Positive Emotions Remediate the Communal and Exchange Relationships at the Workplace: An Empirical Investigation
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Abstract: Positive emotions are contagious in nature and hence, play an important role at the workplace. Two emotions, i.e., Companionate love and Joy, a positive emotion, have been taken for this research study as they significantly affect the relationships amongst the employees in the organization. An organization-public relationship consists of two types of relationships i.e.: communal and exchange. A communal relationship is a relationship in which employees help each other without expecting anything in return, but in the exchange relationship, they expect a return on their favours. This research study is based on the primary data employing a sample size of 108 employees from Delhi-NCR organisations. It was hypothesized that companionate love and joy have a significant positive association with communal relationships and exchange relationships. Structural equation modelling has been performed to analyze the data. Results depict that companionate love has a significant negative association with both communal and exchange relationships. On the contrary, joy revealed a significant positive association with communal and exchange relationships. The reason is love is comparatively an ‘others-driven emotion’, in which one person's emotions are dependent on others; love is a mixed emotion which can bring jealousy, possessiveness, dominance, and love. On the other side, joy is a ‘self-driven emotion’ in which a happy person is happy on his own, too. Joy is a positive emotion which brings happiness, pleasure and joviality. This research study contributes insights into Emotions at the workplace for human Resource Managers, Top Level Managers and Policymakers regarding the employee welfare schemes and mental well-being of the employees at the workplace.

Introduction

Love, an ardent emotion considered for its sentiments (Smahly, 2024; Cobbe, 2024; Fromm et al., 2024; Channing, 2024; Liu, 2024; Castelli, 2024; Harrison et al., 2011), which is felt by nearly everyone in the form of affection, care and compassion for others (Austen, 2024; Lazarus, 1991; Oatley et al., 1987; Finck, 2023; Zorin, 2023). It is considered as a mixed emotion as it can bring happiness (Zorin, 2023) and satisfaction to some (Austen, 2022; Hume, 2022; Finck, 2022) and suffering and pain to others; and it differs in its intensity, i.e., Companionate love and Romantic love (Hatfield et al., 1996; Lazarus, 1991; Sternberg, 1986). Companionate love exists among friends or colleagues; it can be achieved through cooperation and co-ordination, a feeling of mutual respect, trust, care and empathy towards each other. It is a mild but comfortable feeling (Hatfield et al., 1996; Hatfield et al., 1978; Kim et al., 2004). Moreover, romantic love is an intense feeling of sexual attraction towards each other; jealousy, despair, hurt and sacrifices for each other are the obvious elements (Wang et al., 1995). In this research study, only companionate love and joy have been considered to assess the impact of emotions on the organization-public relationships.

Joy is a feeling of happiness that is felt when one experiences a pleasant or cheerful situation. It consists of happiness, enthusiasm and excitement about something or somebody. The feeling of joviality is also experienced.
when a person receives good news or attends an exciting and happening event (Hartmann et al., 2021; Ilies et al., 2024; Ingram, 2024; Knight et al., 2024; Holm, 2023; Becker, 2023; Cojocaru, 2023; Whitby et al., 2023; Robinson, 2023; Oh and Pham, 2022; Alonso and O'Neill, 2022; Sawyer and Clair, 2022; Little et al., 2022; Cumming et al., 2022).

In the organization-public relationships, communal relationships and exchange relationships have been considered. Communal relationship is a type of relationship in which a person tries to give benefits to another party without any expectations of returns or any kind of favours (Ellis et al., 2023; Balkin and Werner, 2023; Saglam et al., 2022; Adams and Miller, 2022; Wallenburg and Handfield, 2022; Wang et al., 2022; Nguyen et al., 2022). On the other hand, an exchange relationship is a type of relationship in which a person makes an effort to benefit another party while expecting something in return in the future. This is more like an economic relationship (Lee et al., 2020; Bahadur et al., 2024; Muldoon et al., 2024; Akkermans et al., 2024; Santos et al., 2024; Paluch et al., 2024; Gunnarsson, 2024; Ahmad et al., 2023; Zhao and Detlor, 2023).

Generally, emotions are studied in the field of psychology and OPR is studied in the field of human resource management.

