Impact of Trust in Leadership on Sportsmanship Behavior of Subordinates and Moderating Role of Trait Emotional Intelligence

Dr. Vibhuti Gupta
Associate Professor, IILM Academy of Higher Learning, Lucknow

---**ABSTRACT**---
 The study examines the relationship between trust in leader and single dimension of organisation citizenship behaviour i.e. sportsmanship behaviour of subordinates. The mediating role of trait emotional intelligence on trust in leader and sportsmanship behaviour of subordinates was also studied. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients are .832 for 5 dimensions of OCB (whole scale) and .832 for sportsmanship alone; .907 for transformational leadership (whole scale) with trust in leader and .888 for trust in leader alone; .889 for emotional intelligence (whole scale). The study concluded that emotional intelligence has some effect on sportsmanship behaviour of employees and trust in leader, however, there may be other contributory factors as well.

Keywords - Transformational Leadership, Trust in Leader, Organisational Citizenship Behaviour, Sportsmanship, Emotional Intelligence.

Studies on leadership and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) have gained popularity and attention recently due to their applicability and positive effects in organisations. Some remarkable work on the subject has helped them gain wider acceptance and become popular as a subject matter of research. In their work, Podsakoff, et.al. 1990 have applied the concept of Transformational Leadership (TL) and its six dimensions on OCB where trust in leader has been considered as outcome of transformational leadership and is instrumental in maintaining positive OCB in organisations. Past research has proved that trait emotional intelligence plays an important role in maintaining positive OCB and has a mediating role.

I. TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Transformational Leadership (TL) has attracted good amount of research work. Common features found in majority of research work (House, 1977, Tichy and DeVanna, 1986, Conger and Kanungo, 1987, Bass, Avolio and Goodheim, 1987, Avolio and Bass 1988, Boal and Bryson, 1988, House, Spangler and Woycke, 1989, Howell and Frost, 1989) is that these leaders alter the basic thought process and beliefs of an individual thereby motivating them to "do more than they are expected to do" (Yukl, 1989a, p. 272). TL is defined as "that activity which stimulates purposeful activity in others by changing the way they look at the world around them and relate to one another. Transformational leaders motivate the employees to perform beyond mechanical role prescribed by the organisation (Katz and Kahn, 1978, p. 528). TL affects people's personal beliefs by touching their hearts and minds" (Nicholls, 1994, cited in Modassir and Singh, 2008). According to Graham 1988, the most important effect of transformational leadership is the extra role performance rather than in-role performance. According to (Nicholls, 1994), a transformational leader enables his subordinates to perform better and develops a communication style that helps transforming their relationship from a leader in the strict sense to more of a partner. This in return helps enhancing their contribution to the organisation. The actual worth of TL is that these leaders take "ordinary people to extraordinary heights" (Boal and Bryson, 1988, p. 11). One of the key reasons why the followers are motivated to perform over and above the desired performance is the trust and respect the followers have for these transformational leaders as trust and respect are earned by a transformational leader from their subordinates (Yukl 1989b, Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990).

II. TRUST IN LEADER

Trust represents an affirmative belief that the person whom you trust will not indulge in any act against you that is unethical or opportunistic. (Boon & Holmes, 1991; Engelbrecht & Cloete, 2000; McAllister, 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998). Wayne, Shore and Liden (1997) suggested that "…the exchange between an employee and his or her direct superior is the primary determinant of employee behaviour". According to Folger and Cropanzano (1998) trust reactions are relevant to any person with whom one is interdependent (Colquitt, et al 2001). Carnevale and Weschler (1992) explain that trust is the belief of "…ethical, fair, and non-threatening behaviour, and concerns for the rights of others". It takes time to build trust and it keeps growing with the passage of time. Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995) define trust as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the second party will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party".

According to Boal and Bryson (1988) and Yukl (1989, 1989b), a follower's trust in his or her leader has not been given more attention in empirical research. However, with the passage of time and more interest in

what makes a transformational leader successful in terms of extra role behaviours displayed by subordinates, trust in leader is gradually gaining pace with research studies being devoted to it, generally and more particularly finding the role of trust in leader with respect to organisational citizenship behaviours. Tan and Tan (2000) in their study found that trust in the supervisor was correlated strongly with ability, benevolence and integrity of the supervisor. Research has focussed on the leader behaviour that make follower more aware of the importance and values of task outcomes, activate their higher order needs and induce them to transcend self interests for the sake of organisation. (Bass 1985, Yukl 19898a, 1989b cited in Podsakoff Transformational Leadership). Schindler and Thomas (1993) identified five key factors that helps establish leader trustworthiness with the followers. These are integrity, competence, consistency, loyalty and openness.

