

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND LEADERSHIP

Ali Çağlar GÜLLÜCE¹

Abstract

The role of emotional intelligence and leadership is becoming increasingly important. Effectiveness relies on the ability of leaders to respond to ongoing pressures and to manage others efficiently. One goal of the emotional intelligence is to improve the effectiveness of today's and future leaders by implementing rigorous standards for selecting, developing, and assessing leaders. This focus on leader selection and development has prompted an interest in examining the qualities of successful leaders. Recently, interest in the new concept of emotional intelligence has flourished as a result of the claims suggesting that emotional intelligence can be used to select and develop successful leaders. Leaders who exhibit heightened levels of emotional intelligence may be more likely to engage in transformational leadership behaviours than those individuals who possess lower levels of emotional. However, only a few studies have examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership. The purpose of this paper is to present a review of emotional intelligence models and measures, and to make a conceptual link between components that fall under the concept of emotional intelligence and effective leadership behaviours.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Leadership, Transformation

1. OVERVIEW OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

1.1. History & Development of Emotional Intelligence

Despite the widespread belief that emotions and intelligence are two contradictory concepts, emotions have been included in the intelligence literature since the early 1920's (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000c: 399). Individuals who expressed emotion were often viewed negatively because emotions and reasoning were seen as opposing terms (Mayer & Salovey, 1997:14). In fact, those who engaged in emotional expression were often considered mentally ill and were subject to therapy in order to suppress their emotionality. It wasn't until the early 1960's that some researchers agreed that emotions could guide one's thinking and actions and could direct one's attention toward solving problems.

Many prominent researchers in the field of emotional intelligence have compared the emotional intelligence construct to an historical intelligence construct labelled social intelligence (Bar-On, 2000: 357). In some instances, these two types of intelligences have been used interchangeably. Emotional intelligence has also been referred to as a type of social intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1993:433).

¹ Atatürk Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, achaglar@atauni.edu.tr

Thorndike (1920) introduced the concept of social intelligence. He divided intelligence into three facets: abstract intelligence (i.e., managing and understanding ideas), mechanical intelligence (i.e., managing and understanding concrete objects), and social intelligence (i.e., managing and understanding people). Social intelligence refers to the ability to perceive one's own and others' behaviours and motives in order to successfully make use of that information in social situations (Thorndike, 1920: 228). Social intelligence involves adapting to social situations and using social knowledge to act accordingly. Cantor and Kihlstrom (1987:68) referred to social intelligence as possessing knowledge of social norms, and having the ability to get along well with others.

A necessary step in identifying a new intelligence is to determine whether it is distinct from already existing types of intelligence. The social intelligence construct had many early critics due to the finding that it was not easily distinguishable from other types of intelligence. One reason for this lack of discriminant validity was that the definition of social intelligence was too broad (Mayer & Salovey, 1993: 440). Furthermore, there were few attempts to measure the social intelligence construct and many endeavours proved to be unsuccessful as a result of the increased reliance on self-report measures (Hedlund & Sternberg, 2000: 327). Many researchers felt that the study of social intelligence was not warranted as a result of the inability to accurately define and measure this construct.

Mayer and Salovey (1997:31) suggested that the emotional intelligence construct would not suffer from the same problems as the social intelligence construct. Emotional intelligence focuses more on emotional problem solving, rather than on the social, political, or verbal aspects inherent in the social intelligence construct (Mayer & Geher, 1996: 101). Emotional intelligence is also similar to interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences, as defined by Gardner (1983: 32) in his theory of multiple intelligences. Gardner (1983:44) defined interpersonal intelligence as the ability to understand others, and he defined intrapersonal intelligence as the ability to understand oneself.

The theory guiding the development of the emotional intelligence construct comes from the notion that emotions are one of the necessary mental operations along with motivation and cognition (Mayer & Salovey, 1993: 65). Our emotions serve as signals that result in reactions to changing circumstances. In essence, our emotions impact on our behavioural responses to situational cues (Arvey, Renz, & Watson, 1998: 132). Emotional intelligence may arise as a result of the interaction between emotions and cognitions (Mayer & Salovey, 1995: 201). For example, mood can influence an individual to think positively or negatively and there has been a great deal of research examining the impact of mood on effective decision-making. Emotionally intelligent individuals use their emotions to engage in intelligent thought and also possess the ability to think intelligently about their emotions.