In this research, efforts have been made to assess the impact of emotions (companionate love and joy) on the organization's public relationships (communal relationship and exchange relationship) as it has a prominent effect on the mental health of the employees considering the organizational behaviour.

**Literature Review**

**Companionate love**

Despite its limited use in present-day management literature, psychologists have spent more than 50 years studying companionate love as a fundamental human emotion. Companionate love includes feelings of affection, care, compassion, and tenderness towards others. In contrast to passionate love, companionate love is a less intense emotion. It emphasizes connection and warmth rather than passion (Sternberg, 1986), and it arises when we form deep bonds with individuals who are closely connected to our lives.

In contrast to joy, happiness, and pride, which focus on the individual and autonomy, companionate love is characterized by a focus on others, empathy, and mutual dependence. From an evolutionary perspective, companionate love reinforces social connections, promoting dedication and interconnectedness. Our social environment influences this emotional connection, highlighting the importance of studying its effect on organizational culture, especially in terms of teamwork, within a professional environment.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported in 2011 that people spend significant time collaborating with others. Research by Shaver et al. (1987) found that companionate love has a noticeable impact on various aspects of life. Rynes et al. (2012) also highlighted the increasing focus on human connections in the field of positive organizational behavior. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect the presence of this fundamental human emotion in the workplace and its influence on work-related outcomes. Early 20th-century organizational researchers observed deep connections among workers, including elements of care, affection, and compassion that align with the concept of companionate love, even though a formal definition has not been established. Sanyal et al. (2018) highlight the significance of indigenous knowledge in their research on the usage of Kripa, illustrating that the exploration of community knowledge underscores the broader relevance of understanding communal relationships, which is also crucial in workplace dynamics, where positive emotions can play a pivotal role in enhancing both communal and exchange relationships, similar to how indigenous practices strengthen community bonds.

To establish a robust culture of companionate love, consider two colleagues collaborating closely, consistently showing affection, safeguarding each other's feelings, demonstrating tenderness and empathy during difficult periods, and providing assistance in both work-related and personal issues. A strong culture of companionate love also entails substantial emotional expression, including affection, care, compassion, and tenderness (Jackson, 1966).

In contrast, weak companionate love cultures exhibit minimal or no expressions of love, care, compassion, or tenderness among employees, indicating low intensity and consolidation. In societies with low levels of companionate love, individuals display a callous or indifferent attitude towards one another. They do not express or anticipate the positive emotions associated with companionate love during favorable circumstances, nor do they create space for addressing negative emotions in the workplace when things go wrong.

In addition, companionate love is similar to the affection felt between close friends (La Fuente, 2024; Flicker and Sancier-Barbosa, 2024; Granillo-Velasco et al., 2024; Nosrati et al., 2024; Gnaulati, 2023; Xia et al., 2023) and arises from a shared desire for closeness,
companionship, aligned values, long-term commitment, and intimacy (Hatfield et al., 1996; Sternberg, 1986; Rabung, 2022; Wang et al., 2022). In a professional setting, companionate love often manifests as mutual respect and appreciation (Kim et al., 2004). The primary function of companionate love is to cultivate positive relationships with others. Behavioral tendencies linked to companionate love include warmth, kindness, attentiveness, tolerance, security, care, comfort, respect and cooperative behavior (Hatfield et al., 1996; Lazarus, 1991).

Joy

Many authors discuss emotional culture as the prevailing behaviors, beliefs (O’Neill et al., 2017; Han et al., 2022; Mesquita, 2022; Salice and Salmela, 2022; Van Kleef and Côté, 2022) and assumptions that influence the expression or repression of specific emotions (Verbalyte and Ulinskaitė, 2024; Ilyas and Dawood, 2024; Turrell-Celente, 2024; Penić et al., 2024) and the perceived acceptance of exhibiting those feelings within a social group (Van Kleef and Côté, 2022; Salice and Salmela, 2022; Han et al., 2022; Mesquita, 2022). The discovery is consistent with previous research emphasizing happiness as the most commonly felt emotion and a fundamental representation of positive affect (Fredrickson, 2013; Shaver et al., 1987; Kimball and Willis, 2023; Hartmann et al., 2023; Prinzling et al., 2023). Joy, in contrast to contentment or satisfaction, is distinguished by heightened emotional arousal, promoting action and a longing for connection with others (Fredrickson et al., 1996; Russell, 1980), while contentment encourages a self-centred appreciation of present experiences (Frijda, 1986).