- **Integrity**: the perceptions of honesty and truthfulness for the leader by the follower.
- **Competence**: refers to an individual's technical and interpersonal knowledge and skills.
- **Consistency**: refers to an individual's reliability, predictability, and good judgement.
- **Loyalty**: refers to the willingness of the leader to protect and save face for another person and to not to act opportunistically.
- **Openness**: the extent to which one is able to tell the truth.

Dirks and Ferrin (2002) found that trust in senior leadership was strongly related to organisational level variables. "The followers feel trust and respect towards the leader and they are motivated to do more than they are expected to do" (Yukl 1989b). According to Bennis and Nanus (1985) effective leaders are the leaders who earn the trust of their followers. Kouzes and Posner (1987) presented multiple studies which say that the most valued leader characteristics by followers are honesty, integrity and truthfulness (Schlechter, 2005). Study by Podsakoff, et al (1990) prove that transformational leader behaviour are influenced by both trust and satisfaction, and that OCB was influenced by trust.

Trust in supervisor is shown to be positively related to the supervisor directed citizenship behaviour dimensions of altruism, courtesy and conscientiousness (Podsakoff, MacKenzie Moorman and Fetter, 1990) and a global measure of citizenship behaviour (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994).

Since, research has shown that trust in leader plays a dominant role in forming the OCBs, it has been attempted to study the impact of trust in leader with special reference to the sportsmanship behaviour of employees because sportsmanship behaviour is something which is a desirable attribute in employees to overcome the impact of any negative events in organisation and not exaggerate it to the extent which creates a negative feeling in self and others, thereby leading to de-motivation, resultant effect of which may be detrimental for the organisation, as a whole in the broader context.

Hence the hypothesis:

H1 : Trust in Leader has a positive effect on OCB with special reference to sportsmanship behaviour of employee

III. ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCBs) have been defined as voluntary behaviours that an employee exhibits over and above the routine duty behaviours in an organisation. Various authors have given different definitions of OCBs, however, the common feature in every definition continues to be the extra role voluntary behaviours displayed by the employees that are necessary and play an important role in the growth of the organisation. These extra role behaviours, termed as OCBs, contribute to the success of the organisation, are voluntary and are not recognized by formal reward systems (Organ, 1988; McShane & Von Glinow, 2001). OCBs although voluntary, are necessary as they promote the sound functioning of an organisation (Organ 1988 and Schnake 1991). According to Katz (1964) OCBs are creative and voluntary behaviours to implement roles other than officially given duties. Organ (1997) stated OCBs are "the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance". According to Appelbaum et al. (2004) OCB is discretionary behaviour that is not part of an employee's formal job requirement, but it is that which promotes the effective functioning of the organization (cited in Modassir and Singh, 2008). Organ et al. (2006) emphasised the discretionary nature of OCB by defining it as, "discretionary contributions that go beyond the strict descriptions and that do not lay claim to the contractual recompense from the formal reward system" (cited in Kumar, Jauhari and Singh, 2016). According to Karambayya (1989), since OCBs show the degrees of interdependency among an organization's employees, they are quite closely related to the life of the organization. It is a psychological contract, a reciprocal relationship from the individual's point of view between self and organisations. (Rousseau 1989; Van Dyne et.al., 1994).

The dimensionality of OCBs i.e. division into various sub-categories was first introduced by Organ (1988) in his paper and later by various authors in their respective papers, taking Organ's division of OCBs into five dimensions as base.

Organ (1988) in his paper on OCBs identified five key dimensions that an employee performs beyond his/her expected duty for the organisation. These are:

- Altruism which means help extended to a co-worker, who is lagging behind on a task to overcome the problem.
- Courtesy which means keeping others informed about any change that may affect their work.
- Conscientiousness signifies a style in carrying out one's duties and responsibilities well beyond the minimum required levels.

- Sportsmanship is explained as behaviour displayed by employees by tolerating any inconvenience and not complaining about it.
- Civic virtue means involvement in the governance of the organisation (Jung and Yoon, 2012).
- Williams and Anderson (1991) merged the dimensions proposed by Organ (1988) and gave a two dimensional model of OCB:
- OCB-I which are the behaviours that are directed towards the individuals and comprises of altruism and courtesy
- OCB-O which are the behaviours that are directed towards the organisation and it comprises of conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue since they contribute towards the growth of the organisation. (cited in Salami, 2009).

However, Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1994) found that with Organ's explanation of five conceptually distinct dimensions of OCB, the managers sometimes find difficulty in making a distinction and hence they modified the categorization and merged altruism and courtesy. They named it as helping behaviour since "helping behaviour is the broadest and most complex construct and is also the one with the deepest roots in the research literature" (Podsakoff, Ahearne and MazKenzie, 1997).

