. In the same scope, employees who demonstrate high EQ through the ability to utilize their emotions to solve problems (Schutte et al., 1998) may perceive the credibility of their organization differently than low EQ employees. By examining how employee EQ may affect employee perceptions of OC, the study has helped to identify credibility issues in organizations that may have previously gone unnoticed. In the event that previously unknown credibility issues are identified, the study has helped to incentivize leaders and trainers to develop new OC strategies or offer improved organizational training techniques that appeal to employees with high EQ. For example, workplace curricula, such as the Mastering Emotional Intelligence (MEI) Program (Sala, 2002) or Williams Lifeskills Programs (Williams & Williams, 1997) have provided significant and valid measures of positive EQ change when tested on employees in organizations. By identifying effective countermeasures for any credibility-based issues in organizations



that have previously been hidden, the overall credibility of organizations may have been raised, which may have indirectly and positively altered other organizational work factors, such as the level of employee work satisfaction experienced and the quality of work. In addition, increases in OC may have contributed to valuable increases in positive individual and corporate social behaviors, which has then fostered positive individual and corporate social change (Inoue & Kent, 2011). Increases in OC may lead to improved public perceptions and increased demonstrations of reciprocal community-organization commitment in areas where individuals, groups, and organizations share common communities (Kouzes & Posner, 2011).

### **Summary and Conclusion**

EQ has the potential to transform the way that workers view their organizations and the means by which leaders facilitate their organizations. The purpose of this research study was to examine significant ways in which employee EQ may affect employee perceptions of OC. Uncovering the relationship between employee EQ and employee perceptions of OC may aid all members of organizations in fostering individual worker awareness and overall organizational awareness. Discerning the bond between EQ and OC can show how the integration of certain EQ-related work strategies has transformed the way that organizations are perceived. In addition, understanding the relationship between employee EQ and employee perceptions of OC has helped to advance socially responsible behavior, which has then influenced positive social change.

Chapter Two will provide an introduction of the body of research, describe the literature search strategy, define and describe key terms such as EQ and OC, introduce

and describe various dimensions and several psychological theories that inform the study of EQ and OC, and utilize existing research to describe the association between dimensions of EQ and OC. Chapter Three will provide a rationale and justification for the use of a quantitative-based, cross-sectional research design for the study of EQ and OC. The instrumentation utilized, research questions, methodology for obtaining a participant sample, data analyses, and ethical considerations will be described. Chapter Four will describe and explain the findings on EQ and OC using various tables and figures. Chapter Five will summarize the findings of the relationship between EQ and OC, describe the implications that such findings may have for increasing positive social change through individuals and organizations, provide suggested action steps that may be taken as a result of the findings on EQ and OC, describe any limitations of the study, and provide recommendations of ways that the study of EQ and OC may be continued and expanded.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

### **Introduction**

Although it is important for organizations to evaluate internal stakeholder perceptions of OC (Duncan, Ginter, & Swayne, 1998), the relationship between human characteristics that may influence internal stakeholder perceptions of OC is somewhat unclear. Although research has indicated the EQ of internal stakeholders is an organizational issue that may be directly and positively related to certain organization outcomes (Lekavičienė & Remeikait, 2004; Momeni, 2009; Rafiq, Naseer, & Ali, 2011; Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011), there is no research to date that has identified how employee EQ may affect OC. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between EQ and employee perceptions of OC within an organization. This literature review chapter will examine the origins and theoretical conceptualization of organizational credibility, identify the dimensions of organizational credibility, and review the existing external and internal focus of OC. The chapter will also examine the origins and theoretical conceptualization of emotional intelligence, identify the dimensions of EQ, and identify the existing ways EQ research has been integrated within organizations.

### **Documentation**

Multiple types of sources were utilized in the compilation of the literature review. Online databases included Business Source Premiere, EBSCOHost, ProQuest, Mental Measurements Yearbook, ProQuest Central, PsychARTICLES, PsychINFO, and Sage Journals. Only peer-reviewed articles that were considered important to the research topic

were used in the literature review. Publication dates for this study ranged from 1924-2014. Books and articles authored by Salovey, Mayer, and Goleman, early originators of the theory of EQ as well as articles written by other researchers of EQ and OC were used. A list of search terms used to locate research for this chapter included: *credibility and accountability, credibility and attractiveness, credibility and corporate social responsibility, credibility and expertise, credibility and goodwill, credibility and integrity, credibility and legitimacy, credibility and power, credibility and trust, corporate credibility, emotional intelligence; emotion and intelligence; emotional intelligence and credibility; emotional intelligence and dimensions, emotional intelligence and organizational credibility; institutional credibility, organization and credibility, and organizational credibility.*

## **Theoretical Foundation**

### **Source Credibility and Organizational Credibility**

The origins of scientific studies of OC have been based upon earlier, formative theories of source credibility and speech communication, which found that the level of acceptance given by an audience to a message was significantly affected by the degree to which the audience perceived the source of the message to be trustworthy (Hovland & Weiss, 1951). The ability of sources of communication to persuade their audience that the information presented was either fair or justifiable was positively related to the level of perceived credibility of the source (Hovland & Weiss, 1951).

Historical research after Hovland and Weiss (1951) was slow to identify, distinguish, and confirm the number of distinct dimensions of source credibility.

McCroskey (1966) suggested that authoritativeness and character comprised source credibility. Bowers and Phillips (1967) noted two distinct components of source credibility, trustworthiness and competency. Whitehead (1968) identified four dimensions of source credibility, including trustworthiness, competence, dynamism, and objectivity. The research of Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz (1969) in the field of speech communication suggested that dynamism, qualification, and safety formed the bases of source credibility. Applbaum and Anatol (1972, 1973) identified dynamism, expertise, objectivity, and trustworthiness as key components of source credibility. McCroskey (1975) later expanded his dimensions of source credibility to include character, competence, composure, extroversion, and sociability. Later research within the field of media communication suggested that reporters recognized dimensions such as appearance, motivation, reliability, and the status-position of their sources (Dansker, Wilcox, & van Tubergen, 1980). Early research examining source credibility has suggested that the identification of a significant variety of dimensions of source credibility has resulted from the fact that such dimensions are rooted in the individual perceptions of the perceiver (McCroskey & Young, 1981), is affected by sociocultural dynamics, and is able to evolve over time (Applebaum & Anatol, 1973; McGlone & Anderson, 1973).

### **Organizational Credibility**

OC is defined as “how positively or negatively an institution and those representing it are perceived by its stakeholders” (Springer, 2008, pp. 2, para. 2).

Falcione (1974) was the first researcher to examine the potential effects of source

credibility within organizational and managerial environments. This groundbreaking research identified four dimensions including competence, emotional stability, extroversion, and safety (Falcione, 1974). Later research into organization-based sales and marketing environments identified believability, dynamism, expertise, and sociability as dimensions of source credibility (Simpson & Kahler, 1980). Newell and Goldsmith's (2001) study of corporate credibility identified two dimensions: trustworthiness and expertise.

Richardson's (1986) study specifically identified OC as a significant factor that is responsible for influencing the nature, direction, and growth of the consumer movement. The operating relationship between OC and consumerism has been a significant focus of contemporary research. These studies have focused mainly on the perceptions of external stakeholders, which are rooted in studies of consumer perceptions (Jin & Yeo, 2011; Moussa & Touzani, 2008; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001), advertising and brand (Goldsmith, Lafferty, & Newell, 2000; Lafferty & Goldsmith, 2004; Sallam, 2011; Sojung & Sejung Marina, 2010), purchase intention (Lafferty & Goldsmith, 1999; Sallam, 2011), sponsor motivation (Rodgers & Bae, 2005), public relations (Kazeolas & Teven, 2009), and emerging markets (Zhang & Rezaee, 2009).

The utilization of certain communication messages and integration of certain communication strategies have been found to aid in either the promotion or diminishment of OC. Levenhagen, Porac, and Thomas (1994) have suggested that for any organization seeking to sustain or improve stakeholder perceptions, OC must be either strategically created or strategically captured. Barrett (2005) has noted that limiting the number of

organizational spokespersons and utilizing ambiguous messages helped to protect the credibility levels of organizations. David (2011) suggested that communicating crisis information with stakeholders of organizations in an accurate, thorough, and timely manner could diminish the likelihood that any false or negative messages from stakeholders would go public. Beatty, Ewing, and Tharp (2003) have asserted that instances of specific corporate misconduct negatively affect stakeholder perceptions of organizational credibility for entire organizational communities regardless of whether the organizations within such communities are innocent or guilty.

### **External vs. Internal OC Focus**

Differences among internal and external OC perceptions have been shown to vary according to organization (Due & Jorgensen, 2011). Research studies report that internal stakeholders' perceptions of OC were determinants of external stakeholder perceptions (de Chernatony, 1999). Davies and Chun (2002) suggested a focus on internal stakeholder perceptions rather than on external perceptions, particularly when credibility gaps have remained between the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders. Further, de Chernatony (1999) found that leaders of organizations overemphasized the importance of external perceptions of credibility while minimizing or ignoring internal perceptions of credibility. Yet, stakeholder perceptions of OC have been linked to internal stakeholder perceptions of trustworthiness (David, 2011; Nan & Qin, 2009) and expertise (Baker, 2010; Majchrzak, Jarvenpaa, & Hollingshead, 2007). Indeed, organizations with optimal levels of credibility possessed internal and external

stakeholder perceptions of OC that are aligned with each other (Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Hatch & Schultz, 2001).

Although research has shown that it is important for organizations to evaluate internal stakeholder perceptions of OC (Duncan, Ginter, & Swayne, 1998), the relationship between certain individual factors that may influence internal stakeholder perceptions of various dimensions of OC is somewhat unclear. Although research has indicated the EQ of internal stakeholders (employees) is an organizational issue that may be directly and positively related to certain organization outcomes (Lekavičienė & Remeikait, 2004; Momeni, 2009; Rafiq, Naseer, & Ali, 2011; Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011), the lack of research that might identify how employee EQ may affect credibility in organizations is apparent. To date, no one has examined the relationship of employee self-report of EQ and employee self-report perceptions of OC. Based upon the lack of available research, this question warranted further investigation. This study specifically examined this question and provided knowledge to the field on this issue.

### **Emotional Intelligence (EQ)**

EQ is “the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s own thinking and actions” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, pp. 189). The origins of EQ studies were based upon earlier, formative studies of social intelligence (Thorndike, 1920; Thorndike, 1924; Thorndike & Stein, 1937), human motivation theory and emotional reinforcement (Maslow, 1943), and neuropsychological intelligence (Gardner, 1975). Pioneering researchers of social intelligence (SQ) were



dissatisfied with existing and unidimensional intelligence measures (Thorndike, 1920; Thorndike, 1924; Thorndike & Stein, 1937) and noted that such measures lacked the means to evaluate age-related intellectual development, learning ability, and truth acquisition (Thorndike, 1924). Thorndike's (1920) early framework for human intelligence included three general dimensions of intelligence: abstract, mechanical, and social.

Subsequent pioneering studies of groups of individuals with either abnormal psychology or cognitive impairment noted the significance of personality-based factors that contributed to intelligence (Wechsler, 1943; Gardner, 1975). Wechsler (1950) identified natural human functions that included drive, persistence, temperament, and will. His later research proposed that any valid theory of intelligence would require the inclusion of various nonintellectual factors, such as the potential of individuals to interact with aesthetic, moral, and social values (Wechsler, 1975).

Gardner (1975) noted the significance of emotional factors among intelligence studies that focused on individuals with human cognitive impairment resulting from injury. These studies provided further scientific proof of the need to develop an expanded and multi-faceted framework of human intelligence. Gardner (1994) suggested that various cognitive styles, problem-solving processes, personal temperaments, and types of intelligence are used within the integration of human skills and accomplishment of various human disciplines or tasks. Gardner's (1983) theory of multiple intelligence proposed seven individual EQ dimensions that included: bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, and spatial.

Gardner described intrapersonal intelligence as how the individual related to the self, and interpersonal intelligence as how the individual related to others (Gardner & Hatch, 1989).

The research of Wechsler (1943) and Gardner (1975) advanced the study of human intelligence by providing significant evidence that existing intelligence frameworks needed to be further conceptualized. However, neither framework introduced EQ terminology nor defined or described intelligence using components of EQ (Wechsler, 1943; Gardner, 1975). The term EQ was first introduced within both European psychology and American humanist literary writing in the 1960s (Leuner, 1966; Van Ghent, 1961) and was first introduced into academia by Payne (1985). Payne's (1985) EQ framework suggested that emotional intelligence involved the ability to problem solve in environments where the human emotions of fear, pain, and desire were present.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) provided the first definition and theoretical framework of EQ (Hahn, Sabou, Toader, & Radulescuc, 2012). The EQ framework was introduced as a subcategory of the preceding concept of SQ and as an individual subcategory of Gardner's (1983) interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences. Salovey and Mayer's (1990) conceptualization of EQ was divided into three components: appraisal and expression of emotion, which included the verbal and nonverbal self; other nonverbal perception and other empathy; the regulation of emotion, which included self and others; and the utilization of emotion, including flexible planning, creative thinking, redirected

attention, and motivation. Salovey and Mayer's (1990) framework focused on generalized ways that individual emotions affect the personality.

However novel, Salovey & Mayer's (1990) medical-based conception of EQ was not widely acclaimed by the general public (Hahn, Sabou, Toade, & Radulescu, 2012). The EQ framework remained significantly unrecognized as a legitimate form of human intelligence until the publication of Goleman's (1995) framework helped to increase the level of popularity of EQ among the public and scientific community (Hahn, Sabou, Toader, & Radulescu, 2012; Petrides, Frederickson, & Furnham, 2004). Goleman's (1995) book brought mainstream recognition to EQ by openly questioning the inherent value of cognitive intelligence (IQ) as a holistic measure of human intelligence and by describing the high cost that may be associated with ignoring emotional development on an individual and social level. On both an individual and organized level, Goleman (1995) connected the significance and meaning of EQ to various human environments including school and occupation; human relationships, including family and marriage; various human tasks, including child-rearing, coaching, and education; and various states of human existence, including depression, trauma, and generalized mental health. Goleman (1998) suggested that individuals and organizations could make increases in EQ ability through both education and practice.

### **Mainstream Conceptualization of EQ**

As the public and scientific community realized the theoretical and practical importance of EQ on individual and organizational levels, the concept of EQ gained new levels of mainstream acceptance (Makino, 2010; Petrides, Frederickson, & Furnham,

2004). The public perceived that this new framework of EQ provided a practical justification, both personal and moral, for the development of significant EQ-associated life skills and consequent effective EQ-associated life outcomes (Goleman, 1995; Newsome, Day, & Catano, 1999). The subsequent development and validation of individual EQ competency clusters (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 1999) as well as early and later EQ assessment inventories (Bar-On, 1997; Boyatzis & Sala, 2004) increased the level of acceptance of EQ as an individual concept of human intelligence within the scientific community.

### **EQ as an Ability-Based Model**

Schutte et al.'s (1998) EQ model or framework is comprised of three (3) core dimensions including (1) appraisal and expression of emotion in the self and others, (2) regulation of emotion in the self and others, and (3) utilization of emotions in solving problems (Schutte et al., 1998). Each dimension is based upon certain learned competencies (Goleman, 1995; Schutte et al., 1998). Research suggested that individuals possess an innate level of EQ that fosters their ability to learn emotional competencies (Goleman, 1995).

### **EQ and Self-Determination Theory**

Schutte et al.'s (1998) EQ model or framework has maintained fundamental roots within self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Self determination theory is related to intrinsic motivation and has suggested that individual growth tendencies influence personality development and integration, as well as behavioral regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Self-Determination Theory has posited that the identification and

satisfaction of three innate needs (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness) provide the means by which humans achieve optimal functionality and growth (Deci & Ryan, 2002). The presence of certain social conditions are believed to regulate the motivation to attain autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Self-determination theory has also suggested that human motivations may vary according to time and situation (Deci & Ryan, 2002), and that the development of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations have caused varying affects upon psychological health and performance (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

### **EQ and Performance Theory**

Shutte et al.'s (1998) EQ model or framework has been additionally connected with Performance Theory (Goleman, 1994; Goleman, 1998; Utman, 1997; Trafimow & Rice, 2008; Sonnetag & Frese, 2001). Performance theory is a dynamic and multidimensional construct that has described the complex relationship that exists between individual objective task performance and the subject contextual performance (Sonnetag & Frese, 2001). Similar to EQ models, performance theory has emphasized the development of individually-based intrinsic motivations that foster task performance (Goldman, 1995; Goleman, 1998; Utman, 1997), as well as placed significant emphasis on the unique learning processes that individuals must adopt and model when engaging task performance (Goldeman, 1995; Trafimow & Rice, 2008). As EQ models and social learning theory have posited, performance theory has emphasized the importance of external feedback and self-regulation on performance activity outcomes (Bandura, 1971; Sonnetag & Frese, 2001).

The aforementioned theories have provided a rationale for the use of Schutte et al.'s (1998) EQ model in that the EQ dimensions of appraisal and expression of emotion in the self and others, regulation of emotion in the self and others, and utilization of emotions in solving problems collectively support the concepts of self-learning, self-awareness, and socially-informed learning. The EQ model has been used extensively in organizational psychology to predict the level of performance and success within organizations (Cherniss, Extein, Goleman, & Weissberg, 2006). This model has helped to positively affect organizational climate: credibility is an identified factor of organizational climate (Momeni, 2009). Individual studies have supported the use of dimensions of accountability, attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, goodwill, integrity, power, and trustworthiness as measures of credibility (Balboni, 2008; Berlo, Lermert, & Mertz, 1970; Due & Jorgensen, 2011; Kazoleas & Teven, 1992; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Underwood, 2003).

### **Key Variables and Concepts**

#### **Dimensions of OC**

Research has identified several individual dimensions that construct OC, including accountability (Due & Jorgensen, 2011), attractiveness (Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Underwood, 2003), corporate social responsibility (Balboni, 2008; Hudak & Werder, 2009), expertise (Balboni, 2008; Berlo, Lermert, & Mertz, 1970; Haley, 1996; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981), goodwill (Kazoleas & Teven, 1992), integrity (Kazoleas & Teven, 1992), legitimacy (Due & Jorgensen, 2011), power (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Underwood, 2003), and

trustworthiness (Balboni, 2008; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Underwood, 2003). The relationship between OC and these individual dimensions will be described in detail below.

### **Accountability**

Accountability is considered a dimension of credibility (Due & Jorgensen, 2011; Prewitt, 2008). Accountability is an organizational objective that has an internal and external orientation (Van Bussel, 2012). Accountability has contributed to the perceived credibility of organizations, including civil society organizations (Due & Jorgensen, 2011). In a general sense, accountability has contributed to OC wherever organizations are involved with communication, documentation, and transparency (Kumar, 1996; Due & Jorgensen, 2011). Within programs of organizations, accountability has contributed to OC through the consideration of program impact, program sustainability, the creation of constructive solutions, and the creation of realistic objectives and targets (Due & Jorgensen, 2011). Within the work processes of organizations, accountability has contributed to OC through the consideration and development of the specific organization structure and collaborative decision-making processes, the size of the organization, the beneficial nature of participation, the scientific capacity of the organization, and its presence within the regional community (Due & Jorgensen, 2011).

Although general levels of accountability in organizations may be threatened as like-minded organizations seek to form partnerships with other organizations, levels of program accountability may be strengthened by such partnerships, with the result being that OC may be strengthened (Due & Jorgensen, 2011). Organizations of all types that

have been responsive to accountability practices have developed a credible reputation of flexibility and fair-mindedness, which has created a positive appeal for employees (Andre, 2010). By engaging responsively with desirable accountability practices, benefit corporations and other specific types of organizations that are not typically subject to external regulation have found their image and level of OC to be autonomously enhanced (Andre, 2012). The development and utilization of independent, accountability-driven watchdog groups as well as the formation of partnerships with other independent businesses may further enhance levels of OC (Baur & Schmitz, 2011). The utilization of accountability interventions that are both objectively measured and publicly explained have provided other opportunities for the enhancement of OC (Colby, Fishman, Pickell, 2011).

### **Attractiveness**

Attractiveness is a fundamental dimension of source credibility (DeSarbo & Harshman, 1985; Eager, 2009; Keller, 1998; Kenisicki, 2003; Mumford, 2012; Ohanian, 1990; Yoon, Kim, & Kim, 1998), which is a larger dimension of OC. Individual perceptions of corporate credibility have been shown to be connected to perceptions of organizational attractiveness (Tsai & Yang, 2010), and this may be fostered by the combination of emotional and cognitive reasoning processes that stakeholders use (Matthius, Rodenburg, & Sikkell, 2004). For individuals applying for jobs in organizations, the perceived attractiveness of an organization is significantly affected by a number of factors, including the individual's familiarity with the organization, and their knowledge of the image and reputation of the employing organization (Lievens, Van



Hoye, & Schreurs, 2005), or their knowledge of the organizational brand (Yaqub & Khan, 2011). An applicant's perceptions of whether fair or just treatment is extended within the job application process (Bauer et. al., 2001; Schmidt & Gilliland, 1992), their perceptions of job characteristics with organizations, their perceptions of the people already within such organizations, and their perceptions of the country of origin in which the organization is based (Froese, Vo, & Garrett, 2010) all play a part in determining the level of organizational attractiveness. An applicant's perceptions of organizational attractiveness may also be affected by the degree to which the organization is thought to support ethical leader behavior (Strobel, Tumasjan, & Welp, 2010) and socially responsible behavior (Kim & Park, 2011; Lis, 2012). For job applicants, the higher level of OC resulting from word-of-mouth advertising has been shown to improve perceptions of organizational attractiveness (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2005), especially when the applicant has a close relationship to the advertiser (Van Hoye & Lievens, 2007).

Other factors that affect perceptions of organizational attractiveness may be formed as individuals become members of the organization. Employee access to satisfactory mentoring opportunities may significantly affect perceptions of organizational attractiveness (Spitzmuller et. al., 2008). Status-driven employees who discover similar status-driven environments within organizations may increase their perceptual levels of organizational attractiveness (Umphress, Smith-Crowe, Brief, Dietz, & Watkins, 2007). Once individuals have gained membership within organizations, the perceived attractiveness of an organization may affect employee retention levels (Anderson, Ahmed, & Costa, 2012).

### **Corporate Social Responsibility**

Corporate social responsibility has been considered a dimension of OC (Balboni, 2008; Hudak & Werder, 2009; Kim & Choi, 2007). OC has a reciprocal relationship with corporate social responsibility; OC is significantly related to and influences the positive development of corporate social responsibility (Alcañiz, Cáceres, & Pérez, 2010), while corporate social responsibility may also result in the development of OC (Dando & Swift, 2003; Kihan, K., & Sejung Marina, 2007; Pfau, Haigh, Sims, & Wigley, 2008; Peters & Caro, 2013). Research suggested that corporate social responsibility messages retain their own source credibility (Pflugrath, Roebuck, & Simnett, 2011), which may subsequently affect stakeholders' perceptions of OC, including brand credibility (Creel, 2012). Corporate social responsibility-related communication containing high levels of interactivity have been shown to foster higher message credibility and OC (Eberle, Berens, & Ti, 2013). OC-related behaviors that have supported social causes have positively affected corporate social responsibility levels, including the effectiveness by which corporate social responsibility initiatives are marketed (Inoue & Kent, 2014).

### **Expertise**

Expertise is one of the key dimensions of OC (Arora, 2000; Chiarelli, Stedmen, Carter, and Telg, 2010; Eager, 2009; Hovland, Janis, & Kelly, 1953; Issaksson, M., & Jørgensen, 2010; Lui & Standing, 1989; McDermott & Faules, 1973; MacKenzie, & Lutz, 1989; Nachailit & Ussahawanitchakit, 2009; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Petelin, 2008; Yoon, Kim, & Kim, 1998). Expertise demonstrated by individuals or organizations, consisting of knowledge, experience, and problem-solving abilities related to a given

subject (Herling, 2000) helps stakeholders develop OC (Goldsmith, Lafferty, & Newell, 2000). Expertise has aided internal stakeholders in developing organizational design competences, both theoretical and applied (Sanchez-Manzanares, Rico, & Gil, 2008), and expertise is itself a positive effect of environments where organizational learning materials have been organized and presented in a hierarchical manner (Zeitz & Spoeher, 1989). The utilization of either ordinary or specialized technologies in organizational communication have been shown to influence internal stakeholder perceptions in that they may assess the particular style of expertise and type of expertise (Technology use as a status characteristic: The influences of mundane and novel communication technologies on attributions of expertise in organizations, 2012).

Expertise has helped profit-oriented organizations endorse the positive attributes of their products and services to external stakeholders (Hyojin, Ball, & Stout, 2010). Expertise has helped positively influence external stakeholders attitudes toward the products and services advertised by organizations online (Kyung-Ran & ChangHyun, 2003). Expertise has influenced the positive behavioral intentions of external stakeholders toward the organization, thereby increasing OC (Hudak & Werder, 2009). For instances in which expertise has been voluntarily donated to external stakeholders within the community, OC has increased (Watson & Ripley, 2013). Factors such as nationality have been shown to predict external stakeholders evaluations of expertise in organizations (Connolly-Ahern, 2005).

### **Goodwill**

Goodwill, or benevolence, is considered a dimension of credibility (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Kazeolas & Teven, 1992; McCroskey & Teven, 1999; Teven, 2008). The presence of goodwill found among managers of organizations has been shown to increase perceptions of OC (Choi & Wang, 2007). The increased awareness among stakeholders of the utilization of certain goodwill-associated behaviors by member organizations may lead to increases in the perception of OC (Walker & Kent, 2012). Both benevolence and credibility have worked in tandem to assist stakeholder commitment to an organization (Ganesan & Hess, 1997).