When individuals encounter pleasant stimuli or fortunate events, they often experience feelings of joy in safe conditions (Frijda, 1988). For example, joyful events, pleasant moments with friends, or hearing positive news can elicit a sense of joy (Ekman, 1992; Frijda, 1988).

Feelings of happiness at a personal level can merge to form a collective emotional environment of joy within a group, which is influenced by emotional contagion, empathy, socially constructed processes, and shared experiences (Hobfoll et al., 2018; Menges et al., 2015). This emotional culture of joy within a group encompasses behavioral norms, beliefs, and assumptions that dictate how joy, happiness, excitement, and enthusiasm are displayed or repressed. In groups with a strong emotional culture of joy, team members often convey their excitement through various methods, such as spoken words, facial expressions, body language, and tone of voice. Engaging in lighthearted activities and joyful interactions in the workplace contributes to the development of this emotional culture of joy. Smiling and expressing happiness during interactions are common in teams with a strong emotional culture of joy (Shaver et al., 1987). Joy at work has similarities with joviality and involves playfulness, teasing, and fun, and teams that value cheerful behavior tend to nurture a strong emotional culture of joy. Therefore, actions such as leaders' role modeling, team artefacts like visible team photos, and social events that demonstrate positive interactions among team members can elicit and sustain an emotional culture of joy.

Organization-Public Relationship

The field of public relations has seen widespread research into the organization-public relationship (OPR) and its various components, which are crucial for achieving desired outcomes in public relations (Zhao and Dettor, 2023). Hon et al. (1999) have identified four essential attributes - trust, commitment, satisfaction, and control mutuality - that should be present in such a relationship. Additionally, they have classified the relationship into communal and exchange categories. Numerous scholars have also studied the OPR and its underlying factors to comprehend its significance for companies in terms of the organization and its employees (Khaw et al., 2023).

Communal Relationships

Employees' communal relationship is a type of positive relationship initially introduced by (Clark and Mills, 1979) as an act of providing benefits to the other party without expecting anything in return in the future. Research shows that a communal relationship plays a vital role in organizational management by enabling a focus on responsibilities and supporting employees without expecting reciprocal favors. To enhance the significance of employees' relationships with the organization (Hon et al., 1999) emphasized the importance of cultivating communal relationships within management. Such initiatives allow management to prioritize their responsibilities and benefit employees without expecting immediate returns.

Even in the absence of mutual advantages or incentives, a communal relationship involves the effort to provide benefits to the other party (Hon et al., 1999). While these benefits may not be completely selfless, employees seek more than a simple exchange of work for a salary (Hon et al., 1999). Both parties involved in the communal relationship strive to develop a strong and lasting commitment. Research has shown that establishing such relationships ultimately leads to
improved organizational productivity and growth. Additionally, the party that offers favors in a communal relationship is more likely to receive support and encounter fewer obstacles when pursuing long-term benefits (Hon and Grunig, 1999). Experts have long promoted building a shared connection with stakeholders as a way to add value to an organization's public relations. By nurturing this relationship with the community, an organization can fulfill its social responsibilities and provide benefits without expecting anything in return (Hon and Grunig 1999; Hung, 2005; Aldalaty and Piranej, 2024; Dion, 2024; Rathobei et al., 2024; Dong et al., 2024; Lashitew et al., 2024; Suykens et al., 2023; Pütz et al., 2023; Kallmuenzer et al., 2023; Chtioui et al., 2023; Abuaya, 2023; Gibson, 2022; Hadjielias et al., 2022; Wójcik et al., 2022; Ogunyemi, 2022; Banks, 2022)

In a communal relationship, both parties offer mutual benefits with authentic concern for each other's welfare, even without expecting reciprocity (Hon et al., 1999). Within the context of the relationship between organizations and employees, a communal relationship is formed when employees believe that their employer values their well-being beyond the simple exchange of work for compensation (referred to as an exchange relationship) (Lee et al., 2017). Establishing and upholding a communal relationship, similar to long-term exchange relationships, is vital for companies as it enhances long-term brand reputation and nurtures a sense of belonging. Empirical evidence shows that a communal relationship is crucial for motivating employees to actively communicate and solve problems within the organization.