Based on Organ's (1988) work Van Dyne et al. (1994) "reconceptualised OCBs in terms of civic citizenship" and proposed five factors of OCBs: obedience, loyalty, social participation, inspiring participation, and functional participation (Yoon, 2012).

Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) proposed a two-dimensional model of OCB: altruism and general compliance. Altruism has been defined as being cooperative, helpful, and other instances of extra-role behaviour. Compliance, on the other hand, has been defined as behaviour that employees must demonstrate like arriving to work on time, not taking too many coffee breaks, taking only the required lunch time, or not leaving early etc.

Through various explanations of OCB, it can be understood that OCB, as a whole, is a multidimensional construct that is composed of several different but correlated categories. The extra role behaviours displayed by an employee for the growth, sustenance and well being of the organisation are not mentioned in any code book as rules of the organisation. These are different dimensions that motivate employees to perform extra role behaviours voluntarily. Research has proved that these extra role behaviours, which are in the interest of the organisation and a must, beyond the prescribed duties and responsibilities, are themselves influenced by several factors.

IV. SPORTSMANSHIP

The meaning of sportsmanship, as per Oxford dictionary is that it is a fair and generous behaviour or treatment of others. According to Organ (1988), sportsmanship is a willingness on the part of an employee to tolerate less than ideal circumstances without "complaining, railing against real or imagined slights, and making federal cases out of small potatoes" (p. 11) and was defined by him as "the behaviour of warmly tolerating the irritations that are an unavoidable part of nearly every organization". It is one of the five dimensions classified by Organ (1988) and is explained as behaviour displayed by employees by tolerating any inconvenience and not complaining about it. "Good sports" are people who do not complain or raise petty grievances when others inconvenience them. They tend to maintain positive attitude even when things do not turn up as desired by them, they happily sacrifice their personal interest for the sake of others and don't take rejection of their suggestions in bad spirit. According to Podsakoff, Ahearne and MacKenzie (1997) "sportsmanship is expected to be positively related to work group performance". If the employees are ready to accept changes that may occur in due course of time with positive spirit, it may be beneficial for the organisation and as a consequence of it; the managers may be able to devote quality time in more productive assignments (Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie, 1997).

V. EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Of late, Emotional intelligence (EI) has emerged as a promising subject matter for research with numerous studies devoted to the concept. The studies examined the effect of EI on organizational effectiveness (Abraham, 1999; Druskat and Wolff, 2001; Nikolaou and Tsaousis, 2002; Wong and Law, 2002; Weinberger, 2003) as well as the non-task related behaviours of employees (Cote and Miners, 2006; Cartwright and Pappas, 2008).

Emotional Intelligence is the ability to understand self and others. It was first explained by Salovey and Mayer (1990) "the ability to monitor one's own and others' emotions, to discriminate among them, and use the information to guide one's thinking and actions." They conceptualised emotional intelligence in terms of three categories of adaptive abilities: appraisal and expression of emotion, regulation of emotions and utilisation of emotions in solving problems. They (Mayer and Salovey, 1997) further revised the model in terms of potential for intellectual and emotional growth and provided four components: perception, appraisal and expression of emotion; emotional facilitation of thinking; understanding, analysing and employing emotional knowledge; and reflective regulation of emotions to further emotional and intellectual growth (Schlechter, 2005).

Daniel Goleman in the year 1995 in his book, Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ defines emotional intelligence as the "abilities such as being able to motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to control impulse and delay gratification; to regulate one's moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to empathize and to hope."

Later Goleman (1998) explained EI consisting of five components, each with a number of associated competencies; viz; Self Awareness, Self-regulation, Motivation, Empathy and Social skills.

- Self-awareness: Where the person is aware of his own emotions and knows how to manage them.
- Self-regulation: It signifies self control where the person is aware of consequences of his actions and hence practices control over them.
- Motivation: It is related to achievement drive and optimism.
- Empathy: It is related to the ability to understand others and their problems.
- Social skills: It is related to influence, communication, and team capabilities.

Goleman, Boyazis and McKee (2002) in a further conceptualisation of emotional intelligence distinguish between four fundamental areas of emotional intelligence that can be split up in:

personal competence, which consists of two emotional domains namely; a) self-awareness

and b.) self-management; and c.) social competence, which encompasses social awareness and d.) relationship management. Each of these four domains is once again made up of different associated competencies (Schlechter, 2005).

Research has shown that EI plays a very important role in modern organisations. According to Welch (2003), EI enables teams to boost their performance and that EI in teams is a significant factor (Modassir, Singh, 2008). However, according to Welch (2003) in addition to it, trust also has an important role to play. Trust is the foundation of teamwork; it allows people to examine where they can improve without becoming self-critical or defensive. (Modassir and Singh 2008)

VI. TRAIT EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Emotions play a very important role in organisational context. Fleming et al in their article say that after spending twenty years of research in neuroscience and behavioural economics, they established that people base their decisions on complicated mixture of emotion and reason. Past researches have proved that human relations are affected more by emotional factors than by rational factors and hence study of EI has gained acceptance and importance.

