

California State University, San Bernardino

**CSUSB ScholarWorks**

---

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

---

2001

## Emotional intelligence as a predictor of consideration behaviors, which lead to leadership effectiveness

Janice Claire Evelyn

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Evelyn, Janice Claire, "Emotional intelligence as a predictor of consideration behaviors, which lead to leadership effectiveness" (2001). *Theses Digitization Project*. 4381.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/4381>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@csusb.edu](mailto:scholarworks@csusb.edu).

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AS A PREDICTOR OF CONSIDERATION  
BEHAVIORS, WHICH LEAD TO LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Science  
in  
Psychology:  
Industrial/Organizational

---

by  
Janice Claire Evelyn

June 2001

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AS A PREDICTOR OF CONSIDERATION  
BEHAVIORS, WHICH LEAD TO LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS


---

A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino


---

by  
Janice Claire Evelyn  
June 2001

Approved by:

  
Dr. Janelle Gilbert, Chair, Psychology

  
Dr. Yu-Chin Chien

  
Dr. Jean Peacock

6/7/01  
Date

## ABSTRACT

Studies investigating effective leadership often focus on either traits or behaviors. Emotional Intelligence (EQ) is a trait that has consistently surfaced as an important variable in studies examining patterns of effective leadership. The Ohio State Leadership studies on behaviors identified two important dimensions of leadership:

Consideration, the degree to which a leader acts in a supportive, friendly manner and Initiating Structure, the degree to which a leader structures and defines his or her own goals, and the goals of subordinates in alignment with the groups' formal goals. The present study combined traits and behaviors by examining the potential effects of EQ leading to the use of consideration behaviors to increase a leader's overall effectiveness. Therefore, the present study investigated the possible mediating effects of consideration behaviors as an intermediary step in establishing an indirect link between EQ and leadership effectiveness. A total of 76 participants from both public and private sector organizations and working students completed ratings about their supervisors on an EQ scale, a Consideration and Initiating Structure scale, and a leadership effectiveness scale.

A correlational approach was used to test the proposed hypotheses. The results indicated both a mediating effect of consideration behaviors and a direct effect of EQ on leadership effectiveness. In contrast, initiating structure was not found to mediate the relationship between EQ and leadership effectiveness. Implications surfacing from these findings are discussed, and directions for future research are suggested in the context of an organizational setting.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to my exceptional thesis advisor Dr. Janelle Gilbert for your enthusiasm, expertise, persistence and patience in energizing, directing and guiding me throughout this entire thesis process. You are an inspiration to me and I have thoroughly enjoyed having the opportunity, privilege and pleasure to work with you. Thank you to my entire thesis committee, Dr. Janelle Gilbert, Dr. Yu-Chin Chien, and Dr. Jean Peacock for your commitment and expertise in helping me to reach my educational goals. I appreciate your continued support, time and energy in helping me to complete my thesis. A special thank you to my fellow colleagues. I am very fortunate to have had the pleasure of working with such a wonderful group of people. Thank you to my extraordinary I/O faculty, Dr. Janelle Gilbert, Dr. Jan Kottke, Dr. Ken Shultz and Dr. Mark Agars for your continuous encouragement and support over the past two years. Thank you to the Psychology department and Luci Van Loon, who has continually gone out of her way to be helpful, kind, and supportive. You are greatly appreciated. Thank you to Bridget Styers and Kathryn Paget who have been so supportive of me throughout my graduate career.

## DEDICATION

To my Dad, Jerome Jr., my Mom Alison, my step dad, George my brother, Justin and my entire family for all the continued love and support that you have provided me throughout my entire educational career. Thank you for always believing in me and encouraging me to pursue my goals. This is also dedicated to my beloved Nana, Louise Hoak, and my Gramps, Jerome Sr., who both recently passed away. Thank you both for your infinite love and support.

