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What is This?
Emotional Intelligence, Leadership Style, and Perceived Leadership Effectiveness

Lisa Ann Weinberger

Abstract
Effective leadership is critical for today’s rapidly changing organizations. Emotional intelligence has been identified by some as that crucial element needed for this effective leadership. Although the research is growing, there still remains a gap on the relationships that exist between emotional intelligence and leadership. The study outlined in this article explored the relationships between emotional intelligence, leadership style, and leadership effectiveness. One hundred fifty-one managers completed the MSCEIT, an ability-measuring instrument of emotional intelligence. Those managers’ direct reports were asked to complete the MLQ5x, on their perceptions of their managers’ leadership style and leadership effectiveness. The results showed that there are no relationships between a manager’s emotional intelligence and leadership style or the leader’s perceived effectiveness. Implications for human resource development theory and practice are discussed.
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Many organizations today need to change rapidly to maintain their competitive edge. Rapid change requires that an organization has employees and leaders who are adaptive, work effectively, constantly improve systems and processes, are customer focused, and who share the need to make a profit. The continuous environment of turmoil and change is coined the “permanent white waters” of modern life (Vaill, 1996).
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Leadership is a key element in driving and managing these white waters. One only need look at the recent corporate scandals such as Royal Dutch Shell in 2004 misreporting its oil reserves, Hewlett Packard spying of fellow board members in 2006, and most recently Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities fraud in 2009 to see leadership challenges. Then Walmart turns many prior poor perceptions around with their focus on sustainability and a new sustainability index in 2009 and ensures that all its business partners are held to significantly higher performance standards. These examples illustrate that leadership makes a difference. Effective leaders are those that get results within time frames that are considered appropriate for their industries and stakeholders (Goleman, 2000). Examples include Chrysler Corporation and its recovery under Lee Iacocca, Gillette under the leadership of Colman Mockler, and Kimberly-Clark during the years of Darwin Smith’s tenure (V. L. Collins, 2001).

Great leaders move us. They ignite our passion and inspire the best in us. When we try to explain why they are so effective, we speak of strategy, vision, or powerful ideas. But the reality is much more primal: Great leadership works through the emotions. (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002, p. 3)

Emotional Intelligence is identified, through the popular press and some researchers, as that critical element needed for effective leadership. Goleman (1998, p. 94), notes, “the most effective leaders are alike in one crucial way; they all have a high degree of what has come to be known as emotional intelligence.” Others say, “By now, most executives have accepted that emotional intelligence is as critical as IQ to an individual’s effectiveness” (Druskat & Wolff, 2001, p. 81). The challenge with these statements is twofold: (a) the study of leadership and what makes leaders effective, and hence their performance, has been found to be much more complicated than a single dimension like emotional intelligence and (b) organizations have incorporated many of these emotional intelligence beliefs into their work systems and performance expectations without it being shown that it truly can accomplish what proponents are claiming. It is this study of leadership, its effectiveness, and its impact on individual and organizational performance that is a key interest and important topic to human resource development (HRD) scholars (Hamlin, 2003; Holton & Lynham, 2000; Kuchinke, 2000; Zehner & Holton, 2003).

**Purpose of the Study**

“One of the most universal cravings of our time is a hunger for compelling and creative leadership” (Burns, 1978, p. 1). Even so, leadership is not easily defined. The scientific study of leadership did not begin until the 20th century. Much of its focus has been on the determinants of leadership effectiveness (Yukl, 1998). Beginning in the 1980s, many of the conceptions of leadership recognized the importance of emotions as a basis of influence (Yukl, 1998). It is those emotional, value-based aspects of leadership that are believed to influence the achievements of groups and organizations.
Much of this leadership research, with its recognition on the importance of emotion, concentrated on the characteristics and effects of charismatic and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Kanungo, 1998; Tichy & Devanna, 1990).

Burns (1978) developed the original idea of transformational leadership and defined it as a process in which “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” (p. 20). Bass (1985) further refined this definition looking at the theory as two distinct types of leadership processes: the first being transactional leadership and the second being transformational leadership. Although he defined these leadership processes as distinct, Bass recognized that the same leader might use both types of leadership at different times in different situations. It is transformational leaders however who influence followers by arousing strong emotions and identification with the leader (Yukl, 1998).

These transformational leaders “seek to raise the consciousness of followers by appealing to higher ideals and moral values such as liberty, justice, equality, peace, not to base emotions such as fear, greed, jealousy, or hatred” (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992, p. 176). Transformational leadership is in contrast to transactional leadership, where followers are motivated by their self-interest in exchange for specific rewards for reaching certain goals and accomplishing specific tasks.

Although transformational leaders are described to motivate followers to perform beyond expectations by intellectually stimulating and inspiring them to transcend their own self-interest for a higher collective purpose, transactional leaders use a negotiation process, where followers exchange efforts and services for rewards. A transformational leader activates follower motivation and increases follower commitment.