Demonstrations of goodwill in organizations may be motivated by altruism, organizational value, profit, or social duty (Webb & Farmer, 1996). Goodwill can improve the level of positive affect that dimensions of competence or expertise may bring to the broader consideration connected to OC; the reputation of organizations (Nguyen, 2010). Goodwill is considered a human resource-based asset as it is a predictor of believability and likeability for source credibility, which would include OC. Although goodwill is also considered an economic asset and future economic benefit of organizations (Gore & Zimmerman, 2010), the dimension has been considered difficult to independently quantify (Gore & Zimmerman, 2010; Pounder, 2013), and a variety of methods of accounting for the dimension have been proposed (Rees & Janes, 2012).

### **Integrity**

The integration and stakeholder recognition of integrity behaviors in organizations has contributed to positive perceptions of OC (Berry, 2004; Choi & Wang,

2007; Simons, 2002; Stone, 2005). Integrity behaviors have also been considered an antecedent of credibility-based behaviors, such as trust (Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007). Integrity behaviors that have been specifically demonstrated within communication processes in organizations may optimally increase perceptions of OC (Shelton, 2003). Alternatively, when a lack of integrity has been demonstrated by individuals in organizations, perceptions of OC may be damaged (Nussenzveig & Zukanovich Funchal, 2008). Integrity that has been applied in organizations may seek to examine of the level of alignment between past communication and past behaviors and to more closely align present and future communication with present and future behaviors (Simons, 2002). Behavioral integrity is subjectively measured (Simons, 2002) and this may be caused by the multi-dimensional nature of the construct (Brown, 2006).

### **Legitimacy**

The construct of organizational legitimacy has helped to both define and contribute to OC (Brown, 2008; Due & Jorgensen, 2011; Minahan, 2005; Parson, 1961; Suchman, 1995). Within the context of OC, organizational legitimacy may take the form of cognitive legitimacy, moral legitimacy, or pragmatic legitimacy (Due & Jorgensen, 2011). Cognitive legitimacy has been significantly related to OC attributes that involve constructive solutions, dedication to the cause, and voluntary foundation (Due & Jorgensen, 2011). Moral legitimacy has been significantly related to OC attributes that involve independence, low administrative budget, mission, purpose, and vision (Due & Jorgensen, 2011). Pragmatic legitimacy has been significantly related to the OC attributes

that involve organizational structure and collaborative decision making processes (Due & Jorgensen, 2011).

Cognitive legitimacy has indirectly threatened OC where organizations have engaged in compromising practices, displayed a lack of transparency, been exclusively motivated by financial gain, and been affected by negative publicity (Due & Jorgensen, 2011). Cognitive legitimacy has both directly and indirectly threatened OC where organizations have engaged in greenwashing or have failed to maintain independence and objectivity (Due & Jorgensen, 2011). Moral legitimacy has directly threatened OC where organizations have engaged in compromising practices or greenwashing tactics, failed to maintain independence and objectivity, displayed a lack of transparency, or have been exclusively motivated by financial gain (Due & Jorgensen, 2011). When exclusively legal means are adopted to secure organizational legitimacy, positive perceptions of OC may be diminished (Haraway, 2005). However, existing perceptions of OC, however slight, may be utilized to repair damaged perceptions of organizational legitimacy (Suchman, 1995).

### **Power**

Power has been considered a component of credibility (Ballentine, 2006; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Underwood, 2003). Power and OC have been found to be associated with outcomes for environments in which trustworthy communication has occurred (Dunleavy, Chory, & Goodboy, 2010). Both organizational power and OC are grounded upon stakeholder perceptions of organizational expertise (Singh, 2009; Newel & Goldsmith, 2001). Two types of power, expert and referent, positively effect control,

communication, decision making, goal setting, interaction, motivation, and performance in organizations (Singh, 2009), all of which may have a positive effect upon OC.

Leadership-associated power in organizations may mediate the effect of organizational policies on OC (Finn & Ledbetter, 2013).

In addition, expert power and referent power have fostered positive organizational climates and work challenges, and promoted career growth and/or personality growth (Singh, 2009). Highly-developed organizations have used power to promote stakeholder awareness and choice in decision making processes, which has indirectly helped promote OC (Singh, 2009). Prosocial power demonstrated by supervisors in organizations may help preserve OC (Teven, 2007). Increases in levels of organizational power have increased demands for the development of OC (McGanne & Johnstone, 2004). The means used to organize power may contribute to increased ethical strategies in organizations (Green, 2013; Tianbing, Chuanmin, Ting, & Ke, 2013), which can positively affect OC. Power that is utilized to enforce organizational policies may increase OC and serve to advance organizational interests (Prechel, 2012). Political power in organizations has aided in the testing of work environment realities, and positive conflict resolution (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977), with the result that OC is fostered.

### **Trustworthiness**

Trust has been described as a dimension of OC (Arora, 2000; Balboni, 2008; Barlow, 1992; Brownell, 2000; Chiarelli, Stedmen, Carter, and Telg, 2010; Eager, 2009; Lui & Standing, 1989; McDaniel & Malone, 2009; MacKenzie & Lutz, 1989; Nachailit & Ussahawanitchakit, 2009; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981;

Underwood, 2003; Yoon, Kim, & Kim, 1998). Trust has been shown to positively foster perceptions of credibility (Dasgupta, 1988). Trust has fostered positive levels of OC by advancing stakeholder commitment and communication efficiency (Hakansson, Lin, & Nguyen, 2013; Singh & Srivastava, 2013). Trust has been shown to foster positive levels of competence (Butler, 1991; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995) and expertise (Hovland, 1953; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). When OC is diminished, trust in organizations is diminished (Springer, 2008).

Trust in organizations has been associated with certain organizational citizenship behaviors that are linked to OC (Altuntas & Baykal, 2013). Trust in organizations has also been associated with the level of perceived job satisfaction in organizations, (Calloway, 2006), and the level of productivity in organizations (Mussaco, 2000; Stanley & McDowell, 2013; Zannini & Migueles, 2013); both dimensions are associated with OC. Trust in organizations has also been associated with a positive, internally-focused culture (Huang, Fang, & Liu, 2013), which may be mediated by OC. Trust in organization has positively facilitated levels of organizational effectiveness (Fard, Ghatari, & Hasiri, 2010; Senthilnathan & Rukshani, 2013), which may be linked to the facilitation of OC.

## **EQ Utilization in Organizations**

### **Dimensions of EQ**

EQ has been associated historically with organizations since the formation of both early management theory and the military personnel assessment practices of World War II (Gowling, 2001). Goleman and his contemporaries recognized the positive contribution



that EQ could make in organizations, both individually and collectively (Goleman, 1995; Goleman, 2006; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Goleman, McKee, & Boyatzis, 2006; Hahn, Sabou, Toader, & Rădulescu, 2012). Goleman connected EQ competency with certain organizational performance outcomes such as profit, return on investment, and stock performance (Goleman, 1998; Hacket & Hortman, 2008). More recent research on EQ has universally connected EQ to individually-based interpersonal factors that influence the success of both individuals and their organizations (Hahn, Sabou, Toader, & Rădulescu, 2012).

EQ is one interpersonal dimension positively related to multiple beneficial outcomes between employees and their organizations, including a.) employee commitment (Abraham, 1999; Abraham, 2000), b.) employee motivation (Adyasha, 2013), c.) employee performance (Allam, 2011; Aydin, Leblebici, Arslan, Kilic, & Oktem, 2005); Gondal & Husain, 2013; Othman, Abdullah, & Ahmad, 2008; Rangriz & Mehrabi, 2010; Ravichandran, Arasu, & Arun Kumar, 2011), d.) employee retention (Harrison-Walker, 2008), e.) employee work climate (Sathya Kumar & Iyer, 2012; Momeni, 2009), f.) employee creativity (Othman et al., 2008), and g.) organizational citizenship behavior (Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011). The relationship between EQ and these organization factors will be described in detail below.

### **Employee Commitment**

Employee EQ has demonstrated a significant and positive affect on the level of employee commitment to their organizations (Abraham, 1999; Abraham, 2000; Adeoye & Torubelli, 2011; Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2013; Carmeli, 2003; Choi, Oh, Guay, &

Lee, 2011). Chovwen, 2012; Gardner, & Stough, 2003). Khalili, 2011; Nazari, Emami, & Shakarbeigi, 2012; Rangriz & Mehrabi, 2010), even when competing factors such as the increased availability of emerging high-EQ employment opportunities are considered (Shooshtarian, Ameli, & Aminilari, 2013). Employee EQ has been shown to lead to the development of a positive sense of individual well-being, which in turn has fostered significant levels of organizational commitment (Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock, & Farr-Wharton, 2012). Specific employee EQ competencies such as social awareness and self-management have demonstrated a positive effect on the individual obligation of employees to their organizations (Khalili, 2011). Employee EQ has demonstrated a positive effect on employee customer orientation, which has been consequently shown to demonstrate a positive effect on employee organizational commitment (Rozell, Pettijohn, & Parker, 2004).

For employees, the positive relationship between high EQ and organizational commitment may be moderated by the development of measurably lower stress levels (Satija & Khan, 2013). The relationship between employee EQ and employee organizational commitment has been noted not only among paid employees of public organizations, but also among volunteer employees working within private organizations (Cichy, Jaemin, Seung Hyun, & Singerling, 2007). Employee EQ may also prevent the development of other employee interpersonal factors such as emotional dissonance, ethical role conflict, and job insecurity from adversely affecting organizational commitment (Abraham, 1999). Employee EQ has positively contributed to the development of positive employee attitudes towards organizational change, which in turn

have positively affected organizational commitment (Vakola, Tsaousis, & Nikolau, 2003).

### **Employee Motivation**

Employee motivation has been influenced by multiple combinations of intelligence dimensions, including EQ (Neal, 2013). Research has demonstrated that employee EQ leads employees to integrate one's work role within their own concept of self (Liu, Prati, Perrewé, & Ferris, 2008), energizes such employees around organizational business models, vicariously teaches such employees to be responsible for their own competence and performance, and builds the strength and resilience necessary to sustain long term motivation (Neil, 2013). Employee EQ has affected employee motivation by providing internal incentives for individuals to understand how work behaviors may benefit employees and their organizations, and by providing an incentive for individual employees to demonstrate such positive and effective work behaviors (Adyasha, 2013; Lall, 2009).

Where employee EQ has been shown to affect employee motivation levels, age has been shown to play a moderating factor (Singh & Srivastava, 2012). On a managerial level, employee EQ may assure that the motivational potential of employees is identified and applied in organizations (Barrett, 1999). On a collective level, the interaction between employee EQ and employee motivation may positively effect the effectiveness of individuals operating within team roles (Othman, Abdullah, & Ahmad, 2009).

### **Employee Performance**

Research has indicated that employee EQ has a significant and positive effect on employee job performance (Allam, 2011; Aydin, Leblebici, Arslan, Kilic, & Oktem, 2005; Bachman, Stein, Campbell, & Sitarenios, 2000; Bilgi & Sümer, 2009; Blank, 2008; Carmeli & Josman, 2006; Chen, Lam, & Zhong, 2012; Codier, Muneno, Franey, & Matsuura, 2010; Côté & Miners, 2006; Cross, & Travaglione, 2003; Devonish, & Greenidge, 2010; Farh, Myeong-Gu, & Tesluk, 2012; Gondal & Husain, 2013; Gunavathy & Ayswarya, 2011;; Hawkins & Dulewicz, 2007; Humphrey, 2013; Jha & Singh, 2012; Jimoh, Olayide, & Saheed, 2012; Lam & Kirby, 2002; Latif, 2004; Law, Wong, Huang, & Li, 2008; Mishra & Mohapatra, 2010; Moon, & Hur, 2011; Neustadt, Chamorro-Premuzic, & Furnham, 2011; O'Boyle, Humphrey, Pollack, Hawver, & Story, 2011; Onay, 2011; Othman, Abdullah, & Ahmad, 2008; Rangriz & Mehrabi, 2010; Rathi & Rastogi, 2008; Ravichandran, Arasu, & Arun Kumar, 2011; Shooshtarian, Ameli, & Aminilari, 2013; Wu & Stemler, 2008; Yu-Chi, 2011; Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts, 2004). Employee EQ has been demonstrated to improve individual self-confidence leading to greater workplace performance, to foster greater self-awareness leading to improved quality workplace interactions, to produce improved impulse control leading to reduced workplace mistakes, to cultivate empathic skills that have improved employee understanding and levels of consistent performance functioning (Allam, 2011). Other specific attributes of employee EQ, such as employee maturity, employee competency, and employee social skills, appear to significantly increase the quantity and quality of labor output within the organizational environment (Mishra & Mohapatra, 2010). The

positive effect of employee EQ on employee job performance may be significantly influenced by high employee learning capacity, a trait that has been associated with employee EQ (Berenson, Boyles, & Weaver, 2008; Rafiq, Naseer, & Ali, 2011). For certain instances in which employee EQ has not had a direct effect upon employee performance, employee EQ has been shown to mediate the relationship between job performance and other employee dimensions in organizations, such as burnout (Huang, Chan, Lam, & Nan, 2010), customer service (Feyerherm & Rice, 2002), interpersonal interaction (Jadhav & Mulla, 2010), and job stress (Ismail, Yeo, Ajis, & Dollah, 2009; Yu-Chi, 2011).

The connection between employee EQ and general work performance has been demonstrated within a variety of occupations and positions within the public and private sector, including government (Jimoh, Olayide, & Saheed, 2012), management and supervision (Chen, Lam, & Zhong, 2012; Semadar, Robins, & Ferris, 2006; Stough & De Guara, 2003), nursing (Codier, Muneno, Franey, & Matsuura, 2010), social work (Morrison, 2007), teaching (Jha & Singh, 2012; Latif, 2004), or other occupations or positions specializing in technical or scientific expertise (Law, Wong, Huang, & Li, 2008; Rathi & Rastogi, 2008). Due to the emerging levels of de-humanizing electronic communication mediums, the degree of knowledge specialization, the increased levels of organizational diversity, and development of work team structures that dominate the modern organizational workplace, employee EQ has demonstrated an increasingly significant influence on employee performance within all types of organizations (Goleman, 1998). Employee EQ has provided a means for individuals working in

organizations to develop and nurture interpersonal relationships with other members of organizations and to cultivate and utilize larger, informal communication networks in order to accomplish occupational tasks (Goleman, 1998).

Employee EQ has also demonstrated a significant influence on the job performance of employees working in abnormally stressful occupations such as debt collection (Bachman, Stein, Campbell, & Sitarenios, 2000), entrepreneurship (Cross & Travaglione, 2003), law enforcement (Hawkins & Dulewicz, 2007) executive leadership (Mishra & Mohaptra, 2010), military leadership (Bilgic & Sumer, 2009), and sales (Deeter-Schmelz & Sojka, 2003). Debt collectors found to possess high EQ dimensions of independence, self-awareness, self-actualization, assertiveness, interpersonal relationships, and social responsibility also possessed high stress tolerance qualities and were appraised as top performers (Bachman, Stein, Campbell, & Sitarenios, 2000). Entrepreneurs that demonstrated an elevated ability to evaluate and express emotion, regulate emotion, and use emotion in problem solving have been found to demonstrate a greater level of self-awareness, self-confidence, empathy, motivation, passion, and greater level of persistence when facing criticism, rejection, or operational setbacks (Cross & Travaglione, 2003; Humphrey, 2013).

Police officers who have been measured with high EQ among dimensions such as self-awareness, resilience, intuitiveness, interpersonal sensitivity, influencing, motivation, and conscientiousness, have been thought to perform better as leaders (Hawkins & Dulewicz, 2007). Among executive officers, EQ related dimensions, such as competency, maturity, and sensitivity, contributed to positive overall work performance (Mishra &

Mohaptra, 2010). Among military officers, EQ related dimensions, such as emotional stability and self-discipline, contributed to the receiving of positive work performance commendations (Bilgic & Sumer, 2009). Sales associates who demonstrated empathy, perceptions of others' emotions, self-awareness, self-regulation, and self-motivation were considered successful by personal standards and company standards (Deeter-Schmelz & Sojka, 2003; Rozell, Pettijohn, & Parker, 2006).

### **Employee Retention**

EQ has demonstrated a significant and positive effect upon employee or member retention behaviors in organizations (Allam, 2011; Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock, & Farr-Wharton, 2012; Buvoltz, Powell, Solan, & Longbotham, 2008; Codier, Freitas, & Muneno, 2013; Connolly, 2002; Coetzee & Pauw, 2013; Feather, 2009; Harrison-Walker, 2008; Hernandez, 2012; Kidwell, Hardesty, Murtha, & Shibin, 2012; Ray & Smith, 2010; Schoo, 2008; Sparkman, Maulding, & Roberts, 2012; Tait, 2008; Young-Ritchie, Laschinger, & Wong, 2007) and specific business ventures (Kidwell, Hardesty, Murtha, & Shibin, 2012; Schoo, 2008). Among human resource groups and managers in business organizations, the ability of employees to perceive emotion, understand emotion, facilitate emotion, and manage emotion has been viewed as a valuable commodity, and the emerging realization that high employee EQ is associated with reduced employee turnover, has fostered an interest in integrating EQ dimensions within selection procedures (Kidwell, Hardesty, Murtha, & Shibin, 2012). For leaders of business organizations, employee EQ has been viewed as a means to foster personal change by inducing an awareness of personal strengths and deficiencies, and to influence, persuade,

and motivate others toward the accomplishment of organizational objectives. (Schoo, 2008).

Among educational organizations catering to young adults, EQ has been associated with elevated organizational retention rates. EQ components, such as internal locus of control and self-efficacy, have been positively and significantly connected to the Grade Point Average (GPA) of online high school students, which facilitated elevated retention rates (Berenson, Boyles, & Weaver, 2008). College students that showed high levels of EQ demonstrated greater levels of learning autonomy, which contributed to elevated retention rates (Buvoltz, Powell, Solan, Longbotham, 2008). Other college students that demonstrated empathy, social responsibility, and impulse control have been shown to be less likely to drop out, and more likely to graduate within a four year period (Sparkman, Maulding, & Roberts, 2012). Other studies of teachers working within such settings have found that EQ components of resilience, personal efficacy, and competence positively contributed to retention behaviors (Tait, 2008).

The effects of EQ on employee retention behaviors have been examined in depth among public service occupations, such as health care (Coder, Freitas, & Muneno, 2013; Connolly, 2002; Hernandez, 2012; Young-Ritchie, Laschinger, & Wong, 2007) or law enforcement (Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock, & Farr-Wharton, 2012). In some instances, EQ has mediated the relationship between employee retention and other organization dimensions, including positive leadership (Schoo, 2008) and structural empowerment (Young-Ritchie, Laschinger, & Wong, 2007).



### **Organizational Climate**

Employee EQ has demonstrated a significant and positive impact on the general climate of organizations (Akerjordet & Severinsson, 2008; Deshpande & Joseph, 2009; Hoffman, Hutchinson, & Reiss, 2009; Klem & Schlecter, 2008; Landau, & Meirovich, 2011; Momeni, 2009), including the quality of work life that is experienced by members within organizations (Sathya Kumar & Iyer, 2012). More specifically, EQ has demonstrated a significant and positive impact on certain climate dimensions operating within organizations, such as ethical climate (Deshpande & Joseph, 2009), educational climate (Andersen, Evans, & Harvey, 2012; Clarke, 2006; Hoffman, Hutchinson, & Reiss, 2009; Landau, & Meirovich, 2011; Newsome, 2006; Potter, 2011; Rivers, Brackett, Reyes, Elbertson, & Salovey, 2013), psychological climate (Lekavičienė & Remeikait, 2004), relational climate (Perez-Escoda, Filella, Alegre, & Bisquerra, 2012), and social climate (Lekavičienė & Remeikait, 2004; Momeni, 2009; Rivers, Brackett, Reyes, Elbertson, & Salovey, 2013). Positive organizational climates created by dimensions of EQ have been characterized by resilience, innovation, and change (Akerjordet & Severinsson, 2008). The core identification and valuation of EQ by leaders of organizations has been associated with the emerging need for leaders to seek and direct climate change in their organizations (Hahn, Sabou, Toader, & Rădulescu, 2012; Newsome, 1997).

### **Employee Work Creativity**

Research has positively linked EQ to emotional creativity (Ivcevic, Brackett, & Mayer, 2007) and the demonstration of subsequent individual creative behaviors (Averill,

2004; Barczak, Lassk, & Multi, 2010; Castro, Gomes, & de Sousa, 2012; Chan, 2005; DiNapoli, 2009; Dominguez, 2013; Fekula, 2011; Harris, Reiter-Palmon, Kaufman, 2013; Ivcevic, Brackett, & Mayer, 2007; Olatoye, Akintunde, & Yakasai, 2010; Özdemir & Çakmak, 2008; Rego, Sousa, Pina e Cunha, Correja, & Saur-Amaral, 2007; Sánchez-Ruiz, Hernández-Torrano, Pérez-González, Batey, & Petrides, 2011; Sen, 2008; Van der Merwe, 2010). The link between high EQ and high creativity has been shown to transcend cultural limitations (Chan, 2005), and has included creativity behaviors that are demonstrated by members of organizations (Barczak, Lassk, Mulki, 2010; Chan, 2005; DiNapoli, 2009; Dominguez, 2013; Fekula, 2011; Harris, Reiter-Palmon, & Kaufman, 2013; Olatoye, Akintunde, & Yakasai, 2010; Özdemir, & Çakmak, 2008; Rego, Sousa, Pina e Cunha, Correia, & Saur-Amaral, 2007; Van Der Merwe, 2010). High EQ has been shown to act as an inhibitor of workplace misbehavior among individual members of organizations (Harris, Reiter-Palmon, & Kaufman, 2013).

Within work groups, EQ has served as a moderator of group trust, which in turn has enhanced team creativity (Barczak, Lassk, & Mulki, 2010). Leader-associated EQ has demonstrated a positive effect on follower creativity in organizations (Castro, Gomes & de Sousa, 2012), and generalized employee creativity in organizations (Fekula, 2011). EQ has helped to facilitate creative decision-making behaviors within organizations in ways that are perceived as competitive, agreeable, and cost-effective (Fekula, 2011). EQ has demonstrated a positive effect on individual creativity in organizations by moderating the influence of factors that diminish creativity, such as conflict, dissatisfaction with the status quo, and work stress (Dominguez, 2013). The development of EQ-associated

creativity may be learned through conventional education processes (Chan, 2005), or through a dramatic, role-playing process (DiNapoli, 2009; Özdemir & Çakmak, 2008). Research has indicated that EQ regulates individual creativity through neurophysiological processes (Sen, 2008).

### **Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

Despite the fact that research has linked impulsivity, a dimension associated with low employee EQ, to organizational citizenship behavior (Winkel, Wyland, Shaffer, & Clason, 2011), the significant majority of research has positively correlated EQ to organizational citizenship behavior (Caldwell, Floyd, Atkins, & Holzgrefe, 2012; Carmeli & Josman, 2006; Côté & Miners, 2006; Hj. Yunus, Ishak, Raja Mustapha, & Othman, 2010; Jain, 2012; Maini, Singh, & Kaur, 2012; Sahafi, Danaee, Sarlak, & Haghollahi, 2011; Sahafi, Danaee, Sarlak, & Haghollah, 2012; Salami, 2009; Shanker, 2012; Susan Tee Suan & Anantharaman, & David Yoon Kin, 2011; Turnipseed & Vandewaa, 2012; VandeWaa & Turnipseed, 2012; Winkel, Wyland, Shaffer, & Clason, 2011; Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011; Yuan Wan-Lung, Jia-Horng, & Kuang-Pin, 2012). The strongest correlations between EQ and the organizational citizenship have been demonstrated within the behaviors of individual members of organizations (Susan Tee Suan & Anantharaman & David Yoon Kin, 2011; Turnipseed & Vandewaa, 2012), although these may be influenced by other industrial or organizational factors (Susan Tee Suan & Anantharaman & David Yoon Kin, 2011).

Specific dimensions of EQ that have facilitated organizational citizenship behavior have included empathy (Sahafi, Danaee, Sarlak, & Haghollahi, 2011), use of

emotion (Hj. Yunus, Ishak, Raja Mustapha, & Othman, 2010; Turnipseed & Vandewaa, 2012), leader-member exchange (Hj. Yunus, Ishak, Raja Mustapha, & Othman, 2010; management of emotion (Turnipseed & Vandewaa, 2012), emotional appraisal of fellow employees (Hj. Yunus, Ishak, Raja Mustapha, & Othman, 2010), regulation of emotion (Hj. Yunus, Ishak, Raja Mustapha, & Othman, 2010), self control (Sahafi, Danaee, Sarlak, & Haghollahi, 2011), self motivation (Sahafi, Danaee, Sarlak, & Haghollahi, 2011), and sympathy (Sahafi, Danaee, Sarlak, & Haghollah, 2012).

EQ has also been linked to particular dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior, including altruism (Carmelli & Josman, 2006; Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011,) civic virtue (Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011), conscientiousness, (Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011), compliance (Carmelli & Josman, 2006), and positive discretionary behavior (VandeWaa & Turnipseed, 2012). EQ has been viewed as a moderator of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and conflict strategies. EQ has also been correlated to the organizational citizenship behavior of transformational leaders of organizations (Shanker, 2012; Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011; Yuan Wan-Lung, Jia-Horng, & Kuang-Pin, 2012) and members of organizations working in non-leadership roles (Caldwell, Floyd, Atkins, & Holzgrefe, 2012; transformational leadership has been identified as a moderator of the correlation between EQ and organizational citizenship behavior (Yuan Wan-Lung, Jia-Horng, & Kuang-Pin, 2012). EQ has been correlated to the organizational citizenship behavior of members where diminished levels of cognitive intelligence were measured (Côté, & Miners, 2006).