Emotional intelligence gained popular and academic attention during the 1990's. During this time, audacious claims were made regarding the ability of emotional intelligence to predict work and non-work "success". However, many of these claims lack empirical evidence and have been based on anecdotal accounts (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000: 349). The first uses of the term "emotional intelligence" were by Mayer, DiPaolo and Salovey (1990: 779). The popularity of emotional intelligence was not a result of the surge of academic work but rather a result of the publication of Daniel Goleman's book entitled "Emotional Intelligence" (Goleman, 1995), and his successive book examining emotional intelligence at work (Goleman, 1998). In 1997, another researcher, Bar-On introduced the first published scale assessing self-reported emotional intelligence. Bar-On (1997) has also contributed to the prominence of emotional intelligence in popular culture.

There has been much effort in the past decade devoted to defining and measuring the emotional intelligence construct. However, researchers have not reached a consensus on the definition and measurement of emotional intelligence. In fact, several emotional intelligence models have been proposed that have competing viewpoints on the nature of this construct.

2. EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE MODELS

There have been many different uses of the term emotional intelligence. Definitions or models of emotional intelligence tend to be either ability-based or a mixture of abilities and personality traits. The ability-based model refers to emotional intelligence as a type of intelligence reflecting the ability to process emotional information. In contrast, the mixed emotional intelligence model incorporates both ability factors and personality traits

2.1. Ability-Based Emotional Intelligence Model

Initially, Mayer, Salovey, and their colleagues included some personality traits in their conceptualization of emotional intelligence (Hedlund & Sternberg, 2000: 324). Their most recent model has moved away from the inclusion of personality concepts toward a more specific model focusing on the mental abilities involved in the processing of emotional information. Additionally, there was a shift from defining emotional intelligence in terms of individual abilities, such as emotional understanding, toward a more comprehensive ability-based definition that incorporated multiple emotional abilities (Mayer et al., 2000: 99). Mayer and Salovey (1997:10) defined emotional intelligence as "the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and / or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge;

and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth”.

Emotional intelligence as an ability involves the interchange of emotions and intelligence. Emotionally intelligent individuals possess a clear understanding of their feelings, and can restore their moods more quickly than those individuals with low levels of emotional intelligence (Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000: 551). This model suggests that emotional intelligence fulfils the criteria for inclusion as a type of intelligence . These criteria indicate that: (1) measures of emotional intelligence have correct and incorrect responses; (2) emotional intelligence correlates with other types of mental abilities (e.g., verbal intelligence); and (3) emotional intelligence is developmental in nature and will increase with age and experience (2000; Mayer et al., 2000c: 404). Only recently have researchers begun to test these propositions.

Mayer and Salovey arranged the four branches of emotional intelligence from basic processes (i.e., emotional perception and emotional facilitation / integration) to higher-level mechanisms (i.e., emotional understanding and emotional management). Each branch contains abilities that range from early developing abilities to more advanced abilities (Mayer & Salovey, 1997: 19). Individuals with heightened levels of emotional intelligence are expected to develop these abilities more quickly than those individuals with lower levels of emotional intelligence. These emotional abilities tend to be positively correlated with each other.

2.1.1. Perceiving, Appraising, & Expressing Emotions

Emotional perception is the lowest level in Mayer and Salovey’s model. Emotional perception occurs when individuals can effectively identify emotions and their content (Mayer & Salovey, 1997: 30). Identifying emotions in oneself, others, and objects are integral to successfully perceiving emotions and are necessary to engage in the tasks involved in the more advanced branches in this model. Another group of abilities associated with emotional perception are accurate expression of emotion and accurate expression of the needs arising from emotions (Mayer et al., 2000c: 398). In essence, emotional perception involves accurately perceiving emotions and their content in facial expressions, objects, and stories. The ability to perceive emotions is important because if an individual can accurately interpret emotions then he / she may be better equipped to respond to situations involving emotional interactions . Appraising emotions can lead to the utilization of emotional information for making decisions and / or forming judgements. The ability to appraise and express emotional information involves understanding nonverbal cues, such as facial expressions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997:11). Some individuals, such as those who suffer from alexthymia, tend to have difficulty appraising and expressing their emotions (Parker, Taylor, & Bagby, 2001). Alexthymia has been found to be negatively associated with scores on an emotional intelligence measure (Parker

et al., 2001). Individuals who possess the ability to appraise and express their emotions also tend to be more empathetic (e.g., Mayer & Salovey, 1997: 110). Some areas in which the ability to perceive / identify emotions would lead to enhanced performance include job interviews, interacting with family members and co-workers, and appreciating art and stories.