**Exchange Relationships**

An exchange relationship is established when parties provide favours to each other in consideration of the benefits they have received or anticipate receiving in the future. This type of relationship, commonly known as an "economic relationship" in strategic marketing, generates an implied duty for both parties to return the favors. The majority of relationships typically commence as exchange relationships. In the context of employment, a company offers its employees a variety of economic and concrete perks, such as bonuses, wages, advancement opportunities, and career growth, in exchange for their contributions. Employees may also perceive that their efforts are being fairly compensated.

In an organizational relationship with its stakeholders, one party provides benefits to the other. This occurs because the other party has previously provided benefits or is expected to do so in the future. This reciprocal relationship includes giving benefits with the anticipation of receiving them in return. Conversely, a communal relationship consists of providing benefits based on the other party's needs or to please them without creating an obligation to reciprocate. Those who prefer a reciprocal relationship tend to focus on the contributions made by the other party, as opposed to those who desire a communal relationship. Previous studies have found that employees who prioritize the organization's welfare (communal relationship) demonstrate positive organizational behavior (Blader et al., 2000; Coyle and Kessler, 2004).

**Hypotheses Development**

- **H1**: Companionate love is positively associated with communal relationship
- **H2**: Companionate love is positively associated with exchange relationship
- **H3**: Joy is positively associated with communal relationship
- **H4**: Joy is positively associated with exchange relationship

**Research Methodology**

**Method**

An online survey was conducted amongst the employees of the corporate sector in Delhi-NCR using Google Forms to test the hypothesized model (Sajjad et al., 2019).
Companionate Love is measured using eight statements, with a Cronbach's alpha (α) of 0.838, indicating high reliability. The (CR) for Joy is 0.888, and the (AVE) is 0.613. These values suggest that the indicators effectively capture the construct. The retained statements reflect motivation, enjoyment, positive feelings, and willingness to share knowledge within the organization.

Communal Relationships are assessed using six statements, with a Cronbach's alpha (α) of 0.877, demonstrating high internal consistency. The (CR) is 0.916 and the (AVE) is 0.731, indicating that the indicators represent the construct well. Two items were eliminated due to low factor loadings: "This organization is very concerned about my welfare" (loading of 0.154) and "This organization helps me without expecting anything in return" (loading of 0.475). The retained statements focus on perceptions of the organization's concern for employee welfare, exploitation, and helpfulness.

Exchange Relationships are measured using four statements, with a Cronbach's alpha (α) of 0.867, indicating high reliability. The (CR) is 0.899, and the (AVE) is 0.690, suggesting that the indicators capture the construct effectively. The statements retained for this construct emphasize the expectation of reciprocity and mutual benefit in the relationship with the organization.

