

# **Emotional intelligence and leadership**

**Prepared for:  
Canadian Forces Leadership Institute**

**Prepared by:  
Dr. Arla L. Day, Dr. Shaun Newsome,  
& Dr. Victor M. Catano**

Draft: March 28, 2002

**Table of Contents**

Executive Summary.....	2
Background.....	3
Introduction to leadership & emotional intelligence .....	4
Models and definitions of leadership.....	5
a. Trait-Based Model	
➤ Charismatic Leadership	
➤ Transformational Leadership	
b. Situational/Contingency	
c. Interaction of Leader & Follower	
Emotional Intelligence: General History & Background.....	9
a. Intelligence research	
➤ Social intelligence	
➤ Practical intelligence	
b. Emotions research	
Current models and definitions of emotional intelligence .....	11
a. Ability-based model	
b. Trait-based model (or “Mixed-model”)	
Critique of available tests of emotional intelligence .....	12
a. Ability-based tests	
b. Mixed-model (self-report) tests	
Construct and predictive validity of emotional intelligence measures.....	16
Emotional Intelligence and Leadership.....	20
a. Comparison of constructs	
b. Ability-based EI and leadership	
c. Mixed-model EI, Personality, and leadership	
Implications for organizations .....	21
a. Selection	
b. Training	
Conclusions .....	22
a. Summary of the literature	
b. Suggestions for future research	
c. Implications and recommendations for the military	

## **Emotional Intelligence and Leadership**

### **Executive Summary**

Leadership is important in all organizations and is even more important in large military organizations such as the Canadian Forces (CF). It is important to examine the factors that may influence the emergence and utilization of effective leadership styles, as well as influence the overall effectiveness of organizations (including the CF). Emotional intelligence (EI) is a popular new construct that has been credited with being an effective new organizational tool for leaders and employees alike (Goleman, 1995). However, EI is not without its critics, and research in the area is just beginning to examine the effectiveness of EI in organizational contexts. Two main problems with the current EI literature are identified: the lack of a consensus regarding the meaning of EI.

## **Background**

The Canadian Forces (CF) has identified leadership as a central issue to its effective functioning. The CF is interested in examining all aspects of leadership and identifying potential research areas as well as practical implications for the successful integration of leadership philosophies and models (and leadership-related factors) into the military. Strong leadership is important for all organizations and is especially important in a military context (Meyer, 1997).

The relatively new concept of emotional intelligence may have important implications for leadership in the military. There have been many claims about the ability of emotional intelligence to predict work and life satisfaction (Goleman, 1995), although there has been little evidence to support these claims.

We were requested to examine the leadership literature in terms of its various models. We were also requested to examine the emotional intelligence literature in terms of its definitions, popular models, validity, and use in organizations. We will link these two topics, highlight the implications of the research in both of these areas, and identify future research and implementation issues, with specific emphasis on leadership in the military.

## **Introduction to leadership & emotional intelligence**

Leadership is an important to any organization, but may be even more important to a military institution. Meyer (1997) outlined the importance of sound leadership across all levels of an organization, and he emphasized the criticality of having effective leadership in the military. He noted that just prior to WWII, there was “a proficient relationship between the leader and the led, rooted in peacetime administration – but insufficiently developed to withstand the rigor of combat” (p.59).

When examining leadership, we must also examine how it is related other constructs. The “relatively new” concept of emotional intelligence has been creating a lot of interest among employers, practitioners, employees, and academics alike. In the present paper, we will examine various perspectives of leadership and review the literature on emotional intelligence. We will draw these two diverse topics together and discuss the implications of EI on leadership, making specific suggestions for future research and outlining the implications for organizations.

## **Models and definitions of leadership**

Theories of leadership have revolved around either identifying the individual traits and behaviours of successful leaders, examining the situations that can foster or inhibit effective leadership (i.e., the organizational, societal, and external environments), or examining the relationship between leaders and followers. When examining the relationship between EI and leadership, it may be argued that the most pertinent leadership theories deal with individual leader traits and behaviours.

### Trait- and Behaviour-Based Model

According to the trait- and behaviour-based models, specific traits are associated with effective leadership. For example, intelligence, self-confidence, need for achievement, motivation to lead, emotional stability, honesty, integrity, need for achievement have all been identified as being necessary for successful leadership performance (Greenberg et al., 2000; Johns & Saks, 2001).

Meyer (1997) argued that the factors for “which soldiers are willing to sacrifice their lives for – loyalty, team spirit, morale, trust and confidence – cannot be infused by managing” (p. 59). He noted the individual nature of subordinates, stressing the importance of individual consideration and motivation. He believed that it is the goal of the leader to encourage the subordinate’s search for individual growth. Three factors are necessary to produce a successful leaders: having strength of character (in terms of honesty, loyalty, courage, self-confidence, and self-sacrifice); having the requisite knowledge; and application of character and knowledge (through teaching, mentoring, setting an example, etc.; Meyer, 1997).