2.1.2. Using Emotions to Facilitate Thought

Emotional facilitation of thought involves how emotions are used and how they impact on cognitions to assist in thought processes or problem solving (Mayer et al., 2000a: 108). Emotions can act as mechanisms to prioritize thinking or inhibit thought processes. For example, a positive mood can cause an individual to think more optimistically about a given situation, whereas a negative mood can result in pessimism (Mayer et al., 2000a: 111). This may result in the individual considering multiple perspectives in a given situation. Emotional intelligence arises when these thought processes lead to enhanced problem solving and direct an individual's attention toward the problem situation. Additionally, the ability to predict how one would feel in a given situation in order to engage in planning would be characteristic of an individual who scores highly on emotional facilitation (Mayer & Salovey, 1997: 25). That is, such individuals can "anticipate" or "generate" feelings when asked about a potential situation

2.1.3. Understanding & Reasoning With Emotions

Emotional understanding refers to the ability to understand emotions and to reason with emotional knowledge (Mayer et al., 2000c: 414). For example, individuals with advanced emotional intelligence possess the ability to discriminate among different emotions, and to understand that particular emotions can arise from different situations. Furthermore, the ability to recognize and understand the simultaneous experience of contradictory emotions is characteristic of an individual who has a high level of emotional understanding (Mayer & Salovey, 1997: 18). Such individuals possess the ability to understand combinations of different emotions. Additionally, understanding that emotional progressions can occur depending on different situational circumstances is a quality of individuals with heightened levels of emotional intelligence. Moreover, an individual who possesses a high level of emotional understanding can better comprehend the advantages and disadvantages of future actions. Understanding the consequences of moods and emotions is also characteristic of an individual who possesses advanced emotional intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1997: 27).

2.1.4. Managing / Regulating Emotions

The ability to manage or regulate emotions in oneself and in others is the most advanced emotional ability in the ability-based model. Possessing the ability to calm down after a hostile situation is an example of emotional

management (Mayer et al., 2000c:415). Emotional management involves consciously considering alternative solutions to different emotional problems and choosing the most effective response (Mayer et al., 2000a: 109). The ability to detach one's emotions from one's behaviour is also a feature of an individual with heightened emotional management abilities. An individual who engages in emotional management may also reflect on their feelings and moods in order to gain a greater understanding of the impact they will have on future behaviours (Mayer & Salovey, 1997: 32). High emotionally intelligent individuals also possess the ability to manage emotions in others by regulating the expression of negative emotions and enhancing the expression of positive emotions.

2.1.5.Mixed Emotional Intelligence Model

Mixed models of emotional intelligence combine mental abilities and personality traits and are considerably different from ability-based models. Goleman (1995:23) referred to emotional intelligence as being comprised of five dimensions: knowing one's emotions, managing emotions, motivation, recognizing emotions in others, and handling relationships. Emotional intelligence, according to Goleman (1995:26), includes zeal, persistence, self-control, and motivation. Goleman was the first to make claims regarding the ability of emotional intelligence to predict life and job success. Goleman's view of emotional intelligence is not based on scientific evidence and has been criticized for including almost anything that may predict successful life functioning (Hedlund & Sternberg, 2000: 324). Therefore, the present review of mixed emotional intelligence models will not include a detailed discussion of Goleman's model.

There has been more support for Bar-On's (model of emotional intelligence. Bar-On defined emotional intelligence as "an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures" (Bar-On, 1997: 14). In his review of personality literature, Bar-On identified five major areas that may contribute to success in life including intrapersonal functioning, interpersonal skills, adaptability, stress management, and general mood. Intrapersonal functioning refers to the ability to be aware of and understand one's emotions, feelings and ideas (Bar-On, 1997: 33-34). Being aware of and understanding others' emotions and feelings is characteristic of an individual with strong interpersonal skills. Adaptability refers to the ability to be flexible and alter one's feelings with changing situations. An individual engages in stress management when he /she is able to cope with stress and control emotions. General mood refers to the ability to feel and express positive emotions and remain optimistic. These five broad aspects of emotional intelligence consist of more specific characteristics that are presented in Table 2.