Numerous studies examine the correlation between transformational and transactional leadership styles and various criteria of leadership effectiveness (e.g., Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000; Avolio & Howell, 1992; Yammarino & Bass, 1990). A meta-analysis of results from 39 studies found that three transformational leadership behaviors (charisma, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation) are related to leadership effectiveness in most studies (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). The transformational leadership behaviors correlated more strongly with leadership effectiveness than did the transactional leadership behaviors. Utilizing the connection of emotion and leadership, Sosik and Megerian (1999) studied the relationship between transformational leadership behavior, emotional intelligence, and leader effectiveness. They collect data from 63 managers who responded about their transformational leadership behavior and emotional intelligence, 192 subordinates who rated their manager’s transformational leadership behavior and performance outcomes, and 63 superiors who rated managerial performance. They found that categorizations of self-awareness are correlated between emotional intelligence of leadership and leadership behavior. Subordinate ratings of transformational leadership behavior are positively related to those leaders categorized as self-aware. They concluded “managers who maintain self-awareness (self–other rating agreement) possess more aspects of emotional intelligence and are rated as more effective by both superiors and subordinates than those who are not self-aware” (Sosik & Megerian, 1999, p. 386). The purpose of this study was to
investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence, leadership style, and leadership effectiveness. The more effective a leader generally has been translates to their higher performance. This study evaluated the construct of emotional intelligence as the basis for that performance.

**Statement of the Problem**

Given the above purpose, the problem that was the focus of this study, is the recognition that although a significant amount of research on leadership exists (see Stogdill, 1974; Yukl, 1998; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992), the emotional intelligence research is comparatively thin and the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence is smaller yet. What is most troubling is the general notion that it is critically important for leaders to be emotionally intelligent for individual performance and organizational success, yet the scholarly support behind this claim is still lacking. The major research questions are briefly stated as follows:

1. What is the relationship between the emotional intelligence of leaders and their leadership style?
2. What is the relationship between the emotional intelligence of leaders and their leadership effectiveness?

**Emotional Intelligence**

The topic of emotional intelligence and its impact on organizations and its leaders grew largely through the popular publications of Goleman’s (1995) book titled *Emotional Intelligence* and his subsequent book *Working with Emotional Intelligence* (Goleman, 1998). The interest in emotional intelligence continues today. The scholarly study of emotional intelligence began in the early 1990s when Salovey and Mayer (1990) first defined and then further refined it in 1997 (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) as

the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate though; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth. (p. 10)

This definition is largely considered the “ability model” perspective as it defines emotional intelligence narrowly. The key assumption underlying this definition is the connection between emotions and intelligence (Weinberger, 2002). It is the ability to think intelligently and make informed decisions that is critical to this perspective (Graves, 1999). In addition, this model is exclusive of many of the personality characteristics that are included in other definitions/models.

The mixed model was popularized by Goleman (1995, 1998), one of the earlier proponents of this model. Goleman used psychological theories and neuroscience to
form the basis and defined it as one’s ability to “motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to control impulses and delay gratification; to regulate one’s moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to empathize and to hope” (Goleman, 1995, p. 34). In addition, Bar-On (1995) defines emotional intelligence from a mixed model perspective, defining it as “an array of capabilities, competencies and skills which influence one’s ability to success in coping with environmental demands and pressures” (p. 5).

Throughout the 1990s and continuing into 2000s, we continue to see primarily two diverging perspectives through the emotional intelligence definitional work. One represents a more trait-focused perspective of emotional intelligence, incorporating personality characteristics and self-perceived abilities. The other is a more cognitively focused perspective, narrowly confined to abilities that can be measured through performance components (Petrides & Furnham, 2001).

Since that early inception, there continues to be refinement, debate, and dialogue around the topic of emotional intelligence in the research community. Practitioners have incorporated the concept of emotional intelligence into performance management systems and training and development programs as a result of the influence of the popular press and consultants. At this point in time, practices related to embracing emotional intelligence appear to be far ahead of what is actually known from the research and theory.

The question asked by many of these authors is what role is emotions and/or emotional intelligence playing in the organization through change efforts, leadership effectiveness, training, and organizational performance. Studies of leadership, its effectiveness, and overall impact on improving performance are important to advancing the understanding in the field of HRD and its role in advancing the strategic capability of organizations.

**Emotion and Human Resource Development**

The topic of emotion research has also been a topic of interest and exploration within the discipline of HRD. The significant impact of emotions and emotional management in an organizational setting has driven this research. The concepts of emotion and emotion management have recently been brought to the forefront of HRD scholars through interests in emotion management and organizational functions (Callahan-Fabian, 1999) and a collection of articles titled *Perspectives of Emotion and Organizational Change* (Callahan, 2002). This collection brought forward the importance of studying emotion within the organizational context for both HRD scholars and practitioners. The authors in this journal (Callahan & McCollum, 2002; Jordan & Troth, 2002; Kiefer, 2002; Short & Yorks, 2002; Turnbull, 2002) all write on various derivations of emotion in research, ranging from its role in organizational change efforts to training and conflict resolution.

Dialogue continues in HRD through studies on the impact of emotion on organizational learning (Vince, 2002), the evaluation of the roles of gender and emotion
management as evidence of a community of practice (Tomaszewski & Callahan, 2003), and emotion saturation as a theory of emotion in organizations (Callahan, 2003). The last topic further refines various perspectives on the importance of the role of emotion within the organization (Callahan, 2003).