Charismatic and Transformational Leadership. Within the trait literature, many researchers have examined charismatic and transformational leader characteristics. Charismatic leaders are defined as having high self-confidence and a clear vision (Shamir, Zakay, & Popper, 1998), engaging in unconventional behaviour, and acting as a change agent, and still being realistic about environmental constraints (Greenberg et al., 2000).

The research on transformational leadership evolved from the charismatic literature. Transformational leaders are defined as leaders that inspire followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of an overall vision (REF). Bass (1985) distinguished between charismatic

and transformational leaders in that transformational leaders are charismatic leaders who influence followers and whose followers benefit from this influence. That is, all transformational leaders must be charismatic, although all charismatic leaders are not necessarily transformational.

There are three key components of charismatic and transformational leadership: (1) inspirational leadership; (2) individual consideration; and (3) intellectual stimulation. Inspirational leadership involves arousal of motivational factors in terms of instilling pride, role modeling, and encouraging followers, and stimulating enthusiasm and self-confidence. For transformational leaders, this inspiration also involves influencing followers to succeed. Individual consideration involves considering followers not only at a group level, but also treating followers differently (yet all fairly) on an individual basis (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1993). Finally, intellectual stimulation involves “the arousal and change in followers of problem awareness and problem solving, of thought and imagination, and of beliefs and values, rather than arousal and change in immediate action” (Bass, 1985, p. 99). Transformational leaders challenge followers to question the status quo (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999).

Charismatic leadership has been associated with increased organizational effectiveness (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramanian, 1996), subjective and objective performance (Fuller, Patterson, Hester, & Stringer, 1996), organizational financial performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993), subordinate ratings or effectiveness (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramanian, 1996). Similarly, transformational leadership has also been associated with higher follower attitudes, organizational commitment, and performance (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Kirkpartick

& Locke, 1996), increased organizational financial performance (Avolio, Waldman, & Einstein, 1988; Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996)

Conger & Kanungo (1994) argued that the main distinction between the charismatic and transformational leadership literature was that the charismatic literature focused on the characteristics and behaviours of the leader, whereas the transformational literature examined the impact of the leader characteristics on the followers.

However, Bass (1985) didn't make this distinction, and noted that defining a leader as charismatic or transformational depends not only on the leader, but also on the characteristics of the followers and the environment (Bass, 1985). He stated that charisma was defined solely in terms of how followers perceive it. Moreover, Howell and Hall-Merenda (1999) argued that it is important to look at both the leader characteristics and the leader-follower (i.e., leader-member exchange) perspectives simultaneously. That is, how do transformational leaders develop a relationship with their followers? EI may influence this relationship as well as how this interaction is defined.

### The Interaction of Leader and Followers

According to Hersey & Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory, effective leadership style is based on the followers' characteristics, in terms of willingness and ability to do the job (Greenberg et al., 2000). Other theories incorporate both situation and follower characteristics. For example, according to Fiedler's Contingency Theory (Fiedler, 1967; Fiedler, 1978; Fiedler & Chemers, 1974), the orientation of leadership style (i.e., relationship vs. task-oriented) used is dependent on the favourability of the situation.



The impact that leaders have on their followers is influenced by the characteristics of these followers (Lord, Brown, & Frieberg, 1999). Little research has examined how followers affect a leader's tendency toward charismatic, transformational, or transactional leadership. However, this perception of followers and follower characteristics are inherent in the definition of charismatic and transformational leadership.

For example, although transformational leaders must exhibit intellectual stimulation and the leader must be seen as having high intellect, he or she must also be able to relate to his or her followers and must gauge the amount of stimulation required for particular followers (Bass, 1985). The ability of the leader to inspire belief in his or her vision is contingent upon the receptivity of the followers to the vision. This receptivity depends on the relevance of the vision (Bass, 1985).

According to the Leader-Member Exchange theory, leadership is a process focusing on the dyadic relationship between the leader and follower (Northouse, 1997). Leaders must focus on the dyadic relationship between leader and subordinate involving mutual trust, respect, and influence. A leader has different relationships with different subordinates (Graen & Wakabayashi, 1994; Greenberg et al., 2000).

In addition to examining the characteristics of and relationship between leaders and followers, it is also important to look at the influence of the environment on these types of leaders.

### Contingency-based Models

Contingency or situational theories of leadership are based on the premise that successful leadership depends on environmental factors (such as task clarity and the degree of challenge offered by the task, which are both related to organizational level; Johns & Saks, 2001).

