New Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employees' Efficiency in the Work Group: Emotional Work

Ph.D. Daniela Boţone

GJHSS Classification - C (FOR) 170102,170105,170107

***Abstract*-Organizations are complex entities, in which employees work with their hands, associating to this type of work a various quantity of physical effort (manual work); the same employees working with their intellect (intellectual work), the intellectual effort ranging this time also, according to the specific job requirements. This specific activity can be easily assessed in terms of number, frequency, intensity, tasks repetition (job description) and in terms of psycho-physical and psycho-social abilities (job specification). Work in an organization takes a third form.; emotional work/emotional labor: emotional labor reflects the management of emotions. This happens through mental effort, sometimes consciously, sometimes not, and its purpose is the change of personal feelings or emotions, so that these are in accordance with the "emotional rules" established by the formal group's norms, having a higher or lower intensity, on a shorter or longer period, instantly or slowly. Identity confusion, socio-professional stress, professional dissatisfaction, organizational silence are just a few of the negative effects of emotional labor, respectively of the discrepancy between the required emotion and the emotion experienced in reality by the employees of a large number of organizations.**

Keywords-emotional work, organizational citizenship behavior, surface-acting, deep -acting, group

I. Introduction

According to the specialized literature from the field of organizational and economic psychology, the work group is defined as "two or more persons who interact and pursue common goals, have stable relationships, are to some extent interdependent and realize they are in fact part of the group" (Baron, Byrne, 2001).

The term of group is of Italian origin and derives from the terms "gruppo", "groppo", designating several painted or sculpted individuals that make up a subject and was first expressed in the paper „De arte graphica" published in 1668, translated by Du Fresnoy and made by R. de Piles.

The existence of work groups within the most diverse organizations is associated with going through several development stages, each involving several psycho-social processes. Thus, we have the following development stages of the work group and related to these, several psycho-social processes that characterize the stages. Therefore we can mention some of these processes: social categorization processes, stereotype and prejudice development, discriminatory behavior, in group and out group mechanisms, attribution mechanisms, in particular the effects of the fundamental attribution error, the process of individual perception and direct applications of the implicit personality theory, etc.

Thus, if for the initial stages of the work group development, respectively the stages of "formation" and "outbreak", the specific mechanisms of social categorization are the formation of stereotypes and prejudices and discriminating behaviors between employees, through the other stages of this work group, i.e. the "normalization" and "functioning", powerful mechanisms of ingroup and outgroup prevail, which result in the voluntary/involuntary blocking of communication channels, content distortion of written and oral messages between employees and a very high frequency of fundamental attribution errors between employees.

Other processes that "color" the existence of a work group as early as the first hours of operation (of the work group) are two typical forms of organizational behavior, respectively organizational citizenship behavior and emotional work performed by employees. The study of these organizational behaviors is the subject of intense concern for organizations' managers in identifying new methods and techniques to go deeply into the problems of efficiency and organizational performance.

How effective can people become in an organization, which are the factors that contribute directly to their job efficiency, how can they become better professionals where financial resources are sometimes a problem for the organization's management? How willing are employees to provide an effective organizational behavior (expressed as altruism towards colleagues, loyalty to the organization, desire of professional development), as the work performed does not always provide the expected emotional comfort.

According to the definition developed by American researcher Dennis Organ, organizational citizenship behavior is "individual behavior that is voluntary, without being directly or explicitly rewarded by the formal reward system, and, overall, sustains the efficient functioning of the organization" (D. Organ, 1988, 32).

Since it is voluntary, this type of behavior is not an express requirement of the job specifications, such as the highly specific conditions of the contract between employee and organization, this behavior is rather a matter of personal choice, and therefore his absence is not generally considered punishable.

The term is also known as the good soldier syndrome being considered by D. Organ and his colleagues as an alternative

About-[1]Assistant Professor, Lucian Blaga" University, Sibiu(e-mail; danielapaler@yahoo.com)

form of professional performance; furthermore, they argued that the low correlation between job satisfaction and professional performance is due to the meaning given to performance, generally defined by the quantity of output (products, services performed by employees), although some authors claim the existence of cultural differences in the structure of organizational citizenship behavior, even within the same culture, the study of P. Podsakoff (2000) proves that all these can be organized around seven dimensions: altruism, fair play, organizational loyalty, organizational conformism, individual initiative, citizenship and personal development.