## **Summary and Conclusion**

Existing research indicated that OC contains a number of dimensions, including accountability, attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, goodwill, integrity, legitimacy, power, and trustworthiness. Existing research on OC has mainly focused on external variables, including the perceptions of external stakeholders. The research has also indicated that the perceptions of internal stakeholders have not been researched extensively, despite the fact that internal stakeholder perceptions of OC may be as important as external stakeholder perceptions, and in some occasions, even more important.

EQ has been grounded in performance theory and self-determination theory, and as an ability-based model, is composed of the dimensions of (a) appraisal and expression of emotion in the self and others, (b) regulation of emotion in the self and others, and (c) utilization of emotions in solving problems. On an individual and collective level, EQ has displayed a significant effect upon various aspects of organization behavior, including employee commitment, employee motivation, employee retention, employee work creativity, organizational climate, and organizational citizenship behavior.

While the existing research has revealed the significance of OC and EQ as individual constructs, and has described the existing ways that EQ has been integrated within organizations, what the literature has not revealed is how employee EQ may affect employee perceptions of OC. This current study will fill a gap in the literature by giving employees, managers, and trainers a broader and more accurate understanding of how

individual employees perceive the credibility of their organizations, and by subsequently providing a significant incentive for organizational leaders to develop and integrate credibility interventions whenever such interventions are deemed necessary.

Chapter Three will provide a description of the research design and a rationale that is used to justify the research design. The chapter will describe and expand on information related to the research questions, sample population, sampling procedures, instrumentation and operationalization constructs, variables, data collection, data analysis plan, a description of any threats to validity, and a section that identifies ethical procedures.

## Chapter 3: Methodology

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between EQ and employee perceptions of OC within an organization. A relationship between EQ and OC was shown to exist. This study examined the predictive ability of EQ on OC by regressing the specific dimensions of EQ on the specific dimensions of OC. The information provided will help leaders in organizations to tailor-design interventions that are specific and effective in function.

This chapter will describe the research design and provide a justification for its selection. The chapter will describe the methodology, including population and sampling procedures, recruitment, participation, data collection procedures, and instrumentalization and operationalization of the constructs. The chapter will also discuss ethical procedures and any threats to validity. The IRB number for this study is: 07-01-15-0257052. A brief summary of the design and methodology will be included.

### **Research Design and Rationale**

This cross-sectional study will examine the effects of three independent variables of employee EQ (appraisal and expression of emotion in the self and others, regulation of emotion in the self and others, and utilization of emotions in solving problems) and their effect on seven dimensions of employee perceptions of OC (accountability, attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, goodwill, integrity, legitimacy, power, and trustworthiness). A cross-sectional design was chosen for this study in order to provide data on an entire population at a single point of time rather than at multiple

points of time such as that which is targeted in experimental design studies. In addition, the process of determining and estimating the outcome frequency of EQ and OC are benefitted by the use of a cross-sectional study. The use of a cross-sectional design was relatively inexpensive and was not as time consuming as other research designs, and this type of design allowed for many outcomes to be assessed. Finally, the utilization of a cross-sectional design approach was further supported in quantitative research wherever reliable and valid self-report questionnaires have been used to collect data.

This cross-sectional review used an electronic survey. Research has suggested that the use of electronic survey methodologies may allow researchers to more effectively reach certain target population demographics, including individuals within population samples who may otherwise be more difficult to contact or who may demonstrate a greater reluctance to participate (Andrews, Nonnecke, & Preece, 2003). Although the effectiveness of online surveys may be more constrained in certain settings where technological or sociocultural barriers exist, the ability of electronic surveys to effectively reach target populations and generate data quickly at reduced cost levels (Vu & Hoffman, 2011) suggest that they represented an ideal means of collecting data for this study.

### **Methodology**

The following section of this chapter will include any relevant information that concerns the study population, sampling, and procedures related to sampling, recruitment, participation, and data collection. The section will also describe the instrumentation and operationalization of constructs.



## **Population**

The population of this study consisted of individuals in medical and/or health care organizations that staff 500 or more employees. The sampling population was comprised of doctors, nurses, health care staff, custodians, and any other individuals who were employed in larger medical and/or health care organizations within the United States. The estimated target sample was approximately 100 employees. Due to certain population access considerations, including a voluntary willingness of the individuals in the sample to participate in the study, a nonprobability convenience sample was used. The convenience sample that was drawn from the population participated by responding to an electronic survey created through SurveyMonkey. All individuals in the population sample who were 18 years or older and had worked for the organization for at least three months were considered for participation in this study.

## **Sampling and Sampling Procedures**

A meta-analysis of 126 studies of organizational work settings and employee attitudes was examined in order to estimate the required effect size (Lipsey & Wilson, 1993; Neuman, Edwards, & Raju, 1989). Using a power of 0.80 ( $1-\beta = 0.80$ ), an alpha level of .05 ( $\alpha = .05$ ), an estimated effect size of .32 ( $d = 32$ ) was predicted (Lipsey & Wilson, 1993; Neuman et al., 1989). Research has indicated that medium or larger effect sizes are preferable to smaller effect sizes in quantitative studies (Cohen, 1988). Using this estimated effect size of .32 in conjunction with the Correlation Necessary Sample Size Table (Laureate Education Inc., 2013), a convenience sample of approximately 100 participants was minimally required to complete the survey.

### **Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection**

Representatives and technicians of SurveyMonkey, the survey services company that was used to create the survey and provide the survey sample, were contacted via e-mail, phone, and in person in order to gain written permission to conduct research on a national-based sample of random employees. Any participating employees were informed that participating in the research study was voluntary. Equal numbers of men and women were sought for inclusion, but the study did not limit or restrict responses by gender. Employees from the medical and/or health care organizations that participated were voluntarily self-selected for inclusion. Once the survey was officially released, the first one hundred (100) completed responses were included in the study. There were no negative consequences as a result of declining to participate in the study.

All employees who chose to participate were asked to complete a consent form. The consent form was included with the cover letter on the SurveyMonkey website, and included information that explained the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of the study, any related benefits and risks of participation, and the anonymous nature of the study. The consent form also contained pertinent contact information for the university.

For each of the first one hundred (100) individuals who participated by fully completing the demographic information and questionnaire, SurveyMonkey made a donation of \$0.50 to the charity of each participant's choice. These same one hundred (100) participants were also be entered into sweepstakes for the opportunity to win an electronic \$100 Amazon gift card. Electronic contact information that was provided by participants on the Survey Monkey questionnaire allowed SurveyMonkey to

anonymously distribute gift certificates and other information related to the drawing for the \$100 gift certificate. Only surveys that were completed in full were included in the study and data analysis.

SurveyMonkey provided a link for survey participants in order to access the online questionnaire located on their secure website. SurveyMonkey technicians were responsible to e-mail the link to the website to all employees in their medical and/or health care sample in order to give employees the individual choice to participate. The survey used to collect employee information can be found in Appendix A. Demographic information that will be collected on the survey was restricted to age, education level, and occupational tenure. All data that was collected through the website was analyzed using Microsoft Excel and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

### **Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs**

#### **Emotional Intelligence**

Emotional intelligence was measured using Schutte et al's (1998) Assessing Emotions Scale (AES). The scale assessed three dimensions of emotional intelligence, including appraisal of emotions in self and others, expression and regulation of emotions in self and others, and utilization of emotions in problem solving. The scale was composed of a 33-item questionnaire (Schutte et al., 1998). The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). For each question, participants submitted an electronic checkmark next to the statement that best summarized their EQ. Examples of questions for the appraisal of emotions in self and others included the following: "I am aware of my emotions as I experience them" and, "I

find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages of other people” (Schutte et al., 1998). Examples of questions for expression and regulation of emotion in self and others included the following: “I have control over my emotions,” and “I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others” (Schutte et al., 1998). Examples of questions for the utilization of emotions in problem solving included the following: “I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on” and “When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail” (Schutte et al., 1998).

Schutte et al.’s (1998) self report AES was designed to be used as a continuous measure of emotional intelligence. Therefore, in the current study, the scale was used as a continuous measure rather than as a categorical measure. The survey used in the study changed the wording of questions at times in order to adapt it to the participant sample (i.e., employees of a hospital, such as nurses, doctors, custodians, etc.).

The AES was considered an ideal scale to use for this research because validation studies have correlated the scale to eight EQ-related constructs, including alexithymia, attention to feelings, clarity of feelings, impulse control, mood repair, and optimism (Schutte et al., 1998). The scale was not correlated to cognitive ability (Schutte et al., 1998) as performance-based scales of EQ would be correlated (Jonker & Vosloo, 2008; Pérez, Petrides, & Furnham, 2005). Due to the fact that the AES is trait-based, it was deemed more suitable than other ability-based scales for use as a measure of non-ability based constructs (Jonker & Vosloo, 2008) such as employee perceptions.

The AES, measured by Cronbach’s alpha, was shown to have an internal consistency of .90 and a mean alpha internal consistency of .87 when measured across a

variety of other study samples (Schutte, Malouff, & Bhullar, 2009). A two-week retest reliability of total scores for the scale was measured at .78 (Schutte et al., 1998; Schutte et al., 2009).

The AES demonstrated a significant level of convergent validity. Scores on the AES were significantly correlated with scores on the Emotional Quotient Inventory ( $r = .43$ ) and Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test ( $r = .18$ ), other self-report EQ assessments (Schutte, Malouff, & Bhullar, 2009). The Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale (SEIS) also demonstrated a significant level of divergent validity (Schutte, Malouff, & Bhullar, 2009). Schutte et al. (1998, 2009) reported correlations between the SEIS scale and the Big Five dimensions, including agreeableness, .26, .09, .23; conscientiousness, .21, .25, .32; emotional stability, .28, .19, .37; extraversion, .28, .32, .61; and openness, .54, .43, .43. The survey questions of the SEIS can be found in Appendix K.

### **Organizational Credibility**

OC was measured using the COCI. The COCI is comprised of a composite of scales or subscales representing nine (9) separate dimensions of credibility. Each of these dimensions and their corresponding scales or sub scales will be discussed below.

The first dimension of OC, accountability, was measured using Wood and Winston's (2007) Leader Accountability Scale (LAS). The LAS is a 10-point Likert Scale instrument comprised of three sub scales (Responsibility, Openness, and Answerability) and 66 total items (Wood & Winston, 2007). This study used the most relevant subscale, Answerability, which contained 16 total items (Wood & Winston,

2007). Using Cronbach's alpha, the reliability coefficients for the Answerability subscales was .98. A factor analysis of the Answerability subscale indicated a range between .84 and .92 (Wood & Winston, 2007). Examples of survey questions included: "The leader seeks regular feedback"; "The leader answers questions from constituents"; and "The leader explains the reasons for his/her decisions" (Wood & Winston, 2007). The subscale questions were modified to include the word "organization" instead of the word "leader". The survey questions of Wood and Winston's (2007) LAS subscale can be found in Appendix L.

The second dimension of OC, attractiveness, was measured using Ohanian's (1990) semantic differential scale; the Source Credibility Scale (SCS). The Likert scale is composed of five (5) subscales (Attractive, Beautiful, Classy, Elegant, and Sexy) and five (5) total items (Ohanian, 1990). Multiple measure of item reliability ranged from as follows: Attractive (.67-.80), Beautiful (.75-.76), Classy (.48-.64), Elegant (.47-.55), and Sexy (.64-.66). The SCS construct reliability scores ranged from .893 to .904, and the SCS demonstrated significant nomological, convergent, and discriminant validity (Ohanian, 1990). Input correlations for the Attractive dimension using a Multi-Trait–Multi-Method Matrix resulted in scores of .79 for the Likert Scale and a range of .81 to .83 for the Stapel Scale (Ohanian, 1990). Ohanian's (1990) partitioning of variance scores for the Attractive dimension were as follows: Semantic Differential Scale (.76), Likert Scale (.91), and Staple Scale (.88). Examples of questions in this survey included: *"Attractive-Unattractive"*; *"Classy-Not Classy"*; *"Beautiful-Ugly"*; *"Elegant-Plain"*

Ohanian, 1990). The survey questions of the Ohanian's (1990) SCS can be found in Appendix L.

The third dimension of OC, corporate social responsibility, was measured using Turker's (2009) Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Scale. The CSR is a 7-point Likert scale composed of four (4) components (CSR to Society, CSR to Natural Environment, CSR to Future Generations, and CSR to Non-Governmental Organizations) and seventeen (17) total items (Turker, 2009). Using a previously established and reliable model-building framework, a factor analysis of the four components and 17 items secured 70.78% of the variance (Turker, 2009). Using Cronbach's alpha, reliability levels for the components of the scale were as follows: CSR to Society (.89), CSR to Employees (.88), CSR to Customers (.86), and CSR to Government (.93). The average inter-item correlation for all 4 components and 17 items was .35 (Turker, 2009). Examples of scale questions that were asked included: *"Our company encourages its employees to participate in voluntary activities"*; *"Our company makes investments to create a better life for future generations"*; *"Our company complies with legal regulations completely and promptly"* (Turker, 2009). The subscale questions were modified to include the word "organization" instead of the word "company". The survey questions for Turker's (2009) CSR Scale be found in Appendix L.

The fourth and fifth dimensions of OC, expertise and trustworthiness, was assessed using Newell & Goldsmith's (2001) Corporate Credibility Scale (CCS). The CCS is a 7-point Likert scale composed of eight (8) items, with four (4) items representing each of the two dimensions (Newell & Goldsmith, 2001). Using Cronbach's

alpha, the reliability coefficients for the two individual dimensions were as follows: expertise (.85-.90), and trustworthiness (.86-.87), while the complete scale had a coefficient of .84 (Newell & Goldsmith, 2001). Construct reliability scores were good for both expertise (.87) and trustworthiness (.87), and the scale showed significant evidence for discriminate validity (Newell & Goldsmith, 2001). As a whole, Newell and Goldsmith's (2001) scale showed acceptable internal consistency ranging from .85-.92. Examples of scale questions included: "*The XYZ Corporation has a great amount of experience*"; "*The XYZ Corporation is skilled in what they do*"; "*I trust the XYZ Corporation*"; "*The XYZ Corporation makes truthful claims*" (Newell & Goldsmith, 2001). The subscale questions were modified to include the word "organization" instead of the word "corporation". The survey questions for the Newell and Goldsmith (2001) CCS can be found in Appendix L.

The sixth dimension of OC, goodwill, was measured using McCroskey and Teven's (1999) ethos/source credibility scale. McCroskey and Teven's (1999) 7-point Likert scale is composed of three subscales, including goodwill, competence, and trustworthiness. McCroskey and Teven's (1999) goodwill subscale included three components (understanding, empathy, and responsiveness), was composed of six (6) total items, and had a significant reliability construct of .92. The correlation of the dimension of goodwill to the overall credibility dimension was significant as well at .89 (McCroskey & Teven, 1999). Examples of Likert scale questions included: "*Cares about me ... doesn't care about me*"; "*Has my interests at heart ... doesn't have my interests at heart*"; "*Self-centered ... not self-centered*" (McCroskey & Teven, 1999). The survey



questions for McCroskey and Teven's (1999) ethos/source credibility scale can be found in Appendix L.

The seventh dimension of OC, integrity, was measured using Kalshoven, Den Hartog, and De Hoogh's (2011) Ethical Leadership in the Workplace Questionnaire (ELW). Kalshoven, Den Hartog, and De Hoogh's (2011) 5-point Likert sub scale is composed of four (4) total items, and had a significant reliability construct of .94, with factor loadings ranging from .73-.82. Examples of Likert scale questions included: "Keeps his/her promises"; "Can be trusted to do the things he/she says"; "Always keeps his/her words." The questions were modified to include the type of organization that is being studied. The subscale questions were modified to include the word "organization" instead of the words "he/she", or, "his/her". The survey questions for Kalshoven, Den Hartog, and De Hoogh's (2011) ELW sub scale can be found in Appendix L.

The seventh dimension of OC, legitimacy, was measured using Chung's (2010) Organizational Legitimacy (OL) subscale. The OL subscale is a 7-point Likert scale instrument comprised of 5 total items, and the reliability coefficients for five total items was .84-.87 (Chung, 2010). Factor loadings for each of the five total items ranged from .637-.760 (Chung, 2010). Examples of scale questions that were asked in Chung's (2010) research included: "*I have a positive opinion about prescription drug companies*"; "*I believe that prescription drug companies follow government regulations*"; "*I think that prescription drug companies are honest*". The subscale questions were modified to include the word "organization" instead of the phrase "prescription drug companies". The survey questions for Chung's (2010) OL sub scale can be found in Appendix L.

The eighth dimension of OC, power, were measured using Gaski's (1986) Power Source (PS) Scale. The PS Scale is a 5-point Likert scale composed of three categorical sub scales (Expert, Legitimate, and Referent) and 15 total items (Gaski, 1986). Using Cronbach's alpha, the reliability levels for Gaski's (1986) subscales were: Expert (.77), Legitimate (.65), and Referent (.81). Examples of scale questions for this instrument included: "Clark Equipment gives credit where credit is due"; "I respect the judgment of Clark Equipment representatives"; "Clark Equipment should stay out of my business"; and "Clark Equipment has no right to tell me what to do" (Gaski, 1986). The subscale questions were modified to include the words "my organization" instead of the words "Clark Equipment". The survey questions for Gaski's (1986) PS Scale can be found in Appendix I.

A summary of the AES scale for EQ, with its three dimensions, as well as a summary of the COCI scale of OC, with its nine dimensions, may be found in Table 1 and 2 below.

Table 1

*Study Measures*

<b>Scale</b>	<b>Domain(s)</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>Measurement</b>	<b>Example</b>	<b>Source</b>
Assessing Emotions Scale (AES)	Appraisal of emotion in self and others	10	5 Point Likert Scale	<i>"I am aware of my emotions as I experience them."</i>	Schutte et al. (1998)
Assessing Emotions Scale (AES)	Regulation of emotion in self and others	17	5 Point Likert Scale	<i>"I have control over my emotions."</i>	Schutte et al. (1998)
Assessing Emotions Scale (AES)	Utilization of emotion in problem solving	6	5 Point Likert Scale	<i>"I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on."</i>	Schutte et al. (1998)
Leader Accountability Scale (AES)	Answerability	16	10 Point Likert Scale	<i>"Answers questions from constituents"</i>	Wood & Winston (2007)
Source Credibility Scale (SCS)	Attractiveness	5	7 Point Likert Scale	<i>"Attractive-Unattractive"</i>	Ohanian (1990)
Corporate Social Responsibility Scale (CSR)	CSR to Society	17	7 Point Likert Scale	<i>"Our company encourages its employees to participate in voluntary activities."</i>	Turker (2009)
	CSR to Natural Environment				
	CSR to Future Generations				
	CSR to Non-Governmental Organizations				

*(continued)*

Scale	Domain(s)	Items	Measurement	Example	Source
Corporate Credibility Scale (CCS)	Expertise	4	7 Point Likert Scale	<i>“The XYZ Corporation has a great amount of experience.”</i>	Newell & Goldsmith (2000)
Corporate Credibility Scale (CCS)	Trustworthiness	4	7 Point Likert Scale	<i>“I trust the XYZ Corporation.”</i>	Newell & Goldsmith (2000)
Ethos/Source Credibility Scale (ESCS)	Goodwill	6	7 Point Likert Scale	<i>“Cares about me ... doesn’t care about me.”</i>	McCroskey & Teven (1999)
Ethical Leadership at Work Questionnaire (ELW)	Integrity	4	5 Point Likert Scale	<i>“The organization keeps their promises.”</i>	Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh, (2011)
Organizational Legitimacy (OL)	Legitimacy	5	7 Point Likert Scale	<i>“I have a positive opinion about prescription drug companies.”</i>	Chung (2010)
Power Source Scale (PS)	Expert Power Legitimate Power Referent Power	15	5 Point Likert Scale	<i>“I couldn’t care less what Clark Eqpt. thinks of me.”</i>	Gaski (1986)

Table 2

*Study Measures Psychometric Properties*

<b>Scale</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Chronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>Factor Analysis</b>	<b>Requires Modification</b>
Assessing Emotions Scale (AES) – Appraisal	Schutte et al. (1998)	.90		No
Assessing Emotions Scale (AES) – Regulation	Schutte et al. (1998)	.90		No
Assessing Emotions Scale (AES) – Utilization	Schutte et al. (1998)	.90		No
Leader Accountability Scale (AES)	Wood & Winston (2007)	.98	.84-.92	Yes
Source Credibility Scale (SCS)	Ohanian (1990)	.89-.90	.50-.79	Yes
Corporate Social Responsibility Scale (CSR)	Turker (2009)	.86-.93	.56-.92	No
Corporate Credibility Scale (CCS)	Newell & Goldsmith (2000)	.85-.90	.64-.86	No
Corporate Credibility Scale (CCS)	Newell & Goldsmith (2000)	.86-.87	.65-.89	No

*(continued)*

<b>Scale</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Chronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>Factor Analysis</b>	<b>Requires Modification</b>
Ethos/Source Credibility Scale (ESCS)	McCroskey & Teven (1999)	.92	.62-.87	No
Ethical Leadership at Work Questionnaire (ELW)	Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh, (2011)	.90	.73-.82	Yes
Organizational Legitimacy (OL)	Chung (2010)	.84-.87	.64-.76	Yes

This previous section of Chapter Three examined the specific instruments (i.e., the AES and COCI) that were utilized to measure perceptions of EQ and perceptions of OC. The reliability and validity of each instrument was described, and examples of sample questions from each instrument were included. The next section will describe the data collection process.

The study analyzed only three categorical variables of respondents that previous research had linked to EQ, including age (Harrod & Scheer, 2005; Nasir & Iqbal, 2013), education level (Harrod & Scheer, 2005; Katyal & Awasthi, 2006; Nasir & Iqbal, 2013), and occupational tenure (Bhopatkar, 2013). These three categorical variables were regressed on the nine (9) dimensions of OC.

### **Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The following research questions and hypotheses were developed to determine if EQ is correlated to OC, and also to determine if EQ may predict OC....

RQ1: What is the relationship between employee self-report of EQ, as measured by Schutte's Emotional Intelligence Scale, and employee self-report of the perception of organizational credibility, as measured by the Comprehensive Organizational Credibility Inventory?

*H<sub>0</sub>1*: There is no relationship between self-report measures of EQ and OC.

*H<sub>1</sub>1*: There is a positive relationship between self-report measures of EQ and OC.

RQ2: Do high scores on EQ dimensions predict high scores on OC dimensions?

*H<sub>0</sub>2*: High scores on EQ will be accompanied by high scores on OC.

*H<sub>1</sub>2*: High scores on EQ will not be accompanied by high scores on OC.

After the predictor variables (EQ) and criterion variables (OC) were regressed, any differences in associations were tested by running a hypothesis test, or probability test. Alpha values will be set at  $\leq .05$ .

### **Data Analysis Plan**

The first null hypothesis in this study proposed that there is no relationship between self-report measures of EQ and OC. The alternative hypothesis predicted that there is a relationship between the nine (9) OC criterion variables (accountability, attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, goodwill, expertise, integrity, legitimacy, power, and trustworthiness) and the three (3) EQ predictor variables (appraisal and

expression of emotion in the self and others, regulation of emotion in the self and others, utilization of emotion in solving problems). The second null hypothesis in this study proposed that there is no significantly different association of high OC as measured by the COCI; that all EQ dimensions would relate equally to OC. The second alternative hypothesis suggested that there is a significant different association of high OC as measured by the COCI; that all EQ dimensions will not relate equally to OC.

To answer Hypothesis 1, both a multiple regression analysis and Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine if any of the employee self report EQ dimensions are individually associated with employee self report COCI sub-dimensions. The multiple regression analysis allowed the study to control for the influence of the three demographic variables of age, educational experience, and occupational tenure. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used in regression studies to determine the linear and directional relationship of separate variables (Explorable, 2014). A criteria value of  $p < .05$  was used to determine statistical significance.

Age, educational experience, and occupational tenure were included in regression analyses as covariates. Research has indicated that age has a significant effect on individual sensitivity to credibility cues and overall credibility judgments (Jackson & Nuttall, 1994; Liao & Fu, 2014); these findings have included studies where stakeholders evaluated the credibility of multiple organizational messages simultaneously (Beard, 2015). Research has also suggested that perceptions of credibility may vary significantly according to the evaluator's education level (Bucy, 2003; Iding, Crosby, Auernheimer, & Klemm, 2002; Klemm, Iding, & Speitel, 2001; Robinson & Kohut, 1988;) and



occupational tenure (Costigan, Insinga, Kranas, Kureshov, & Ilter, 2004; Leidner & MacKay, 2007; Straiter, 2005). Further, the level of intraorganizational trust demonstrated by employees has been shown to be facilitated by factors related to occupational tenure, such as the frequency of communication exchange (Becerra & Gupta, 2003).

To answer Hypothesis 2, a multiple regression analysis was employed to determine whether the regulation of emotion dimension among employees is significantly associated with self-reported perception of high organizational credibility as measured by the Comprehensive Organizational Credibility Inventory. Regression analysis represented an ideal way to statistically estimate the relationships between variables (Encyclopedia of Mathematics, 2014). Regression analysis was conducted using Microsoft Excel software and SPSS computer software for Macintosh OS X Version 10.6.8. The results of the regression analysis determined whether that the hypotheses was partly supported. A criteria of  $p < .05$  was used to measure and identify significant outcomes.