Certain situations may foster the emergence of a charismatic or transformational leader: This emergence depends on factors within the organization and industry, and well as the more general historical, economic, and social circumstances (Bass, 1985). That is, transformational leaders may emerge as a reflection of social values during times of stress or change, when new leaders are sought to solve old problems and encourage organizational survival (Bass, 1985). Similarly, Donohue and Wong (1994) noted several conditions in which transformational leadership may emerge: during an acute crisis or when the organizational culture is being attacked; when a general “malaise” exists; when subordinates are disillusioned.

House’s Path-Goal Theory states that the type of leader behaviours (i.e., directive, supportive, participative, and achievement oriented) are most effective in certain situations (House, 1971; House, 1996; Johns & Saks, 2001). Popper, Landau, and Gluskinso (1992) argued that leadership must be examined in the context of the organization’s culture and socio-technical issues. For example, in a combat situation involving relatively simple individual tasks (e.g., working in a tank) or in combat situations involving complicated technology and instruments (e.g., a fighter plane), transformational leadership is not critical because the leader does not have any opportunity to influence the individual. However, Popper et al. (1992) argued that transformational leadership is much more critical in an infantry situation (complicated technology and relatively simple instruments) because the leader has a greater opportunity to express his/her vision and influence the followers’ motivation level and behaviours.

### **Introduction to emotional intelligence**

Emotional Intelligence (EI) has become a popular topic since the publication of Goleman’s (1995) best-seller book on the topic. It has been heralded as the best predictor of

work and life success (Goleman, 1995; 1998). Many claims have been made about the ability of this construct to predict work outcomes, such as job satisfaction, turnover (Goleman, 1998), and performance (Bachman, Stein, Campbell, & Sitarenios, 2000). However, this construct has not been without its critics, who assert that there is a lack of research examining these claims.

### **Emotional Intelligence: General History & Background**

#### Emotions & Intelligence Research

Although EI is promoted as a “new” construct, similar constructs have been circulating for over 80 years. Salovey and Mayer (1990) referred to EI as an aspect of social intelligence. Social intelligence was defined as the ability to understand and manage emotions (Thorndike, 1920). This type of intelligence was viewed as being a part of a multifaceted construction of intelligence.

Practical intelligence (Sternberg’s (1985) triarchic theory of intelligence classifies three types of intelligences: (1) Analytic Intelligence, which assesses one’s logical and mathematical ability; (2) Creative Intelligence, which measures one’s ability to cope with new tasks; and (3) Practical intelligence, which assesses one’s ability to adapt to their environment. Gardner (1983) also viewed intelligence as being multifaceted. Two types of socially-based intelligences are related to EI: interpersonal intelligence involves the ability to understand other people; intrapersonal intelligence involves the ability to understand one’s self. Research has not been successful in defining nor measuring social intelligence (Cronbach, 1960; Riggio, Messamer, & Throckmorton, 1991).

### **Current models and definitions of emotional intelligence**

Although EI has become a popular topic among researchers, practitioners, and the general public, there is no consensus as to the definition of EI. There are two competing models of emotional intelligence: The ability-based model, which is endorsed by Mayer and his colleagues (Mayer, DiPaolo, & Salovey, 1990; Mayer & Salovey, 1997) and the trait-based (or “mixed”) model, which is endorsed by researchers such as Goleman (1995; 1998) and Bar-On (1997).

#### Ability-Based Model

These previous conceptualizations of social or interpersonal intelligence have focused on the intelligence literature. In addition to the intelligence literature, Salovey and Mayer (1990) examined the emotions literature to develop their conceptualization of EI. They initially defined EI as “the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (p. 189). In this definition of EI, Salovey and Mayer (1990) identified three components of EI: an ability to appraise others’ emotions, an ability to regulate one’s own emotions, and an ability to use emotions to solve problems. The first component draws largely on Ekman’s work on display of emotions. Ekman and his colleagues (Ekman, 1993; Ekman & Friesen, 1975) argued that there are a number of basic (i.e., unlearned) emotions that are universal across all cultures (although display rules may differ), and that are reflected in the same facial expressions. The second component involves research on emotional knowledge. The third component expands research that looks at how emotions facilitate expression and communication.

According to this ability perspective, EI is a group of abilities that are distinct from the traditional dimensions of intelligence and that facilitate the perception, expression, assimilation,

understanding, and regulation of emotions, so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). More specifically, Mayer and Salovey (1997) expanded on their 1990 definition by creating a four-branch model of EI consisting of: (1) Emotional Perception: the ability to perceive emotions in oneself and others, as well as in objects, art, and stories; (2) Emotional Facilitation of Thought: the ability to generate, use, and feel emotions in order to communicate feelings, or use them in other mental processes; (3) Emotional Understanding: the ability to understand how emotions combine and progress through relationship transitions and to reason about emotions; and (4) Emotional Management: the ability to be open to emotions and to moderate them in oneself and others, in order to encourage personal understanding and growth.