Being emotionally intelligent is necessary in the organisational context because it helps having a sound understanding of self and others. EI has been further categorised into two types: Trait EI and Ability EI.

Both Trait and Ability EI can be distinguished on the basis of measurement methods adopted for these both constructs (Furnham & Petrides, 2003). Trait EI (emotional self-efficacy) is measured through self report questionnaire (Furnham & Petrides, 2003); while ability EI (or cognitive-emotional ability) is measured through maximum performance tests, that is, tests comprising items that may be answered correctly or incorrectly (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Research has proved that employees with high trait EI have the inherent quality to deal with the negative events that may occur in their professional lives, in organisations and hence is termed as emotional self-efficacy. According to Furnham & Petrides, (2003) trait EI like ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings etc may promote helping behaviour and other citizenship behaviours since it allows employees to understand the feelings of their peer group as well as superiors (Salami, 2009). Employees with high trait EI are capable of judging the situation, processing the information and adopting adequate coping strategy to prevent any non OCB behaviour from occurring.

VII. TRAIT EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AS MODERATOR

With the ability to manage emotions, understanding self and others, remain motivated, it has been found by Mikolajczak, Petrides, Luminet and Coumans (2007) that people who possess high trait EI do not get disturbed by unfavourable events, are able to deal with them competently as compared to people with low trait EI. In a study on nurses, it was found that nurses with high trait EI suffered less burnout (Mikolajczak, Menil & Luminet, 2007; Mikolajczak, Petrides, Luminet & Coumans, 2007; Mikolajczak, Roy, Luminet, Fillee & de Timary, 2007). In this study, trait EI is expected to moderate the relationship between trust in leader and sportsmanship behaviour of OCB.

The paper attempts to seek answer to the question if trait EI has a moderating effect on sportsmanship behaviour of employees and trust in leadership, i.e. if an employee encounters some negative event in the organisation, and he does not get adequate support from the leader, will the sportsmanship behaviour and trust in leader be affected or not, if the employee possesses high trait EI compared to those who possess low trait EI. Hence, does Trait Emotional Intelligence of the employees has a role in their sportsmanship behaviour? And if trust in leader has a positive impact on the sportsmanship behaviour of employees. (Dyne, 1994).

Hence the hypothesis:

H2: Sportsmanship behaviour and EI of employees are

positively related.

H3: EI will mediate the relationship between

sportsmanship behaviour and trust in leadership.

VIII. METHOD

Instruments

The 24-item Organizational Citizenship Behavior scale devised by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) was used to measure the five dimensions of OCB of the employees by themselves. The 5 dimensions of OCB scale consisted of conscientiousness (5 items), sportsmanship (5 items), civic

virtue (4 items), Courtesy (5 items), and Altruism (5 items).

The 5-item Trust in Leader scale devised by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) was used to measure the trust in leadership by the subordinates. The Trust in Leader scale consisted of 5 items.

The 16-item Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS) developed by Wong, Law, and Wong (2004) on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was used to measure the Trait emotional intelligence EI of subordinates. The WLEIS has 4 subscales with 4 items each: Self-emotions appraisal, Use of emotions, Regulation of emotions, Others' emotions appraisal, however, in this study it was used as a unidimensional scale. Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS) can be used as a multidimensional or unidimensional scale (Salami, 2009).

The 23-item Transformational Leadership scale devised by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) was used to measure the six dimensions of Transformational Leadership by the subordinates. The 6 dimensions of Transformational Leadership scale consisted of Articulating Vision (5 items), Provide Appropriate Model (3 items), Foster Acceptance of Goals (4 items), High Performance Expectations (3 items), Individualised Support (4 items), and Intellectual Stimulation (4 items).

Sample

Karambayya (1989) studied the OCB of members of a unit in 18 work groups, from 12 different organizations (Podsakoff, Ahearne and MazKenzie, 1997). Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994) proposed new measurement of OCB in which they collected data from 950 employees who were working in diverse organisational and occupational contexts and hence they claimed that it supported the construct validity of measurement of OCB proposed by them (Dyne et al. 1994). Similarly, in this study, the data was collected from different organisations and diverse occupational streams (749) from doctors, nurses, insurance sales personnel, teachers, managers in banks, employees working in malls, employees in retail shops, police personnel and officers and staff in various capacities. The respondents belonged to both public and private sectors.

800 questionnaires were distributed in which 749 filled in questionnaires were received back; giving it a response rate of 93.62%. The survey questionnaire forms were distributed amongst the above mentioned randomly selected target population. The questionnaire clearly mentioned that the data is being collected only for the purpose of academic research and enhance our

understanding on the concepts like organisational citizenship behaviour and transformational leadership and the names of respondents would never be disclosed.