Each of the nine dimensions of OC and each of the subscales along with the average OC score was regressed on all three EQ dimensions along with employee demographics in order to determine whether the demographics impact the DV. Age and educational level was measured as categorical variables, while occupational tenure will be measured as a continuous variable. Age groupings of participants was measured using the following categories: 18-24 years; 25-34 years; 35-35 years; 45-55 years; 56-64 years; 65 years-older. The highest educational level attained by participants was measured using the following categories: High School Diploma, Associates Degree,

Technical Degree, Bachelors Degree, Masters Degree, or Doctoral Degree. The current occupational tenure of participants was measured by having participants write in their months or years of experience. Parameter estimates and standard errors were reported. The study examined the potential for multicollinearity among EQ dimensions through using the variance inflation factor statistic in the multivariate regression model. Although multicollinearity may produce larger standard errors among independent variables that are related, it will not bias the results produced in multiple regression analysis (Chatterjee, Hadi, & Price, 2000). The three dimensions of Schutte et al.'s (98) Emotional Intelligence Scale and the nine dimensions of the COCI can be found below in Table 3.

Table 3  
*Dimensions of Schutte et al.'s (1998) Assessing Emotions Scale and the Comprehensive Organizational Credibility Inventory*

Shutte et al.'s (1998) EQ Dimensions	COCI Dimensions
Appraisal and expression of emotion in the self / others	Accountability
Regulation of emotion in the self / others	Attractiveness
Utilization of emotion in solving problems	Corporate Social
	Expertise
	Integrity
	Goodwill
	Legitimacy
	Power
	Trustworthiness

### **Threats to Validity**

All of the survey instruments in Chapter Three that measured the various dimensions of EQ and OC have demonstrated proven levels of reliability and validity. However, various methodological challenges to validity could have potentially occurred. For example, because this research study was non-experimental in nature, casual inferences between variables may have been established, but no cause-and effect relationships could be established (Mitchell, 1985). This phenomenon has been shown to negatively affect internal validity levels (Cook & Campbell, 1976; Mitchell, 1985). In addition, construct validity levels may have been negatively affected whenever

operational definitions were used that were not precisely defined and understood (Cook & Campbell, 1976; Mitchell, 1985). External validity levels may have been negatively affected where the relationships between constructs were not accurately represented, or when the relationship was not able to be generalized to different population groups (Cook & Campbell, 1976; Mitchell, 1985). However, there was a significant level of internal validity, construct validity, and external validity for the stand-alone SEIS scale and the COCI scale composed of individual credibility scales.

### **Ethical Procedures**

All potential ethical concerns were identified and addressed prior to and during the study. In order to protect participant anonymity while simultaneously rewarding participation, the researcher was not provided access to any participant identifying information. A \$0.50 donation was made on behalf of each of the first one hundred (100) participants who completed the survey in full. Only the researcher was provided access to the study data. The results of each completed survey were not linked to any identifying information of the participant. The questions included in the cross-sectional survey were utilized previously in various other studies that were not known to cause undue harm or distress on the participants. The introductory letter, informed consent form, and IRB resources are included in the appendices.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

This cross sectional survey study examined the way in which perceptual dimensions of EQ (appraisal and expression of emotion in the self and others, regulation of emotion in the self and others, and utilization of emotion in solving problems)

predicted perceptual dimensions of OC (accountability, attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, goodwill, integrity, legitimacy, power, and trustworthiness). The SEIS Questionnaire was used to measure EQ, and the COCI was used to measure OC. These scales have been utilized in various studies previously, and demonstrated strong reliability and validity. Multiple regression analysis was performed using Microsoft Excel software and SPSS software for Macintosh OS X.

This chapter discussed the research design and rationale for using a cross sectional survey design, the methodology, research questions, and the hypotheses. The chapter also discussed instrumentation and operationalization of constructs, data analysis plan, specific threats to validity, and ethical procedures. Chapter Four will examine the results of the analyses in detail.

## Chapter 4: Results

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between employee EQ and employee perceptions of OC within their organization. Hypothesis 1 proposed a positive relationship would be identified between self-report measures of EQ and OC. Hypothesis 2 proposed that high scores on employee EQ would not be accompanied by high scores on employee OC.

Chapter 4 begins with a summary of how the survey data was collected, how the data was organized, and how any zero value scores from the various Likert scales were tabulated. The chapter then presents the descriptive and inferential statistics, statistical correlations between variables, and multiple regression analysis. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings of the data analysis.

### **Data Collection**

Participants in this study were individuals working in larger-sized medical and/or health care organizations throughout the United States. Participants were contacted by SurveyMonkey via e-mail on July 8, 2015, and the total number of questionnaires required for the participant sample was completed in two consecutive days. Participants who were interested in contributing questionnaires used the link to the SurveyMonkey website, and the website recorded all survey responses. All raw data collected from the survey was downloaded from SurveyMonkey and imported into both Microsoft Excel and SPSS for analysis.

A total of 150 individuals were initially contacted for this study on July 8, 2015. Out of the 150 invitations sent out, 112 responses were recorded between July 8 and 9, 2015. However, nine of these responses were removed from the data analysis because they did not meet the survey age requirement (i.e., at least 18 years old), had not worked at their organization for a minimum of three months, or chose not to complete the survey questions. All 103 remaining participants completed the entire study survey. This was an effective response rate of 68.6% (103/150). Other than receiving complete participant data from three more participants than the study required, there were no data collection discrepancies from the plan presented in Chapter 3.

### **Descriptive and Demographic Sample Characteristics**

For participants who completed the survey, nine respondents were between the ages of 18-25 (8.74%); 31 were between the ages of 26-35 (30.10%); 21 were between the ages of 36-45 (20.39%); 19 were between the ages of 46-55 (18.45%); and 23 were between the ages of 56-65 (22.33%). Education statistics for all participants indicated that 28 earned a high school diploma (27.18%); 36 earned an Associate's Degree (34.95%); 24 earned a Bachelor's Degree (23.30%); five earned a Master's Degree (4.85%); one earned a Doctorate Degree (0.97%); three earned a professional degree (2.91%); and six earned a vocational or technical degree (5.83%).

Occupational tenure statistics for all participants indicated that 13 currently worked for their organization between three months and one year (12.62%); 16 currently worked for their organization between two and three years (15.53%); nine currently worked for their organization between three and four years (8.74%); 24 currently worked

for their organization between five and eight years (23.30%); and 41 currently worked for their organization nine or more years (39.81%). Table 4 presents a summary of the sample characteristics.

Table 4

*Sample Demographics*

<b>Variable</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
<b>Age</b>		
18-25	9	8.74
26-35	31	30.10
36-45	21	20.39
46-55	19	18.45
56-65	23	22.33
<b>Education Level</b>		
Did not graduate	0	0.00
High School Diploma	28	27.18
Associate's Degree	36	34.95
Bachelor's Degree	24	23.30
Master's Degree	5	4.85
Doctorate	1	0.97
Professional Degree	3	2.91
Other	6	5.83
<b>Occupational Tenure</b>		
3 Months – 1 Year	13	12.62
2-3 Years	16	15.53
3-4 Years	9	8.74
5-8 Years	24	23.30
9+ Years	41	39.81

(N=103)



The data collected was representative of the population of participants working in organizations employing 500 or more individuals. Individual participants in the organizations were contacted randomly by SurveyMonkey, and each individual volunteered and self-selected into the study. Though every effort was made to recruit a sample that would be representative of people working in larger companies, there is no way to know whether that goal was achieved.

### **Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables**

As mentioned in chapter 3, multiple measures were utilized to measure EQ and OC. EQ was measured using Schutte et al.'s (1998) AES, which produced a score for three separate dimensions: appraisal and expression of emotion in the self and others, regulation of emotion in the self and others, and utilization of emotions in solving problems. OC was measured using the COCI, which is composed of nine separate dimensions of credibility borrowed from eight published credibility scales, including accountability (Leader Accountability Scale; Wood & Winston, 2007); attractiveness (Source Credibility Scale; Ohanian, 1990); corporate social responsibility (Corporate Social Responsibility Scale; Turker, 2009); expertise and trustworthiness (Corporate Credibility Scale; Newell & Goldsmith, 2008); goodwill (Ethos/Source Credibility Scale McCroskey & Teven, 1999); integrity (Ethical Leadership At Work Questionnaire; Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh, 2011) legitimacy (Organizational Legitimacy Scale; Chung, 2010); power (Power Source Scale; Gaski, 1986). Means, reliabilities, and standard deviations for each of these scales are included in Table 5.

Table 5

*Number of items, Reliability, Means, and Standard Deviations for all Scales*

<b>Scale</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Reliability</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
EQ Assessing Emotions Scale	33	.92	3.86	.48
OC Accountability Scale	30	.98	6.95	2.00
OC Attractiveness Scale	5	.85	3.62	1.18
OC Corp. Social Responsibility Scale	17	.93	2.25	.72
OC Expertise Scale	4	.78	2.08	1.07
OC Goodwill Scale	6	.91	4.29	1.48
OC Integrity Scale	4	.97	3.39	1.03
OC Legitimacy Scale	5	.91	5.63	1.24
OC Power Scale	15	.83	3.58	.60
OC Trust Scale	4	.83	2.77	1.29

(N=103)

Reliabilities were very good for all scales, with all measuring above, and most scales significantly above, the commonly accepted .70 threshold (Tavakol & Deick, 2011). Based on the alpha coefficient numbers, there is nothing significant to report that would negatively affect the reliability or validity of this study.

Table 6

*Bivariate Correlations Among Study Variables*

		1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Age	(1)					
2	Educational Level	-.08	(1)				
3	Job Tenure	.43**	.00	(1)			
4	EQ Overall	-.03	-.16	-.07	(1)		
5	OC Accountability	-.01	-.13	-.19	.27**	(1)	
6	OC Attractiveness	.01	.06	.01	-.26**	-.51**	(1)
7	OC Corporate Responsibility	-.02	.03	.07	-.42**	-.61**	.65**
8	OC Expertise	-.10	.08	.04	-.27**	-.48**	.42**
9	OC Goodwill	-.01	-.12	-.17	.26**	.70**	-.62**
10	OC Integrity	.01	-.04	-.20*	.22*	.76**	-.58**
11	OC Legitimacy	.07	-.10	-.19	.22*	.65**	-.53**
12	OC Power	.04	-.13	-.17	.35**	.66**	-.61**
13	OC Trust	-.05	.06	.15	-.19*	-.57**	.53**

*(continued)*\* $p < .05$ \*\* $p < .01$

	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Age							
2 Educational Level							
3 Job Tenure							
4 EQ Overall							
5 OC Accountability							
6 OC Attractiveness							
7 OC Corporate Responsibility	(1)						
8 OC Expertise	.56**	(1)					
9 OC Goodwill	-.63**	-.52**	(1)				
10 OC Integrity	-.63**	-.57**	.81**	(1)			
11 OC Legitimacy	-.64**	-.79**	.71**	.78**	(1)		
12 OC Power	-.67**	-.72**	.77**	.78**	.86**	(1)	
13 OC Trust	.56**	.70**	-.62**	-.68**	-.77**	-.73**	(1)

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

EQ showed a statistically significant and positive correlation with accountability ( $r = .27, p < .01$ ); with goodwill ( $r = .26, p < .01$ ); with integrity ( $r = .22, p < .05$ ); with legitimacy ( $r = .22, p < .05$ ); and with power ( $r = .35, p < .01$ ). EQ showed a statistically significant and negative correlation with attractiveness ( $r = -.26, p < .01$ ); with corporate social responsibility ( $r = -.42, p < .01$ ); with expertise ( $r = -.27, p < .01$ ); and with trustworthiness ( $r = -.19, p < .05$ ). Thus, research question 1 was partly supported. Table 6 shows correlations between EQ and OC dimensions.

The second research question was: Do high scores on EQ dimensions predict high scores on OC dimensions? The hypothesis proposed that high scores on EQ dimensions would be accompanied by high scores on OC dimensions. In order to examine predictions between EQ and OC, a series of hierarchical multiple regressions was used to analyze research question 2 after controlling for the demographics of age, educational level, and length of employment.

For all analyses, EQ was entered into Model 2, and the resulting increase in  $R^2$  was interpreted.

### **OC Accountability**

Demographic variables in Model 1 did not predict OC accountability ( $R^2 = .06$ ,  $F(3, 99) = 1.95$ ,  $p = .13$ ). The inclusion of EQ in Model 2 resulted in a significant increase in  $R^2$  ( $\Delta R^2 = .06$ ). The overall result for Model 2 was also significant ( $R^2 = .11$ ,  $F(4, 98) = 3.13$ ,  $p = .02$ ).

In Model 2, none of the demographic variables were predictors of OC accountability, but the EQ overall score was significant ( $B = 1.02$ ,  $t = 2.52$ ,  $p = .01$ ) (Table 7). Thus, for each unit of increase in EQ, participants reported a 1.02 unit increase in OC accountability.

Table 7

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Accountability*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>
Constant	8.22	.75	10.93**	4.05	1.81	2.24*
Age	.12	.17	.70	.12	.16	.75
Education	-.16	.12	-1.27	-.12	.12	-.97
Employment	-.30	.15	-2.01*	-.28	.15	-1.90
EQ Overall				.97	.37	2.61**
R <sup>2</sup>	.06			.11		
F	1.95			3.13*		
Δ R <sup>2</sup>				.06		
Δ F				6.34**		

\**p* < .05\*\**p* < .01**OC Attractiveness**

Demographic variables in Model 1 did not significantly predict OC attractiveness ( $R^2 = .00$ ,  $F(3, 99) = .14$ ,  $p = .94$ ). The addition of EQ in Model 2 resulted in a significant increase in  $R^2$  ( $R^2_{\text{change}} = .06$ ). The overall result for Model 2 was not significant ( $R^2 = .06$ ,  $F(4, 98) = 1.55$ ,  $p = .20$ ).

In Model 2, the demographic variables were not significant predictors of OC attractiveness, but the EQ overall scores were significant ( $B = -.59$ ,  $t = -2.40$ ,  $p = .02$ ), as shown in Table 8. Thus, for each unit of increase in emotional intelligence, participants reported a -.59 unit decrease in OC attractiveness.

Table 8

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Attractiveness*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Std. Error	<i>T</i>	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>
Constant	3.42	.46	7.51**	5.83	1.10	5.31**
Age	.02	.10	.15	.01	.10	.12
Education	.05	.08	.63	.02	.07	.33
Employment	-.00	.09	-.02*	-.02	.09	-.17
EQ Overall				-.59	.25	-2.40*
R <sup>2</sup>	.00			.06		
F	.14			1.55		
Δ R <sup>2</sup>				.06		
Δ F				5.76*		

\**p* < .05\*\**p* < .01**OC Corporate Social Responsibility**

Demographic variables in Model 1 did not significantly predict OC corporate social responsibility ( $R^2 = .01$ ,  $F(3, 99) = .30$ ,  $p = .83$ ). The addition of EQ in Model 2 resulted in a significant increase in  $R^2$  ( $\Delta R^2 = .15$ ). The overall model for Model 2 was also significant ( $R^2 = .16$ ,  $F(4, 98) = 4.76$ ,  $p = .00$ ).

In Model 2, the demographic variables were not significant predictors of OC corporate social responsibility, but the EQ overall score was significant ( $B = -.60$ ,  $t = -4.24$ ,  $p = .00$ ), as shown in Table 9. Thus, for each unit of increase in emotional intelligence, participants reported a -.60 unit decrease in OC corporate social responsibility.

Table 9

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Corporate Social Responsibility*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>
Constant	2.13	.28	7.69**	4.59	.63	7.25**
Age	-.03	.06	-.50	-.03	.06	-.60
Education	.01	.05	.26	-.01	.04	-.27
Employment	.05	.06	.89	.04	.05	.70
EQ Overall				-.60	.14	-4.24**
R <sup>2</sup>	.01			.16		
F	.30			4.76		
Δ R <sup>2</sup>				.15		
Δ F				17.98**		

\**p* < .05\*\**p* < .01**OC Expertise**

Demographic variables in Model 1 did not predict OC expertise ( $R^2 = .02$ ,  $F(3, 99) = .82$ ,  $p = .49$ ). The addition of EQ in Model 2 resulted in a significant increase in  $R^2$  ( $\Delta R^2 = .06$ ). The overall measure for Model 2 was not significant ( $R^2 = .09$ ,  $F(4, 98) = 2.27$ ,  $p = .07$ ).

In Model 2, the demographic variables were not significant predictors of OC expertise, but the EQ overall score was significant ( $B = -.56$ ,  $t = -2.55$ ,  $p = .01$ ) (Table 10). Thus, for each unit of increase in emotional intelligence, participants reported a -.56 unit decrease in OC expertise.



Table 10

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Expertise*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>
Constant	2.01	.41	4.93**	4.30	.98	4.38**
Age	-.12	.09	-1.29	-.12	.09	-1.36
Education	.05	.07	.69	.03	.07	.37
Employment	.07	.08	.92	.06	.08	.79
EQ Overall				-.56	.22	-2.55*
R <sup>2</sup>	.02			.09		
F	.82			2.27		
Δ R <sup>2</sup>				.06		
Δ F				6.49**		

\**p* < .05\*\**p* < .01**OC Goodwill**

Demographic variables in Model 1 did not significantly predict OC goodwill ( $R^2 = .05$ ,  $F(3, 99) = 1.69$ ,  $p = .17$ ). The addition of EQ in Model 2 resulted in a significant increase in  $R^2$  ( $\Delta R^2 = .05$ ). The overall score for Model 2 was significant ( $R^2 = .10$ ,  $F(4, 98) = 2.78$ ,  $p = .03$ ).

In Model 2, the demographic variables were not significant predictors of OC goodwill, but the EQ overall score was significant ( $B = .73$ ,  $t = 2.41$ ,  $p = .02$ ), as shown in Table 11. Thus, for each unit of increase in emotional intelligence, participants reported a .73 unit increase in OC goodwill.

Table 11

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Goodwill*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Std. Error	T	B	Std. Error	t
Constant	5.18	.56	9.26**	2.21	1.35	1.64
Age	.08	.12	.61	.08	.12	.66
Education	-.11	.09	-1.18	-.08	.09	-.89
Employment	-.21	.11	-1.87	-.19	.11	-1.76
EQ Overall				.73	.30	.241*
R <sup>2</sup>	.05			.10		
F	1.69			2.78		
Δ R <sup>2</sup>				.05		
Δ F				5.80*		

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

### OC Integrity

Demographic variables in Model 1 did not significantly predict OC integrity ( $R^2 = .05$ ,  $F(3, 99) = 1.70$ ,  $p = .17$ ). The addition of EQ in Model 2 resulted in an increase in  $R^2$  ( $\Delta R^2 = .04$ , however this increase was not significant. The overall score for Model 2 was not significant ( $R^2 = .08$ ,  $F(4, 98) = 2.24$ ,  $p = .07$ ).

In Model 2, the demographic predictors were not significant predictors of OC integrity, and the EQ overall score was not significant ( $B = .41$ ,  $t = 1.93$ ,  $p = .06$ ), as shown in Table 12.

Table 12

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Integrity*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>
Constant	3.81	.39	9.79**	2.14	.95	2.25
Age	.08	.09	.99	.09	.09	1.03
Education	-.02	.06	-.32	-.00	.06	-.07
Employment	-.17	.08	-2.22*	-.16	.08	-2.13
EQ Overall				.41	.21	1.93
$R^2$	.05			.08		
F	1.70			2.24		
$\Delta R^2$				.04		
$\Delta F$				3.73		

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

### OC Legitimacy

Demographic variables in Model 1 did not significantly predict OC legitimacy ( $R^2 = .04$ ,  $F(3, 99) = 1.35$ ,  $p = .26$ ). The addition of EQ in Model 2 resulted in a significant increase in  $R^2$  ( $\Delta R^2 = .04$ ). However, the overall model for Model 2 was not significant ( $R^2 = .08$ ,  $F(4, 98) = 2.03$ ,  $p = .10$ ).

In Model 2, the demographic variables were not significant predictors of OC legitimacy, but the EQ overall score was significant ( $B = .51$ ,  $t = 1.99$ ,  $p = .05$ ) (Table 13). Thus, for each unit of increase in emotional intelligence, participants reported a .51 unit increase in OC legitimacy.

Table 13

#### *Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Legitimacy*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>
Constant	5.99	.47	12.67**	3.90	1.15	3.39**
Age	.14	.10	1.30	.14	.10	1.35
Education	-.07	.08	-.85	-.05	.08	-.60
Employment	-.15	.09	-1.64*	-.14	.09	-1.54
EQ Overall				.51	.26	1.99*
$R^2$	.04			.08		
F	1.35			2.03		
$\Delta R^2$				.04		
$\Delta F$				3.95*		

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

### OC Power

Demographic variables in Model 1 did not significantly predict OC power ( $R^2 = .06$ ,  $F(3, 99) = 1.99$ ,  $p = .12$ ). The addition of EQ in Model 2 resulted in a significant increase in  $R^2$  ( $\Delta R^2 = .09$ ). The overall score for Model 2 was also significant ( $R^2 = .15$ ,  $F(4, 98) = 4.27$ ,  $p = .00$ ).

In Model 2, the demographic predictors were not significant predictors of OC power, however EQ overall scores were significant ( $B = .39$ ,  $t = 3.24$ ,  $p = .00$ ), as shown in Table 14. Thus, for each unit of increase in emotional intelligence, participants reported a .39 unit increase in OC power.

Table 14

#### *Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Power*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	B	Std. Error	<i>T</i>
Constant	3.89	.23	17.12**	2.30	.54	4.29**
Age	.06	.05	1.17	.06	.05	1.27
Education	-.05	.04	-1.21	-.03	.04	-.84
Employment	-.09	.05	-2.03*	-.08	.04	-1.93
EQ Overall				.39	.12	3.24**
$R^2$	.06			.15		
F	1.99			4.27		
$\Delta R^2$				.09		
$\Delta F$				10.52*		

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

### OC Trustworthiness

Demographic variables in Model 1 did not significantly predict OC trustworthiness ( $R^2 = .04$ ,  $F(3, 99) = 1.45$ ,  $p = .23$ ). The addition of EQ in Model 2 did not result in a significant increase in  $R^2$  ( $\Delta R^2 = .03$ ). The overall score for Model 2 was also not significant ( $R^2 = .07$ ,  $F(4, 98) = 1.93$ ,  $p = .11$ ).

In Model 2, the demographic variables were not significant predictors of OC trustworthiness, and the EQ overall score was not significant ( $B = -.48$ ,  $t = -1.81$ ,  $p = .07$ ), as shown in Table 15. Thus, for each unit of increase in emotional intelligence, participants reported a  $-.48$  unit decrease in OC trustworthiness.

Table 15

*Results of Multiple Regression Predicting OC Trustworthiness*

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>	B	Std. Error	<i>t</i>
Constant	2.37	.49	4.87**	4.34	1.19	3.65**
Age	-.13	.11	-1.25	-.14	.11	-1.29
Education	-.04	.08	.50	.02	.08	.27
Employment	.19	.10	1.95*	.18	.10	1.85
EQ Overall				-.48	.27	-1.81
$R^2$	.04			.07		
F	1.45			1.93		
$\Delta R^2$				.03		
$\Delta F$				3.27		

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

### **EQ Overall and OC Overall**

Research indicated that the demographic covariates did not have a significant effect on the outcome variables. Due to this finding, a multiple regression was run without including the demographic covariates in order to confirm that EQ would predict OC. Simple linear regression showed overall EQ (EQoverall\_M) to be a significant predictor of the OC dimensions of accountability (OC\_ACC,  $\beta = 1.12$ ,  $t(101) = 2.78$ ,  $p = .01$ ); goodwill (OC\_GOOD,  $\beta = .80$ ,  $t(101) = 2.66$ ,  $p = .01$ ); legitimacy (OC\_LEGIT,  $\beta = .55$ ,  $t(101) = 2.16$ ,  $p = .03$ ); power (OC\_POWER,  $\beta = .41$ ,  $t(101) = 3.47$ ,  $p = .00$ ); Overall EQ (EQoverall\_M) was not a significant predictor of the OC dimensions of attractiveness (OC\_ATT,  $\beta = -.60$ ,  $t(101) = -2.50$ ,  $p = .01$ ); corporate social responsibility (OC\_CSR,  $\beta = -.60$ ,  $t(101) = -4.34$ ,  $p = .00$ ); expertise (OC\_EXP,  $\beta = -.57$ ,  $t(101) = -2.65$ ,  $p = .01$ ); integrity (OC\_INTEG,  $\beta = .44$ ,  $t(101) = 2.08$ ,  $p = .04$ ); or trustworthiness (OC\_TRUST,  $\beta = -.52$ ,  $t(101) = -1.96$ ,  $p = .05$ ). Results have been included below in Table 16.