Despite the initial research defining EI in terms of an ability, subsequent researchers have claimed that EI is composed of non-cognitive related competencies, traits, and skills (Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1995). The trait-based model of EI tends to be more pervasive in non-academic settings than the ability-based approach. Goleman defined EI as being non-cognitive in nature, and including such personal traits as empathy, optimism, adaptability, warmth, and motivation. Bar-On (1997) defined EI in broad terms as a set of non-cognitive abilities, skills, and competencies that affect the way in which individuals cope with environmental demands (Bar-On, 1997).

### **Measures of EI**

As the popularity of the construct of EI skyrocketed, so did the number of “tests” of EI. These tests can be divided into the ability-based measures and measures based on the mixed model.

Ability-Based EI Measures

For the most part, few measures have been created based on the ability measure. The reason for the lack of measures is primarily due the difficult nature of creating these types of measures. The primary measure that is currently operational is the Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002).<sup>1</sup>

The MSCEIT was first developed by Mayer et al. (1999) to assess their four branch ability-based model of EI: emotional management, emotional understanding, emotional integration, and emotional perception. The MSCEIT was based on Mayer and his colleagues' earlier ability-based measure, the Multi-factor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS; REF). The MEIS was also designed to assess Mayer and Salovey's (1997) four branch model. However, the MEIS suffered from low reliability.

The MSCEIT (version 2) consists of the 4 branches and 2 scales per branch (see Table 1).

**Table 1: The factors, definition, and subscales of the MSCEIT.**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Subscales</b>
1. Emotional Perception	➤ The ability to perceive emotions in oneself and others, as well as in objects, art, stories, and the like.	➤ Faces ➤ Landscapes & Designs
2. Emotional facilitation of thought	➤ The ability to generate and use emotion to improve mental processes.	➤ Synesthesia ➤ Facilitation
3. Emotional Understanding	➤ The ability to understand emotional information (i.e., how emotions combine and change) and to reason about these emotional meanings.	➤ Blends ➤ Progressions & Transitions
4. Emotional Management	➤ The ability to be open to feelings and to change one's own feelings to promote	➤ Emotions in Relationships

<sup>1</sup> A research version is currently available. The version for general use is to be available by March 30, 2002.

	personal understanding and growth.	➤ Emotion Management
--	------------------------------------	----------------------

The MSCEIT uses a consensus method to score responses. This method involves collecting a large number of judgements from a normative sample for each item. The test taker is deemed “correct” if he or she answers in the same manner as the majority of the norm group. Mayer and his colleagues argued that the consensus scoring procedure is the most accurate and reliable method of determining the correct response (Mayer et al., 2000a; Mayer et al., 2000b; Mayer, DiPaolo, & Salovey, 1990) and is highly correlated with the expert ratings (Mayer, personal communication). They argued that consensus scoring results in higher correlations between EI and outcomes than when using other scoring procedures (Mayer et al., 2000a).

Critique of Ability-Based Measures:

One of the original criticisms of the ability-based measures was that they tended to exhibit low reliability (Davies, Stankov, & Roberts, 1998). However, Mayer ... contend that their new measure (i.e., MSCEIT) has addressed this criticism. They report split half reliabilities ranging from  $r = .79$  to  $r = .91$  for the four factors, and  $r = .64$  to  $r = .88$  for the eight tasks.

Ability-based measures tend to show good discriminant validity from personality measures and are slightly correlated with cognitive ability (Carroll & Day, 2001; Livingstone & Day, 2001). These measures tend to show low or moderate correlations with psychosocial outcomes (Livingstone & Day, 2001). However, there is little evidence that ability-based measures are related to job performance and academic performance.

Trait-Based EI Measures

Unlike the ability-based measures, trait (or mixed-model) measures have flourished. The prolific numbers of test is evidenced by a quick examination of the internet. Self-report measures are quicker and easier to develop and to score. However, they have been criticized as lacking reliability and validity (Barrette, 2001), and have even been criticized as not measuring EI (Mayer et al., 2000).

The most popular published mixed-model measure is the EQ-i (Bar-On, 1997). This 133-item test assesses 15 subscales, which can be classified into 5 scales: (1) Intrapersonal functioning; (2) Interpersonal skills; (3) Adaptability; (4) Stress management; (5) General mood (see Table 1)

**Table 1: Bar-On’s (1997) EI model.**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Subscales</b>
1. Intrapersonal functioning	➤ the ability to be aware of and understand one’s emotions, feelings, and ideas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ emotional self-awareness</li> <li>➤ assertiveness</li> <li>➤ self-regard</li> <li>➤ self-actualization</li> <li>➤ independence</li> </ul>
2. Interpersonal skills	➤ the ability to be aware of and understand others’ emotions and feelings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ empathy</li> <li>➤ interpersonal relationships</li> <li>➤ social responsibility</li> </ul>
3. Adaptability	➤ the ability to be flexible and alter one’s feelings with changing situations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ problem solving</li> <li>➤ reality testing</li> <li>➤ flexibility</li> </ul>
4. Stress management	➤ the ability to cope with stress and to control emotions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ stress tolerance</li> <li>➤ impulse control</li> </ul>
5. General mood	➤ the ability to feel and express positive emotions and remain optimistic.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ happiness</li> <li>➤ optimism</li> </ul>