In the public evaluation of the alternative form of professional performance there is a great deal of subjectivism, as the criteria are variable. However, a correct and more objective evaluation depends on the degree of information and education of the person who conducts the evaluation.

In the research conducted so far on this type of behavior, American researcher Vanessa Chaves (2001) has identified among the predictors of organizational citizenship behavior, individual professional satisfaction, conscientiousness and the level of career development. In addition, in this study it was proven that the work status influences the development of organizational citizenship behavior.

In a study conducted on 257 employees, Christina Stamper (2001) found that part-time employees express and display a lower level of organizational citizenship behavior than full-time employees; the researcher identifies a moderating variable that occurred in this study, organizational culture. In this study was formulated and confirmed the hypothesis that the type of organizational culture, respectively a participatory organizational culture will determine a high level of organizational citizenship behavior among employees of the institution.

John Warren Wilson identifies in a comprehensive study made in 2001 in several American companies, individual political behavior in the organizational environment and employee perceptions regarding the policies of the organization, as significant factors in the emergence of organizational citizenship behavior.

Self-perceived discrimination by employees at work (E. Ensher and J. Steward Donaldson, 2001) is strongly correlated with professional obligations, professional satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior in the case of 366 employees with the average age of 43 years (including workers, team leaders and workshop superintendents) in an oil equipment factory.

Counterproductive work behavior and its relationship with organizational citizenship behavior was presented in an illustrative study conducted by researchers Paul E. Spector and Suzy Fox (2002), in the paper "An emotion - centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior". The authors have characterized counterproductive work behavior (CWB) as a form of aggression and sabotage intended to negatively affect the organization as a system and its employees; in this approach organizational citizenship behavior is viewed as a pro-social behavior intended to help the organization and its members. In this paper the authors introduce a new model - "the CWB- OCB emotion model" - which considers organizational behavior as "a result, outcome of interactions between individuals (potentiated with a certain level and capacity of emotions display and expression) and the organizational environment in which it operates" (Paul E. Spector and Suzy Fox (2002). This model includes the following dimensions: counterproductive work behavior (CWB); organizational citizenship behavior (OCB); the perception of control; personality; negative emotion; positive emotion; evaluation/interpretation; organizational environment.

The above-mentioned American researchers support the idea that negative emotion causes an increased level of CWB, while positive emotion will increase the level of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). CWB is associated with the following characteristics of personality: anxiety, locus of control and delinquency. The OCB is associated with empathy and the perceived ability of the subject to help others. The management of emotion occurrence conditions can help us to better control the voluntary behavior of workers in order to increase both their and the organization's level of well-being.

II. The role of emotions in organizational behavior

Pre-eminently, the individual is an emotional being; emotions are the most important resources of the individual and are also displayed at the workplace; emotions can be educated, and the benefits obtained from this process are enormous for the personal efficiency but also for the organizational efficiency.

Recognizing the existing emotions within organizations is essential. Organizations that are interested in maintaining a "healthy emotional environment" will cause less suffering and will obtain more efficiency and a more productive behavior – states American management professor Neal M. Ashkanasy (2003). Of course, we cannot talk about an ideal type of perfectly healthy emotional environment within organizations, with a complete absence of stressors; this would be impossible and, as Hans Selye stated, "complete freedom from stress means death to the individual". Therefore, there will always be a certain amount of stressors (except for the professions that through their content of tasks and preparation of employees involve a great deal of social and professional eustress and distress, risk and responsibility, that will affect both in a favorable way the employee's behavior (eustress reactions), and in an unfavorable way (distress reactions). The important thing is how the intensity, frequency and type of stressors are managed both at the individual's (employee's) level, and also at an organizational level, through specific actions of the decision factors. For this purpose, organizations should maintain, support the value of a "constructive emotional culture, which in turn may create an organizational behavior that will directly contribute to the health of the employees" (N. M. Ashkanasy, 2003).