The responses were then computed in SPSS software to generate results. The missing variables were filled in by taking average in the SPSS software. Total 504 male 67.3 percent and 245 females 32.7 percent were included in the study. 54.6 percent of respondents belonged to the age bracket of 23-30 years followed by age brackets upto 70 years. Overall, 50.1 percent of respondents were graduate, 54.5 percent of respondents had experience upto five years followed by experience more than 20 years. 47.8 percent respondents had salary upto 30 thousand followed by salary above 1 lakh per month. 43.4 percent respondents were in mid managerial level, 27.4 non managerial, junior managerial 18.2 percent and 11.1 percent belonged to top management. 57.8 percent private sector and 42.1 percent public sector employees were covered, 25.1 percent belonged to unionised group, 74.9 percent were not member of any union. 46.5 percent belonged to category of 0-100 employees, 22.6 percent belonged to organisation with 100-500 employees, 10.7 percent respondents belonged to organisations with 500-100 employees and 20.3 percent respondents belonged to organisations having employee strength above 1000 employees.

Unlike most OCB researches undertaken and like the work of Wayne and Green (1993), in which they studied the effect of Leader Member Exchange on OCB from the employees' point of view rather than from the leader's perspective, work of Podsakoff, Ahearne and MazKenzie, 1997, in which they studied the OCB responses received from work group members themselves rather than from their supervisors, this study has also attempted to take the employees point of view in terms of trust in leader as well as OCB with moderating effect of emotional intelligence of employees. The research has been built on studies of Wayne and Green's and of Podsakoff, Ahearne and MacKenzie, by examining the relationship between leadership and the consequences of OCB, with the member as the source and mediating role of emotional intelligence of members. In this study the OCB measures have been examined from the employees' perspective with special reference to trust in leader and its impact on sportsmanship behaviour of employees, where emotional intelligence of the employees was examined as a mediator.

That positive OCBs lead to positive organisational outcomes has been proved by numerous studies undertaken on the subject. Wayne and Green (1993) suggested the relationship between leader member exchange (LMX) and employee citizenship behaviour, with special reference to altruism. According to Karambayya (1989), since OCBs show the degrees of interdependency among an organization's employees, they are quite closely related to the life of the organization (Truikenbrodt, 2000). Podsakoff et al. (2000) and Ilies et al. (2007) suggested that, from a long-term viewpoint, OCBs positively affect organizational outcomes (Salami,

2009). Key findings reveal that trust in leader has a positive impact on sportsmanship behaviour of employees and emotional intelligence of employees play a mediating role in maintaining the sportsmanship behaviour and trust in leader in employees, although, there are other contributory factors too.

Analytical Procedure

Multiple regression analysis technique was used to predict the variability of the dependent variable based on its covariance with all the independent variables. This study examined if sportsmanship behaviour can be influenced if the follower has trust in leader with the moderating role of trait EI. It was found that trust in leader influenced sportsmanship behaviour of employees which is consistent with the findings of Podaskoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) regarding trust in leader. According to Podaskoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990), "trust made an important contribution to the overall fit of the model and should not be omitted". In the same study it was found that trust in leader significantly influenced the sportsmanship behaviour of employees, with trait EI as a moderator.

IX. RESULTS

The psychometric properties of scale has been explained by Podaskoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990), Moorman (1991). Both studies found support for a five dimension model of citizenship and reported reliabilities over .70 for each dimension.

In this study the reported Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients are .832 for 5 dimensions of OCB (whole scale) and .832 for sportsmanship alone; .907 for Transformational leadership (whole scale) and trust in leader and .888 for trust in leader alone; .889 for Emotional Intelligence (whole scale). WLEIS was used as a one dimensional scale in this study. All the scales proved to be highly reliable. Further, post calculation of reliabilities of scales, stepwise multiple regression analysis was done to measure impact of trust in leader on sportsmanship behaviour of employees. Finally, the mediating role of trait emotional intelligence was calculated.

For the purpose of study, OCB sportsmanship behaviour was taken as dependent variable and various dimensions of transformational leadership like Articulated Vision, High Performace Expectations, Individualised Support, and Intellectual Stimulation and Trust in Leader, as independent variables. Other dimensions of transformational leadership were not taken into consideration due to their relatively less reliability scores. Data was analysed with the help of SPSS. From the regression results, calculated at 95% confidence interval, it became evident that there is a relatively higher degree of correlation between trust in leader with OCB sportsmanship compared to other independent variables. However, the values of R^2 were relatively low which indicates trust in leader does not have much impact on sportsmanship behaviour. Hence, Hypothesis 1 which speaks about relationship between trust in leader and sportsmanship behaviour is not supported. Other variables were excluded by SPSS package, may be due to less significant values.