### Critique of Trait-Based Model (or “Mixed-model”)

Despite the popularity of this view, the mixed-model view of EI has received a lot of criticism from the scientific community. Mayer and Salovey (1997) argued that measures of emotional intelligence must assess actual abilities as opposed to self-reports of constructs such as optimism and motivation. That is, they argue that these mixed-model measures of “EI” are really measuring a construct or constructs other than EI. One of the frequent criticisms of the trait-based measures of EI is that they tend to be highly correlated with personality measures (Davies et al., 1998; Newsome, Day, & Catano, 2000). This lack of discriminant validity from a well-established construct of personality is worrisome. Mixed-model measures of EI also tend to be uncorrelated with cognitive ability, which Mayer and his colleagues claim is imperative for any intelligence.

There is little evidence that mixed-model measures are related to job performance or academic performance (Newsome et al., 2000). However, there is some evidence that certain trait-based measures of EI may be related to life outcomes (e.g., life satisfaction, relationship quality, ability to manage moods; Bar-On 1997; Ciarrochi, Chan & Caputi, 2000) and work outcomes (e.g., career commitment; Carson & Carson, 1998). However, some of this relationship may be explained through common method variance. That is, questions on measures such as the EQ-i ask respondents to indicate how happy they are. We would expect these questions to be highly correlated with the same type of questions on satisfaction measures asking respondents how satisfied they are.

### Claims About Emotional Intelligence

Since its' conception, EI has been heralded as an important variable in the prediction of life and work success (Goleman, 1995: 1998). Mayer, Salovey, et al. (2000b) suggested that EI may have an impact on many work-related outcomes, including job performance and interpersonal interactions, such as job interviews and interacting with coworkers on a daily basis. For example, based on research showing that IQ accounts for approximately 20% of the variance in life success, Goleman made the argument that EI accounts for the remaining 80% of the variance (Neely-Martinez, 1997). Claims have also been made about the role of EI in the prediction of job performance. For example, publishers of EI tests advocate the use of EI tests for personnel selection purposes, claiming that research has demonstrated a strong correlation between EI and job performance (Multi-Health Systems, 2001). Goleman (1998) also claimed that employees who are high in EI are "star performers." These claims, however, have been strongly criticized as being implausible and lacking empirical support (Barrett, Miguel, Tan, & Hurd, 2001; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000a). Critics argue that many of these claims are made on the basis of unpublished studies, anecdotal accounts, and misinterpreted data (Barrett et al., 2001; Jordan et al., 2001).

Although claims are made about the importance of EI to organizations and to the successful performance of employees, little research has examined these issues. Moreover, the connection between leadership and EI has not been addressed in detail. In order to further examine this issue, we must first take a more detailed look at different leadership theories and perspectives.

## **Emotional Intelligence and Leadership**

Leadership can be defined as a process of influencing other people's orientation towards and achievement of goals (Greenberg, Baron, Sales, & Owens, 2000; Johns & Saks, 2001).

Transformational leadership involves inspiring followers and communicating a vision.

Intuitively, it may appear logical to expect aspects of the ability-based model of EI to have important consequences for the study of leadership.

### Comparison of EI abilities to leadership traits

Several of the traits and behaviours associated with effective leaders (e.g., emotional stability, self-confidence, adaptability, and tenacity) overlap with the trait-based view of EI. An integral part of impression management is managing own emotions (which requires an ability to perceive others' emotions and one's own emotions). Theoretically, an individual who is high on impression management must also be adept at managing his or her own emotions and must also be able to correctly perceive others' emotions and one's own emotions. Charismatic leaders must have "insight into the needs, values, and hopes of their followers" (Bass, 1985, p.46). This insight may be facilitated through a higher level of emotional awareness and sensitivity. Bass (1985) also claimed that charismatic leaders are great actors, because they are engaging in impression management. Charismatic leaders create, communicate, and instill commitment toward a common vision (Bass, 1985). They create emotional responses (e.g., sense of excitement) in followers. Charismatic leaders create shared norms and tend to "actively shape and enlarge audiences through their own energy, self-confidence, assertiveness, ambition, and seizing of opportunities" (Bass, 1985; p.40).