Organizations are complex entities, in which employees work with their hands, associating to this type of work a various quantity of physical effort (manual work); the same employees working with their intellect (intellectual work), the intellectual effort ranging this time also, according to the specific job requirements. This specific activity can be easily assessed in terms of number, frequency, intensity, tasks repetition (job description) and in terms of psycho-physical and psycho-social abilities (job specification).

Work in an organization takes a third form, i.e. emotional work/emotional labor (Septimiu Chelcea, 2008). The term "emotional work" has been described for the first time in psycho-sociology in 1979 by Arlie Russell Hochschild and has been synthesized in the paper The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling, 1983. According to the author, emotional labor reflects the management of emotions. This happens through mental effort, sometimes consciously, sometimes not, and its purpose is the change of personal feelings or emotions, so that these are in accordance with the "emotional rules" established by the formal group's norms, having a higher or lower intensity, on a shorter or longer period, instantly or slowly. Identity confusion, socio-professional stress, professional dissatisfaction, organizational silence are just a few of the negative effects of emotional labor, respectively of the discrepancy between the required emotion and the emotion experienced in reality by the employees of a large number of organizations. Thus, we can differentiate professions according to the intensity of emotional labor that must be displayed; thus, the professions that require the obligation to express the feeling of hospitality are professions with intensive emotional labor because the word hospitality combines images of kindness and smile.

J. G. Van Maanen and G. Kunda (1989) (after, Chelcea, 2008), assert that the approach of emotion as a state is more likely a question of context and it depends on each employee's style to emotionally adjust to a particular context; consequently emotion can be controlled and "played" by each individual as one knows, can or is required by the job's specifications. In this context, emotion becomes instrumental.

Currently, it is estimated that half of the jobs impose emotional labor and three quarters of the women's jobs require the management of emotions. Characteristic for women are the situations of flight attendants and policewomen: the firs must control their emotions, to express positive emotions in every situation, even in the case of imminent danger, and on duty policewomen mustn't express any emotion. (S. Chelcea, 2008). Arlie Hochschild (1983) refers to the trust of the employee in the morality of the emotional game. When an employee considers that he/she conforms "willingly" to a certain emotional game imposed by the task, he/she remains faithful to the emotional rules (for example, to appear sad when it is required by the situation), the game is interiorized and becomes a part of the employee's mind; in this situation the employee understands the emotional game, he/she identifies with it, expresses and follows it. To follow the emotional game in an "unwillingly" is another form of emotional labor but the employee does this, being forced by the specific regulation of the profession or by the superior's requirements; in this situation, the employee does not understand the purpose of his behavior, does not share the same objective and is inclined to outrun the objectives of his work, sometimes resorting to cynicism.

According to the theoretical approaches, the conceptualizations of "emotional labor" can be classified into three categories: in the first category fall those theories which conceive emotional labor as an emotional state which originates in social, organizational norms and requirements; in the second category fall those theories which suggest that emotional labor consists of assumed behaviors, to coordinate and control an explicit or implicit emotional state; the third group of theories explains the emotional labor through a close relation between states, behavior, and/or situational factors. In this category also fall the conceptualizations of J. Morris and D. C. Feldman (1996, after, Chelcea, 2008), which defined emotional labor as an assembly of five situational factors (frequency, duration, variety and intensity of the emotional display) and a factor, individual state (emotional dissonance);

A recently appeared model in psycho-sociology is the model defined by Alicia Grandey (2003). She constructed a comprehensive model of the emotional labor in which the concept is more likely defined as an act than an emotional state, with situational factors and variable effect. Emotional labor is an emotional regulation process enacted by the response to the organizational rules, such as the interaction expectations in the field of services. Emotional regulation is used when the confrontation with the organizational requirements felt by the employees takes place and it can be acquired by surface acting and deep acting (after, A. Hochschild, 1983).