Some of Bar-On's (1997) emotional intelligence components can be labelled mental abilities and other components appear to be more personality based (Hedlund & Sternberg, 2000: 331). Bar-On claims that his model

predicts the potential for success rather than success itself. Mixed models appear to overlap with dozens of other constructs (Mayer et al., 2000c: 419) and research examining this issue has begun to accumulate.

3. MEASUREMENT OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

The development of competing models of emotional intelligence has resulted in the construction of different measures designed to assess emotional intelligence (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000: 356). These measures tend to be grouped into three categories: self-report, ability-based, and observer-rating methods (Lewis, 2000, 224). Researchers have not reached a consensus with regard to the most appropriate method of measurement for the emotional intelligence construct (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000: 349). There are a variety of measures assessing the different components of emotional intelligence, however the present review is limited to the discussion of popular measures that are being marketed to assess emotional intelligence, and those measures that are representative of the competing emotional intelligence models.

3.1. Ability-Based Emotional Intelligence Measures

The first ability-based measure of emotional intelligence was the Multi-Factor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS). The MEIS was designed to assess four components: emotional perception; emotional facilitation of thought; emotional understanding; and emotional management (Judge, 2000: 757). The MEIS underwent several revisions as a result of the low internal consistency and the length of the measure (Ciarrochi et al., 2000: 554). The MEIS provided the framework for the subsequent development of the Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT).

The MSCEIT also assesses Mayer and Salovey's four branch model of EI: emotional perception, emotional integration / facilitation, emotional understanding, and emotional management (Isen & Nowicki, 1987: 1130). Mayer et al. developed the MSCEIT to measure individuals' performance on emotion-related tasks. For example, several items on the MSCEIT require the test-taker to identify emotions in faces. Mayer et al reported that the reliability of the MSCEIT improved from the original MEIS scale. This measure provides an overall emotional intelligence score and scores on each of the four sub-scales (Mayer et al., 2000c: 399).

The scales measuring emotional perception assess the ability to perceive emotions in oneself and others, as well as in objects, art, and stories. In these sections, the test taker is required to decide the amount of emotional content in the faces, landscapes, and designs. The scales measuring emotional facilitation / integration assess the ability to use and feel emotion in order to communicate feelings and to use emotional information in problem solving (Mayer et al., 2000a: 115). This sub-scale assesses similarities between emotional feelings and other sensations, such as temperatures and tastes. The scales measuring

emotional understanding assess the ability to understand emotional information and the different combinations and progressions of emotions (Ciarrochi et al., 2000: 552). Participants may be asked to indicate what happens as an emotion changes or becomes more intense or to identify a change in mood. Finally, the scales measuring emotional management assess the ability to be open to feelings and to monitor them in oneself and others. This scale of the MSCEIT requires the test-taker to select a course of action in order to achieve a particular goal (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000: 346).

One issue that still remains with the use of the MSCEIT is the ambiguity of the correct response (Ciarrochi et al., 2000: 549). There are three methods of arriving at the correct response on an objective EI measure: target criteria, expert criteria, and consensus criteria (Mayer & Geher, 1996: 89). The target criteria method involves using the target's actual self-reported response / feeling as the correct response when the target's emotional expressions or creations are being rated (Lewis, 2000, 229). The test taker is correct when his / her response corresponds with the emotions reported by the target for a given item. Expert criteria involve asking experts in the field of emotions, such as clinical psychologists, to judge how the target is feeling by observing the target or reading his or her account of a situation (House, 1971: 324). The test taker receives credit if his or her response corresponds to that of the experts. Finally, the consensus method involves gathering judgements from a number of individuals; the test taker is deemed correct if he or she has the same view as the group (Mayer & Geher, 1996: 110). The consensus scoring procedure has been viewed as the most accurate and reliable method of determining the correct response (Mayer et al., 2000c: 420). Correlations among these three scoring methods tend to be positive (House, 1971: 333).

The ability-based approach to the study of emotional intelligence has also been measured by self-report. However, self-report tends to be a less direct means of assessing one's performance on ability-based tasks. An example of efforts to measure ability-based emotional intelligence through the self-report method is the Trait Meta-Mood Scale (TMMS) developed by Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey, and Palfai (1995). The TMMS measured attention to emotion, emotional clarity, and emotional repair (Salovey et al., 1995: 134). Shutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden, and Dornheim also developed a self-report emotional intelligence measure based on Mayer and Salovey's ability-based model (House, 1971: 328).