Bass (1985) noted that when focusing on their individual followers, leaders must be supportive, considerate, empathetic, caring, and must give personalized attention. These requirements may be easier for an individual high in emotional intelligence, who is able to accurately perceive and understand others' emotions, while managing his or her own emotions. Bass (1985) also recognized that in many situations military leaders are expected to be mentors and counselors to their followers. They must display developmentally-oriented behaviours (e.g., encourage delegation), conduct individual counseling, and become a mentor and role model for followers. Emotional intelligence may also help leaders understand the emotions of followers and understand how to manage his or own emotions. This emotional knowledge helps the leader become an effective mentor by modeling appropriate emotional responses. The emotional perception ability of leaders is critical to the counseling and mentoring role.

Although charismatic leadership has been associated with positive outcomes, charismatic leaders may be ineffective for several reasons. A leader may fail if he or she is unable to cope with the difficulties that s/he faces, if the leader is overly confident and unwilling to compromise his or her principles, or if the leader is cold or arrogant (Bass, 1985). Charismatic leaders who are also sensitive to their followers, who have a good understanding of their own emotions (as well as the emotions of their followers), and who are capable of managing their own emotions (i.e., having high EI) may be less likely to fail. That is, it is possible that EI moderates the relationship between charisma and leadership effectiveness. Future research must examine this issue.

Moreover, charismatic leaders are not necessarily effective, and there is a potential dark side of charismatic leaders, which is evident if the number of charismatic leaders who

manipulated their followers for their own gain (e.g., Adolf Hitler, Charles Manson, etc.). Some EI researchers have also suggested that an individual who was extremely high in EI may be excellent at impression management to the extent of negatively influencing people.

#### Mixed-model EI, Personality, and leadership

Despite the view that mixed-model measures of EI do not actually assess EI, it may be worthwhile to examine these measures in conjunction with leadership. Even if these measures are not really EI, they could be very useful to organizations if they are associated with more effective leader (and organizational) performance.

The only two studies to examine EI and leadership have utilized mixed-model measures of EI. Barling, Slater, and Kelloway (2000) found that EI scores were related to subordinates' ratings of transformational leadership. Because of the large overlap of the mixed-model measures of EI and personality, the link between EI and leadership may be due solely to the shared variance with personality. Research has indicated that personality may predict effective leadership behaviours. For example, Judge and Bono (2000) found that extraversion and agreeableness uniquely predicted transformational leadership, while controlling for the effects of the other Big 5 factors. Openness to experience had a significant zero-order correlation with transformational leadership, although this relationship disappeared when the five factors were examined jointly. Neuroticism and conscientiousness were unrelated to transformational leadership.

One of the high performance leadership competencies that Schroder and colleagues (Schroder 1997; Spangenberg, Schroder, & Duvenage, 1999) identified is Interpersonal learning. It is feasible that EI (especially the Interpersonal Skills factor of the EQ-i, Bar-On, 1997) would

overlap significantly with this factor. Again, these studies on leadership competencies may reinforce the idea that certain factors of the mixed-model measures of EI are not truly EI, but are effective leader competencies. Future research should examine these issues and relate them to existing validated measures (e.g., 5-factor model of personality, self-monitoring ability, empathy, self-control, and delayed gratification).

### **Implications for organizations**

#### Selection & Training in Organizations and implications for the military

There have been many claims about the ability of EI measures to predict job performance. However, these claims are not supported by research (Barrett et al., 2001; Mayer et al., 1999). Regardless of the view of EI, there is inadequate data to justify using measures of EI as selection tools.

Claims have also been made about increasing EI through training. Depending on the view of EI (e.g., ability-based model), training may not be an option. Mayer and his colleagues argue that you can not train “emotional intelligence” but you are able to provide people with “emotional knowledge” (Mayer, personal communication, March 22, 2002). This knowledge may help people to better perceive and understand emotions, but it will not necessarily increase their emotional intelligence. Bar-On argues that EI, unlike personality, can be trained. However, there is little evidence that EI may be trained to any greater degree than personality.

### **Concluding remarks**

#### Summary of EI & Leadership

Despite the increasing attention that EI has received, there are two primary criticisms of EI that have not been addressed: (1) There is a variety of unrelated definitions and measures of

EI; and (2) There are unsubstantiated claims regarding the construct and criterion-related validity of EI.

The two primary models of EI are ability-based models (which conceptualize EI as an ability that shows a moderate relationship with traditional measures of EI) and mixed-model measures, which conceptualize EI as a combination of “non-cognitive” personality traits, moods, and other characteristics. Little research has examined leadership and any EI measures. There is even less evidence for a relationship between ability-based EI measures and leadership.

#### Suggestions for future research

The various definitions and measurement of EI must be clarified. The ability model should be used and the mixed-model measures should be re-labeled to more accurately reflect their content. The relationship between ability-based EI measures (and mixed-model “EI” measures) and job performance must be examined in greater detail. Moreover, multiple indicators of performance must be assessed. The feasibility of increasing EI characteristics through training must be addressed. Future research must also examine whether EI can have negative consequences if it is excessively high. Research must examine the comparability of EI and leadership traits. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that EI is an important characteristic for employees, let alone leaders.