Emotion work has also lent to discussions about the role of emotional intelligence within the field of HRD. An argument of the importance of the topic for study and implications outline for further research for HRD scholars to include leadership, management, and individual and team performance is made (Weinberger, 2002). If we are to better understand the role of emotional intelligence, how does that play into an individual’s performance or their performance in a team? Does it have an impact? Does it matter if one is an individual contributor versus a leader? Emotions are conceptualized holistically and their relationships may interact with the process of leadership (Drodge & Murphy, 2002). This is one premise that lends support for further study of emotions in HRD. Emotional intelligence is having the ability, whereas emotion work is acting on that ability (Fabian, 1999). These areas of study provide a foundation of the emotion work discussion and suggest that emotional intelligence might be an aid to leadership development and hence leadership effectiveness and performance.

Method

Respondents

This study was conducted using a correlational research design. The target population for this study consisted of the managers of CSW—a Midwestern-based manufacturing organization that employs 2,300 people worldwide. Of that 2,300, approximately 2,000 were located within the United States. The study was restricted to the North American employees of CSW, who must use English in their day-to-day communications in order to minimize language barriers or potential conflicts with instruments not in the native or primary language of the participant. The total population of 151 managers participated in the study, which had more than three direct reports. These managers included executives and directors of CSW, managers across all functions of the organization, and supervisors in customer service and manufacturing. This represented about 90% of the companies’ personnel having the title of manager. From CSW human resource records, these managers were made up of 27 females and 124 males.

Measures

Emotional Intelligence

The Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002) was administered to all the top managers (N = 151) of CSW to measure
the variable of emotional intelligence. The instruments were collected and sent to the publisher for scoring. The scoring data were returned and analyzed using correlational statistics. This instrument reported five scores in the areas of (a) perceiving emotions, (b) facilitating emotions, (c) understanding emotions, (d) managing emotions, and (e) overall emotional intelligence.

The MSCEIT, published for commercial use in the spring of 2002, is becoming the standard for measuring emotional intelligence from an ability perspective. The MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2002) provides 15 main scores: total EIQ score, two area scores, four branch scores, and eight task scores. The overall Emotional Intelligence Score (EIQ) provides an overall index of the respondent’s emotional intelligence. A total EIQ score compares an individual’s performance on the MSCEIT to those in the normative sample (of more than 5,000 respondents). The area scores enable one to gain insight into possible differences between the respondents’ (a) ability to perceive and utilize emotions (experiential emotional intelligence) and (b) their ability to understand and manage emotions (strategic emotional intelligence).

Perceiving emotions, the first branch, is defined as the “ability to recognize how an individual and those around the individual are feeling...this involves the capacity to perceive and to express feelings” (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 19). This emotion perception involves paying attention to and accurately decoding emotional signals in facial expressions, tone of voice, and artistic expressions. In this section, the participant would be asked to look at a picture of a face expressing some type of emotion, or general picture of some kind (see Table 2 for item count detail for each branch).

The second branch of the MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2002), facilitating thought, measures how much a respondent’s thoughts and other cognitive activities are informed by his or her experience of emotions: “Facilitating thought focuses on how emotions affect the cognitive system and, as such, can be harnessed for more effective problem-solving, reasoning, decision-making, and creative endeavors” (p. 19).

Understanding emotions was measured through the third branch of the MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2002). This branch includes the ability to label emotions and to recognize that there are groups of related emotional terms: “Knowledge of how emotions combine and change over time is important in one’s dealings with other people and in enhancing one’s self-understanding” (p. 19).

The final, fourth branch measures the managing emotions component of emotional intelligence: “Managing emotions means that, at appropriate times, one feels the feeling rather than repressing it, and then uses the feeling to make better decisions” (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 19). This management involves the participation of emotions in thought and allowing thought to include emotions.

The MSCEIT measures people’s actual performance, rather than their self-reported skills on emotional problem-solving tasks. Performance on these tasks has been only slightly related to personality traits as measured by self-report personality tests (Caruso & Wolfe, 2001). The current self-reporting tests of emotional intelligence appear to be repackaged models of traditional personality traits such as optimism, motivation, and stress tolerance (Caruso & Wolfe, 2001).
The ability model of emotional intelligence is framed as a type of intelligence; hence, it is intended to coexist with, supplement, and clarify existing models of leadership—not replace them (Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey, 2002). Although the model is too new to have extensive data in support of its predictive validity, it is believed that it will make significant contributions to our understanding of leadership (Caruso et al., 2002). “Leadership, which embraces the emotional side of directing organizations, pumps life and meaning into management structures, bringing them to full life” (Barach & Eckhardt, 1996, p. 4). Other components of leadership, such as charisma, includes the leader regulating the emotions of team members (Friedman, Riggio, & Casella, 1988; Wasielewski, 1985) and appears to require the ability to enhance pleasant emotions and deemphasize unpleasant emotions in others. Charismatic leadership, a form of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985, 1997), may also have its roots in managing emotions (Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000). Hence, a better empirical understanding of the role of emotional intelligence and leadership is warranted.

Leadership style. The second instrument, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ5x; Bass & Avolio, 2000) was administered to the subordinates of those 151 managers. This instrument measures the variables of transformational leadership style, transactional leadership style, and laissez-faire leadership style. In addition, the MLQ5x reports results in the areas of extra effort, satisfaction with the leader, and the leader’s effectiveness. This instrument was also sent to the publisher for scoring and the respective results were then entered and analyzed using correlational statistics.