3.2. Mixed Model Emotional Intelligence Measures

There are a number of self-report emotional intelligence measures. The most widely known self-report measure of emotional intelligence is the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) developed by Bar-On (1997). The EQ-i is a self-report inventory that consists of 133 items assessing 15 sub-scales that are classified under 5 main factors (intrapersonal functioning, interpersonal skills, adaptability, general mood, and stress management). The intrapersonal

functioning factor assesses emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization, and independence. The scale measuring interpersonal skills includes empathy, interpersonal relationships, and social responsibility. The adaptability scale assesses problem solving, reality testing, and flexibility. The scale measuring stress management assesses stress tolerance and impulse control. The general mood scale assesses happiness and optimism. Participants are asked to respond to the EQ-i based on a 5-point scale (1=not true of me, 5=true of me). The EQ-i demonstrates a high degree of internal consistency (Bar-On, 1997: 44; Bar-On, 2000: 380). In general, mixed models of emotional intelligence tend to assess a wide variety of personality traits (Mayer et al., 2000c: 403).

3.3. Emotional Intelligence Measures: Reliability & Validity Issues

There has been a great deal of inquiry into the construct validity of emotional intelligence measures in recent years. In order to determine construct validity, it is necessary to determine if measures of the same construct correlate with each other (Crocker & Algina, 1986: 34). This method is problematic for the study of emotional intelligence measures because no agreement has been reached as to what model / measure of emotional intelligence is most appropriate. Therefore, the construct validity of emotional intelligence is typically examined by evaluating the relationship of the different emotional intelligence measures with other constructs, such as personality and general cognitive ability. In order to constitute a set of abilities, emotional intelligence must be somewhat related to, but also appreciably distinct from, other types of intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1997: 30). Furthermore, issues of content validity (what the test measures) and incremental validity (whether the test adds to our knowledge beyond already existing measures) are also important for the understanding of the emotional intelligence construct (Barchard, 2000: 154).

An ability-based emotional intelligence measure should be distinct from personality traits (Salovey & Mayer, 1994: 66). Some research suggests low to moderate correlations between scores on the MSCEIT and personality (Barchard & Hakstian, 2001: 74). Furthermore, the MEIS tends to be independent of personality traits, such as neuroticism, but somewhat related to empathy, extraversion, and openness to experience (Ciarrochi et al., 2000: 544). More research is needed to clarify the relationship between ability-based emotional intelligence measures and personality.

Ability-based emotional intelligence should be moderately correlated with other forms of intelligence. The emotional understanding scale of the MSCEIT has been found to be associated with general intelligence (Kane & Tremble, 2000: 151). Verbal intelligence was moderately correlated with scores on an ability-based emotional intelligence measure. In another study, scores on the MEIS were unrelated to general cognitive ability scores (Ciarrochi et al., 2000: 557). In order for the MSCEIT to be considered a measure of intelligence, it should increase with age and experience (Mayer et al., 2000: 281). Mayer et al.

(2000: 286) found that adults scored significantly higher on the MEIS than adolescents regardless of the type of scoring procedure used. More research is needed to determine the relationship between ability-based emotional intelligence measures and general intelligence.

The moderate to high relationship between self-report emotional intelligence measures and measures of the Big Five personality dimensions is well established (Dawda & Hart, 2000 :801). Many researchers suggest that the EQ-i would be best typified as a measure of personality (Hedlund & Sternberg, 2000: 327). Research also suggests that self-report emotional intelligence measures are independent of general cognitive ability (Barchard & Hakstian, 2001: 78). This finding does not comply with the original definition of emotional intelligence proposed by Salovey and Mayer.