Table 16

*Results of Multiple Regression for EQ Overall Predicting OC Variables Without Covariates*

Outcome	R <sup>2</sup>	F	B	T	Sig
OC ACC	.07	7.71	1.12	2.78	.007
OC ATT	.06	6.23	-.60	-2.50	.014
OC CSR	.16	18.82	-.60	-4.34	.000
OC EXP	.07	7.02	-.57	-2.65	.009
OC GOOD	.07	7.06	.80	2.66	.009
OC INTEG	.04	4.33	.44	2.08	.040
OC LEGIT	.04	4.65	.55	2.16	.033
OC POWER	.11	12.02	.41	3.47	.001
OC TRUST	.04	3.83	-.52	-1.96	.053

### Summary and Conclusions

In this study, two separate hypotheses were offered. The first was that there would be a positive correlation between self-report measures of EQ and OC. EQ showed a statistically significant and positive correlation with OC dimensions of accountability, goodwill, integrity, legitimacy, and power. In other words, employees with high EQ perceived their employing organizations to have high credibility in areas of accountability, goodwill, legitimacy, and power. EQ also showed a statistically significant and negative correlation with OC dimensions of attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, and trustworthiness. In other words, employees with high EQ perceived their employing organizations to have low credibility in areas of



attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, and trustworthiness. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported.

Previous research showed that age (Jackson & Nuttall, 1994; Liao & Fu, 2014), educational level (Bucy, 2003; Iding, Crosby, Auernheimer, & Klemm, 2002; Klemm, Iding, & Speitel, 2001; Robinson & Kohut, 1988;), and occupational tenure (Costigan, Insinga, Kranas, Kureshov, & Ilter, 2004; Leidner & MacKay, 2007; Straiter, 2005) could have a significant effect on individual perceptions of individual or source credibility. Contrary to these previous findings however, these demographic covariates were not significantly related to the outcome variables in this study. One explanation for the differences in findings could be that, unlike the above sources, the current study examined individual perceptions of organizational credibility rather than individual perceptions of individual or source credibility. Another explanation for this finding could be that when compared to the current study, the above sources examined the effects that demographic variables would have on a much more limited number of dimensions of credibility. Perez and del Bosque (2013) have suggested that the individual psychological features of a research sample may be significantly more influential than demographic features in explaining perceptions of certain dimensions of organizational credibility, such as in studies of corporate social responsibility. Individual psychological features that have significantly influenced perceptions of credibility could include individualist or collectivist cognitive frameworks (Erdem, Swait, & Valenzuela, 2006; Lee & Boster, 1992).

A second hypothesis proposed that high scores on EQ would be accompanied by high scores on OC dimensions. After controlling for the demographic variables of age, educational level, and occupational tenure, high scores on EQ predicted high scores on OC dimensions of accountability, goodwill, legitimacy, and power, but not on OC dimensions of attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, or trustworthiness. Scores for OC dimensions of integrity and trustworthiness were not significant. In other words, employees with high EQ perceived their employing organizations to have high OC in areas of accountability, goodwill, legitimacy, and power, but not did not perceive their employing organizations to have high OC in areas of attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, or trustworthiness. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. The pattern of results was observed in both the analysis that included demographic covariates, and the analysis that excluded demographic covariates. The final chapter provides an analysis and discussion of the research findings, an assessment of possible limitations to the study, recommendations for future research, potential benefits and contributions of this study toward social change, and endorsements for action.

## Chapter 5: Discussion

### **Introduction**

Research demonstrated that OC contains a number of dimensions, including accountability (Due & Jorgensen, 2011), attractiveness (Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Underwood, 2003), corporate social responsibility (Balboni, 2008; Hudak & Werder, 2009), expertise (Balboni, 2008; Berlo, Lermert, & Mertz, 1970; Haley, 1996; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981), goodwill (Kazoleas & Teven, 1992), integrity (Kazoleas & Teven, 1992), legitimacy (Due & Jorgensen, 2011), power (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Underwood, 2003), and trustworthiness (Balboni, 2008; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Underwood, 2003). Existing studies have indicated that it is important for organizations to evaluate internal stakeholder perceptions of OC (Duncan, Ginter, & Swayne, 1998). However, most existing research on OC has focused on external variables, including perceptions of external stakeholders, while failing to thoroughly investigate internal stakeholder perceptions of OC (de Chernatony, 1999).

Research has also shown that EQ has a fundamental framework in both self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2002) and performance theory (Goleman, 1994; Goleman, 1998; Sonnetag & Frese, 2001; Trafimow & Rice, 2008; Utman, 1997). EQ has been both generally and positively linked to multiple beneficial outcomes in organizations (Lekavičienė & Remeikait, 2004; Momeni, 2009; Rafiq, Naseer, & Ali, 2011; Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011). EQ has displayed a significant effect upon various aspects of organization behavior, including employee commitment (Abraham,

1999; Abraham, 2000), employee motivation (Adyasha, 2013), employee performance (Allam, 2011; Aydin, Leblebici, Arslan, Kilic, & Oktem, 2005; Gondal & Husain, 2013; Othman, Abdullah, & Ahmad, 2008; Rangriz & Mehrabi, 2010; Ravichandran, Arasu, & Arun Kumar, 2011), employee retention (Harrison-Walker, 2008), employee work climate (Momeni, 2009; Sathya Kumar & Iyer, 2012), employee creativity (Othman et al., 2008), and organizational citizenship behavior (Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011).

While the existing research showed the significance of OC and EQ as individual constructs and described the existing ways that EQ has been integrated within organizations, what the literature had not previously revealed was how employee EQ may affect employee perceptions of OC. The current study was conducted in order to give employees, managers, and trainers a broader and more accurate understanding of how individual employees perceive the credibility of their organizations, and by subsequently providing a significant incentive for organizational leaders to develop and integrate EQ and OC improvement interventions.

Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between EQ and employee perceptions of OC within an organization. Using a cross-sectional survey of 103 participants representing various medical and health care organizations in the United States, the study measured the levels of EQ and OC and determined the strength and direction of a relationship between the two variables. Hypothesis 1 proposed a relationship could be established between self-report measures of EQ and OC. Hypothesis 2 proposed high scores on EQ would be accompanied by high scores on OC.

Results of the study partially supported Hypothesis 1. The study showed a statistically significant and positive correlation between EQ and five of the individual OC dimensions, including accountability, goodwill, integrity, legitimacy, and power. EQ also showed a statistically significant and negative correlation with four of the individual OC dimensions, including attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, and trustworthiness.

Results of the study also partially supported Hypothesis 2. After controlling for the demographic variables of age, educational level, and length of employment, high scores on EQ predicted high scores on four of the individual OC dimensions, including accountability, goodwill, legitimacy, and power, but not on four of the OC dimensions of attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, or trustworthiness. Scores for OC dimensions of integrity and trustworthiness were not significant.

### **Interpretations of the Findings**

In agreement with previous research that has linked EQ with other credibility-associated dimensions in organizations; the current study found that EQ is related to employee perceptions of OC. EQ was related to employee perceptions of OC in that employees with significant EQ perceived their organization as being more credible. EQ was also related to employee perceptions of OC in that, in some instances, employees with significant EQ also perceived their organization as being less credible. Whether EQ was found to be related to employee perceptions of either high OC or low OC was dependent upon the particular dimension of OC that was measured. The current study findings are in agreement with existing research that has determined that EQ has both a

positive correlation to, and a significant influence on, dimensions that describe employee perceptions of an organization's outward features, such as OC and organizational climate (Momeni, 2009). The current study findings have also pointed to the universal importance of EQ as an important influence on worker perceptions of organizations; existing research has similarly determined that OC is significantly affected by manager EQ (Momeni, 2009).

### **Self-Determination Theory Implications**

As discussed previously in Chapter 2, EQ has maintained fundamental roots within self determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Previous research has shown that self determination theory is connected to intrinsic motivation and has further suggested that individual growth influences both how one's personality is developed and how one's behavior is governed (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Self determination theory has also suggested that meeting innate needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness help humans grow and function in an optimal manner (Deci & Ryan, 2002). An individual's motivations can vary according to time and situation (Deci & Ryan, 2002), and the surrounding social environment can assist in sustaining the motivation to attain autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2008). The research has clearly indicated that the development of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations have varying affects upon individual psychological health and performance; this finding is apparent in the way that human autonomy and motivation behaviors are expressed (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

The negative effects for organizations with low OC are significant (Bosetti & Victor, 2011). For example, negative or low OC has been shown to create adverse

economic and social conditions for organizations and communities (Bosetti & Victor, 2011). Because self-determination theory has emphasized the importance of motivation in employee performance, one implication for future research would be to examine how hindering the development of employee intrinsic and/or extrinsic motivation may either make organizations more susceptible to the development of low OC behaviors, or more susceptible to a reduction of high OC behaviors. Future research might also compare both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations for employees within the same sample population in organizations in order to determine whether these two fundamentally different types of motivations have a measurably greater or lesser effect on employee behavior.

### **Performance Theory Implications**

Previous research has indicated that EQ Theory is closely associated with Performance Theory (Goleman, 1994; Goleman, 1998; Utman, 1997; Trafimow & Rice, 2008; Sonnentag & Frese, 2002). Performance Theory has described the relationship that exists between individual objective task performance and the subject contextual performance (Sonnentag & Frese, 2002). Furthermore, Performance Theory has emphasized the development of individually-based intrinsic motivations that facilitate task performance (Goldman, 1995; Goleman, 1998; Utman, 1997), and any subsequently associated performance-based learning processes (Goldman, 1995; Trafimow & Rice, 2008). Previous research has shown that Performance Theory emphasizes the importance of external feedback and self-regulation in relationship to task performance (Bandura, 1971; Sonnentag & Frese, 2002).

Research has also suggested that when high EQ individuals can monitor and discriminate the emotions of themselves and others they are able to successfully change their perceptions or thinking patterns (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Because OC is a human perception of the value of an organization, the current research has directly suggested that the employee perceptions of OC can be successfully altered. Furthermore, research has also suggested that increasing knowledge and awareness of low-credibility organizational issues can help to improve or reform organizational behavior (Birkinshaw, 1997; Ulman, 2014). Therefore, future research should focus on why low EQ employee hiring practices, low level employee external feedback, and employee learning processes may cause organizations to be more vulnerable to low OC.

### **Methodological Implications**

The AES scale, used in this study to measure EQ, has been found to be useful for research purposes, specifically for individuals who are interested in career-based occupational-based self-reflection (Schutte et al., 1998; Schutte, Malouff, & Bhullar, 2009). However, Schutte, Malouff, and Bhullar (2009) have recommended that the AES scale not be used specifically for employment screening, as the questions may not be appropriate for individuals who may be motivated to present themselves in a socially desirable manner. Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios' (2003) Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test, or MSCEIT, has been recommended as an alternative instrument to be used for employee screenings (Schutte, Malouff, & Bhullar, 2009).

In addition, for the purposes of constructing a uniform survey, certain words on several of the nine OC scales were changed so that the questions were more uniform and



more specifically applicable to the responding participant sample. While reliability scores for all scales were strong, significant attention should be given in future research to the potential for decreased reliability when scale questions are modified. In addition, while the number of scale points varied by individual scale, all original scale points from each original published scale were used in an identical manner in this research study in order to preserve each scale's data characteristics and avoid negatively affecting the comparability of data. Dawes (2008) has noted that while no issues of skewness or kurtosis may arise due to re-scaling methods, larger scales (i.e., 10 point scales) tend to produce slightly lower relative means scores than those produced by 5 or 7 point scales.

### **Practical Implications**

The findings of this research study should be considered important for CEOs, managers, HR directors, and any other employee classifications in organizations in that the findings provide motivation and incentive for change. The research clearly indicated that internal perceptions of OC were vital contributions to the health of organizations (Davies and Chun, 2002; de Chernatony, 1999; Duncan, Ginter, & Swayne, 1998). The findings of the current study also supported previous research that has found that positive internal stakeholder perceptions of their organization are associated with external stakeholder perceptions of the same organizations (Baker, 2010; David, 2011; Hatch & Schultz, 1997; Hatch & Schultz, 2001; Majchrzak, Jarvenpaa, & Hollingshead, 2007; Nan & Qin, 2009). The current study indicated an association existed between the internal employee perceptions and the external perceptions associated with marketing and consumerism (Goldsmith, Lafferty, & Newell, 2000; Lafferty & Goldsmith, 1999;

Lafferty & Goldsmith, 2004; Jin & Yeo, 2011; Moussa & Touzani, 2008; Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Rodgers & Bae, 2005; Sallam, 2011; Sojung & Sejung Marina, 2010; Zhang & Rezaee, 2009). The current study also provided the indicators and significance of low OC (Barrett, 2005; Beatty, Ewing, & Tharp, 2003; Bosetti & Victor, 2011; David, 2011; Hammond, 1986; Richardson, 1986). By understanding the associations connecting internal and external perceptions of organizations and the significance of low OC, organizational leaders may become more motivated to consider the relationship and importance of EQ and OC.

The findings in the current study are also relevant for workers within organizations in that they have provided an improved connection between EQ and OC, an improved understanding of how employees with EQ are likely to view the credibility of their employing organizations, and therefore a clear direction for change. This research study showed that employee EQ influences individuals' perceptions of OC dimensions, such as accountability, goodwill, integrity, legitimacy, and power in a significant and positive way, and influences the perceptions of other OC dimensions, such as attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, and trustworthiness, in a significant and negative way. The findings of this study both add to and agree with the findings of previous research that demonstrated that EQ is both generally and positively related to multiple beneficial outcomes in organizations (Lekavičienė & Remeikait, 2004; Momeni, 2009; Rafiq, Naseer, & Ali, 2011; Yaghoubi, Mashinchi, & Hadi, 2011), but the current study also provided contradictory evidence indicating that EQ relates negatively to other dimensions of OC. By providing specific, original information on the various

ways that employees are more likely to be perceived either positively or negatively in the workforce, organizational leaders may be better equipped to create and enact stronger and more effective EQ and OC intervention processes.

### **Limitations of the Study**

One limitation of the study involved the potential for natural selection bias or response bias. Although fully random sampling procedures were utilized, the characteristics of employee participants in any cross-sectional survey are likely to differ somewhat from those employee participants who chose not to participate. While the participant sample size was significant, it is reasonable to expect that a demographic of potential participants who are not familiar or skilled with online electronic media or are uncomfortable with online electronic surveys would not have chosen to self-select for participation.

A second limitation of this study involved the utilization of single-time data collection procedures, making it more difficult for this study to fully draw causal inferences about the relationship of EQ and OC among employees of other organizations. The selected participant sample was comprised of employees of medical and/or health care organizations employing 500 or more. Because of this limitation, it therefore cannot be considered a representative sample of the target population of all employees of hospitals.

A third limitation of this study involved the characteristics commonly associated with self-report data. All individuals that participated in the self-report survey had varied comprehension levels as well as varied perceptions of the meaning of each question.

Also, though no specific threat was known to exist in this study, on a theoretical level, it remains possible that participants may have been intentionally deceptive in providing their questionnaire responses. Participants also may have also unintentionally disengaged on a cognitive level from the questionnaire process due to a variety of uncontrollable environmental factors, and as a result may not complete the questionnaire accurately. One important limitation that may not be accounted for in the current study is common method variance (CMV), where the variance measurements may be inflated a result of the survey method used, rather than as a result of the representative constructs themselves (*Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003*). However, a meta-analysis of the impact of CMV on 216 separate data correlations from various independent studies found that inflated correlations were measured at 0.10 or less, and that most of the correlations remained significant after controlling for CMV (*Malhotra, Kim, & Patil, 2006*).

### **Recommendations**

A direction for future research would involve conducting the same study on a different population. For example, a future study might sample smaller-sized, rather than larger-sized organizations, or a participant sample representing occupations that specifically require emotional and/or non-emotional work performance. Uncovering similar results to the current study within any subsequent study would add credence to the inherent theory proposed in this study; that employee EQ is related to employee perceptions of OC.

Another recommendation for future research would involve designing a qualitative study to examine the relationship between employee EQ and employee

perceptions of OC. A qualitative study can provide a more holistic interpretation of a phenomenon (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975), and may allow the researcher to engage participants by utilizing language and meaning of their choice, and consequently are more comfortable with (Kirk & Miller, 1986). Because of this inherent ability, a qualitative study may provide a greater opportunity to investigate any cultural differences that may exist in studies of employee EQ and employee perceptions of OC. For example, Ghorbini, Bing, Watson, Davison, and Mack (2002) have reported that self-report measures of EQ among comparative participant groups in America and Iran were significantly dissimilar for measurable self-consciousness and the processing of emotional information, and these findings were thought to be related to differences between both countries in individualist and collectivist values. Likewise, in a study of trust, an individual dimension of organizational credibility, Yuki, Maddux, Brewer, and Takemura (2005) have noted significant differences in how American and Japanese cultures perceive the importance of having categorical similarities in common with others versus the importance of sharing a direct or indirect relationship with others.

A third recommendation for future research would involve training CEOs, Human Research officers, managers, and/or low-level employees in understanding EQ, employee perceptions of OC, and the relationship between both constructs. Providing training interventions on EQ and OC would allow for the use of an experimental study. Such a study could examine the effects of increasing EQ and OC knowledge for participants and their organizations.

### **Implications for Social Change**

Individual members, families, and other groups within modern society continue to be profoundly and negatively influenced by low-OC behavior in organizations (Deane, 2008; De Haan, Amtenbrink, & Waller, 2004; Hackett, Glidewell, Carder, Doran, & Foy, 2014; Gibelman & Gelman, 2004; O'Loughlin, 2013). Various forms of institutionalized crime, corruption (Deane, 2008), financial mismanagement (De Haan, Amtenbrink, & Waller, 2004), health care based misconduct (Hackett, Glidewell, Carder, Doran, & Foy, 2014), and religious power abuse and accountability issues (O'Loughlin, 2013) have reduced individual and community based perceptions of credibility for many organizations. Corresponding research suggested that increasing knowledge and awareness of low-credibility organizational issues could help to improve or reform organizational behavior (Birkinshaw, 1997; Ulman, 2014). However, research into OC has maintained a decidedly narrow focus; a majority of the foundational research involving source credibility and OC has concentrated on the development of consumer advertising and marketing strategies and, as such, has emphasized external influences of credibility (Fogg, 2003; Lafferty & Goldsmith, 1999; McCroskey & Teven, 1975; Ohanian, 1990).

The current study has provided an alternative to the OC research trend by examining an internal influence of OC. By researching how employee EQ may affect employee perceptions of OC, the study has helped to identify OC issues that have gone largely unnoticed. The current study has additionally provided a positive incentive for leaders and trainers to develop EQ and OC improvement strategies and to offer improved

organizational hiring or training techniques that appeal to employees with high EQ. These strategies can raise OC levels, which may indirectly and positively influence other organizational work factors, and ultimately improve organizational levels of financial success, attractiveness, and influence.

EQ has served as a significant and valuable resource when acting within both the workplace (Zeider, Matthews, & Roberts, 2004) and society at large (Hunt, 1995). The current study has provided tangible evidence of the need for organization decision makers to reconsider ways that EQ either has influenced, or has the potential to influence, employee perceptions. Organizational strategies that have involved EQ and have shown potential to improve employee credibility perceptions may need to be adopted, reconsidered, modified, or expanded. An intentional and systematic investment into institutional training processes on an individual, group, and organizational-based level may be required in order for EQ to benefit people in the workforce in a meaningful way (Hunt, 1995).

OC is important because it has directly affected the way that stakeholders view their organization. The level of commitment that any stakeholder is willing to extend to an organization is dictated by the level of trust that the same stakeholder has in the organization (Ganesan & Hess, 1997). For this reason, organizations and their leaders have benefitted not only when they have incorporated a fresh understanding of how OC is perceived on an individual or group level, but also as they have devised and enacted workforce strategies that are based upon new and relevant knowledge of OC.

The current study has provided evidence of the need to strategically accommodate, plan for, and invest in the development of employee EQ in ways that lead to improvements in internal perceptions of credibility for organizations. A significant challenge for organizations has been that the absence or presence of EQ traits among employees has influenced employees to see the credibility of their employing organization in markedly different ways. Various levels and types of decision makers within organizations such as HR managers, area supervisors, organizational CEOs, and governing members have benefitted by not only considering the EQ traits that are desired in employees, but by also creating or adapting the processes by which intelligence traits such as EQ may be valued, emphasized, developed, and integrated on a uniform level within the workforce. Leaders that have considered the significance of the relationship between employee EQ and OC, and as a result have enacted workforce countermeasures designed to foster greater employee EQ and OC will observe the climate of employee trust for their organization become significantly strengthened and improved.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

The current study sought to examine the relationship between employee EQ and employee perceptions of OC. The current study was consistent with previous research where EQ has shown a statistically significant and positive correlation to multiple beneficial outcomes between employees and their organizations. The current study identified a significantly positive relationship between EQ and OC dimensions of accountability, goodwill, integrity, legitimacy, and power. The current research also identified a statistically significant and negative correlation between EQ and OC



dimensions of attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, and trustworthiness. High scores on EQ were associated with high scores on OC dimensions of accountability, goodwill, legitimacy, and power, but not on OC dimensions of attractiveness, corporate social responsibility, expertise, or trustworthiness. As a result of the current study, organizations and their leaders that have experienced a decrease in employee commitment, employee performance, employee retention, organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational climate may be incentivized to hire new employees with significant levels of EQ, and to train existing employees to improve current levels of EQ. Improvements in employee EQ can aid in the development of positive OC behaviors, which may directly and indirectly strengthen organizations both internally and externally.

## References

- Abraham, R. (1999). Emotional intelligence in organizations: A conceptualization. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 125*(2), 209-224.
- Abraham, R. (2000). The role of job control as a moderator of emotional dissonance and emotional intelligence-outcome relationships. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 134*(2), 169-184. doi:10.1080/00223980009600860
- Adyasha, R. (2013). A motivated employee: A qualitative study on various motivational practices used in organizations. *Aweshkar Research Journal, 15*(1), 98-103.
- Aeeoye, H., & Torubelli, V. (2011). Emotional intelligence and human relationship management as predictors of organizational commitment. *IFE Psychologia, 19*(2), 212-226.
- Akerjordet, K., & Severinsson, E. (2008). Emotionally intelligent nurse leadership: a literature review study. *Journal of Nursing Management, 16*(5), 565-577. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2008.00893.x
- Akomolafe, M., & Olatomide, O. (2013). Job satisfaction and emotional intelligence as predictors of organizational commitment of secondary school teachers. *IFE Psychologia, 21*(2), 65-74.
- Alcañiz, E., Cáceres, R., & Pérez, R. (2010). Alliances between brands and social causes: The influence of company credibility on social responsibility image. *Journal of Business Ethics, 96*(2), 169-186. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0461-x
- Allam, Z. (2011). Emotional intelligence at workplace: A psychological review. *Global Management Review, 5*(2), 71-80.

- Allen, N. J. & J. P. Meyer, 1996. Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(3): 252-76.
- Altunas, S., & Baykal, U. (2013). Relationship between nurses' organizational trust levels and their organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 42(2), 186-194. doi: 10.1111/j.1547-5069.2010.01347.x
- Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1997) *Psychological testing. (6th ed.)*. New York: MacMillan.
- Andersen, R. J., Evans, I. M., & Harvey, S. T. (2012). Insider views of the emotional climate of the classroom: What New Zealand children tell us about their teachers' feelings. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 26(2), 199-220.
- Anderson, N., Ahmed, S., & Costa, A. (2012). Applicant reactions in Saudi Arabia: Organizational attractiveness and core-self evaluation. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(2), 197-208.
- Andre, R. (2010). Assessing the accountability of government-sponsored enterprises and quangos. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97, 271-289. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0509-y
- Andre, R. (2012). Assessing the accountability of the benefit corporation: Will this new gray sector organization enhance corporate social responsibility? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110, 133-150. doi: 10.1007/s10551-012-1254-1

- Andrews, D., Nonnecke, B., & Preece, J. (2003). Electronic survey methodology: A case study in reaching hard-to-involve internet users. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 16*(2), 185.
- Appelbaum, R. L., & Anatol, K. E. (1973). Dimensions of source credibility: A test for reproducibility. *Speech Monographs, 40*(3), 231-237.
- Applebaum, R.L., & Anatol, K.E. (1972). The factor structure of source credibility as a function of the speaking situation. *Speech Monographs, 39*(3), 216-222.
- Arora, R. (2000). Message framing and credibility: Application in dental services. *Health Marketing Quarterly, 18*(1/2), 29.
- Averill, J. R. (2004). A tale of two snarks: Emotional intelligence and emotional creativity compared. *Psychological Inquiry, 15*(3), 228-233.
- Aydin, M., Leblebici, D., Arslan, M., Kilic, M., & Oktem, M. (2005). The impact of IQ and EQ on pre-eminent achievement in organizations: implications for the hiring decisions of HRM specialists. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*(5), 701-719. doi:10.1080/09585190500082998
- Bachman, J., Stein, S., Campbell, K. K., & Sitarenios, G. (2000). Emotional intelligence in the collection of debt. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8*(3), 176-182. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00145
- Baker, N. (2010). Know your business. *Internal Auditor, 67*(3), 32-37.

- Balboni, B. (2008). Perceived corporate creditability as the emergent property of corporate reputation's transmission process. MPRA Paper No. 7944, posted 27. March 2008. Retrieved from Munich Personal REPEC Archive website: [http://mpa.ub.unimuenchen.de/7944/1/MPRA\\_paper\\_7944.pdf](http://mpa.ub.unimuenchen.de/7944/1/MPRA_paper_7944.pdf).
- Barlow, P. C. (1992). Generating organizational trust and credibility. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 47(3), 236.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *The bar-on emotional quotient inventory (EQ-I): Technical manual*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Barrett, R. (1999). Why the future belongs to values added companies. *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 22(1), 30.
- Barczak, G., Lassk, F., & Mulki, J. (2010). Antecedents of team creativity: An examination of team emotional intelligence, team trust and collaborative culture. *Creativity & Innovation Management*, 19(4), 332-345. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00574.x
- Barrett, M. (2005). Spokespersons and message control: How the cdc lost credibility during the anthrax crisis. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, 6(1), 59-68. doi:10.1080/17459430500262190
- Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Sanchez, R. J., Craig, J. M., Ferrarra, P., & Compion, M.A. (2001). Applicant reactions to selection: Development of the selection procedural justice scale (SPJS). *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 387-419.