All scales had high reliabilities as Cronbach’s alpha was more than 0.70 for all the constructs (Nunnally, 1978; Peterson, 1994). The factor loading of all the statements should be at a level of more than 0.50, as suggested in the literature (Hair et al., 1998), to be sufficient for the considered sample size. Due to low factor loadings, items CL2, CR2 and CR5 have been eliminated. CL2 item “I would rather suffer myself than see someone else suffer,” was eliminated due to a low factor loading of 0.431, which is logically more aligned with passionate love rather than companionate love in organizational contexts.
# Table 1. Internal Consistency and Reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Companionate Love</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s alpha</strong> ( (\alpha) = 0.851, \text{ CR} = 0.906, \text{ AVE} = 0.580 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL1</td>
<td>‘I feel considerable love for people in the organization’</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL2</td>
<td>‘I would rather suffer myself than see someone else suffer’</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL3</td>
<td>‘I often help colleagues when they seem to be in need’</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL4</td>
<td>‘I feel a selfless caring for most of colleagues’</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL5</td>
<td>‘I try to understand rather than judge people in the organization’</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL6</td>
<td>‘I try to put myself in colleagues’ shoes when he or she is in trouble’</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL7</td>
<td>‘I feel happy when I see that others are happy’</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL8</td>
<td>‘I wish to be kind and good to fellow employees’</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s alpha</strong> ( (\alpha) = 0.838, \text{ CR} = 0.888, \text{ AVE} = 0.613 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>‘I am motivated to go to the organization because it’s exciting’</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>‘I enjoy being in the organization’</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>‘I feel good when I am in the organization listening to my boss’</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>‘For me, my job is a challenge that is enjoyable’</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>‘I am willing to show my knowledge in the organization’</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communal Relationships</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s alpha</strong> ( (\alpha) = 0.877, \text{ CR} = 0.916, \text{ AVE} = 0.731 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>“This organization does not enjoy giving aid to employees”</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR2</td>
<td>“This organization is very concerned about my welfare”</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR3</td>
<td>“I feel that this organization takes advantage of people who are weak”</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR4</td>
<td>“I think that this organization succeeds by stepping on other people”</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR5</td>
<td>“This organization helps me without expecting anything in return”</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>Eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR6</td>
<td>“I don’t consider this to be a helpful organization”</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exchange Relationships</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s alpha</strong> ( (\alpha) = 0.867, \text{ CR} = 0.899, \text{ AVE} = 0.690 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER1</td>
<td>“Whenever this organization gives something to me, it expects something in return”</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER2</td>
<td>“Even though I have had a relationship with this organization for a long time, it still expects something in return whenever it offers us a favour”</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER3</td>
<td>“The organization will compromise with me when it knows that it will gain something”</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER4</td>
<td>“This organization takes care of people who are likely to reward the organization”</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Model Fit Summary of Zero Order Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model outcomes</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>Recommended Value</th>
<th>Model fit Indices</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Companionate Love</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>CL8 was eliminated to improve the badness of fit, i.e., RMSEA (RMSEA was 0.124 before the modification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt;.10</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>1.915</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt;.10</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal Relationship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt;.10</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Relationship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>No modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt;.10</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < 0.001

Model Fit Summary of Zero Order Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The model fit summary of the zero-order confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) provides a detailed evaluation of the constructs used in the research study, assessing their reliability and validity through various fit indices. This analysis is crucial for validating the constructs and ensuring that the measures employed are robust and appropriate for the research context.

Six items were evaluated for the construct Companionate Love after eliminating one item (CL8) to improve the model fit. Initially, the (RMSEA) was 0.124, indicating a poor fit. However, after removing the item “I wish to be kind and good to fellow employees,” the RMSEA improved significantly to 0.025, which is well within the acceptable range of less than 0.10. The other fit indices for Companionate Love also indicated a good fit: the Chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio (CMIN/DF) was 1.066, which is below the recommended value of less than 5; the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) was 0.972, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) was 0.998, the Incremental Fit Index (IFI) was 0.998, and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) was 0.996, all of which exceed the recommended threshold of 0.90.

For the construct Joy, five items were evaluated without any modifications. The fit indices showed that the model fit the data well: the CMIN/DF was 1.915, the GFI was 0.965, the CFI was 0.978, the IFI was 0.979, and the TLI was 0.995, and all these values are within the acceptable ranges, indicating a good fit between the model and the observed data.

The construct of a communal relationship was assessed using four items, and no modifications were needed. The fit indices demonstrated an excellent model fit: the CMIN/DF was 1.171, the GFI was 0.990, the CFI was 0.998, the IFI was 0.998, the TLI was 0.995, and the...
RMSEA was 0.040. These indices confirm that the construct is well-represented by the items and fits the data well.

Similarly, the construct Exchange Relationship was evaluated using four items without any modifications. The fit indices indicated a good model fit: the CMIN/DF was 1.811, the GFI was 0.985, the CFI was 0.992, the IFI was 0.992, the TLI was 0.976, and the RMSEA was 0.087. These values are all within the acceptable ranges, showing that the construct fits the data well.

Overall, the zero-order confirmatory factor analysis validated the constructs by demonstrating that all fit indices met the criteria for model fit. The CMIN/DF values were all less than 5, and the GFI, CFI, IFI, and TLI values exceeded 0.90, while the RMSEA values were less than 0.10. These results indicate that the constructs of Companionate Love, Joy, Communal Relationship, and Exchange Relationship are reliable and valid measures within the research context. The modifications made, particularly the removal of item CL8 from Companionate Love, significantly improved the model fit, ensuring the overall integrity and robustness of the constructs.