Transformational leadership consists of four factors as measured by the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000): (a) intellectual stimulation, (b) individualized consideration, (c) charisma (idealized attributes and idealized behaviors), and (d) inspirational motivation. Intellectual stimulation gets followers to question the status quo and encourages them to question their methods and seek ways to improve them. A sample item is “seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.” Individualized consideration is where the leader focuses on the unique needs of each follower and works continuously to help his or her followers to reach their full potential. Charisma involves gaining respect, trust, and confidence toward the leader and transmitting a strong sense of mission and vision of the desired future to the followers. And finally, inspirational motivation is communicating an energizing sense of purpose.

Transactional leadership consists of two factors as measured by the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000): (a) contingent reward and (b) management by exception (which includes management by exception–passive; and management by exception–active). Contingent reward clarifies expectations, positively reinforces the achievement of mutually agreed on goals and what will be received if certain performance levels are met. Management by exception is defined as focusing on task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems to maintain performance at an acceptable level.

Laissez-faire leadership is the negation of or a no-leadership factor (Bass & Avolio, 1993). In this situation, leadership is “absent and intervention by the nominal leaders is avoided. Decisions are often delayed; feedback, rewards, and involvement are
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absent; and there is no attempt to motivate followers or recognize and satisfy their needs” (Bass & Avolio, 1993, p. 53).

In addition to the transformational and transactional leadership components, there are three leadership outcomes: (a) satisfaction, (b) extra effort, and (c) effectiveness. From a subordinate perspective, these are described, respectively, as (a) how satisfied I am with my leader, (b) the degree to which my leader gets extra effort out of me, and (c) how effective my leader is. A sample item for effectiveness is “is effective in meeting my job-related needs.” There are a number of survey studies that have used the MLQ5x to examine the relationship between leadership behavior and various criteria of leadership effectiveness (e.g., Avolio & Howell, 1992; Yammarino & Bass, 1990).

Generally speaking, effective leadership includes the following essential elements (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Locke, 1991; Yukl, 1998): (a) development of a collective sense of goals and objectives; (b) instills in others knowledge and appreciation of work activities and behaviors; (c) generates and maintains confidence, excitement, and enthusiasm in an organization as well as trust and cooperation; (d) encourages flexibility in decision making and change; and (e) establishes a meaningful identity for an organization. Emotional intelligence may be an avenue for leaders to accomplish effective leadership (George, 2000). Having these elements of effective leadership can translate to an effective performing leader.

The MLQ5x has generally adequate reliabilities (Cronbach’s alpha) ranging from .63 to .92. Estimates of internal consistency were above $\alpha = .70$ for all scales except for active management by exception (Bass & Avolio, 2000). The intercorrelations among the five MLQ5x transformational leadership scales were relatively high and positive. The average intercorrelation was .83, and it was .71 for the five transformational leadership scales with ratings of contingent reward leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2000). Transformational leadership scales and contingent reward were positively correlated with the three outcome measures: extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction ($r = .18$ to .74). Management by exception–active was only slightly correlated with these three outcome measures and management by exception–passive, and laissez-faire leadership was strongly negatively correlated with the outcome measures (Bass & Avolio, 2000). All of these results confirm the factor structure and validate the instrument. Because of the relatively high intercorrelations among the subscales in transformational leadership, some authors (Atwater & Yammarino, 1992; Dubinsky, Yammarino, & Jolson, 1995) combine them and consider transformational leadership as one 20-item scale instead of five separate 4-item scales.

Transformational leadership augments rather than replaces transactional leadership in terms of its impact on performance. The emotional appeals of the transformational leader are interspersed with the balances of establishing expectations and satisfying agreed on contracts (Bass & Avolio, 2000). Transformational leaders motivate followers to perform beyond their own expectations based on the leader’s idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. These transformational leadership styles build on the transactional base in contributing to the extra effort and performance of others.
Results

The 151 managers were sent the MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2002) to evaluate their emotional intelligence, 138 completed surveys were received, 3 managers refused to participate, and 10 managers did not respond. A response rate of 93.3% occurred with the management group. The MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000) was sent out to the subordinates to gain their perceptions of their manager’s leadership style and leadership effectiveness. A total of 1,165 subordinates were asked to participate. Seven hundred ninety-one completed surveys were returned. Each of the 791 subordinate responses was connected to a particular manager. Those subordinate responses that belonged to a manager were aggregated by that manager, and so on through the entire data set. The resulting subordinate response dataset was matched to each of the 151 managers who were provided the MSCEIT. The subordinate responses for the managers who did not complete the MSCEIT were not included in the study analyses. Any manager that did not receive a minimum of three responses was also not included in the final analyses. The results were entered and analyzed using descriptive and correlational statistics. The total response rate was 68.9%.

Demographic Variables

Emotional intelligence and leadership style may be influenced by demographic characteristics such as gender, age, and occupation level (Mayer et al., 2002). These demographic data were collected from the human resources department of CSW simply for descriptive purposes, but further analysis was not included on the smaller variations due to gender, age, and occupation that may be possible (see Table 1).

To stay consistent with the leadership literature in reporting on the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000), the leadership factors were grouped into three leadership styles: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership. Intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, charisma, and inspirational motivation all make up transformational leadership; transactional leadership consists of contingent reward and management by exception; and laissez-faire leadership is simply reported as the laissez-faire factor. Each leadership outcome variable is reported independently. Emotional intelligence is reported by each factor, and a combination of the four factors is reported as an overall emotional intelligence score.