- Baur, D., & Schmitz, H. P. (2012). Corporations and NGOs: When accountability leads to co-optation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 106*, 9-21. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1057-9
- Beard, F. (2015). The effectiveness of comparative versus non-comparative advertising: Do 'strictly' comparative ads hurt credibility of non-professional service brands?. *Journal of Advertising Research, 55*(3), 296-306. doi:10.2501/JAR-2015-010
- Beatty, R. W., Ewing, J. R., & Tharp, C. G. (2003). HR's role in corporate governance: Present and prospective. *Human Resource Management, 42*(3), 257-269. doi:10.102/hrm.10084
- Becerra, M., & Gupta, A. K. (2003). Perceived trustworthiness within the organization: The moderating impact of communication frequency on trustor and trustee effects. *Organization Science, 14*(1), 32-44.
- Berenson, R., Boyles, G., & Weaver, A. (2008). Emotional intelligence as a predictor for success in online learning. *International Review of Research In Open And Distance Learning, 9*(2), 1-17.
- Berlo, D. K., Lemert, J. B., & Mertz, R. J. (1969). Dimensions for evaluating the acceptability of message sources. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 33*(4), 563-576.
- Bernet, M. (1996, August). Emotional intelligence: Components and correlates. In *Symposium §4057, Emotional Health and Emotional Intelligence*. Symposium conducted at the 104<sup>th</sup> Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.

- Berry, B. (2004). Organizational culture: A framework and strategies for facilitating employee whistleblowing. *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal*, 16(1), 1-11.
- Berthon, P., Ewing, M., Hah, L. L. (2005). Captivating company: Dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International Journal of Advertising*, 24(2).
- Bhopatkar, N. (2013). Effect of emotional intelligence and job tenure on employee effectiveness. *MERC Global's International Journal of Management*, 1(2), 86-102.
- Bilgi, R., & Sümer, H. (2009). Predicting military performance from specific personality measures: A validity study. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 17(2), 231-238. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2009.00465.x
- Birkinshaw, P. (1997). Freedom of information and open government: The European community/union dimension. *Government Information Quarterly*, 14(1), 27.
- Blank, I. (2008). Selecting employees based on emotional intelligence competencies: Reap the rewards and minimize the risk. *Employee Relations Law Journal*, 34(3), 77-85.
- Blythe, T., & Gardner, H. (1990). A school for all intelligences. *Educational Leadership*, 47(7), 33-37.
- Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S.J. (1975). Introduction to qualitative research methods. New York: John Wiley.

- Bosetti, V., & Victor, D. G. (2011). Politics and economics of second-best regulation of greenhouse gases: The importance of regulatory credibility. *Energy Journal*, 32(1), 1-24.
- Bowers, J. W., & Phillips, W. A. (1967). A note on the generality of source credibility scales. *Speech Monographs*, 34(2) doi: 10.1080/03637756709375542
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (1999). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the emotional competence inventory (ECI). Retrieved from <http://weatherhead.case.edu/departments/organizational-behavior/workingPapers/WP%2099-6.pdf>
- Boyatzis, R.E. & Sala, F. (2004). Assessing emotional intelligence competencies. In G. Geher, Ed.), *The measurement of emotional intelligence* (pp. 147-180). Haupapage, NY: Novas Science Publishers. Retrieved from [http://www.eiconsortium.org/pdf/Assessing\\_Emotional\\_Intelligence\\_Compentences.pdf](http://www.eiconsortium.org/pdf/Assessing_Emotional_Intelligence_Compentences.pdf)
- Brown, L.D. (2008). *Creating credibility: Legitimacy and accountability for transnational civil society*. Kumerian Press: Sterling, VA.
- Brown, M. T. (2006). Corporate integrity and public interest: A relational approach to business ethics and leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66(1), 11-18. doi:10.1007/s10551-006-9050-4
- Brownell, E. (2000). How to create organizational trust. *Manage*, 10-11.



- Brunetto, Y., Teo, S. T., Shacklock, K., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2012). Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, well-being and engagement: Explaining organisational commitment and turnover intentions in policing. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22(4), 428-441. doi:10.1111/j.1748-8583.2012.00198.x
- Bühlmann, H. & Gisler, A. (2005). *A course in credibility theory and its applications*. New York: Springer Publishing.
- Butler, J. K. 1991. Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a conditions of trust inventory. *Journal of Management*, 17, 643-663.
- Buvoltz, K. A., Powell, F. J., Solan, A. M., & Longbotham, G. J. (2008). Exploring emotional intelligence, learner autonomy, and retention in an accelerated undergraduate degree completion program. *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource Development*, 22(3-4), 26-43.
- Caldwell, C., Floyd, L., Atkins, R., & Holzgrefe, R. (2012). Ethical duties of organizational citizens: Obligations owed by highly committed employees. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110(3), 285-299. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1154-9
- Callaway, P. L. (2006). *Relationship between organizational trust and job satisfaction: An analysis in the U.S. federal work force*. Dissertation.com: Boca Raton, FL.
- Campbell, D.T., Stanley, J.C. (1966). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Skokie, IL: Rand McNally.

- Carmeli, A. (2003). The relationship between emotional intelligence and work attitudes, behavior and outcomes: An examination among senior managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *18*(8), 788-813. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940310511881>
- Carmeli, A., & Josman, Z. E. (2006). The relationship among emotional intelligence, task performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Human Performance*, *19*(4), 403-419. doi:10.1207/s15327043hup1904\_5
- Castro, F., Gomes, J., & de Sousa, F. C. (2012). Do intelligent leaders make a difference? The effect of a leader's emotional intelligence on followers' creativity. *Creativity & Innovation Management*, *21*(2), 171-182. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8691.2012.00636.x
- Chan, D. W. (2005). Self-perceived creativity, family hardiness, and emotional intelligence of Chinese gifted students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, *16*(2/3), 47-56.
- Chatterjee, S., Hadi, A. S. & Price, B. (2000). *Regression Analysis by Example* (Third ed.). John Wiley and Sons.
- Chen, Z., Lam, W., & Zhong, J. (2012). Effects of perceptions on LMX and work performance: Effects of supervisors' perception of subordinates' emotional intelligence and subordinates' perception of trust in the supervisor on LMX and, consequently, performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *29*(3), 597-616. doi:10.1007/s10490-010-9210-z

- Cherniss, C., Extein, M., Goleman, D., & Weissberg, R. P. (2006). Emotional intelligence: What does the research really indicate?. *Educational Psychologist, 41*(4), 239-245. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep4104\_4
- Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (Eds.). (2001). *The emotionally intelligence workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved on January 17, 2014 from <http://196.29.172.66:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/2124/1/128.pdf>
- Chung, J., Berger, B. K., & DeCoster, J. (2011, May). *Developing measurement scales of organizational and issue legitimacy in issue management: A case of direct-to-consumer advertising in the pharmaceutical industry*. In S. K. Kioussis (Chair), *Reputation, Crisis, Ethical Communication, Negotiation, and Issues Management*. Symposium conducted at the International Communication Association, Boston, MA. Retrieved from [http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p491585\\_index.html](http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p491585_index.html)
- Chiarelli, C., Stedman, N., Carter, H., & Telg, R. (2010). The impact of organizational source credibility and the factors that contribute to opinion leaders' decisions to diffuse information. *Journal of Southern Agricultural Education Research, 60*, 103-117. Retrieved from <http://jsaer.org/pdf/vol60Whole.pdf#page=107>

- Choi, D., Oh, I., Guay, R. P., & Lee, E. (2011). Why do emotionally intelligent people have positive work attitudes? The mediating role of situational judgment effectiveness. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 19(4), 352-362. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2011.00564.x
- Choi, J., & Wang, H. (2007). The promise of a managerial values approach to corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 75(4), 345-359. doi:10.1007/s10551-006-9257-4
- Chowwen, C. (2012). Predictors of organizational commitment of factory employees. *IFE Psychologia*, 20(2), 184-191.
- Cichy, R. F., Jaemin, C., Seung Hyun, K., & Singerling, J. B. (2007). Emotional intelligence and organizational commitment among private club board and committee volunteer leaders: A pilot study. *FIU Hospitality Review*, 25(1), 40-49.
- Clarke, N. (2006). Developing emotional intelligence through workplace learning: Findings from a case study in healthcare. *Human Resource Development International*, 9(4), 447-465. doi:10.1080/13678860601032585
- Codier, E., Freitas, B., & Muneno, L. (2013). Developing emotional intelligence ability in oncology nurses: A clinical rounds approach. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 40(1), 22-29. doi:10.1188/13.ONF.22-29
- Codier, E., Muneno, L., Franey, K., & Matsuura, F. (2010). Is emotional intelligence an important concept for nursing practice?. *Journal of Psychiatric & Mental Health Nursing*, 17(10), 940-948. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2850.2010.01610.x

- Coetzee, M., & Pauw, D. (2013). Staff perception of leader emotional competency as a predictor of satisfaction with retention factors. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 23(2), 177-185.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Colby, D. C., Fishman, N. W., & Pickell, S. G. (2011). Achieving foundational accountability and transparency: Lessons from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's scorecard. *The Foundation Review* 3(1), 70-80, doi:10.4087/FOUNDATIONREVIEW-D-10-00031. Retrieved from <http://www.rwjf.org/content/dam/web-assets/2011/09/achieving-foundation-accountability-and-transparency>
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 909-927. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909
- Connolly, K. (2002). Recruitment & retention report. The new IQ. *Nursing Management*, 33(7 part 1), 17-18.
- Connolly-Ahern, C. (2005). Assessing the relative credibility of excuses offered in editorial content and advertising in two cultures. *Conference Papers -- International Communication Association*, 1-30.

- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1976). The design and conduct of quasi-experiments and true experiments in field settings. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Skokie, IL: Rand McNally.
- Costigan, R. D., Insinga, R. C., Kranas, G., Kureshov, V. A., & Ilter, S. S. (2004). Predictors of employee trust of their CEO: A three-country study. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16(2), 197-216.
- Côté, S., & Miners, C. H. (2006). Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(1), 1-28.
- Creel, T. (2012). How corporate social responsibility influences brand equity. *Management Accounting Quarterly*, 13(4), 20-24.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cross, B., & Travaglione, A. (2003). The untold story: Is the entrepreneur of the 21<sup>st</sup> century defined by emotional intelligence?. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11(3), 221-228. doi:10.1108/eb028973
- Dando, N., & Swift, T. (2003). Transparency and assurance: Minding the credibility gap. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44(2/3), 195-200.
- Dansker, E., Wilcox, J. R., & van Tubergen, G. (1980). How reporters evaluate the credibility of their sources. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 1(2), 40-45.
- Dasgupta, P. 1988. Trust as a commodity. In D. G. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust*: 49-72. New York: Basil Blackwell.

- David, G. (2011). Internal communication - Essential component of crisis communication. *Journal of Media Research*, 4(2), 72-81.
- Davies, G., & Chun, R. (2002). Gaps between the internal and external perceptions of the corporate brand. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 5(2/3), 144-158.
- Dawes, John G. (2008). Do data characteristics change according to the number of scale points used? An experiment using 5 point, 7 point and 10 point scales. *International Journal of Market Research*, 50(1), 61-77.
- Deane, S. (2008). Crime corrupting credibility: The problem of shifting from paramilitaries to parliamentarians. *Civil Wars*, 10(4), 431-450.  
doi:10.1080/13698240802354508
- Deeter-Schmelz, D. R., & Sojka, J. Z. (2003). Developing effective salespeople: Exploring the link between emotional intelligence and sales performance. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis (2003)*, 11(3), 211-220.
- de Chernatony, L. (1999). Brand management through narrowing the gap between brand identity and brand reputation. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(1-3), 157-179.
- De Haan, J., Amtenbrink, F., & Waller, S. (2004). The transparency and credibility of the european central bank. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 42(4), 775-794.  
doi:10.1111/j.0021-9886.2004.00529.x

- DeSarbo, Wayne S., & Harshman, R. A. (1985). Celebrity-brand congruence analysis: Current issues and research in advertising. J.H. Leigh and C.R. Martin, Jr., eds., Ann Arbor, MI: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan, 17-52.
- Deshpande, S., & Joseph, J. (2009). Impact of emotional intelligence, ethical climate, and behavior of peers on ethical behavior of nurses. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(3), 403-410. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9779-z
- Deshpande, R., & Webster Jr., F. E. (1989). Organizational culture and marketing: Defining the research agenda. *Journal Of Marketing*, 53(1), 3-15.
- Devonish, D., & Greenidge, D. (2010). The effect of organizational justice on contextual performance, counterproductive work behaviors, and task performance: Investigating the moderating role of ability-based emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 18(1), 75-86. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00490.x
- DiNapoli, R. (2009). Using dramatic role-play to develop emotional aptitude. *International Journal of English Studies*, 9(2), 97-110.
- Dominguez, E. (2013). Work stressors and creativity. (English). *Management*, 16(4), 479-504.
- Due, M., & Jorgensen, M. P. (2011). Credibility of civil society organizations in CSO-business partnerships: A case study of forests of the world. *Copenhagen Business School*, 1-128.



- Dulewicz, V., & Higgs, M. (2003). Leadership at the top: The need for emotional intelligence in organizations. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis* (2003), 11(3), 193-210.
- Duncan, W., Ginter, P. M., & Swayne, L. E. (1998). Competitive advantage and internal organizational assessment. *Academy of Management Executive*, 12(3), 6-16.  
doi:10.5465/AME.1998.1109046
- Dunleavy, K., Chory, R. M., & Goodboy, A. K. (2010). Responses to deception in the workplace: Perceptions of credibility, power, and trustworthiness. *Communication Studies*, 61(2), 239-255. doi:10.1080/10510971003603879
- Eagar, T. (2009). Defining the brand hero: Explorations of the impact of brand hero credibility on a brand community. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 36488-493.
- Eberle, D., Berens, G., & Li, T. (2013). The impact of interactive corporate social responsibility communication on corporate reputation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 118(4), 731-746. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1957-y
- Encyclopedia of Mathematics (2014). *Regression analysis*. Retrieved November 1, 2014 from  
[http://www.encyclopediaofmath.org/index.php?title=Regression\\_analysis&oldid=28558](http://www.encyclopediaofmath.org/index.php?title=Regression_analysis&oldid=28558)
- Erdem, T., Swait, J., & Valenzuela, A. (2006). Brands as signals: A cross-country validation study. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(1), 34-49.

Explorable.com. (2014). *Pearson product-moment correlation*. Retrieved Nov 01, 2014

from Explorable.com: <https://explorable.com/pearson-product-moment-correlation>

Falcione, R. L. (1974) The factor structure of source credibility scales for immediate supervisors in the organizational context. *Central States Speech Journal*, (25), 1-21.

Fard, H.D., Ghatari, A.R., & Hasiri, A. (2010a). Employees morale in public sector: Is organizational trust an important factor? *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 46(3), 378-390.

Farh, C., Myeong-Gu, S., & Tesluk, P. E. (2012). Emotional intelligence, teamwork effectiveness, and job performance: The moderating role of job context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(4), 890-900. doi:10.1037/a0027377

Feather, R. (2009). Emotional intelligence in relation to nursing leadership: does it matter?. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 17(3), 376-382. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2008.00931.x

Fekula, M. J. (2011). Managerial creativity, critical thinking, and emotional intelligence: Convergence in course design. *Business Education Innovation Journal*, 3(2), 92-102.

Feyerherm, A. E., & Rice, C. L. (2002). Emotional intelligence and team performance: The good, the bad and the ugly. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 10(4), 343-362. doi:10.1108/eb028957

- Finn, A. N., & Ledbetter, A. M. (2013). Teacher power mediates the effects of technology policies on teacher credibility. *Communication Education, 62*(1), 26-47.
- Fogg, B.J. (2003). *Persuasive technology using computers to change what we think and do*. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers.
- Froese, F., Vo, A., & Garrett, T. C. (2010). Organizational attractiveness of foreign-based companies: A country of origin perspective. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 18*(3), 271-281. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00510.x
- Ganesan, S., & Hess, R. (1997). Dimensions and levels of trust: Implications for commitment to a relationship. *Marketing Letters, 8*(4), 439-448. doi:10.1023/A:1007955514781
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1999) *Intelligence Reframed. Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*, New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1976). *The Shattered Mind*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gardner, H., & Boix-Mansilla, V. (1994). Teaching for understanding--Within and across disciplines. *Educational Leadership, 51*(5), 14-18.
- Gardner, H., & Hatch, T. (1989). Multiple intelligences go to school: Educational implications of the theory of multiple intelligences. *Educational Researcher, 18*(8), 4-10.

- Gardner, L. L., & Stough, C. C. (2003). Assessing the relationship between workplace emotional intelligence, job satisfaction and organisational commitment. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 55(124).
- Gibelman, M., & Gelman, S. R. (2004). A loss of credibility: Patterns of wrongdoing among nongovernmental organizations. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, 15(4), 355-381. doi:10.1007/s11266-004-1237-7
- Goldsmith, R. E., Lafferty, B. A., & Newell, S. J. (2000). The impact of corporate credibility and celebrity credibility on consumer reaction to advertisements and brands. *Journal of Advertising*, 29(3), 43-54.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (2003). Maxed emotions. *Business Strategy Review*, 14(2), 26-32. doi:10.1111/1467-8616.00256
- Goleman, D. (2006). The socially intelligent leader. *Educational Leadership*, 64(1), 76-81.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). The emotional reality of teams. *Journal Of Organizational Excellence*, 21(2), 55-65.
- Goleman, D., McKee, A., & Boyayzis, R. (2006). Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence. *Nursing News*, 30(3), 24.

- Gondal, U., & Husain, T. (2013). A comparative study of intelligence quotient and emotional intelligence: Effect on employees' performance. *Asian Journal of Business Management*, 5(1), 153-162.
- Ghorbani, N., Bing, M. N., Watson, P. J., Davison, H. K., & Mack, D. A. (2002). Self-reported emotional intelligence: Construct similarity and functional dissimilarity of higher-order processing in Iran and the United States. *International Journal of psychology*, 37(5), 297-308.
- Gore, R., & Zimmerman, D. (2010). Is goodwill an asset?. *CPA Journal*, 80(6), 46-48.
- Gowing, M.K. (2001). Measures of individual emotional competencies. In C. Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace* (pp. 83–131). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Green, C. (2013). The organizational power matrix: Toward a metapraxis of power. *Journal of Integral Theory and Practice* 8(1&2), 87-105.
- Gunavathy, J. S., & Ayswarya, R. R. (2011). Emotional intelligence and job satisfaction as correlates of job performance – A study among women employed in the indian software industry. *Paradigm (Institute of Management Technology)*, 15(1/2), 58-65.
- Hahn, R., Sabou, S., Toader, R., & Rădulescu, C. (2012). About emotional intelligence and leadership. *Annals of The University of Oradea, Economic Science Series*, 21(2), 744-749.

- Hakansson, K., Lin, X., & Nguyen, H. T. A. (2013). Inter-organizational systems adoption in innovation networks: A case study. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 112(9), 1366-1382.
- Haley, E. (1996). Exploring the construct of organization as source: Consumers' understanding of organizational sponsorship of advocacy advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 25(2), 19- 35.
- Haraway, W. (2005). Employee grievance programs: Understanding the nexus between workplace justice, organizational legitimacy and successful organizations. *Public Personnel Management*, 34(4), 329-342.
- Harris, D. J., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Kaufman, J. C. (2013). The effect of emotional intelligence and task type on malevolent creativity. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and The Arts*, 7(3), 237-244. doi:10.1037/a0032139
- Harrison-Walker, L. (2008). How emotional intelligence and spirituality impact job survivors in a post-m&a work environment. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications & Conflict*, 12(1), 1-23.
- Harrod, N. R., & Scheer, S. D. (2005). An explanation of adolescent emotional intelligence in relation to demographic characteristics. *Adolescence*, 40(159), 503-512.
- Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2001). Are the strategic stars aligned for your corporate brand? *Harvard Business Review*, February, 128-134.
- Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between organizational culture, identity, and image. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(5/6), 356-365.

- Hawkins, J., & Dulewicz, V. (2007). The relationship between performance as a leader and emotional intelligence, intellectual and managerial competences. *Journal of General Management*, 33(2), 57-78.
- Herling, R. W. (2000). Operational definitions of expertise and competence. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 2(1). doi:10.1177/152342230000200103
- Hernandez, J. S. (2012). Tips for Recruiting and Retaining the Best Physicians. *Physician Executive*, 38(6), 64-67.
- Hj. Yunus, N., Ishak, N., Raja Mustapha, R., & Othman, A. (2010). Displaying employees' organizational citizenship behavior at the workplace: The impact of superior's emotional intelligence and moderating impact of leader member exchange. *Vision (09722629)*, 14(1/2), 13-23. doi:10.1177/097226291001400102
- Hoffman, L. L., Hutchinson, C. J., & Reiss, E. (2009). On improving school climate: Reducing reliance on rewards and punishment. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 5(1), 13-24.
- Holzbach, Jr., R. L. (1974). An investigation of a model for managerial effectiveness: The effects of leadership style and leader attributed social power on subordinate job performance. Doctoral Dissertation, Carnegie-Mellon University.
- Hovland, C. I., & Weiss, W. (1951). The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 635-650.
- Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelly, H. H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Huang, Q., Fang, K., & Liu, H. (2013). The moderating role of organizational culture in the relationship between power, trust, and ESCMS adoption intention. *PACIS 2013 Proceedings*, 1-16.
- Huang, X., Chan, S. H., Lam, W., & Nan, X. (2010). The joint effect of leader-member exchange and emotional intelligence on burnout and work performance in call centers in China. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(7), 1124-1144. doi:10.1080/09585191003783553
- Hubbell, L. L. (2007). Quality, efficiency, and accountability: Definitions and applications. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2007(140), 5-13.
- Hudak, A., & Werder, K. (2009). An experimental analysis of the influence of corporate social responsibility initiatives on beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral intention. *Conference Papers -- International Communication Association*, 1-37.
- Humphrey, R. H. (2013). The benefits of emotional intelligence and empathy to entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 3(3), 287-294. doi:10.1515/erj-2013-0057
- Hunt, E. (1995). The role of intelligence in modern society. *American Scientist*, 83, 356-356.
- Hyojin, K., Ball, J. G., & Stout, P. A. (2010). The effects of endorser attributes and corporate credibility on consumer responses to dtc pharmaceutical advertising. *American Academy of Advertising Conference Proceedings*, 28.



- Iding, M.K., Crosby, M., Auernheimer, B. & Klemm, E.B. (2002). Critical evaluation skills for web-based information: "Lies, damned lies" and web-based information. In P. Barker & S. Rebelsky (Eds.), *Proceedings of EdMedia: World Conference on Educational Media and Technology 2002* (pp. 369-370). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE)
- Inoue, Y., & Kent, A. (2012). Investigating the role of corporate credibility in corporate social marketing: A case study of environmental initiatives by professional sports organizations. *Sport Management Review, 15*(3), 330-344.  
doi:10.1016/j.smr.2011.12.002
- Inoue, Y., & Kent, A. (2014). A conceptual framework for understanding the effects of corporate social marketing on consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 121*(4), 621-633. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1742-y
- Ismail, A. M., Armstrong, A., & Clark, C. (2010). Directors' integrity: An assessment of corporate integrity. Finance and Corporate Governance Conference 2011 Paper. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1717487> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1717487>
- Isaksson, M., & Jørgensen, P. (2010). Communicating corporate ethos on the web. *Journal of Business Communication, 47*(2), 119-140.
- Ivcevic, Z., Brackett, M., & Mayer, J. (2007). Emotional intelligence and emotional creativity. *Journal of Personality, 75*(2), 199-235.