Regression table

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.543[a]	.295	.294	.75873

To further improve the significance of the model, Trait Emotional Intelligence (EI) of the followers was introduced as moderator, as suggested by Barron and Kenny (1986). It was attempted to understand the impact of different levels of EI on the relationship between trust in leader and OCB Sportsmanship behaviour. After introducing EI as moderator, R^2 value slightly increased which means EI of followers have an impact on their sportsmanship behaviour and trust in leader. Hence, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Correlations

		Zscore(OCB_SP)	Zscore(TinL)
Pearson Correlation	Zscore(OCB_SP)	1.000	.543
	Zscore(TinL)	.543	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Zscore(OCB_SP)	.	.000
	Zscore(TinL)	.000	.
N	Zscore(OCB_SP)	749	749
	Zscore(TinL)	749	749

Regression Table

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.606[a]	.367	.365	.79659892
2	.614[b]	.377	.375	.79059073

The results further reveal a positive relation between EI and sportsmanship behaviour, with a significant increase in the value of R2, hence Hypothesis 3 has been also been supported.

Age, experience and gender were used as control variables so that any influence of demographic factors on outcome variables may be ruled out because previous researchers have proved that they exert some influence on OCB (Salami, 2007, 2008; Zellars, Tepper & Duffy, 2002).

X. DISCUSSION

Past research, to a great extent, focus on key behaviours of employees and leaders that are in the interest of the organisation, where employees exhibit behaviours over and above the norms, for the growth and sustenance of the organisation. Though, Podsakoff, et al, 1990 in their study on Transformational Leadership have attempted to find the correlation and covariance amongst various dimensions of OCB and Transformational Leadership, Job Satisfaction, Trust in Leader, etc, with analysing possibly all the permutations and combinations of six dimensions of TL, Trust in Leader, Job Satisfaction with five dimensions of OCB, not many studies have been undertaken to study the effect of a single factor of OCB or Transformational Leadership on each other. The paper attempts to study the single dimension of Trust in Leader (Podaskoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter, 1990) and its impact on one of the five dimensions of OCB; viz. Sportsmanship. Further, it has been proved through past researches that Emotional Intelligence (EI) has a moderating effect and plays an important role in maintaining positive OCB. Hence, moderating role of EI has been studied in this work.

Past researches have undertaken the work on EI of the leader and its impact on productivity of employees. In this research, attempt has been made to find the moderating impact of EI, if employees are themselves emotionally intelligent. Past researches have taken dyads of managers and subordinates to study the impact of transformational leaders if the leader is emotionally intelligent. In this study, the focus has been to study the impact, if employees are themselves emotionally intelligent, what they think about their leader and their response towards their own OCB. Hence, dyads of managers and subordinates have not been taken; rather, responses of employees have been recorded who have been working in various capacities in varied streams. Like the work of Wayne and Green (1993) in which they studied the effect of Leader Member

Exchange on OCB from the employees' point of view rather than from the leader's perspective (Truikenbrodt, 2000), this study has also attempted to take the employees point of view in terms of trust in leader as well as sportsmanship behaviour of OCB with moderating effect of emotional intelligence of employees.

Karambayya (1989) studied the OCB of members of a unit in 18 work groups, from 12 different organizations (Podsakoff, Ahearne and MazKenzie, 1997). Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994) proposed new measurement of OCB in which they collected data from 950 employees who were working in diverse organisational and occupational contexts and hence they claimed that it supported the construct validity of measurement of OCB proposed by them. In this study, employees from both public and private sector were covered from ten different organisations possessing varied occupational streams.

The results show that trust is leader is not significantly related to sportsmanship behaviour of employees. However, the mediating role of emotional intelligence of followers was found to have a significant role in enhancing the sportsmanship behaviour of employees as well as maintain trust in leader. Hence, emotional intelligence plays an important role in professional life; since an emotionally intelligent employee will be able to manage his/her relationships well, empathise as well as maintain sportsmanship behaviour during tumultuous situations and will not lose trust in their leaders rather will be able to understand their perspective.

XI. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study demonstrates the importance of emotional intelligence and sportsmanship behaviour amongst employees. It explains that an emotionally intelligent employee can effectively manage stressful situations, irritants that are common in nearly every organisation (Organ, 1988), without losing trust in their leader. Hence, the study can be beneficial for organisations in terms of hiring their prospective emotionally intelligent employees, organising workshops for enhancing emotional intelligence of existing employees as well as leaders, art of coping with stress etc. Therefore, this may help organisations achieve the desired outcomes for their growth and sustenance.