### Results and Hypotheses Testing

The results and hypotheses testing section provides a detailed analysis of the path coefficient estimation results, which are presented in Table 3 and illustrated in Figure 2. The hypotheses were tested to determine the relationships between the constructs of companionate love, joy, communal relationship, and exchange relationship.

Hypothesis 1 (H1) posited that there would be a positive significant association between companionate love and communal relationships. However, the path analysis revealed a significant negative association, with a path coefficient (β) of -0.71 (p < 0.001). This indicates that as companionate love increases, the communal relationship decreases, contrary to the initial hypothesis. Therefore, H1 is not supported. Hypothesis 2 (H2) suggested a positive significant association between companionate love and exchange relationship. Similar to H1, the path analysis showed a significant negative association, with a path coefficient (β) of -0.68 (p < 0.001). This result implies that higher levels of companionate love are associated with lower levels of exchange relationships, which is also contrary to the hypothesis. Consequently, H2 is not supported. On the other hand, Hypothesis 3 (H3) posited a positive significant association between joy and communal relationship. The path analysis revealed a significant positive association, with a path coefficient (β) of 0.71 (p < 0.001). This indicates that as joy increases, the communal relationship also increases, supporting the hypothesis. Hypothesis 4 (H4) stated that there would be a positive significant association between joy and exchange relationship. The path analysis confirmed this hypothesis, with a path coefficient (β) of 0.73 (p < 0.001), showing that as joy increases, the exchange relationship also increases.

### Table 3. Results of the hypotheses testing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Supporting/ Not Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Companionate Love → Communal Relationship</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Not Supporting (A significant negative association has been revealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Companionate Love → Exchange Relationship</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Not Supporting (A significant negative association has been revealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Joy → Communal Relationship</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supporting (A significant positive association has been revealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Joy → Exchange Relationship</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supporting (A significant positive association has been revealed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<0.001

![Figure 2. Effect of Emotions on the Organization-Public Relationships.](image-url)
other hand, Hypothesis 3 (H3) proposed that joy would positively affect communal relationships. The path analysis supported this hypothesis, revealing a significant positive association with a path coefficient (β) of 0.71 (p < 0.001). This finding indicates that higher levels of joy are associated with stronger communal relationships, thus supporting H3. Hypothesis 4 (H4) posited that joy would have a positive significant association with exchange relationships. The path analysis confirmed this hypothesis, showing a significant positive association with a path coefficient (β) of 0.73 (p < 0.001). This result suggests increased joy is linked to stronger exchange relationships, thereby supporting H4.

In summary, the results indicate that companionate love is negatively associated with both communal and exchange relationships, contrary to the initial hypotheses H1 and H2. Conversely, joy is positively associated with both communal and exchange relationships, supporting hypotheses H3 and H4. These findings highlight the complex dynamics between emotional constructs and relational outcomes within organizational contexts. The detailed path coefficients and significance levels provide robust evidence for these relationships, as summarized in Table 3.

Discussion

The findings of this research present several critical theoretical implications, particularly concerning the emotional constructs of companionate love and joy and their relationships with communal and exchange relationships in organizational settings. The negative associations identified between companionate love and both communal and exchange relationships challenge the prevailing assumption that higher levels of companionship naturally foster positive relational outcomes. This finding is significant as it contradicts the traditional view that emotional closeness and affection within organizations invariably lead to stronger communal bonds and reciprocal relationships.

The negative association between companionate love and communal relationship (β = -0.71, p < 0.001) suggests that while companionate love involves a deep sense of caring and empathy, it may not always translate into a communal relationship characterized by mutual concern and support. This result aligns with the work of Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2000), which suggests that emotional states do not always predict relational dynamics positively. Similarly, the negative association between companionate love and exchange relationships (β = -0.68, p < 0.001) indicates that high levels of companionate love may reduce the perceived need for reciprocal exchanges, potentially undermining the balance of give-and-take that defines exchange relationships. This finding challenges the assumption that emotional bonds inherently enhance reciprocal interactions within organizations.