- Jackson, H., & Nuttall, R. (1994). Effects of gender, age, and history of abuse on social workers' judgments of sexual abuse allegations. *Social Work Research, 18*(2), 105-113.
- Jadhav, S., & Mulla, Z. R. (2010). Do emotionally intelligent people do well in all jobs? Exploring the moderating role of inter-personal interaction. *Vision (09722629), 14*(4), 247-254.
- Jain, A. K. (2012). Moderating effect of impression management on the relationship of emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management, 13*(2), 86-107.
- Jha, A., & Singh, I. (2012). Teacher effectiveness in relation to emotional intelligence among medical and engineering faculty members. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 8*(4), 667-685. doi:10.5964/ejop.v8i4.483
- Jimoh, Y., Olayide, R., & Saheed, O. (2012). Influence of leadership styles and emotional intelligence on job performance of local government workers in Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in The Social Sciences, 3*(4), 973-996.
- Jin, C., & Yeo, H. (2011). Satisfaction, corporate credibility, CEO reputation and leadership effects on public relationships. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement & Analysis for Marketing, 19*(2), 127-140. doi:10.1057/jt.2011.10
- Jonker, C. S., & Vosloo, C. (2008). The psychometric properties of the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 34*(2), doi: 10.4102/sajip.v34i2.689

- Katyal, S., & Awasthi, E. (2006). Effect of personal and family characteristics on emotional intelligence among adolescents. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4*(1/2), 1-20.
- Kazoleas, D., & Teven, J. J. (2009). Public relations and organizational credibility: Refining the definition, measurement and assessment of organizational trust. *Human Communication, 12*(1), 19-32.
- Keller, K. L. (1998). *Strategic brand management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Kelley, T. L. (1927). *Interpretation of educational measurements*. New York: Macmillan.
- Kensicki, L. J. (2003). Building credibility for non-profit organizations through webpage interface design. *Journal of Visual Literacy, 23*(2), 139-162
- Khalili, A. (2011). Examining the relevance of emotional intelligence and organizational commitment among employees of small and medium enterprise in private sector. *International Journal of Business Management, 6*(12), 180-194.
- Kidwell, B., Hardesty, D. M., Murtha, B. R., & Shibin, S. (2012). A closer look at emotional intelligence in marketing exchange. *Gfk-Marketing Intelligence Review, 4*(1), 24-31.
- Kihan, K., & Sejung Marina, C. (2007). Understanding the impacts of sponsorship-induced beliefs on corporate credibility and attitude toward the sponsor. *American Academy of Advertising Conference Proceedings, 109-118*.
- Kim, K., & Choi, S. M. (2007). Understanding the impacts of sponsorship-induced beliefs on corporate credibility and attitude toward the sponsor. *American Academy of Advertising, 109-119*

- Kirk, J., & Miller, M.L. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Qualitative Research Methods Series, 1. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Klem, C. C., & Schlechter, A. F. (2008). The relationship between leader emotional intelligence and psychological climate: An exploratory study. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 39(2), 9-23.
- Klemm, E. B., Iding, M., & Speitel, T. (2001). Do scientists and teachers agree on the credibility of media information sources? *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 28(1), 83–91.
- Kotler, P., & Lee, N. (2005). *Corporate social responsibility: Doing the most good for your company and your cause: Best practices from Hewlett-Packard, Ben & Jerry's, and other leading companies*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2011). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it: Why people demand it*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kyung-Ran, K., & ChangHyun, J. (2003). Corporate credibility's role in consumers attitudes toward the website, brand, and purchase intention on the website: A structural equation analysis. *Conference Papers -- International Communication Association*, 1-21. doi:ica\_proceeding\_11947.pdf
- Kumar, N. (1996). The power of trust in manufacturer-retailer relationships. *Harvard Business Review*, 74, 92-106.
- Ismail, A., Yeo, S., Ajis, M., & Dollah, N. (2009). Relationship between occupational stress, emotional intelligence and job performance: An empirical study in malaysia. *Theoretical & Applied Economics*, 16(10), 3-16.

- Lafferty, B., & Goldsmith, R. E. (1999). Corporate credibility's role in consumers' attitudes and purchase intentions when a high versus a low credibility endorser is used in the ad. *Journal of Business Research*, 44 (February), 109-116.
- Lafferty, B. A., & Goldsmith, R. E. (2004). How influential are corporate credibility and endorser attractiveness when innovators react to advertisements for a new high-technology product?. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 7(1), 24-36.
- Lafferty, B. A., Goldsmith, R. E., & Newell, S. J. (2002). The dual credibility model: The influence of corporate and endorser credibility on attitudes and purchase intentions. *Journal of Marketing*, 10(3), 1-11.
- Lall, M. (2009). Physiological understanding of human emotions for effective management. *Global Business & Management Research*, 1(3/4), 117-130.
- Lam, L., & Kirby, S. L. (2002). Is emotional intelligence an advantage? An exploration of the impact of emotional and general intelligence on individual performance. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(1), 133-143.
- Landau, J., & Meirovich, G. (2011). Development of students' emotional intelligence: Participative classroom environments in higher education. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 15(3), 89-104.
- Latif, D. A. (2004). Emotional Intelligence: Is it a missing ingredient in pharmacy education?. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 68(2), 1-2.
- Laureate Education Inc. (2013). Correlation necessary sample size table. Retrieved from [https://class.waldenu.edu/bbcswebdav/institution/USW1/201630\\_27/PH](https://class.waldenu.edu/bbcswebdav/institution/USW1/201630_27/PH)

- Law, K., Wong, C., Huang, G., & Li, X. (2008). The effects of emotional intelligence on job performance and life satisfaction for the research and development scientists in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 25(1), 51-69. doi:10.1007/s10490-007-9062-3
- Lee, H. O., & Boster, F. J. (1992). Collectivism-individualism in perceptions of speech rate A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23(3), 377-388.
- Leidner, D. E., & Mackay, J. M. (2007). How incoming CIOs transition into their new jobs. *MIS Quarterly Executive*, 6(1), 17-28.
- Lekavičienė, R., & Remeikait, I. (2004). The relationship between employees' emotional intelligence and socio-psychological climate in information technology organizations. *Social Sciences (1392-0758)*, 45(3), 95-102.
- Leuner, B. (1966). Emotional intelligence and emancipation. *Praxis der Kinderpsychologie und Kinderpsychiatrie*, 15, 193-203.
- Levenhagen, M., Porac, J. F., & Thomas, H. (1994). Managing strategic evolution in fast-paced technological environments: the case of software development in 'Silicon Prairie'. *Journal of Strategic Change*, 3(5), 287-303.
- Liao, Q. V., & Fu, W. (2014). Age differences in credibility judgments of online health information. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 21(1), 1-23. doi:10.1145/2534410

- Lievens, F., Van Hoye, G., & Schreurs, B. (2005). Examining the relationship between employer knowledge dimensions and organizational attractiveness: An application in a military context. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 78*(4), 553-572.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (1993). The efficacy of psychological, educational, and behavioral treatment: Confirmation from meta-analysis. *American Psychologist, 48*(12), 1181–1209.
- Lis, B. (2012). The relevance of corporate social responsibility for a sustainable human resource management: An analysis of organizational attractiveness as a determinant in employees' selection of a (potential) employer. *Management Revue, 23*(3), 279-295. doi:10.1688/1861-9908
- Liu, H. F., Ke, W. L., Wei, K. K., Gu, J. B., and Chen, H. P. (2010). The role of institutional pressures and organizational culture in the firm's intention to adopt internet-enabled supply chain management systems. *Journal of Operations Management, 28*(5), 372-384.
- Liu, Y., Prati, L., Perrewé, P. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2008). The relationship between emotional resources and emotional labor: An exploratory study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*(10), 2410-2439. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00398.x
- Lui, L., & Standing, L. (1989). Communicator credibility: Trustworthiness defeats expertness. *Social Behavior and Personality, 17*(2), 219-221.

- MacKenzie, S. B. and Lutz Richard, J. 1989. An empirical examination of the structural antecedents of attitude toward the ad in an advertising pretesting context. *Journal Market Research*, 23(May), 130– 43.
- Maini, J., Singh, B., & Kaur, P. (2012). The relationship among emotional intelligence and outcome variables: A study of indian employees. *Vision (09722629)*, 16(3), 187-199. doi:10.1177/0972262912460155
- Makino, H. (2010). *The development of a new performance-based test for measuring emotional intelligence: Humility-empathy-assertiveness-respect test*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation and Thesis database. (UMI No. 3409390).
- Mann, C. J. (2003). Observational research methods. Research design II: Cohort, cross sectional, and case-control studies. *Emergency Medical Journal*, 20, 54-60.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396. doi:10.1037/h0054346
- Maathius, O., Rodenburg, J., & Sikkel, D. (2004). Credibility, emotion or reason? *Corporate Reputation Review*, 6(4), 333-345.
- Majchrzak, A., Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Hollingshead, A. B. (2007). Coordinating expertise among emergent groups responding to disasters. *Organization Science*, 18(1), 147-161.



- Malhotra, N. K., Kim, S. S., & Patil, A.. (2006). Common method variance in is research: A comparison of alternative approaches and a reanalysis of past research. *Management Science*, 52(12), 1865–1883. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20110660>
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734. Retrieved from <http://people.wku.edu/richard.miller/Mayer%20Trust%20article.pdf>
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0, *Emotion*, 3, 97-105.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1966). Scales for the measurement of ethos. *Speech Monographs*, 33, 65-72.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Young, T. J. (1981). Ethos and credibility: The construct and its measurement after three decades. *Central States Speech Journal*, 32, 24-34.
- McDaniel, P. A., & Malone, R. E. (2009). The role of corporate credibility in legitimizing disease promotion. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99(3), 452-461.
- McDermott, P. J., & Faules, D. F. (1973). Context effects on the measurement of organizational credibility. *Central States Speech Journal*, 24(3), 189-192. DOI: 10.1080/10510977309363169
- McGann, J., & Johnstone, M. (2004). The power shift and the NGO credibility crisis. *Brown Journal Of World Affairs*, 11(2), 159-172.

- McGlone, E. L., & Anderson, L. J. (1973). The dimensions of teacher credibility. *Speech Teacher, 22*(3), 196-200.
- McShane, L. and P. Cunningham, 2012. To thine own self be true? Employees' judgments of the authenticity of their organization's corporate social responsibility program. *Journal of Business Ethics, 108*, 81-100.
- Minahan, S. (2005). The organizational legitimacy of the bauhaus. *Journal of Arts Management, Law & Society, 35*(2), 133-145.
- Mishra, P., & Mohapatra, A. (2010). Relevance of emotional intelligence for effective job performance: An empirical study. *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers, 35*(1), 53-61.
- Mitchel, T. R. (1985). An evaluation of the validity of correlational research conducted in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(2), 192-205.
- Modassir, A., & Singh, T. (2008). Relationship of emotional intelligence with transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 4*(1), 3-21.
- Momeni, N. (2009). The relation between managers' emotional intelligence and the organizational climate they create. *Public Personnel Management, 38*(2), 35-48.
- Moon, T., & Hur, W. (2011). Emotional intelligence, emotional exhaustion, and job performance. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 39*(8), 1087-1096. doi:org/10.2224/sbp.2011.39.8.1087

- Morrison, T. (2007). Emotional intelligence, emotion and social work: Context, characteristics, complications and contribution. *British Journal Of Social Work*, 37(2), 245-263.
- Moussa, S., & Touzani, M. (2008). The perceived credibility of quality labels: A scale validation with refinement. *International Journal Of Consumer Studies*, 32(5), 526-533. doi:10.1111/j.1470-6431.2008.00713.x
- Mumford, T.V. (2012). Whom to believe: Recruiting information source credibility and organizational attractiveness. *Business and Management Research*, 1(4), 63-80.
- Mussaco, S. D. (2000). *The relationship between organizational trust and organizational productivity: Understanding the centrality of trust in the organizational setting*. (Doctoral dissertation). Walden University: Minneapolis, MN.
- Nachailit, I. & Ussahawanitchakit, P. (2009). *International Journal of Business Research*, 9(5), 13-32.
- Nan, R., & Qin, L. (2009). Research on the trust model based on the groups' internal recommendation in e-commerce environment. *Journal of Software Engineering & Applications*, 2(4), 283-287. doi:10.4236/jsea.2009.24036
- Nasir, M., & Iqbal, S. (2013). Relationship of demographic factors with emotional intelligence of university students. *New Horizons in Science & Technology*, 1(1), 17-21.

- Nazari, K., Emami, M., & Shakarbeigi, A. (2012). The investigation of the relation between personnel's emotional intelligence and professional commitment (case study in national company of purging and distribution of oil products in Iran (Shiraz)). *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 8(2), 983-991.
- Neal, J. (2013). Spirituality: The secret in project management. *Industrial Management*, 55(4), 10-15.
- Nguyen, N. (2010). Competence and benevolence of contact personnel in the perceived corporate reputation: An empirical study in financial services. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 12(4), 345-356. doi:10.1057/crr.2009.25
- Nikolaou, I., & Tsaousis, I. (2002). Emotional intelligence in the workplace: Exploring its effects on occupational stress and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis (1993 - 2002)*, 10(4), 327.
- Neuman, G. A., Edwards, J. E., & Raju, N. S. (1989). Organizational development interventions: A meta-analysis of their effects on satisfaction and other attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 461-489.
- Neustadt, E., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2011). Attachment at work and performance. *Attachment & Human Development*, 13(5), 471-488.  
doi:10.1080/14616734.2011.602254
- Newsome, C. G. (1997). What does a dean do?. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (98), 101-107.

- Njoroge, C., & Yazdanifard, R. (2014). The impact of social and emotional intelligence on employee motivation in a multigenerational workplace. *International Journal of Information, Business & Management*, 6(4), 163-170.
- Nussenzveig, P., & Zukanovich Funchal, R. (2008). Integrity: misconduct by a few damages credibility for many. *Nature*, 454(7204), 574; author reply 575.  
doi:10.1038/454574c
- O'Boyle, E. H., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. (2011). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 788-818.  
doi:10.1002/job.714
- Ohanian, R. (1990). Construction and validation of a scale to measure celebrity endorsers' perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, 19(3), 39-52.
- O'Keefe, D. J. (1990). *Persuasion: Theory and research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Olatoye, R., Akintunde, S. O., & Yakasai, M. I. (2010). Emotional intelligence, creativity and academic achievement of business administration students. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 8(2), 763-786.
- O'Loughlin, T. (2013). The credibility of the Catholic Church as public actor. *New Blackfriars*, 94(1050), 129-147. doi:10.1111/nbfr.12011
- Onay, M. (2011). The effect of emotional intelligence and emotional labor on task performance and contextual performance. (English). *Ege Academic Review*, 11(4), 587-600.

- Othman, A., Abdullah, H., & Ahmad, J. (2009). The influence of work motivation on emotional intelligence and team effectiveness. *Vision (09722629)*, 13(4), 1-14.
- Özdemir, S., & Çakmak, A. (2008). The effect of drama education on prospective teachers' creativity. *International Journal of Instruction*, 1(1), 13-30.
- Parsons, T. 1961/1987. Suggestions for a sociological approach to the theory of organizations. *In Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader*, ed. E. Amitai. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Payne, W. L. (1985). *A study of emotion: Developing emotional intelligence, self-integration, relating to fear, pain and desire*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation and Thesis database. (UMI No. 8605928).
- Pérez, A., & del Bosque, I. R. (2013). Customer personal features as determinants of the formation process of corporate social responsibility perceptions. *Psychology & Marketing*, 30(10), 903-917. doi:10.1002/mar.20654
- Pérez, J.C., Petrides, K.V. & Furnham, A. (2005). Measuring trait emotional intelligence. In R. Schulze and R.D. Roberts (Eds.). *International Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*. Cambridge: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Perez-Escoda, N. N., Filella, G. G., Alegre, A. A., & Bisquerra, R. R. (2012). Developing the emotional competence of teachers and pupils in school contexts. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 10(3), 1183-1208.
- Petelin, R. (2008). Managing organization writing to enhance corporate credibility. *Journal of Communication Management*, 7(2), 172-180.

- Peters, R., & Caro, C. (2013). Promoting cooperation between corporate social responsibility and inter-organizational relationships. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, *11*(10), 417-430.
- Petrides, K. V., Frederickson, N., & Furnham, A. (2004). The role of trait emotional intelligence in academic performance and deviant behavior at school. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *36*, 277-293.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1981). Issue involvement as a moderator of the effects on attitude of advertising content and context. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *8*(1), 20-24.
- Pfau, M., Haigh, M. M., Sims, J., & Wigley, S. (2008). The influence of corporate social responsibility campaigns on public opinion. *Corporate Reputation Review*, *11*(2), 145-154. doi:10.1057/crr.2008.14
- Pflugrath, G., Roebuck, P., & Simnett, R. (2011). Impact of assurance and assurer's professional affiliation on financial analysts' assessment of credibility of corporate social responsibility information. *Auditing*, *30*(3), 239-254. doi:10.2308/ajpt-10047
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879–903, doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879. Retrieved from <http://www.personal.psu.edu/jxb14/M554/articles/Podsakoffetal2003.pdf>

- Poole, D. L., Nelson, J., Carnahan, S., Chepenik, N. G., & Tubiak, C. (2000). Evaluating performance measurement systems in nonprofit agencies: The program accountability quality scale (paqs). *American Journal of Evaluation, 21*(15). doi: 10.1177/109821400002100102
- Potter, G. (2011). A qualitative exploration of a new concept in support of good educational leadership--emotional intelligence. *International Journal Of Educational Leadership Preparation, 6*(2).
- Pounder, B. (2013). Accounting for goodwill: Back to the good old days?. *Strategic Finance, 95*(7), 15-16.
- Prechel, H. (2012). Corporate power and us economic and environmental policy, 1978-2008. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society, 5*, 357-375.
- Prewitt, G. (2008). Building organizational credibility: CSO governance and evaluation. *Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 191-207*. Retrieved from <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/DigitalLibrary/Publications/Detail/?lang=en&id=95487>
- Rangriz, H., & Mehrabi, J. (2010). The relationship between emotional intelligence, organizational commitment, and employees' performance in Iran. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5*(8), 50-56.
- Rathi, N., & Rastogi, R. (2008). Effect of emotional intelligence on occupational self-efficacy. *ICFAI Journal of Organizational Behavior, 7*(2), 46-56.



- Ravichandran, K. K., Arasu, R. R., & Arun Kumar, S. S. (2011). The impact of emotional intelligence on employee work engagement behavior: An empirical study. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 6(11), 157-169.  
doi:10.5539/ijbm.v6n11p157
- Ray, K., & Smith, M. C. (2010). The kindergarten child: What teachers and administrators need to know to promote academic success in all children. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 38(1), 5-18.
- Rees, D. A., & Janes, T. D. (2012). The continuing evolution of accounting for goodwill. *CPA Journal*, 82(1), 30-33.
- Rego, A., Sousa, F., Pina e Cunha, M., Correia, A., & Saur-Amaral, I. (2007). Leader self-reported emotional intelligence and perceived employee creativity: An exploratory study. *Creativity & Innovation Management*, 16(3), 250-264.  
doi:10.1111/j.1467-8691.2007.00435.x
- Richardson, S. L. (1986). The evolving consumer movement: Predictions for the 1990's. In Bloom, P. N., & Smith, R. B. (Eds.), *The future of consumerism*. Lexington, MA: Lexington, 17-22.
- Riketta, M. (2005) Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 358-384.

- Rivers, S., Brackett, M., Reyes, M., Elbertson, N., & Salovey, P. (2013). Improving the social and emotional climate of classrooms: a clustered randomized controlled trial testing the RULER Approach. *Prevention Science: The Official Journal of the Society for Prevention Research*, *14*(1), 77-87. doi:10.1007/s11121-012-0305-2
- Robinson, M. J., & Kohut, A. (1988). Believability and the press. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *52*(2), 174.
- Rodgers, S., & Bae, J. (2005). The mediating effect of inferred sponsor motive on corporate credibility: When high congruity sponsorships fail. *American Academy of Advertising Conference Proceedings*, 127.
- Rozell, E. J., Pettijohn, C. E., & Parker, R. S. (2004). Customer-oriented selling: Exploring the roles of emotional intelligence and organizational commitment. *Psychology and Marketing*, *21*(6), 405-424.
- Rozell, E. J., Pettijohn, C. E., & Parker, R. (2006). Emotional intelligence and dispositional affectivity as predictors of performance in salespeople. *Journal of Marketing Theory & Practice*, *14*(2), 113-124.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68-78.
- Sahafi, E., Danaee, H., Sarlak, M., & Haghollahi, F. (2011). The impact of emotional intelligence on citizenship behavior of physicians (With emphasis on infertility specialists). *Journal of Family & Reproductive Health*, *5*(4), 109-115.

- Sahafi, E., Danaee, H., Sarlak, M., & Haghollah, F. (2012). The impact of sympathetic components of emotional intelligence on citizenship behavior of physicians. *Journal of Family & Reproductive Health, 6*(1), 5-9.
- Sala, F. (2002). Do programs designed to increase emotional intelligence at work-work? Retrieved January 25, 2013 from [http://www.eiconsortium.org/reports/do\\_ei\\_programs\\_work.html](http://www.eiconsortium.org/reports/do_ei_programs_work.html)
- Salami, S. O. (2009). Conflict resolution strategies and organisational citizenship behaviour: The moderating role of trait emotional intelligence. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 4*, 41-63.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1977). Who gets power -- And how they hold onto It. *Organizational Dynamics, 5*(3), 3-21.
- Sallam, M. (2011). The impact of source credibility on Saudi consumer's attitude toward print advertisement: The moderating role of brand familiarity. *International Journal of Marketing Studies, 3*(4), 63-77. doi:10.5539/ijms.v3n4p63
- Salovey, P. & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9*, 185-211.
- Sánchez-Manzanares, M., Rico, R., & Gil, F. (2008). Designing organizations: Does expertise matter?. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 23*(3-4), 87-101. doi:10.1007/s10869-008-9076-y

- Sánchez-Ruiz, M. M., Hernández-Torrano, D. D., Pérez-González, J. J., Batey, M. M., & Petrides, K. K. (2011). The relationship between trait emotional intelligence and creativity across subject domains. *Motivation & Emotion*, 35(4), 461-473.  
doi:10.1007/s11031-011-9227-8
- Sathya Kumar, J. J., & Iyer, V. (2012). Emotional intelligence and quality of work-life among employees in the educational institutions. *SIES Journal of Management*, 8(2), 21-26.
- Satija, S., & Khan, W. (2013). Emotional intelligence as predictor of occupational stress among working professionals. *Aweshkar Research Journal*, 15(1), 79-97.
- Schmitt, N., & Gilliland, S.W. (1992). Beyond differential prediction: Fairness in selection. In D. M. Saunders (Ed.), *New approaches to employee management: Fairness in employee selection*. (1), 21–46. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Schoo, A. (2008). Leaders and their teams: Learning to improve performance with emotional intelligence and using choice theory. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 27(2), 40-45.
- Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., & Bhullar, N. (2009). The assessing emotions scale. C. Stough, D. Saklofske & J. Parker (Eds.), *The Assessment of Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Springer Publishing, 119-135.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouf, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25(2), 167-177.

- Semadar, A., Robins, G., & Ferris, G. R. (2006). Comparing the validity of multiple social effectiveness constructs in the prediction of managerial job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27*(4), 443-461.
- Sen, A. (2008). Neurology of emotional intelligence: Interpreted for managers. *Vision (09722629), 12*(1), 11-18.
- Senthilnathan, S., & Rukshani, K. (2013). A review on the relationship variables to employee morale and organizational trust. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Practices, 1*(10), 8-15.
- Shanker, M. (2012). Organizational citizenship behavior: Leveraging effects on Transformational Leaders' Emotional Intelligence. *Aweshkar Research Journal, 13*(1), 63-69.
- Shelton, H. Z. (2003). One CFO's transition: maintaining credibility and Integrity. *Financial Executive, 19*(6), 30-31.
- Shooshtarian, Z., Ameli, F., & Aminilari, M. (2013). The effect of labor's emotional intelligence on their job satisfaction, job performance and commitment. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies, 6*(1), 29-45.
- Simons, T. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. *Organization Science, 13*(1), 18-35.
- Simpson, E. K., & Kahler, R. C. (1980). A scale for source credibility, validated in the selling context. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 1*(1), 17.
- Singh, A. (2009). Organizational power in perspective. *Leadership & Management In Engineering, 9*(4), 165-176. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)LM.1943-5630.0000018

- Singh, L. K., & Srivastava, R. (2012). Influence of age and gender on the emotional intelligence of managers. *IBA Business Review*, 7(1), 128-141.
- Singh, U., & Srivastava, R. (2013). Building organizational trust for positive workplace attitude. Paper presented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Biannual Conference of the Indian Academy of Management (IAM), Ahmedabad, India. Retrieved from [http://115.111.81.83:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/11606/OS-PP-247-Building\\_Organizational\\_Trust\\_for\\_Positive\\_Workplace\\_Attitude-85-Singh\\_b.pdf?sequence=3](http://115.111.81.83:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/11606/OS-PP-247-Building_Organizational_Trust_for_Positive_Workplace_Attitude-85-Singh_b.pdf?sequence=3)
- Sojung, K., & Sejung Marina, C. (2010). The effects of corporate credibility and website reputation on banner advertising effectiveness: The moderating role of product-website congruency. *American Academy of Advertising Conference Proceedings*, 29.
- Sonnentag, S. & Frese, M. (2002). Performance concepts and performance theory. In S. Sonnentag (Ed.), *Psychological management of individual performance: A handbook in the psychology of management in organizations*, 3-25, Chichester: Wiley.
- Sparkman, L. A., Maulding, W. S., & Roberts, J. G. (2012). Non-cognitive predictors of student success in college. *College Student Journal*, 46(3), 642-652.
- Spitzmüller, C., Neumann, E., Spitzmüller, M., Rubino, C., Keeton, K. E., Sutton, M. T., & Manzey, D. (2008). Assessing the influence of psychosocial and career mentoring on organizational attractiveness. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 16(4), 403-415. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2008.00444.x

- Springer, C. (2008). Organizational credibility counts. *PA Times*, 31(9), 8.
- Stanley, L. J., & McDowell, W. (2014). The role of interorganizational trust and organizational efficacy in family and nonfamily firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 5(3), 264-275.
- Steiner, D. D., & Gilliland, S.W. (1996). Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in France and the United States. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(2), 134-141.
- Stone, F. (2005). Credibility: It's more than a matter of integrity. *Employment Relations Today (Wiley)*, 32(2), 9-15. doi:10.1002/ert.20059
- Stough, C. C., & De Guara, D. D. (2003). Examining the relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 55, 145.
- Straiter, K. L. (2005). The effects of supervisors' trust of subordinates and their organization on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(1), 86-101.
- Strobel, M., Tumasjan, A., & Welp, I. (2010). Do business ethics pay off?: The influence of ethical leadership on organizational attractiveness. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology*, 218(4), 213-224. doi:10.1027/0044-3409/a000031
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches, *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 571-611.