XII. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study helps understanding role of sportsmanship behaviour and emotional intelligence in organisations. Though the study was conducted on a fairly large group of employed personnel, however, it might lag behind in certain areas like the perspective of leaders was not taken into account. Hence future studies may take this research forward with taking the leader's perspective also into account and have a comparative analysis of employees understanding of their sportsmanship behaviour with their leaders understanding about them in the same context. Similarly emotional intelligence of leaders may also be taken into consideration.

REFERENCES

[1] Abraham, R. (1999). Emotional intelligence in organizations: A conceptualization. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology, 125*, 209-215.

[2] Appelbaum, S., Bartolomucci, N., Beaumier, E., Boulanger, J., Corrigan, R., Dore, I., Girard, C., & Serroni, C. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior: A case study of culture, leadership and trust. Management Decision, 42(1), 13-40.

[3] Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, *23*(3), 267-285.

[4] Avolio, B. & Bass, B. (1988). Transformational leadership, charisma and beyond. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. P. Dachler & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 29-49). Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

[5] Barron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychology research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical consideration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173-1182.

[6] Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Goodheim, L. (1987). Biography and the assessment of transformational leadership at the world-class level. *Journal of management*, *13*(1), 7 19.

[7] Bennis, W. G. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. Cambridge: Harper & Row.

[8] Boal, K. B. & Bryson, J. M. (1988). Charismatic leadership: A phenomenological and structural approach. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. Dachler & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 11-28). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

[9] Boon, S. D. & Holmes, J. G. (1991). The dynamics of interpersonal trust: Resolving uncertainty in the face of risk. In R. A. Hinde & J. Groebel (Eds.), *Cooperation and pro-social behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Cartwright and Pappas, 2008.

[10] Cartwright, S., & Pappas, C. (2008). Emotional intelligence, its measurement and implications for the workplace. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *10*(2), 149-171.

[11] Colquitt, Jason A, Conlon, Donald E., Wesson, Michael J, Porter, Chritopher O.L.H and Ng, K. Yee (2001). Justice at the Millennium: A Meta Analytic Review of 25 years of Justice Research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, (3), 425-445.

[12] Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review, 12*, 637- 647.

[13] Cote, S., & Miners, C. T. (2006). Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *51*(1), 1-28.

[14] Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice.

[15] Druskat, V.U., & Wolff, S.B. (2001). Building the emotional intelligence of groups. Harvard Business Review, 79(3), 80-90.

[16] Engelbrecht, A. S. & Cloete, B. E. (2000). An analysis of a supervisor-subordinate trust relationship. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 26*(1), 24-28.

[17] Fleming, John H, Coffman, Curt & Harter, James K. (2006). *On the High Performance Organisation.* Boston, Harvard Business Review, pp. 117.

[18] Folger, R. G., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management,* (Vol. 7). Sage.

[19] Furnham, A., & Petrides, K.. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence and happiness. *Social Behaviour and Personality*; 31 (8), 815-824.

[20] Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. London: Bloomsbury.

[21] Goleman, D. (1998). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review* (November-December), 94-102.

[22] Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

[23] Graham, J. W. (1988). Commentary: Transformational leadership: Fostering follower autonomy, not automatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. Dachler & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 73-79). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

[24] House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership the cutting edge*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

[25] House, R.J., Spangler, W.D., and Woycke, J. (1989). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leadership effectiveness. Working paper, Wharton Business School, University of Pennsylvania. Cited in Podsakoff, P., & MacKenzie, S. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. Human Performance, 10(2), 133-152.

[26] Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. J. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 43,* 243-269.

[27] Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: a meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(1), 269-277.

[28] Jung, H. S., & Yoon, H. H. (2012). The effects of emotional intelligence on counterproductive work behaviors and organizational citizen behaviors among food and beverage employees in a deluxe hotel. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *31*(2), 369-378.

[29] Karambayya, R. (1989). Contexts for organizational citizenship behavior: Do high performing and satisfying units have better "citizens"? Working paper, York University, North York, Ontario.

[30] Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley & Sons.

[31] Katz, D. (1964). Motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science, 9*, 131-146.

[32] Konovsky, M. A. & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(3), 656-669.

[33] Kouzes, M. A. & Posner, B. Z. (1990). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. London: Jossey-Bass.

[34] Kumar, M., Jauhari, H., & Singh, S. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior & employee well-being. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, *51*(4), 594-608.

[35] Mayer, J. D. & Salovey, P. (1995). Emotional intelligence and the construction and regulation of feelings. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 4*, 197-208.

[36] Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey, & D. Sluyter (Eds.), Emotional development and emotional intelligence: educational implications (pp. 3–31). New York: Basic Books.

[37] Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H. & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*, 709-734.

[38] McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(1).

[39] McShane, S.L. & von Glinow, M.A. (2000). *Organisational behaviour*. (pp. 412-416). Boston: McGraw Hill.