The reliability of each instrument and its scales was measured by calculating Cronbach’s alpha for each scale for the MLQ5x and Split ½ for the MSCEIT. To test the questions relative to emotional intelligence and leadership style, the data sets were merged. Correlational statistics were completed to evaluate the degree of relationship between each factor of leadership, emotional intelligence, and leadership outcomes.
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Table 1. Demographic Summary of Manager Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director and above</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. MSCEIT Survey—Item Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Intelligence Branch</th>
<th>Location and Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branch 1: perceiving emotions</td>
<td>Sections A and E: 50 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 2: facilitating thought</td>
<td>Sections B and F: 30 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 3: understanding emotions</td>
<td>Sections C and G: 32 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 4: managing emotions</td>
<td>Sections D and H: 29 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002).

Descriptive Statistics of Mayer–Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test

Each answer on the MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2002) was scored against a general consensus score. All scores are reported as normed standard scores with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Scores are obtained on the four emotional intelligence branches and an overall emotional intelligence score. The MSCEIT details are shown in Table 2.

The results of the data analysis found a range, including acceptable reliabilities at the overall emotional intelligence level and Branch 1, and relatively low reliabilities for the balance of the dimensions. The overall emotional intelligence factor returned a reliability of .86 (Split ½) compared to the reported reliability of .91 in the test manual. The branch reliabilities ranged from an acceptable (Split ½) reliability of .91 (perceiving emotions) to low reliabilities of .63 (facilitating thought), .56 (understanding...
emotions), and .61 (managing emotions). These reliabilities differ somewhat from those reported by Mayer et al. (2002), which ranged from an overall emotional intelligence reliability (Split ½) of .93 to a low reliability at the facilitating emotions (Branch 2) of .79. See Table 3 for details.

The leaders in this study scored within the range expected from the normed sample.

The means, standard deviations, and internal consistency obtained in this study were consistent with that reported by Bass and Avolio (2000). All leadership dimensions were within the expected range. The nine leadership styles and composite transformational leadership score showed sufficient internal consistency ranging from $\alpha = .74$ (management by exception–passive) to $\alpha = .87$ (inspirational motivation), and $\alpha = .94$ for transformational leadership. The outcome variables of satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort also had sufficient internal consistency.

In this study, the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000) returned higher reliabilities than that of the MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2002) in both the subdimensions and as the item scores within the dimensions.

The only significant result for the entire comparison of the various dimensions of emotional intelligence with transformational leadership was the facilitating thought branch of emotional intelligence and the idealized behavior leadership style dimension at an $r = .157$ (see Table 4). All means and standard deviations for both the subordinate responses on the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000) and the managers’ responses on the MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2002) were within the range expected from the normed sample of each respective instrument. There was a negative correlation ($r = -.030$) between perceiving emotions, as measured by the MSCEIT, and transformational leadership styles, as perceived by subordinates. Although there were a number of positive correlations between various elements of emotional intelligence and transformational leadership (facilitating thought, understanding emotions and managing emotions), every one of them was a nonsignificant correlation. These findings are completely contrary to what the prevailing literature suggests. The relationship between emotional intelligence and transactional leadership style was explored through the next research question.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Emotional Intelligence as Measured by the MSCEIT ($n = 133$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Split ½ Reliability</th>
<th>Test Manual Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total emotional intelligence</td>
<td>95.17</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 1: perceiving emotions</td>
<td>99.16</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 2: facilitating thought</td>
<td>97.11</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 3: understanding emotions</td>
<td>95.38</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 4: managing emotions</td>
<td>96.05</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because of minimal literature in the area of transactional leadership and emotional intelligence, transactional leadership was not identified as having a base in emotions. It was therefore assumed that there would be no significant correlation between the four branches of emotional intelligence, as measured by the MSCEIT, and transactional leadership style, as perceived by subordinates.

Within the various branches of emotional intelligence and transactional leadership dimension contingent reward, the study again found all nonsignificant correlations (Table 5). Both the perceiving emotions branch \( r = -0.079 \) and understanding emotions \( r = -0.024 \) returned negative nonsignificant correlations. The facilitating thought \( r = 0.143 \) branch and managing emotions \( r = 0.085 \) both returned positive yet nonsignificant correlations. Similar to the transformational leadership dimensions, all means and standard deviations on the managers’ responses on the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000) were within the expected range. Laissez-faire leadership was the third and final leadership style variable explored.