Analyzing the role of emotional dissonance in the prediction of the emotional labor, W. J. Zerbe (2002) distinguishes between "the degree of incongruity between felt and displayed or mimed emotions" and "the incongruity between displayed, expressed emotions and local, situational norms". Emotional dissonance should be viewed as a pure emotional state that occurs prior to the act of emotional labor, it is not a conflict between felt emotions and the objective organizational requests (written rules or instructions of the supervisor); emotional dissonance is rather the result of discrepancy between felt emotions and an employee's perceptions about the type of emotional display required by the situation (after, Goleman, 2007).

Thus, emotional labor is nothing but motivated, voluntary behavior, expressed by the employees of an institution, in their desire to reconcile their emotions, feelings, following the installation of emotional dissonance.

How often will it be required in the job description to be kind, to smile graciously? It remains to be seen!

The author of this study attempted to answer a part of this question through a practical study in hospitals, prisons, industrial organizations and organizations from the hotel industry, study that is in the process of being published in a specialized journal in Romania. The study was made by 310 employees; the results confirm the hypotesys that the level

of organizational citizenship behavior correlate with the type of emotional work; for this group, employees who made emotional work by deep-acting at work, had the level of organizational citizenship behavior higher than the employees who made emotional work by surface acting.

With great implications in the culture of each population, we are currently witnessing a real emotional culture, providing the emotional nuances specific to emotional labor performed by employees of organizations, institutions from different geographical areas. Management of emotions does not always cause alienation of the individual from his work, but only in the case of individuals who have an impulsive emotional orientation.

Taking into account the ability of individuals to react actively, to relate differently to a situation, thus leading to an economy of emotions and according to the sympathy theory developed by Candace Clark (1987) individuals do not automatically apply the norms of the emotional culture: they are actively engaged in exchanges of emotions with other individuals, from which they expect to obtain a profit. It leads to a "microeconomics" of emotions - we offer emotions and expect emotions in return: love for love, sympathy for sympathy etc. - but also to a "micro-politics" of emotions, given the fact that according to the social position, emotions are associated with emotional resources.

It might be a little bold to associate the term "economy of emotions" to a complex of emotions such as sympathy, because by showing sympathy to a person, we provide support for overcoming the critical situation, we encourage it, which represents a genuine pro-social behavior. (S. Chelcea, 2008).

Both in daily life and at work we are invaded by emotions. We start with the emotion of joy or feeling of happiness that we were accepted to a job interview, but what emotions shall we face in the next stages of our professional development? What emotions are we meant to experience? Analysis of mental demands of the new profession (from the field of public relations, customer relations, advertising, etc.) in the light of psycho-socio-cultural theories of emotions could suggest some ways of preventing alienation, socio-professional stress, cynicism, and organizational silence, in the case of emotional labor suppliers. Thus, identifying the role that emotions and emotional life play in the social and organizational behavior will contribute to the development of a more sensitive point of view regarding their impact on the workplace, emotions that arise not only in dramatic situations, but also in the daily tasks where they often go unnoticed and influence the professional performance of the employee.