3.4. Understanding the Emotional Intelligence Construct

In general, the various conceptualizations of emotional intelligence appear to be somewhat distinct. The original definition of emotional intelligence proposed by Salovey and Mayer (1994: 9) referred to emotional intelligence as the ability to think intelligently about emotions and their meanings. As an ability, emotional intelligence should be viewed as a type of intelligence that is relatively independent of personality traits (Mayer & Salovey, 1997: 33). In contrast, Goleman's (1995: 14) and Bar-On's (1997: 11) definitions of emotional intelligence are broader and encompass various personality traits. Furthermore, mixed models of emotional intelligence have been criticized for including almost any construct that may predict success (Hedlund & Sternberg, 2000: 330). There appears to be some agreement among researchers that emotional intelligence is in need of further study and development, and that successful efforts to define and measure this construct may prove advantageous for organizations (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000: 349). Self-report mixed-model measures of emotional intelligence are unlikely to prove to be accurate measures of emotional intelligence, especially given their high correlations with various personality dimensions and low correlations with general intelligence (Barchard & Hakstian, 2001: 66). Furthermore, many researchers question whether self-report emotional intelligence measures add incrementally to the prediction of work and non-work outcomes beyond the influence of personality (Newsome et al., 2000: 10). In contrast, some available evidence suggests that ability-based emotional intelligence tends to be somewhat related to general intelligence (Barchard & Hakstian, 2001: 32). Thus, there is evidence to suggest that ability-based emotional intelligence may hold up as a measure of intelligence.

The concepts measured by the mixed model of emotional intelligence may be important however, they should not be incorporated under an intelligence framework (Mayer et al., 2000c: 397). The original approach to the study of emotional intelligence (ability-based) must be explored by determining whether ability-based measures are related to cognitive ability and distinct from personality (Petrides & Furnham, 2000: 316). Some researchers argue that only

those measures that assess mental abilities should be labelled as measures of emotional intelligence (Parker, Taylor & Bagby, 2001: 109).

3.5. Transformational Leadership

Leadership has been defined in many ways but researchers and practitioners still question the nature of leadership. Over the years there have been a number of theories addressing the understanding of leadership, including trait theory of leadership, contingency theory, path-goal theory, leader-member exchange theory, charismatic leadership theory, and transformational leadership theory. Many of these theories have common elements that have been synthesized in a number of reviews focusing on effective leadership behaviours (Conger & Kanungo, 1998: 38).

Transformational leadership theory is the most renowned theory of leadership. Transformational leadership has also been commonly referred to as charismatic, visionary, and inspirational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990: 238). Burns (1978) was the first to introduce the concept of transformational leadership in which the distinction was made between transactional and transformational leaders. Transformational leadership refers to a process involving the leader engaging his / her followers by raising their motivation and promoting their attachment to the organization (Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership focuses on the exchange that occurs between leaders and followers in which the leader rewards the follower for specific behaviours (Burns, 1978: 61). Originally, Burns (1978: 59) viewed transactional and transformational leadership as being at opposite ends of a continuum. Bass (1985:234) suggested that a leader can display both transactional and transformational leadership behaviours.

Bass (1985: 239) later built upon the work by Burns and devised a model of transformational leadership. Transformational leaders motivate their followers by raising their level of awareness about the importance of the organization's goals and by engaging followers to rise above their own self-interests for the interests of the organization or team (Bass, 1985: 250). Transformational leadership theory suggests that there is an emotional attachment that occurs between the leader and his / her followers in that followers tend to identify themselves with a transformational leader to go beyond to call of duty to achieve the organization's mission (Bass, 1985: 247). Transformational leaders stimulate their followers to motivate them to align their values, beliefs, and motives with the vision of the organization. Bass's (1985) original theory of transformational leadership and subsequent development of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) paved the way for the current theory of transformational leadership. The MLQ was designed to measure the behaviours characteristic of transformational and transactional leaders. Factor analytic studies of the MLQ revealed that there were two types of leaders: transformational and transactional leaders (Bass & Avolio, 1990: 257). Four dimensions characterized transformational leadership: charisma or idealized

influence (acting as a role model and gaining respect and trust from followers by communicating a vision), inspirational motivation (communicating a vision with enthusiasm thereby generating enthusiasm and optimism among followers), intellectual stimulation (encouraging followers to look at problems in innovative ways), and individualized consideration (providing personal attention for all followers; Bass, 1995: 244).

3.6. Emotional Intelligence & Transformational Leadership

The role of emotions in the leadership process has been a neglected area of research as a result of the belief that emotions may interfere with effective behaviours (George, 2000: 1039). Traditional theories of leadership suggested that leaders must plan and think rationally without the influence of their emotions (George, 2000: 1050). Researchers have made reference to the notion that transformational or charismatic leaders “emotionally engage their followers” and “display emotions” in order to motivate their followers to adopt the goals and values of the organization (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995: 120). Furthermore, leaders form an emotional attachment with their followers that enhance the quality of their relationships and the effectiveness of the team and organization. Effective processing of emotional information may help leaders to deal with complex ambiguous information by directing their attention to the issues or threats that require immediate attention (George, 2000: 1036). Furthermore, Bass suggested that there is a social or emotional element inherent in transformational leadership.