Finally, leaders who are unable to interact closely with their followers (because of a great physical distance) have a less of an opportunity to show individual consideration and concern for individual followers (Shamir, 1995). Therefore, it would be interesting to examine whether EI can moderate the relationship between physical distance and influence on followers.





## References

- Abraham, R. (1999). Emotional intelligence in organizations: A conceptualization. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology, *125*, 209-215.
- Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1997). Psychological testing. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Andersen, S. M., & Bem, S. L. (1981). Sex typing and androgyny in dyadic interaction: Individual differences in responsiveness to physical attractiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *41*, 74-86.
- Arvey, R. D., Renz, G. L., & Watson, T. W. (1998). Emotionality and job performance: Implications for personnel selection. Personnel and Human Resources Management, *16*, 103-147.
- Ashforth, B. E. & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. Human relations, *48*(2), 97-125.
- Bachman, J., Stein, S., Campbell, K., & Sitarenios, G. (2000). Emotional intelligence in the collection of debt. International Journal of Selection & Assessment, *8*, 176-182.
- Barling, J. Slater, F. & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. The Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, *21*, 157-161.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). Emotional Quotient Inventory: Technical Manual. Toronto: Multi Health Systems.

Bar-On, R., Brown, J. M., Kircaldy, B. D., & Thomé, E. P. (2000). Emotional expression and implications for occupational stress; an application of the Emotional Quotient Inventory. Personality and Individual Differences, 2000, 1107-1118.

Barrett, G. V., Miguel, R. F., Tan, J. A., & Hurd, J. M. (2001, April). Emotional intelligence: The Madison Avenue approach to science and professional practice. Paper presented at the 16<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Organizational Dynamics, 18(3), 19-36.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions (pp. 49-80). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Borman, W. C., & Motowildo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. Human Performance, 10, 99-109.

Brown, L. T. & Anthony, R. G. (1990). Continuing the search for social intelligence. Personality and Individual Differences, 11 (5), 463-470.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 81-105.

Carroll, S. A. & Day, A.L. (2001, June). Examination of an ability-based measure of emotional intelligence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Ste.-Foy, QC.

Carrothers, R. M., Gregory, S. W., and Gallagher, T. J. (2000). Measuring emotional intelligence of medical school applicants. Academic Medicine, *75*, 456-463.

Cooper, R. K. (1997). Applying emotional intelligence in the workplace. Training and Development (Dec), 31-38.

Ciarrochi, J. V., Chan, A. Y., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. Personality and Individual Differences, *28*, 539-561.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). NEO-PI-R Professional Manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Crocker, L., & Algina, A. (1986). Introduction to classical and modern test theory. Toronto, ON: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Dawda, D., & Hart, S. D. (2000). Assessing emotional intelligence: Reliability and validity of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) in university students. Personality and Individual Differences, *28*, 797-812.

Davies, M., Stankov, L., & Roberts, R. D. (1998). Emotional intelligence: In search of an elusive construct. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *75*, 989-1015.

Deaux, K. (1976). The behavior of women and men. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Dindia, K., & Allen, M. (1992). Sex differences in self-disclosure: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, *112*, 106-124.

- Donohue, K. S. & Wong, L. (1994). Understanding and applying transformational leadership. Military Review, 74(8), 24-31.
- Ekman, P. & Friesen, W. V. (1975). Unmasking the face. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ekman, P. (1993). Facial expression and emotion. American Psychologist, 48, 384-392.
- Fox, S. & Spector, P. E. (2000). Relations of emotional intelligence, practical intelligence, general intelligence, and trait affectivity with interview outcomes: It's not all just 'G'. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21, 203-220.
- Fuller, J. B., Patterson, C. E. P., Hester, K., & Stringer, D. Y. (1996). A quantitative review of research on charismatic leadership. Psychological Reports, 78, 271-287.
- George, J. J. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. Human Relations, 53(8), 1027-1055.
- Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. New York: Bantam.
- Goleman, D. (1998). What makes a leader. Harvard Business Review (Nov/Dec), 94-103.
- Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam.
- Graen, G. B. (1976). Role making processes within complex organizations. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology pp. 1201-1245). Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally.
- Graen, G. B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. Leadership Quarterly, 6, 219-247.

Graen & Wakabayashi, (1994).

Greenberg, J., Baron, R. A., Sales, C. A., & Owens, F. A. (2000). Behaviour in organizations. Don Mills, ON: Pearson Education Canada, Inc.

Hall, J. A. (1984). Nonverbal sex differences: Communication accuracy and expressive style. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Harvey, D., & Brown, D. R. (1995). An experiential approach to organization development. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hill, C. T., & Stull, D. E. (1987). Gender and self-disclosure: Strategies for exploring the issues. In V. J. Derlega & J. H. Berg (Eds.) Self disclosure: Theory, research, and therapy (pp. 81-100). New York: Plenum.