III. Bibliography

1. Ashford, B.E. şi Humprey, R.S. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. Academy of Management Review, 18, 1, 88-115.
2. Ashford, B.E. şi Humprey R.S. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. Human Relations, 48, 2, 97-125.
3. Ashford, B. E. şi Tomiuk, M. A. (2000). Emotional labour and authenticity: Views from service agents. În S. Fineman (Ed.), Emotins in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
4. Ashkanasy, N.M., Hartel, C.E.J. şi Daus, C.S. (2002). Advances in organizational behavior: Diversity and emotions. Journal of Management, 28, 307-338.
5. Ashkanasy, N.M., Hartel, C.E.J. şi Zerbe, W.J. (2000). Emotions in the workplace: Research, theory, and practice. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
6. Barsade, S., Brief, A.P. şi Spataro, S.E. (2003). The affective revolution in organizational behavior.The emergence of a paradigm. În J. Greenberg (coord.). Organizational behavior: The state of the science (pp. 23- 83) Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.Briner, Roger. (1999). The neglect and importance of emotional work, Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8 , 3, 323-346.
7. Brotheridge, C.M. şi Lee, R. (1998). On dimensionality of emotional labor: Development and validation of an emotional labor scale (Comunicare prezentată la prima Conferinţă privind „Emoţii în viaţa organizaţională”, San Diego).
8. Brotheridge, C.M. şi Lee, R (2002). Testing a conservation of resources model of the dynamics of emotional labor. Journal of Occupational Health, 7, 1, 57-67.
9. Chaves, Wanda. (2001). An empirical analysis of the effect of work-related and value congruence on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Dissertation Abstract International: Section B, 62 , 584.
10. Chelcea, Septimiu (coord.) (2008). Ruşinea şi vinovăţia în spaţiul public. Pentru o sociologie a emoţiilor. Bucureşti: Editura Humanitas.
11. Cialdini, Robert. [1984](2004). Psihologia persuasiunii. Bucureşti: Editura Business
12. Tech. International Press (Influence. The Psychology of Persuasion. New York:
13. Quill William Morrow. Trad. rom. I. Enache). Clark, Candace (1987) Sympathy biography and sympathy margin. The American Journal of Sociology, 93, 2, 290-321.
14. Cropanzano, R., Weiss, H. M., Hale, J.M. ŞI Reb, J. (2003). The structure of affect: Reconsidering the relationship between negative and positive affectivity. Journal of Management, 29, 6, 831-857.
15. Dalton, Dan şi Cosier, Richard. (1988). Psychometric properties of the Organizational citizeshp Behavior scale. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
16. Eide, D. şi Lindberg, F., (1997). Exploring external interactions and consequences for knowing: A critical analysis of service firms. (Lucrare

prezentată la cea de-a 14-a Conferinţa Nordică de Afaceri Bodo.
17. Ehrhart, Mark. (2002). Leadership and justice climate as antecedents of unit-level
18. organizational citizenship behavior. Boston: McGraw –Hill.Ekman, Paul.(1972). Universals and culturals differences in the judgement of facial expressions of emotion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 284-291
19. Ekman, Paul şi Davidson, Richard J. (1995). The Nature of Emotion: Fundamental Questions. New York: Oxford University Press.
20. Ensher, Ellen. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior and grievances New York: Allyn and Bacon.
21. Farth, J. , Podsakoff, P. şi Organ, D. (1990). Accounting of Organizational Citizenship
22. Behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction, Journal of Management, 16, 45-56.
23. Fischbach, Andrea. (2007). Emotional labor from a work psychological perspective: the redefinition self-regulation model of emotional labor (RS Model). În Modern Psychological Research, trends and perspectives. Sibiu: Psihomedia, 13-26
24. Frijda, N. (1986). The Emotions, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
25. Goleman, Daniel. [1995](2001). Inteligenţa emoţională. Bucureşti: Editura Curtea Veche
26. Grandey, A. A. (2003). When the „Show must go on": Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. Academy of Management Journal, 46, 1, 86-96.
27. Guerrier, Y. (1999). Organizational behavior in hotels and restaurants: An international perspective. Chichester: Wiley.
28. Hartel, Charmine, Zerbe Wilfred si Ashkanasy. (2005) Emotions in organizational behavior, New Jersey: Laurence Erlbaum.
29. Heise, David R. (1977) Social action as the control of affect. Behavioral Science, 22, 163-177.
30. Heise, David R. (1979) Understading Events: Affect and the Constructions of Social Action. New York: Cambridge University Press.
31. Hochschild, Arlie Russell (1975) The sociology of emotions: Selected possibilities. În M. Millman şi R.M. Kanter (eds). Another Voice (pp. 280-307). Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
32. Hochschild, Arlie Russell (1979) Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. The American Journal of Sociology, 85, 3, 551-575.
33. Hochschild, Arlie Russell (1983) The Managed Heart. Commercialization of Human Feeling. Berkeley: University of California Press.
34. Johns, Gary. [1996](1998). Comportament organizaţional. Înţelegerea şi conducerea
35. oamenilor în procesul muncii. Bucureşti: Editura economică. (Organizational
36. Behavior. Understanding and Managing Life at Work, Fourth Edition. New
37. York: HarperCollins College Publisher. Trad. rom. Ioan Ursachi).
38. Katz, Renee, Johnson, Therese. (2006). When professionals weep: Emotional and
39. countertransference responses in end-oflife care. Philadelphia: PA, US Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
40. Kaufmann, Jean-Claude [2002](2007). Cum începe o poveste de dragoste. Bucureşti:
41. Humanitas. (Premier matin. Comment naît une histoire d'amour". Paris: Armand Colin. Trad. Dana Ligia Ilin)
42. Kemper, Theodore D. (2002) Predicting emotions in groups: some lessons from September 11. În J. Barbalet (ed). Emotions and Sociology (pp. 53-68). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
43. LeDoux, Joseph (1993). Emotional Memory Systems in the Brain. În Behavioral and Brain Research, 58.
44. Lopez, Steven, H. (2006). Emotional Labor and Organized Emotional Care. Work and Occupations. 33, 2, 133-160.
45. Lowery, Cristopher şi Beadles, N. (2002), Note on the relationships among job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship
46. behavior, Psychological Reports: Proost and Brandt Distrib.
47. Manstead, Antony S.R., Frijda, Nico H. şi Fischer, Agneta (2004) Feelings and Emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
48. Mann, S. (1999). Emotion at Work, European Journal of Work and Organizational
49. Psychology, 8, 347-369.
50. McCormick, Ernest. (1985). Industrial and OrganizationalPsychology, New Jersey:
    a. Prentice –Hall.
51. Podsakoff, Philip M, Ahearne, Michael, MacKenzie, Scott, B. (1997).Organizational
52. citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. Journal of Applied Psychology.Vol 82 (2): 262-270.
53. Podsakoff, Philip M, MacKenzie, Scott,B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship
54. behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. Human Performance. Vol 10 (2): 133-151.
55. Rafaeli, Anat şi Yavetz – Vilnai, Iris (2007). Emotion in service delivery. În Modern Psychological Research, trends and perspectives. Sibiu: Psihomedia, 27-33
56. Rime, B. şi Scherer K. (1989). Les Emotions, Neuchatel, Delachaux et Niestle.
57. Rosenberg, Morris (1990) Reflexivity and emotions. Social Psychology Quarterly, 53, 3-12.