Researchers have questioned for many years what predisposes certain individuals to adopt a transformational style of leadership, and what makes some leaders more effective than others (George, 2000: 1023; Judge & Bono, 2000: 754). Several researchers have suggested that emotional intelligence may be a useful predictor of transformational / charismatic leadership behaviours (Goleman, 1995: 84; Goleman, 1998: 61; Sosik & Dworakivsky, 1998: 514). However, there have been few attempts to determine the emotional processes involved in effective transformational leadership behaviours. The limited evidence suggests that emotional intelligence is positively associated with transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and contingent reward; Barling et al., 2000: 159).

Nevertheless, the importance of social or emotional relationships are more evident in transformational versus transactional theories of leadership. Transactional leaders are reactive and do not tend to be concerned with engaging in interpersonal relationships with followers or being empathetic to follower’s needs (Barling et al., 2000: 160).

3.7. Future Research Initiatives

Drawing from the present review of emotional intelligence, several areas of future research were identified. The lack of agreement among researchers on the definition of emotional intelligence poses problems for organizations. The

question remains as to whether emotional intelligence is simply a re-labelling of already existing constructs such as personality and general cognitive ability. The abundance of constructs included in the mixed-model framework of emotional intelligence may predict many individual and organizational outcomes. However, labelling these constructs “emotional intelligence” is disingenuous because such constructs fail to meet the criteria for inclusion as a type of intelligence. Future researchers should examine the utility of mixed-model emotional intelligence measures, such as the EQ-i, in predicting work outcomes beyond the influence of other well-established predictor variables, such as personality and general cognitive ability. Current evidence suggests that the EQ-i is not much more than a measure of personality and affect (Newsome et al., 2000: 9).

Further exploration of the psychometric properties of emotional intelligence measures is necessary. Before we can use emotional intelligence measures for decision-making purposes we need a thorough examination of the reliability and validity of these measures (Hedlund & Sternberg, 2000: 339). Accurate measurement of emotional intelligence may prove to be advantageous for the selection and training of managers. In particular, further examination of the procedures used to score ability-based emotional intelligence measures is warranted. The most common method of scoring ability-based emotional intelligence measures is by using consensus. Using this method, the participants’ scores reflect the proportion of the normative group who endorsed a particular response. In this case, there is no right or wrong answer; rather, some answers are deemed as being more correct than others. Further research is needed to examine the accuracy of this scoring procedure.

Several researchers have suggested that emotional intelligence may be used by organizations to select effective leaders (George, 2001: 1031). It is necessary to empirically examine ability-based emotional intelligence measures in relation to effective leadership behaviours context. The present review outlined a conceptual link on emotional intelligence suggesting that emotional perception, emotional facilitation, emotional understanding, and emotional management may be important for the prediction of leadership behaviours. Future researchers should test these propositions at different levels. It is also important to determine the amount of emotional intelligence that is deemed appropriate for leadership. By determining whether emotional abilities are important to successful leadership, through job analysis procedures, researcher may gain a greater understanding of whether emotional constructs would be useful for selection and training. According to Arvey et al. (1998: 146) individuals should be selected on the basis of the match between the individual’s level of emotional display and the degree of emotional display demanded by the organization. Developing assessment tools to determine the congruency between leader’s emotional abilities and the emotional demands of the organization may prove to be beneficial (Arvey et al., 1998: 138). Another related issue involves examining how much emotional intelligence is too much. Leaders who possess

very high levels of emotional management / regulation may use these abilities for their own self-interests (Sosik & Dworakivsky, 1998: 513). That is, they may manipulate followers through emotional regulation for their own personal benefit (Sosik & Dworakivsky, 1998:519). This question should also be addressed in future research.

A related concept to emotional intelligence is emotional labour (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995: 101). Emotional labour involves “enhancing, faking, or suppressing emotions to modify emotional expression” (Grandey, 2000, : 95). An individual engages in this regulation of emotional expression according to the “display rules” of the organization (Grandey, 2000: 101). Research suggests that emotional labour may result in negative individual health outcomes (Morris & Feldman, 1996: 1001). Shaubroeck and Jones (2000: 169) found that individuals who perceived that their job demanded them to express positive emotions tended to report more negative physical health symptoms. Future researchers should examine the impact of emotional management / regulation on the health and well-being of leaders. Finally, the issue of training leaders to enhance their emotional intelligence should be examined in future research. Some researchers suggest that organizations may benefit from providing emotional intelligence training to leaders. However, the question remains as to whether emotional intelligence can be developed if it is a set of personality traits (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000: 371). Ambiguity regarding the construct validity of emotional intelligence makes it difficult to determine a starting point at which to determine if a leader’s emotional intelligence needs development. This issue should be examined in future research.