- Susan Tee Suan, C., Anantharaman, R. N., & David Yoon Kin, T. (2011). Emotional intelligence and organisational citizenship behaviour of manufacturing sector employees: An analysis. *Management (18544223)*, 6(2), 107-125.
- Taatila, V. (2004). The concept of organizational competence – A foundational analysis. University of Jyväskylä. Jyväskylä Studies in Computing. 36.
- Tait, M. (2008). Resilience as a contributor to novice teacher success, commitment, and retention. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(4), 57-75.
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53–55. <http://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>
- Technology use as a status characteristic: The influences of mundane and novel communication technologies on attributions of expertise in organizations. (2012). *Conference Papers -- International Communication Association*, 1-38.
- Teven, J. J. (2007). Effects of supervisor social influence, nonverbal immediacy, and biological sex on subordinates' perceptions of job satisfaction, liking, and supervisor credibility. *Communication Quarterly*, 55(2), 155-177.  
doi:10.1080/01463370601036036
- Teven, J. J. (2008). An examination of perceived credibility of the 2008 presidential candidates: Relationships with believability, likeability, and deceptiveness. *Human Communication*, 11(4), 391-407.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Magazine*, 140, 227-235.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1924). Measurement of Intelligence. *Psychological Review*, 31(3), 219-252. doi:10.1037/h0073975



- Thorndike, R. L., & Stein, S. S. (1937). An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 34(5), 275-285. doi:10.1037/h0053850
- Tianbing, J., Chuanmin, M., Ting, Z., & Ke, Z. (2013). Organization power configuration model based on grey clustering. *Journal of Grey System*, 25(2), 69-80.
- Trafimow, D., & Rice, S. (2008). Potential performance theory (PPT): A general theory of task performance applied to morality. *Psychological Review*, 115(2), 447-462.
- Trochim, W. (2006). *Experimental design*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/desexper.php>
- Turker, D. (2009). Measuring corporate social responsibility: A scale development study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(4), 411-427. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9780-6
- Tsai, W., & Yang, I. (2010). Does image matter to different job applicants? The influences of corporate image and applicant individual differences on organizational attractiveness. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18(1), 48-63. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2010.00488.x
- Turker, D. (2009). Measuring corporate social responsibility: a scale development study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(4), pp. 411-27.
- Turnipseed, D. L., & Vandewaa, E. A. (2012). Relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 110(3), 899-914. doi:10.2466/01.09.20.21.PR0.110.3.899-914
- Ulman, S. (2014). Distinction between corruption perceptions on the ethical and practical levels. *USV Annals of Economics & Public Administration*, 14(1), 251-260.

- Umphress, E. E., Smith-Crowe, K., Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., & Watkins, M. (2007). When birds of a feather flock together and when they do not: Status composition, social dominance orientation, and organizational attractiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 396-409. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.396
- Underwood, R.L. (2003). The communicative power of product packaging: Creating brand identity via lived and mediated experience. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 11*(1), 62-76.
- Utman, C. H. (1997). Performance effects of motivational state: A meta-analysis. *Personality & Social Psychology Review (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates), 1*(2), 170.
- Vakola, M., Tsaousis, I., & Nikolau, I. (2003). The role of emotional intelligence and personality variables on attitude toward organizational change. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 19*(2), 88-110.
- Van Bussel, G. (2012). Reconstructing the past for organizational accountability. *Electronic Journal of Information Systems Evaluation, 15*(1), 127-137.
- Van Hoye, G., & Lievens, F. (2005). Recruitment-related information sources and organizational attractiveness: Can something be done about negative publicity?. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 13*(3), 179-187.  
doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2005.00313.x
- Van Hoye, G., & Lievens, F. (2007). Social influences on organizational attractiveness: Investigating if and when word of mouth matters. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*(9), 2024-2047. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00249.x

- Van der Merwe, P. (2010). Level of emotional creativity in the classroom. *International Journal of Learning, 17*(4), 1-14
- VandeWaa, E., & Turnipseed, D. (2012). Emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior of university professors. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 6*(7), 1-12.
- Van Ghent, D. (1961). *The English novel: Form and function*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Vu, P. H., & Hoffmann, J. (2011). Using online surveys in Vietnam: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Market Research, 53*(1), 41-62. doi:10.2501/IJMR-53-1 -041 -062
- Walker, H., Feild, H., Giles, W., Armenakis, A., & Bernerth, J. (2009). Displaying employee testimonials on recruitment web sites: Effects of communication media, employee race, and job seeker race on organizational attraction and information credibility. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(5), 1354-1364.
- Walker, M., & Kent, A. (2013). The roles of credibility and social consciousness in the corporate philanthropy-consumer behavior relationship. *Journal of Business Ethics, 116*(2), 341-353. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1472-6
- Webb, N. J., & Farmer, A. (1996). Corporate goodwill: A game theoretic approach to the effect of corporate charitable expenditures on firm behaviour. *Annals of Public & Cooperative Economics, 67*(1), 29.
- Wechsler, D. (1950). Cognitive, conative, and non-intellective intelligence. *American Psychologist, 5*(3), 78-83. doi:10.1037/h0063112

- Wechsler, D. (1975). Intelligence defined and undefined: A relativistic appraisal. *American Psychologist*, 30(2), 135-139. doi:10.1037/h0076868
- Wechsler, D. D. (1943). Non-intellective factors in general intelligence. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 38(1), 101-103. doi:10.1037/h0060613
- Wechsler, D., & Jaros, E. (1965). Schizophrenic patterns on the WISC. *Journal Of Clinical Psychology*, 21(3), 288-291.
- Weinberger, L. A. (2003). An examination of the relationship between emotional intelligence, leadership style and perceived effectiveness. *Swanson and Associates*, 1-209.
- Whitehead Jr., J. L. (1968). Factors of source credibility. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 54(1), 59.
- Williams, V., & Williams, R. (1997). *Lifeskills*. (NY: Times Books/Random House.
- Winkel, D. E., Wyland, R. L., Shaffer, M. A., & Clason, P. (2011). A new perspective on psychological resources: Unanticipated consequences of impulsivity and emotional intelligence. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 84(1), 78-94. doi:10.1348/2044-8325.002001
- Wu, M. B., & Stemler, S. (2008). Resident advisor general intelligence, emotional intelligence, personality dimensions, and internal belief characteristics as predictors of rated performance. *NASPA Journal*, 45(4), 528-559.

- Yaghoubi, E., Mashinchi, S. A., & Abdollai, H. (2010). An analysis of correlation between organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and emotional intelligence (EI). *Modern Applied Science*, 5(2), 119-123.
- Yoon, K., Kim, C. H. & Kim, M. (1998). A cross-cultural comparison of the effects of source credibility on attitudes and behavioral intentions. *Mass Communication & Society*, 1, 153-173.
- Young, R. B. (2005). The virtues of organizational integrity. In *New Directions for Student Services*. Wiley Periodicals, Inc, 135. doi: 10:1002/ss.399
- Young-Ritchie, C., Laschinger, H., & Wong, C. (2007). The effects of emotionally intelligent leadership behaviour on emergency staff nurses' workplace empowerment and organizational commitment. *NENA Outlook*, 30(2), 24.
- Yuan B. C., Wan-Lung, H., Jia-Horng, S., & Kuang-Pin, L. (2012). Increasing emotional intelligence of employees: Evidence from research and development teams in taiwan. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 40(10), 1713-1724
- Yu-Chi W. (2011). Job stress and job performance among employees in the Taiwanese finance sector: The role of emotional intelligence. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 39(1), 21-31. doi:10.2224/sbp.2011.39.1.21
- Yaqub, B., & Khan, M. (2011). The role of employer branding and talent management for organizational attractiveness. *Far East Journal of Psychology & Business*, 5(1), 57-65.

- Young, R. B. (2011). The virtues of organizational integrity. *New Directions for Student Services, 2011*(135), 5-14.
- Yuki, M., Maddux, W. W., Brewer, M. B., & Takemura, K. (2005). Cross-cultural differences in relationship-and group-based trust. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(1), 48-62.
- Zhang, R., & Rezaee, Z. (2009). Do credible firms perform better in emerging markets? Evidence from china. *Journal of Business Ethics, 90*(2), 221-237.  
doi:10.1007/s10551-009-0038-8
- Zanini, M. T. F., & Migueles, C. P. (2013). Trust as an element of informal coordination and its relationship with organizational performance. *Economia, 14*(2), 77-87.
- Zeider, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2004). Emotional intelligence in the Workplace: A critical review. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53*(3), 371-399. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2004.00176.x
- Zeitz, C. M., & Spoehr, K. T. (1989). Knowledge organization and the acquisition of procedural expertise. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 3*(4), 313-336.

## Appendix A: Demographic Information

## Age

- 18-25
- 26-33
- 34-41
- 42-49
- 50-57
- 58-65
- 66+

## Education

What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

- Associate's degree (AA, AS)
- Bachelor's degree (BA, BS)
- Master's degree (MA, MS, MEng, MEd, MBA, MSW)
- Professional degree (MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD)
- Doctorate degree (PhD, EdD)
- Other (Vocational / Technical Certificate)

## Occupational Tenure

How many years have you been employed at Alvord Taylor?

- 0-1 years
- 2-3 years

- 3-4 years
- 5-8 years
- 9+ years



## Appendix B: Permission for Use of the Assessing Emotions Scale

**(AES; Schutte et al., 1998)**

From: [REDACTED]  
Date: Mon, Feb 17, 2014 at 4:36 PM  
To: Leif Ford <leif.ford@gmail.com>  
Subject: Emotional Intelligence instrument inquiry

You are welcome to use the scale in your research. Please find attached the manuscript version of a published chapter that contains the scale and background information, including information on items that may comprise subscales.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

## Appendix C: Permission for Use of the Leader Accountability Scale

**(LAS; Wood & Winston, 2007)**

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Fri, Nov 14, 2014 at 2:45 PM  
To: Leif Ford <leif.ford@gmail.com>  
Subject: Re: Accountability Scale - permission request, and a question

Hi Leif and thanks for writing. Congratulations on your success this far, and I am delighted that you are interested in using part of the LAI for your research. Feel free to use it; however, I do have some validity concerns about changing the language simply because the instrument has never been tested in that context. I would suggest that it is vital that you clear this with your dissertation chair. You may need to do a “pre-test” to conduct a validity study changing the language to ascertain the usefulness of the Answerability scale in your research. In this case, permission isn’t the issue so much as the credibility of your research among the academic community once you write and are ready to defend your dissertation. Keep me in the loop and let me know what you decide and discover. Thanks again for contacting me.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## Appendix D: Permission for Use of the Celebrity Endorsers Scale

**(CES; Ohanian, 1990)**

from: Rubina Ohanian <rohanin@us.ibm.com

to: Leif Ford leif.ford@gmail.com

date: Mon, Feb 29, 2016 at 1:56pm

subject: Re: Permission to use Celebrity Endorser Credibility Scale in New Research

Leif,

Thank you for your follow up and sorry you have had a difficult time locating me. You can use the scale and I would appreciate receiving a copy of your document.

Best of luck.

████████████████████

████████████████████

████████████████████

## Appendix E: Permission for Use of the Corporate Social Responsibility Scale

(CSRS; Turker, 2009)

From: [REDACTED]  
Date: Mon, Oct 6, 2014 at 11:35 PM  
To: Leif Ford <leif.ford@gmail.com>  
Subject: Corporate Social Responsibility Instrument inquiry

Dear Leif,

Of course you can use the scale with citing the related article and I'd be happy if you'll inform me about the results.

The items can be modified according to the nature of sample – but it is important to indicate the changes carefully. Otherwise it can be difficult to follow the difference between the original scale and the scale that'll be used by you. Another issue - I used a five point Likert Scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree in the data collection process.

Good luck in your study!

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

## Appendix F: Permission for Use of the Corporate Credibility Scale

**(CCS; Newell & Goldsmith, 2000)**

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thu, Mar 28, 2013 at 10:04 AM  
To: Leif Ford <leif.ford@gmail.com>  
Subject: RE: Organizational Credibility instrument inquiry

Dear Leif,

I believe that the scale items appear in the article. Since it is published, you may use it without permission. I hope your research goes well. Please let me know if you use the scale and how it performs.

With best wishes,

[REDACTED]

## Appendix G: Permission for Use of the Ethos/Source Credibility Scale

**(ESCS; McCroskey & Teven, 1999)**

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Mon, Oct 6, 2014 at 11:15 PM  
To: Leif Ford <leif.ford@gmail.com>  
subject: RE: Goodwill Instrument Inquiry

Hi Leif,

Yes, you have permission to use our Goodwill (and credibility) scale. You should be able to find the scales/measures in Teven & McCroskey (1997) or McCroskey & Teven (1999). Please send me the results for your dissertation when they are available. Thank you for your interest in my research.

All the best,

[REDACTED]

Appendix H: Permission for Use of the Ethical Leadership at Work Questionnaire

**(ELW; Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh, 2011)**

**Dear Leif,**

**Thank you for your request to use the ELW in your research and in this case the sub-dimension integrity. We gladly allow you to use the ELW for scientific research and publication purposes, and hope it will be helpful to you. We do ask that any published work describing research using the ELW (including yours) refers directly to the Kalshoven, Den Hartog and De Hoogh (2011) Leadership Quarterly article as the source of the ELW. We explicitly retain full copyright of the instrument and its items, also in the case of translated versions. We thus also ask you not to publish a full version of the ELW in another language as the copyrights of the instrument lie with us. We wish you success in your research and hope to read about some of the outcomes in the future.**

**It would be great when you share your results with me.**

**Sincerely,**

**[REDACTED]**



Appendix I: Permission for Use of the Organizational and Issue Legitimacy Scale  
(OILS; Chung, 2010)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tue, Oct 7, 2014 at 8:26 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**CC:** Leif Ford <leif.ford@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Organizational Legitimacy Instrument Inquiry

Hi Leif,

Thanks for your interest in our study. It was a part of my dissertation and [REDACTED] is my dissertation advisor!

Surely, you can use those scales (org. legitimacy scale and issue legitimacy scale), and I am sure it would be OK to modify wording to be appropriate to the context you're conducting your study. However, I examined organizational legitimacy from general public, not employees, so it's your discretion. I am attaching two files.

First article is about organizational legitimacy of hospitals (I assume that you already have this, but just in case you don't). Second one is my dissertation. You can see how I used those scales for further research (part 3-experiment) and reliability.

Please let me know if you have any questions, and good luck on your dissertation!

## Appendix J: Permission for use of the Power Source Scale

(PSS; Gaski, 1986)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Mon, Nov 17, 2014 at 8:43 AM  
**To:** Leif Ford <leif.ford@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Formal request to use power source instrumentation, and a related question

Dear Leif,

Feel free to use or adapt in any way you wish. (Just be sure to cite me frequently!)

Only other articles of mine I can think of that could contribute to your effort might be the 1985 JMR and a 1988 mega-validation study (of power itself, not power sources per se) in International J of Physical Distribution & Materials Management. I doubt if slight changes to item text would compromise validity, but you'll be testing that anyway, right?

Between you and me, I doubt that anyone has really measured power very well, including myself, so the playing field should be wide open for you in that regard. Fortunately, power sources are more straightforward to operationalize.

Good luck. I appreciate your interest.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED]

Appendix K: Questions from the Assessing Emotions Scale and COCI Scale  
**(AES; Schutte et al., 1998; CCS; Newell & Goldsmith, 2000; CES; Ohanian, 1990;**  
**CSRS; Turker, 2009; ELW; Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh; ESCS;**  
**McCroskey & Teven, 1999; LAS; Wood & Winston, 2007; OILS; Chung, 2010;**  
**PSS; Gaski, 1986)**

Each EQ dimension and their corresponding items are listed below:

Data on EQ will be collected using a five-point Likert scale that indicates how often the employee exhibited the indicated behavior. Ratings were, ‘strongly disagree’ (1), ‘somewhat disagree’ (2), ‘neither agree or disagree’ (3), ‘ somewhat agree’ (4), ‘strongly agree’ (5). There are 33 total items in this scale.

### **EQ - Perception of Emotion**

P1: I find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages of other people

P2: I am aware of my emotions as I experience them

P3: I am aware of the non-verbal messages I send to others

P4: By looking at their facial expressions, I recognize the emotions people are experiencing

P5: I know why my emotions change

P6: I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them

P7: I am aware of the non-verbal messages other people send

P8: I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them

P9: I can tell how people are feeling by listening to the tone of their voice

P10: It is difficult for me to understand why people feel the way they do

### **EQ - Managing of Own Emotions and Other Emotions**

M1: I know when to speak about my personal problems to others

M2: When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them

M3: I expect that I will do well on most things I try

M4: Other people find it easy to confide in me

M5: I expect good things to happen

M6: I like to share my emotions with others

M7: When I experience a positive emotion, I know how to make it last

M8: I arrange events others enjoy

M9: I seek out activities that make me happy

M10: I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others

M11: I have control over my emotions

M12: I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on

M13: I compliment others when they have done something well

M14: When another person tells me about an important event in his or her life, I almost feel as though I have experienced this event myself

M15: When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail\*

M16: I help other people feel better when they are down

M17: I use good moods to help myself keep trying in the face of obstacles

### **EQ - Utilization of Emotion**

U1: Some of the major events of my life have led me to re-evaluate what is important and not important

U2: When my mood changes, I see new possibilities

U3: Emotions are one of the things that make my life worth living

U4: When I am in a positive mood, solving problems is easy for me

U5: When I am in a positive mood, I am able to come up with new ideas

U6: When I feel a change in emotions, I tend to come up with new ideas

### **OC - Accountability**

Each Accountability dimension and their corresponding items are listed below:

Data on Accountability will be collected using a ten-point Likert scale that indicates how often the organization exhibited the indicated behavior. Labels were assigned at the polar ends of the sequence. Examples of labels include ‘never’ (0), and ‘always’ (10). There were thirty (30) total items in this scale.

### **OC - Accountability (Responsibility)**

R1: The leader demonstrates a sense of obligation to constituents when making decisions

R2: The leader accepts responsibility for his/her actions within the organization

R3: The leader clearly defines for constituents where his/her responsibilities end and theirs begin

R4: The leader provides constituents with safe ways to address grievances against him/her

R5: The leader avoids making excuses for mistakes

R6 The leader avoids blaming others for mistakes

R7: The leader is willing to face the truth, even when it does not fit his/her personal preferences

R8: The leader accepts responsibility for the future direction and accomplishments of the group

R9: The leader accepts ownership for the results of his/her decisions and actions

R10: The leader looks to himself/herself first when the group's results are disappointing

**OC - Accountability (Openness)**

O1: The leader's behavior is consistent from one person to the next

O2: The leader demonstrates consistency in public and private behavior

O3: The leader identifies personal actions – popular or not – as his/her own

O4: The leader openly listens when people offer perspectives that are different from his/her own

O5: The leader avoids isolating from constituents in performing his or her duties

O6: The leader openly explains his/her decisions

O7: The leader openly declares his/her values

O8: The leader is a role model

O9: The leader interacts openly and candidly with constituents

O10: The leader keeps records that are accessible to constituents

**OC - Accountability (Answerability)**

A1: The leader apologizes to the constituents for his/her mistakes

A2: The leader explains the reasons for his/her decisions

A3: The leader answers questions from constituents

- A4: The leader provides explanations for the performance shortfalls without making excuses
- A5: The leader informs constituents of the process by which he/she arrives at decisions
- A6: The leader explains to constituents why suggested action was not taken
- A7: The leader provides regular progress reports about personal commitments he/she has made to constituents
- A8: The leader welcomes constructive feedback of his/her actions
- A9: The leader openly admits his/her mistakes to constituents
- A10: The leader takes quick action to deal with the consequences of a mistake

### **OC – Attractiveness**

Each Attractiveness dimension and their corresponding items are listed below:

Data on Attractiveness will be collected using a 7-point Semantic differential scale that indicates how often the organization exhibited the indicated behavior. Labels were assigned at the polar ends of the sequence. Examples of labels include, ‘Attractive’ (1), and ‘Unattractive’ (7). There were five (5) total items in this scale.

A1: Attractive - Unattractive

A2: Classy – Not Classy

A3: Beautiful – Ugly

A4: Elegant – Plain

A5: Sexy – Not sexy

Each Corporate Social Responsibility dimension and their corresponding items are listed below. Data on Corporate Social Responsibility will be collected using a 7-point Likert

scale that indicates how often the organization exhibited the indicated behavior. Labels were assigned at the polar ends of the sequence. Sample labels include, ‘Strongly Disagree’ (1), and ‘Strongly Agree’ (7). There were seventeen (17) total items in this scale.

### **OC - Corporate Social Responsibility to Society**

S1: Our company contributes to campaigns and projects that promote the well-being of the society.

### **OC - Corporate Social Responsibility to Natural Environment**

NE1: Our company implements special programs to minimize its negative impact on the natural environment.

NE2: Our company participates in activities which aim to protect and improve the quality of the natural environment.

### **OC - Corporate Social Responsibility to Future Generations**

FG1: Our company targets sustainable growth which considers future generations.

FG2: Our company makes investment to create a better life for future generations.

### **OC - Corporate Social Responsibility to Non-Governmental Organizations**

NGO1: Our company encourages its employees to participate in voluntarily activities.

NGO2: Our company supports nongovernmental organizations working in problematic areas.

### **OC - Corporate Social Responsibility to Employees**

E1: Our company supports employees who want to acquire additional education.

E2: Our company policies encourage the employees to develop their skills and careers.



E3: Our company implements flexible policies to provide a good work & life balance for its employees.

E4: The management of our company is primarily concerned with employees' needs and wants.

E5: The managerial decisions related with the employees are usually fair.

### **OC - Corporate Social Responsibility to Customers**

C1: Our company provides full and accurate information about its products to its customers.

C2: Our company respects consumer rights beyond the legal requirements.

C3: Customer satisfaction is highly important for our company.

### **OC - Corporate Social Responsibility to Government**

G1: Our company always pays its taxes on a regular and continuing basis.

G2: Our company complies with legal regulations completely and promptly.

### **OC – Expertise**

The Expertise dimension and Trustworthiness dimension and their corresponding items are listed below. Data on Expertise and Trustworthiness will be collected using a 7-point Likert scale that indicates how often the organization exhibited the indicated behavior. Labels were assigned at the polar ends of the sequence. Sample labels include, 'Very Credible' (1), and 'Not Credible' (7). There were eight (8) total items in this scale.

### **OC – Experience**

T1: My organization has a great amount of experience

T2: My organization is skilled in what they do

T3: My organization has great expertise

T4: My organization does *not* have much experience

### **OC - Trustworthiness**

E1: I trust my organization

E2: My organization makes truthful claims

E3: My organization is honest

E4: I do *not* believe what my organization tells me

### **OC – Goodwill**

The Goodwill dimension and their corresponding items are listed below. Data on Expertise and Trustworthiness will be collected using a 7-point Likert scale that indicates how often the organization exhibited the indicated behavior. Labels were assigned at the polar ends of the sequence. Sample labels include, ‘Insensitive (1), and ‘Sensitive (7).

There were six (6) total items in this scale.

Cares about me – Doesn’t care about me

Has my interests at heart – doesn’t have my interests at heart

Self-centered – Not self-centered

Concerned with me – Unconcerned with me

Insensitive – Sensitive

Not understanding – Understanding

**OC – Integrity**

The Integrity dimension and their corresponding items are listed below. Data on Expertise and Trustworthiness will be collected using a 5-point Likert scale that indicates how often the organization exhibited the indicated behavior. Labels were assigned at the polar ends of the sequence. Sample Ratings range from, ‘Strongly Disagree’ (1), to ‘Strongly Agree’ (5). There were four (4) total items in this scale.

- I1: The organization keeps their promises
- I2: The organization can be trusted to do the things they say
- I3: The organization can be relied on to honor their commitments
- I4: The organization always keeps their words

**OC – Legitimacy**

The Legitimacy dimension and their corresponding items are listed below. Data on Legitimacy will be collected using a 7-point Likert scale that indicates how often the organization exhibited the indicated behavior. Labels were assigned at the polar ends of the sequence. Sample labels include, ‘Strongly Disagree’ (1), and ‘Strongly Agree’ (7). There were five (5) total items in this scale.

- L1: I have a positive opinion about my organization
- L2: I believe that my organization follows government regulations
- L3: The organization does a good job providing health care
- L4: I think that my organization is honest
- L5: I think that the health care industry is a necessary part of society

**OC - Power**

The Power dimension and their corresponding items are listed below. Data on Power will be collected using a 5-point Likert scale that indicates how often the organization exhibited the indicated behavior. Labels were assigned at the polar ends of the sequence. Sample labels include, 'Strongly Disagree' (0), and 'Strongly Agree' (4). There were fifteen (15) total items in this scale.

**OC – Power (Expert)**

P1: My organization is an expert in its field

P2: I respect the judgment of my organization representatives

P3: The people of my organization don't know what they are doing

P4: I get good advice from my organization

P5: Since the people from my organization are familiar with their services, I accept what they tell me

**OC – Power (Referent)**

R1: I like the organization people I deal with

R2: I couldn't care less what my organization thinks of me

R3: I consider my organization an ideal company

R4: I admire my organization and I want to act in a way to merit the respect of the people there

R5: The approval of my organization's people means a lot to me

**OC – Power (Legitimate)**

P1: My organization has the right to expect my cooperation

P2: My organization should stay out of my business

P3: My organization has no right to tell me what to do

P4: Since my organization is my employer, I should accept their recommendations

P5: Employers have a right to expect employees to follow instructions