58. Salovey, Peter şi Mayer D. John (1990). Emotional Intelligence în Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, vol. 9, 185-211.
59. Schachter, Stanley şi Singer, Jerome (1962) Cognitive, social and physiological determinants of emotional state. Psychological Review, 69, 379-399.
60. Scherer, K. et. al. (1986). Experiencing Emotion. A cross-Cultural Study. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
61. Semmer, N.K. (1996). Individual differences, work stress and health, Chichester,
62. Willey, 51-86 .
63. Smelser, Neil J. şi Baltes Paul B. (eds) (2001) International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences. Palo Alto: Elsevier Science Ltd.
64. Spector, Paul. (1986). Perceived control by employees: A meta-analysis of studies concerning autonomy and participation at work, Human relations, 39, 1005-1016
65. Spector Paul şi Fox, Suzy.(2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior
66. and organizational citizenship behavior, Human Resource Management Review, Elsevier Science/Pergamon, 12, 2, 269- 292.
67. Sturdy, A. şi Fleming, P. (2001). Talk as technique A critique of the words and deeds distinction in the diffusion of customer service cultures. Lucrare prezentă la Conferinţa a 17-a EGOS Colloquim, Lyon.
68. Tesser, A. (1993). The importance of heritability in psychological research: The case of attitudes. Psychological Review, 100, 129-142.
69. Turner, Jonathan H. şi Stets, Jean E. (2005) The Sociology of Emotions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
70. Turnipseed, D.L. şi Murkison, G. (2000). A bi-cultural comparison of organizational citizenship behavior: does OCB phenomenon transced national culture? International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 8, 2.
71. Zajonc, Robert B. (1998). Emotions. În D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, G. Lindzey (coord.), The handbook of social psychology. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 591-632.
72. Zapf, Dieter. (1999). Mobbing in Organisationen , Ueberlick zum Stand der Forschung, Zeitschrift fuer Arbeits, Organisationpsychologie, 43, 1-25