The correlation between laissez-faire leadership, which is the negation of leadership, was also expected to show no significant relationship between it and the various components of emotional intelligence. There were negative, nonsignificant correlations with three of the four branches of emotional intelligence and laissez-faire leadership: perceiving emotions \( r = -0.035 \), facilitating thought \( r = -0.051 \), and managing emotions \( r = -0.087 \). A positive, nonsignificant correlation was returned between
Table 4. Correlation of Emotional Intelligence and Transformational Leadership Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>0.609 (n = 137)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation (1)</td>
<td>2.41 0.591 (n = 138)</td>
<td>.925**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized attributes (2)</td>
<td>2.41 0.689 (n = 138)</td>
<td>.956**</td>
<td>.864**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized behaviors (3)</td>
<td>2.41 0.626 (n = 137)</td>
<td>.898**</td>
<td>.771**</td>
<td>.837**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation (4)</td>
<td>2.61 0.718 (n = 138)</td>
<td>.923**</td>
<td>.785**</td>
<td>.852**</td>
<td>.812**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized consideration (5)</td>
<td>2.74 0.667 (n = 138)</td>
<td>.921**</td>
<td>.854**</td>
<td>.849**</td>
<td>.739**</td>
<td>.800**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 1: perceiving emotions (6)</td>
<td>99.16 15.13 (n = 133)</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 2: facilitating thought (7)</td>
<td>97.11 13.71 (n = 133)</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.157*</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.348**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 3: understanding emotions (8)</td>
<td>95.38 9.82 (n = 133)</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.0149</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.236**</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 4: managing emotions (9)</td>
<td>96.05 8.38 (n = 133)</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td>.185**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI total</td>
<td>95.17 11.57 (n = 133)</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.755**</td>
<td>.744**</td>
<td>.613**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 . **p < .01.
**Table 5.** Correlations of Emotional Intelligence and Transactional Leadership Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Contingent Reward</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingent reward</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Management by exception-active</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.169*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management by exception-passive</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>-0.559**</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Branch 1: perceiving emotions</td>
<td>99.16</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Branch 2: facilitating thought</td>
<td>97.11</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.348**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Branch 3: understanding emotions</td>
<td>95.38</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.236**</td>
<td>0.328**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Branch 4: managing emotions</td>
<td>96.05</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.262**</td>
<td>0.395**</td>
<td>0.185*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI total</td>
<td>95.17</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.755**</td>
<td>0.744**</td>
<td>0.613**</td>
<td>0.591***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

**Table 6.** Correlations of Emotional Intelligence and Laissez-Faire Leadership Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Laissez-faire</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Branch 1: perceiving emotions</td>
<td>99.16</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Branch 2: facilitating thought (2)</td>
<td>97.11</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>0.348**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Branch 3: understanding emotions (3)</td>
<td>95.38</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.236**</td>
<td>0.328**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Branch 4: managing emotions (4)</td>
<td>96.05</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.262**</td>
<td>0.395**</td>
<td>0.185**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI total</td>
<td>95.17</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.755**</td>
<td>0.744**</td>
<td>0.613**</td>
<td>0.591***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01.

understanding emotions and laissez-faire leadership. Again, all means and standard deviations obtained in this study were within the expected range as reported by the authors. See Table 6 for the results.
The final sets of hypotheses were around the outcome variables of leadership, namely leadership effectiveness, satisfaction with the leader, and extra effort. The following section describes the analyses of the data surrounding the hypotheses of these relationships. See Figure 2 for a pictorial representation.

Extra effort of a follower is measured by a follower’s willingness to try harder, complete more than they are expected to do, and have a heightened desire to succeed. It was hypothesized that leaders who are more emotionally intelligent would be able to influence this variable.

The results suggest no support, in that there was no relationship between the various components of emotional intelligence and extra effort (see Table 7). These results applied to all four branches of perceiving emotions ($r = .001$), facilitating thought ($r = .060$), understanding emotions ($r = .066$), and managing emotions ($r = .018$). What the results confirm is that there are no significant associations between the reported extra effort and emotional intelligence. A continued analysis follows on the dependent variable of satisfaction.

Based on prior research, it was predicted that no significant correlation between the various components of emotional intelligence and extra effort as perceived by subordinates would be found. Emotional intelligence did not correlate significantly with perceived satisfaction of the leader (see Table 7). Here again, all correlational statistics returned were positive, and they were nonsignificant between the various branches of emotional intelligence and the leadership outcome of satisfaction.
Table 7. Correlation of Emotional Intelligence Dimensions and Leadership Outcome Variable of Extra Effort & Satisfaction & Effectiveness (N = 133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Extra Effort</th>
<th>Branch 1</th>
<th>Branch 2</th>
<th>Branch 3</th>
<th>Branch 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceiving emotions</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitating thought</td>
<td>99.16</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.348**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding emotions</td>
<td>95.38</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.236**</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing emotions</td>
<td>96.05</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td>.185*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceiving emotions</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitating thought</td>
<td>99.19</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.348**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding emotions</td>
<td>95.38</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing emotions</td>
<td>96.025</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>.220**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceiving emotions</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitating thought</td>
<td>99.19</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.348**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding emotions</td>
<td>95.38</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing emotions</td>
<td>96.03</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>.220**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.
satisfaction. The results were as follows: perceiving emotions, \( r = .015 \); facilitating thought, \( r = .075 \); understanding emotion, \( r = .027 \); and managing, \( r = .103 \).

The final questions were around perceived effectiveness of the leader and emotional intelligence. In previous studies, transformational leadership was shown to relate to leadership effectiveness and hence leadership performance (Lowe et al., 1996). In addition, it was stipulated that emotionally intelligent leaders should have a higher aptitude to tap into their followers and hence lead them transformationally. Leading transformationally is to have your followers question methods and seek ways to improve. Hence, this research study was looking for a significant and positive correlation between various components of emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness as perceived by the subordinates.