On the other hand, the positive correlations observed between joy and both communal and exchange relationships provide robust support for the notion that positive emotional experiences can enhance relational quality. The significant positive association between joy and communal relationship (β = 0.71, p < 0.001) suggests that joy fosters a sense of community and mutual support among organizational members. This finding is consistent with Fredrickson's (2001) broaden-and-build theory, which posits that positive emotions expand cognitive processes and promote social connections. Similarly, the positive association between joy and exchange relationship (β = 0.73, p < 0.001) indicates that joy enhances the willingness to engage in reciprocal exchanges, thereby strengthening the relational fabric of the organization (Fredrickson, 2001).

These insights suggest vital areas for future research, addressing the need for a nuanced understanding of how different emotional states interact with relationships within organizations. For instance, future studies could explore the boundary conditions under which companionate love may positively influence communal and exchange relationships, such as the role of organizational culture or individual differences in emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995). Additionally, the differential impact of various positive emotions on relational dynamics warrants further investigation, as the current findings highlight the unique role of joy in fostering both communal and exchange relationships.

Moreover, the study's robust methodological approach reinforces the reliability and validity of its conclusions, contributing to the broader literature on emotional intelligence and organizational behavior. The use of confirmatory factor analysis to validate the constructs and the rigorous testing of hypotheses through path analysis ensure that the findings are both credible and generalizable (Hair et al., 2010). This methodological rigor adds to the growing body of evidence supporting the critical role of emotions in shaping organizational relationships and provides a solid foundation for future research in this area.

In conclusion, the findings underscore the complex interplay between emotional constructs and relational outcomes in organizational settings. The negative associations between companionate love and both communal and exchange relationships challenge
traditional assumptions and highlight the need for a more nuanced understanding of emotional dynamics. Conversely, the positive associations between joy and relational quality reinforce the importance of fostering positive emotional experiences within organizations. These theoretical implications advance our understanding of emotional intelligence and organizational behavior and provide practical insights for enhancing relational quality in the workplace.

Conclusion
Companionate love shows a significant negative association with communal and exchange relationships and the results can be justified by the fact that it is a mixed emotion as it can bring happiness and joviality to some and pain, suffering and jealousy to others; additionally, companionate love is less intense as compared to romantic love; and that is why companionate love does not necessarily improve the relationships. Furthermore, it is an "others-driven emotion." Conversely, joy is a self-driven emotion that is positively associated with relationships. Joy is a positive emotion that brings happiness and joviality, and people feel more inclined towards their relationships. Communal and exchange relationships often involve a sense of reciprocity or a quid pro quo dynamic. In communal relationships, individuals may expect support based on a shared sense of belonging, while exchange relationships involve the expectation of reciprocal actions. Being more emotionally driven, companionate love may not always adhere to clear and immediate expectations of reciprocity, leading to potential conflicts in these dynamics. On the other hand, joy is a positive and contagious emotion. When individuals experience joy within a communal or exchange setting, it fosters a positive atmosphere and strengthens social bonds. Shared moments of joy create a sense of unity and solidarity among group members, reinforcing their connection. Joyful interactions often lead to improved communication. People in a positive emotional state tend to express themselves more openly, listen attentively and engage in positive communication. This, in turn, contributes to healthier and more effective interactions within communal and exchange relationships.

Implications of the Study
Generally, emotions are studied in Psychology and Organization-public relationships in the field of Human Resource Management and Organizational Behavior. In theoretical implications, this research study provides a research framework on the impact of emotions on communal and exchange relationships. In the existing literature, the previous research studies on emotions have been conducted on stress-related professionals, like doctors, nurses, police officers, etc., but this research study has focused on corporate sector employees. This research study highlights the importance of regulating emotions to improve the relationships amongst the employees in the organization; an employee should focus more on being happy to have better relationship building.

Limitations and Future Research Directions
This research study has considered only two emotions, i.e., companionate love and joy, to assess the impact on the relationships; for future research studies, other emotions like pride, gratitude, anger, anxiety etc. can be considered to explore the effect of emotions on the organization-public relationships, whether the association is positive or negative, significant or insignificant. Additionally, this research study has been conducted in the region Delhi-NCR only; further research studies can be conducted in the whole of India or outside India.
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