References

- Arvey, R. D., Renz, G. L., & Watson, T. W. (1998). Emotionality and job performance: Implications for personnel selection. Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management, 16, 103-147.
- Ashforth, B. & Humphrey, R. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: a reappraisal. Human Relations, 48, 97-125.
- Barchard, K. A. & Hakstian, A. R. (June, 2001). The relation of emotional intelligence to traditional cognitive and personality variables. Paper presented at the Canadian Psychological Association Annual Convention, Ste-Foy, Quebec.
- 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. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory. 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. (363-388). San Francisco, California: Jossey Bass Inc.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4, 231-272.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Free Press.
- Cantor, N. & Kihlstrom, J. F. (1987). Personality and social intelligence. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ciarrochi, J. V., Chan, A. Y., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. Personality and Individual Differences, 28, 539-561.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). Charismatic leadership in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crocker, L. M. & Algina, J. (1986). Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- 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.
- Dulewicz, V. & Higgs, M. (2000). Emotional intelligence: A review and validation study. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 15, 341-372.
- Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of Mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York: Basic Books.
- George, J. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. Human Relations, 53, 1027-1055.
- Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional Intelligence. New York: Bantam.
- Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam.
- Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5, 95-110.
- Hedlund, J. & Sternberg, R. J. (2000). Too many intelligences? Integrating social, emotional, and practical intelligence. 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. (320-342). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- House, R. J. (1971). Path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 321-338.
- Isen, A. M., Daubman, K. A., & Nowicki, G. P. (1987). Positive affect facilitates creative problem solving. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 1122-1131.

- Judge, T. A. & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85, 751-765.
- Kane, T. D. & Tremble, T. R. (2000). Transformational leadership effects at different levels of the army. Military Psychology, 12, 137-160.
- Lewis, K. M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: how followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21, 221-234.
- Mayer, J. D., DiPaolo, & 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. & Geher, G. (1996). Emotional intelligence and the identification of emotion. Intelligence, 22, 89-113.
- Mayer, J. D. & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. Intelligence, 17, 433-442.
- Mayer, J. D. & Salovey, P. (1995). Emotional intelligence and the construction and regulation of feelings. Applied and Preventive Psychology, 4, 197-208.
- Mayer, J. D. & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence. In P. Salovey, & D. Sluyter, Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Educational Implications (3-34). New York: Basicbooks, Inc.
- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. R. (2000). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. Intelligence, 27, 267-298.
- 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. (pp. 92-117). San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. (2000c). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed) Handbook of intelligence. (pp. 396-420). New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, J. A. & Feldman, D. C. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. Academy of Management Review, 21, 986-1010.
- Newsome, S., Day, A. L., & Catano, V. (2000). Assessing the predictive validity of emotional intelligence. Personality and Individual Differences, 4, 1-12.
- Parker, J. D. A., Taylor, G. J., Bagby, R. (2001). The relationship between emotional intelligence and alexithymia. Personality & Individual Differences, 30, 107-115.

- Petrides, K. V. & Furnham, A. (2000). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. Personality and Individual Differences, 29, 313-320.
- Salovey, P. & Mayer, J. D. (1994). Some final thoughts about personality and intelligence. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Goldman, S. L., Turvey, C., & Palfai, T. P. (1995). Emotional attention, clarity, and repair: Exploring emotional intelligence using the Trait Meta-Mood Scale. In J. W. Pennebaker (Ed.), Emotion, Disclosure, & Health (125-154). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Schutte, N., 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.
- Shaubroeck, J. & Jones, J. R. (2000). Antecedents of workplace emotional labor dimensions and moderators of their effects on physical symptoms. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21, 163-183
- Sosik, J. J. & Dworakivsky, A. C. (1998). Self-concept based aspects of the charismatic leader: More than meets the eye. Leadership Quarterly, 9, 503-526.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. Harper's Magazine, 140, 227-235.