Hobfoll, S. E., & Stokes, J. P. (1988). The processes and mechanics of social support. In S. Duck (Ed.), Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research, and interventions (pp. 497-518). New York: Wiley.

Howell, J. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business unit performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 891-902.

Howell, J. M. & Hall-Merenda, K. E. (1999). The ties that bind: the impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84, 680-694.

Humpel, N., Caputi, P., and Martin, C. (2001). The relationship between emotions and stress among mental health nurses. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Mental Health Nursing, 10, 55-60.

Johns, G. & Saks, A. M. (2001). Organizational behaviour: Understanding and managing life at work. Toronto: Addison, Wesley, Longman.

Jordan, P. J., Ashkansy, N. M., Härtel, C. E., & Hooper, G. S. (2001, April). Workgroup emotional intelligence: Scale development and relationship to team process effectiveness and goal focus. Paper presented at the 16<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (1999). LISREL 8.30: Interactive LISREL. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International.

Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis or organizational behavior. Behavioral Science, 9, 131-146.

Kirkpatrick, S. A. & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 36-51.

Levinson et al., (1978).

Livingstone, H. A., & Day, A. L. (2001, June). The role of emotional intelligence as a predictor of job satisfaction and well-being. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Ste.-Foy, QC.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramanian, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review. Leadership Quarterly, 7, 385-425.

Martinez-Pons, M. (1997). The relation of emotional intelligence with selected areas of personal functioning. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 17, 3-13.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Mayer, J. D., & Geher, G. (1996). Emotional intelligence and the identification of emotion. Intelligence, *22*, 89-113.

Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2000). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. Intelligence, *27*, 267-298.

Mayer, J. D., DiPaolo, M. & Salovey, P. (1990). Perceiving affective content in ambiguous visual stimuli: A component of emotional intelligence. Journal of Personality Assessment, *54*, 772-781.

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

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (1999). Mayer, Salovey, Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test: Research Version 1.1 Manual 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2000a). Emotional intelligence as zeitgeist, as personality, and as a mental ability. In R. Bar-On and J. Parker (Eds), The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Development, Assessment, and Application at Home, School, and in the Workplace. (p 92-117). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2000b). Test Manual for the Mayer, Salovey, Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test: Research Version 1.1 (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2002). Mayer, Salovey, Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test: Version 2. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- McCrae, R. R. (1987). Creativity, divergent thinking, and openness to experience. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *52*, 1258-1265.
- Mehrabian, A., Young, A. L., & Sato, S. (1988). Emotional empathy and associated individual differences. Current Psychology Research and Reviews, *7*, 221-240.
- Meyer, E. C. (1997). Leadership: A return to basics. Military Review, *77(1)*, 58-61.
- Multi-Health Systems (2001). Emotional intelligence: A collection of new measures and industry-leading solutions. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Neely-Martinez, M. (1997). The smarts that count. HR Magazine, November, 71-78.
- Newsome, S., Day, A. L., & Catano, V. (2000). Assessing the predictive validity of emotional intelligence. Personality and Individual Differences, *4*, 1-12.
- Petrides, K. V. & Furnham, A. (2000). Gender differences in measured and self-estimated trait emotional intelligence. Sex Roles, *42(5-6)*, 449-461.
- Petrides, K. V. & Furnham, A. (2000). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. Personality and Individual Differences, *29*, 313-320.
- Popper, M., Landau, O., & Gluskinso, U. M. (1992). The Israeli Defence Forces: An example of transformational leadership. Leadership and Organization Development Journal *13(1)*, 3-8.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1994). Some final thoughts about personality and intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg & P. Ruzgis, (Eds.) Personality and intelligence (pp. 303-318). New York: Cambridge University Press.



Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., Hall, L.E., Haggerty, D.J., Cooper, J.T., Golden, C.J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence.

Personality and Individual Differences, *25*, 167-177.

Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Breinin, E., Popper, M. (1998). Correlates of charismatic leader behavior in military units: Subordinates' attitudes, unit characteristics, and superiors' appraisals of leader performance. Academy of Management Journal, *41(4)*, 387-409.

Spangenberg, H. H., Schroder, H. M., & Duvenage, A. (1999). A leadership competence utilization questionnaire for South African managers. South African Journal of Psychology, *29(3)*, 117-123.

Sosik, J. J. & Megerian, L. E. (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance: The role of self-other agreement on transformational leadership perceptions. Group and Organization Management, *24*, 367-390.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). Using multivariate statistics (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Harper Collins College Publishers, Inc.

Thayer, J. F., & Johnsen, B. H. (2000). Sex differences in judgement of facial affect: A multivariate analysis of recognition errors. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, *41*, 243-246.