As indicated in the table above, no support was found for the relationship between the various components of emotional intelligence and perceived leadership effectiveness (Table 7). Contrary to what the literature suggests, the study found all positive, nonsignificant correlations. So emotional intelligence in this study was shown to be not related to how effective a leader is perceived to be in setting clear goals and objectives, maintaining confidence in the team, and knowledge and appreciation of work in others. The four branches of emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness were as follows: perceiving emotions \( (r = .015) \), facilitating thought \( (r = .118) \), understanding emotions \( (r = .047) \), and managing emotions \( (r = .129) \). The various branches of emotional intelligence had no significant relationship with the various outcomes of leadership.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

**Transformational Leadership and Emotional Intelligence**

When comparing the data within the dimensions of emotional intelligence and components of transformational leadership, no significant relationships were found, which led to a finding of no support for the first research question. The results of this study differ from those reported by Sosik and Megerian (1999). They evaluated the relationships of emotional intelligence, transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness, and found that managers who were rated more effective leaders by their subordinates possessed more aspects of emotional intelligence. Sosik and Megerian used a trait-based perspective of emotional intelligence, whereas in this study, the author limited the view of emotional intelligence to an ability perspective. Buford (2001) also used a mixed model perspective of emotional intelligence and found a relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. Little relationship, however, has been found between the self-reported leadership practices of nurses and their emotional intelligence (Vitello-Cicciu, 2001), as reported by the MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2002), and no support is suggested for the effect of emotional intelligence as a predictor of leadership success of top executives (V. L. Collins, 2001).
The findings of this study suggest that the ability perspective of emotional intelligence does not have any relationship to perceptions of leadership style. A further explanation for these findings could be that the MSCEIT is not effectively capturing the significant differences in emotional intelligence from one individual to the next. Mixed reliability results were obtained within the correlations among items on the MSCEIT, pointing to some potential construct validity problems, and this could be another possible explanation for no significant correlations found on some of the dimensions.

**Transactional Leadership and Emotional Intelligence**

Similar to the findings for the transformational leadership dimensions, none of the transactional leadership dimensions (contingent reward, management by exception–active and management by exception–passive) had any significant relationships to any of the components of emotional intelligence. Two conclusions can be made: (a) no relationships exist between emotional intelligence and transactional leadership, and therefore the importance of emotional intelligence in day-to-day leadership is grossly exaggerated, or (b) some limitations of the MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002), with the low reliabilities, do not allow for these conclusions at this time and further development is warranted.

**Laissez-Faire Leadership and Emotional Intelligence**

This study found no relationship between the laissez-faire leadership style and the emotional intelligence of their leader. This study suggests that the emotional intelligence of a leader has no relationship to his or her lack of leadership tendencies (laissez-faire leadership). This result is contrary to what the popular press and some research might suggest.

**Leadership Outcomes and Emotional Intelligence**

The final question evaluated the various leadership outcomes (extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness) and their relationship with emotional intelligence. All these leadership outcome variables were based on the perceptions of the followers and all were evaluated in a correlation analysis. In this study, no relationship was found between the extra effort their leader gets out of the follower and the leader’s emotional intelligence; no significant relationships were found between the various components of emotional intelligence and the dependent variable of satisfaction, and there was no significant positive relationship between leadership effectiveness and the various dimensions of emotional intelligence. Therefore, the emotional intelligence of a manager had no correlation to the perceptions of extra effort of a follower, satisfaction with a manager, or perceived effectiveness of that manager and their perceived performance.
**Implications for HRD**

The development of effective leaders is recognized as a high priority for business organizations. A number of popular examples to this effect can be found in the extant literature on leadership and organizational success. One such example is the text *Good to Great* (J. Collins, 2001), which speaks to those critical components for an organization to be “great” as defined in cumulative stock return as compared to the general market. The foundation of their model is that the right leadership is in place. Another is *First, Break all the Rules* (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999), a summary of a Gallup survey on what effective managers did differently, and finally, *Strengths Based Leadership* (Rath & Conchie, 2009), which speaks to the importance of connecting leadership skills with those of himself and his colleagues to drive organizational business results. These examples are challenging the status quo, and they reinforce the notion that “leadership ranks among the most researched and debated topics in the organizational sciences” (George, 2000, p. 1028). The topic of leadership is very important to the practice of HRD.

Goleman’s (1995, 1998, 2000) emotional intelligence premise challenges conventional thinking, in that the emotions are important to consider in relation to one’s effectiveness. Emotions and emotional intelligence are no longer considered taboo in the workplace today and are rather considered an important foundation for performance. Since his early work, the business writings in this area have exploded. The claims however far exceed the scholarly support. Hence our business leaders’ perceptions of the impact of high emotional intelligence on their organizational leaders’ effectiveness and success may be inaccurate. In spite of these findings, the issue of leadership effectiveness remains core to the field of HRD.

A better understanding of emotional intelligence and its relationship to leadership style and effectiveness can address a current gap in the literature today and provide a more informed link between theory and practice. This understanding can also better inform practitioners, and hence their leadership development programs as well as staffing within their organizations. The outcomes of this study contribute to these areas.

**Implications for Practice**

The populations studied were the employees of a single manufacturing organization. The results of the study relate to the employees who participated in this study. This presents a limitation as to the generalizability of the implications for the study. Therefore, it is inappropriate to draw general implications for practice based on the results of this single study. Further replication of this type of study and empirical verification would determine the significance of the recommendations beyond the boundaries of CSW.