[40] Mikolajczak, M. Roy, E. Luminet, O., Fillee, C. & de Timary, P. (2007). The moderating impact of emotional intelligence on free cortisol responses to stress. *Pyschoneuroendocrinology,* 32, 1000-1012.

[41] Mikolajczak, M., Menil, C. & Luminet, O. (2007). Explaining the protective effect of trait emotional intelligence regarding occupational stress. Exploration of emotional labour process. *Journal of Research in Personality.* 14, 1107 – 1117

[42] Mikolajczak, M., Petrides, K.V., Luminet, O. & Coumans, N. (2007). An experimental investigation of the moderating effect of trait emotional intelligence on laboratory induced stress.

[43] 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.

[44] Moorman, R. (1991). Relationship between organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness, perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 76, 845-855.

[45] Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The leadership quarterly*, *1*(2), 107-142.

[46] Nicholls, J. (1994). The heart, head and hands of transforming leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 15*(6), 8-15.

[47] Nikolaou, I., & Tsaousis, I. (2002). Emotional intelligence in the workplace: Exploring its effects on occupational stress and organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *10*(4), 327-342.

[48] Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

[49] Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its construct clean up time. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 85-97.

[50] Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M. & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006), Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

[51] Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, *82*(2), 262-269.

[52] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The leadership quarterly*, *1*(2), 107-142.

[53] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 513-563.

[54] Podsakoff, P., & MacKenzie, S. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 133-152.

[55] Rousseau, D.M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organisations. *Employees Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2, 121-139.

[56] Rousseau, S. B., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S. & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review* (July), 393-404.

[57] Salami, S. O. (2009). Conflict resolution strategies and organisational citizenship behaviour: the moderating role of trait emotional intelligence. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 5(2), 41-63.

[58] Salami, S.O. (2007). Moderating effect of trait EI on the relationship between emotional labour and organisational citizenship behaviour. *European Journal of Social Sciences* 5(2), 142-150.

[59] Salami, S.O. (2008). Impact of job satisfaction and organisational commitment on organisational citizenship behaviour: The moderating role of group cohesiveness. *Perspectivse in Education*, 24(1), 41-50.

[60] Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, cognition, and personality*, 9(3), 185-211.

[61] Schanke, M. (1991). Organizational citizenship: A review, proposed model and resource agenda. *Human Relations, 44*(7), 735-759.

[62] Schindler, P. L. & Thomas, C. C. (1993). The structure of interpersonal trust in the workplace. *Psychological Reports,* (October), 563-573.

[63] Schlechter, A. F. (2005). *The influence of transformational leadership, emotional intelligence, trust, meaning and intention to quit on organisational citizenship behaviour* (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch).

[64] Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W. & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedants. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*(4), 653-663.

[65] Spitzmuller, M., Van Dyne, L., & Ilies, R. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior: A review and extension of its nomological network. *The SAGE handbook of organizational behavior*, *1*, 106-123.

[66] Tan, H. H. & Tan, C. (2000). Toward the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organization. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs* (126), 241-260.

[67] Tichy, N. M. & Devanna, M. A. (1990). *The transformational leader*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

[68] Truckenbrodt, Y. B. (2000). The relationship between leader-member exchange and commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Acquisition Review Quarterly*, *7*(3), 233-244.

[69] Truckenbrodt, Y. B. (2001). An empirical assessment of the relationship between leader-member exchange and organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61,* 3657A. (UMI No. 9988008) cited in Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: a meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(1), 269-277.

[70] Van Dyne, Linn, Graham, Jill W., Dienesch, Richard M. (1994). Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: Construct Redifinition, Measurement, and Validation. Academy of Management Journal, 37(4) 765-802.

[71] Wayne, S. J., & Green, S. A. (1993). The effects of leader-member exchange on employee citizenship behavior and impression management behavior. *Human Relations, 46,* 1431–1440.

[72] Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 40,* 82–111.

[73] Weinberger, L. A. (2003). *An examination of the relationship between emotional intelligence, leadership style and perceived leadership effectiveness* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota).

[74] Welch, J. (2003). The best teams are emotionally literate. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 35* (4), 168-170.

[75] Williams,L.J, & Anderson,S.E, (1991). Job satisfactory and organisational commitment as predictors of organisational citizenship and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management,* 17, 601-617.

[76] Wong, C. S. & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly* (13), 243-274.

[77] Wong, C. S., Law, K. S., & Wong, P. M. (2004). Development and validation of a forced choice emotional intelligence for Chinese respondents in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21(4), 535-559.

[78] Yukl, G. A. (1989). *Leadership in organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[79] Yukl, G.A. (1989b). Managerial leadrship. A review of theory and research. Yearly Review of Management, 15, 251-289.

[80] Zellers, K. L., Tepper, B. J. & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(6), 1068-1076.