CSW had identified emotional intelligence as a key competency for evaluating its leadership and professional employees. Within this perspective, the lack of significant relationships between the various components of leadership style and emotional
intelligence is important to CSW and potentially other organizations wanting to improve performance. Organizational efforts may be expelled in the wrong areas (that of improving emotional intelligence) and could be used in other areas to provide more significant contributions to the organization’s management team.

Another consideration is that an ability-based definition of emotional intelligence has little utility from an organizational perspective. The more broad-stroked, personality-based definitions of emotional intelligence appear to have more face validity with organizations. These perspectives may more effectively describe the kinds of characteristics and behaviors that many organizations hold their leaders accountable to. For specifics in language, however, understanding exactly what the HRD practitioners and managers are defining and looking for when speaking of emotional intelligence is and will continue to be critically important.

Although this study’s results should not be broadly generalized, they are still important to consider for today’s practitioners. It appears that many of the benefits espoused regarding emotional intelligence to an individual’s leadership success, performance, and effectiveness still need to be empirically confirmed. This study shows that those relationships between emotional intelligence, leadership style, and leadership effectiveness do not exist. Hence, further research is needed in the areas of this construct and associated measurement tools before this author would support its use in practice.

**Implications for Theory**

This study suggests that there are no relationships between a leader’s effectiveness and his or her emotional intelligence, contrary to claims by Goleman (1995, 1998, 2000) and others. This finding is important not only for the theory around emotional intelligence but also around the issue of leadership effectiveness and performance.

How leaders can be more effective is a core issue to the field of HRD. This study was intended to address a gap existing in the literature today in providing a more informed link between the theory and practice of the relationship between leadership effectiveness and emotional intelligence. The results of this study indicate that the expertise associated with effective leadership is not related, nor core to an individual’s emotional intelligence. Additional empirical research is needed in this area.

It has been suggested that emotional intelligence might be an aide to leadership development and leadership effectiveness (Drodge & Murphy, 2002). This study found that the perceptions of a leader’s leadership style and leadership effectiveness have no relationship to that leader’s emotional intelligence. Several conclusions can be drawn from this study to the implications for the theory base. Several recent studies have been completed using the MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2002) with mixed results as to the relative contribution of emotional intelligence to predictions of general personality, life criteria, and leadership. One conclusion from this study is that some further development work is needed on the MSCEIT and that the lack of relationship results found are not significant to the knowledge base. Alternatively, the importance of emotional intelligence and
its relationship to leadership style and leadership effectiveness has been overempha-
sized in the literature, and that these relationships neither exist nor are they important
to a continued understanding of a leader’s effectiveness in an organization. The reli-
ability data found for the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000) leadership assessment
however was as expected.

Future Research Needs

Because of the incorporation of emotional intelligence concepts into practice, the as
yet limited amount of empirical research in the area of emotional intelligence, and the
results of this study, a number of future research needs can be identified. These include,
for example, developing consistently reliable instrumentation, developing a more
closely aligned definition of emotional intelligence, determining if the construct of
emotional intelligence is a unique measure, and exploring the construct of emotional
intelligence qualitatively.

Questions on how to measure emotional intelligence have resulted in much dia-
logue in the literature. Most measurement tools however use self-reports. The MSCEIT
(Mayer et al., 2002) is one of the earliest attempts at a performance-based instru-
ment. The results of this study would indicate however that some more work is
needed if this instrument is to be used to identify core relationships between vari-
ables and to further explore research agendas on emotional intelligence, leadership,
and management.

The construct of emotional intelligence itself also needs to be investigated further. This
construct is viewed very broadly in some bodies of work and very narrowly in
others. A more closely aligned definition of emotional intelligence is needed for clar-
ity and to assist future researchers and practitioners. The broad array of definitions has
different underlying assumptions and they are measured with different methods. This
results in the use of the term emotional intelligence in many different ways. A careful
reading is required in the respective theoretical journals to understand the author’s
perspective and compare that perspective to their conclusions. Confusion also occurs in
practice. Without a critical read of the articles and an understanding of the various per-
spectives of emotional intelligence, our practitioners are being led into a continual
pursuit of what might be a corporate fad.

In addition to clarity around the definition of emotional intelligence, the unique-
ess of this construct needs to be investigated further. The question of whether or not
emotional intelligence is contributing anything unique is an important one to answer.
It may be that these concepts of emotion perception, understanding, and managing
emotion are captured in other constructs already in use and that there is no need to
have an emotional intelligence construct.

Another recommendation for future research is to explore the concept of emotional
intelligence from a qualitative perspective. It may be that emotional intelligence is
difficult to measure in the quantitative perspective and a better understanding may be
 gained through looking at it differently. The nuances around individuals’ behavior and
approach to others could be explored through a qualitative lens and would contribute
additional knowledge in this body of emotional intelligence work.
The topic of emotional intelligence has generated a great deal of interest in the practitioner community and a divergence of perspectives in the research community. Finally, several authors have recently raised more specific concerns regarding this construct and suggest either a modified research agenda or approach to better leverage emotions and leadership (Clarke, 2006; Fambrough & Hart, 2008). A better understanding of this construct from a multitude of perspectives, along with tools to effectively measure it, will contribute significantly to this phenomenon of emotional intelligence and further clarify whether it provides a unique contribution to our understanding of individuals and to the field of HRD.
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