With Lots of Love, Janice

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	v
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....	1
Leadership Behaviors .....	5
Leadership Traits .....	8
Emotional Intelligence .....	14
Leadership Effectiveness .....	27
Purpose of the Study .....	34
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY	
Methods .....	37
CHAPTER THREE: FINDINGS AND RESULTS	
Results .....	46
CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Discussion .....	51
Significance and Implications .....	53
Limitations .....	54
APPENDIX A: TABLE 1 .....	57
APPENDIX B: TABLE 2 .....	59
APPENDIX C: TABLE 3 .....	61
APPENDIX D: TABLE 4 .....	63
APPENDIX E: PARTICIPANTS INFORMED CONSENT FORM .....	65
APPENDIX F: LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS SURVEY .....	67



APPENDIX G: LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS SURVEY .....	70
APPENDIX H: LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY .....	73
APPENDIX I: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET .....	76
APPENDIX J: DEBRIEFING STATEMENT .....	78
REFERENCES .....	80

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

Does leadership matter? The importance of leaders has been pursued over the years. Historically, we have seen differences between effective leadership and inept leadership. "The fact that Lincoln's army was inert until Ulysses S. Grant assumed command and that some coaches can move from team to team transforming losers into winners, is for most people, evidence that leadership matters." (Hogan et al, 1994 p.495). Similarly, studies looking at flight crews, the military, and Methodist ministers have found that certain leadership characteristics are associated with effective performance. "Several patterns of leadership behavior are associated with subordinates' performance and satisfaction" (Hogan et al, 1994 p.496). On the contrary, patterns of ineffective leadership have been shown to lead to turnover, insubordination, industrial sabotage, and malingering (Hogan et al, 1994).

Leadership has been an important aspect of research for years. It appears to be one of the most important issues in applied psychology. Volumes appear on the topic every year, and a recent review lists over 7,000 books,

articles, or presentations dealing with leadership (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Yet, we still do not have a definitive answer on what makes an effective leader.

Several definitions of leadership have been proposed over the years. After a comprehensive review of the leadership literature, Stogdill (1974, p.259) concluded, "there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept." Yukl (1998) found that leadership might be defined in terms of traits, behaviors, influence, interaction patterns, role relationships, and occupation of an administrative position. Yukl (1998) identified eight definitions of leadership that have been represented over the past 50 years: (1.) Leadership is "the behavior of an individual...directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal" (Hemphill & Coons, 1957, p.7) (2.) Leadership is the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization (Katz & Kahn, 1978, p.528). (3.) Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement (Rauch & Behling, 1984, p.46). (4.) Leaders are those who consistently make effective contributions to social order and who are

expected and perceived to do so (Hosking, 1988, p.153).

(5.) Leadership is a process of giving purpose (meaningful direction) to collective effort, and causing willing effort to be expended to achieve purpose (Jacobs & Jaques, 1990, p.281). (6.) Leadership...is the ability to step outside the culture...to start evolutionary change processes that are more adaptive (Schein, 1992, p.2). (7.) Leadership is the process of making sense of what people are doing together so that people will understand and be committed (Drath & Palus, 1994, p.4). (8.) Leadership is about articulating visions, embodying values, and creating the environment within which things can be accomplished (Richards & Engle, 1986, p.206).

Most definitions of leadership involve a process whereby one person exerts intentional influence over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization (Yukl, 1998, p.3). The definitions differ in many respects, and have very little in common beyond this assumption of influence. These differences in leadership definitions reflect the deep disagreement about identification of leaders and the leadership process. Different researchers use different

conceptions of leadership, and thus, investigate and interpret the results in different ways.

Reminiscent of all constructs in social science, the definition of leadership is arbitrary and very subjective. Some definitions are more useful than others, but there is no single "correct" definition. "For the time being it is better to use the various conceptions of leadership as a source of different perspectives to view a complex, multifaceted phenomenon" (Yukl, 1998, p. 5). Thus, leadership may be viewed as a complex process involving both inherent traits and behaviors combining to create what we view as a leader. Is leadership a trait, inherently a part of a person's nature, or is it a behavior or pattern of behaviors? Or perhaps from a contingency standpoint, it is a combination of both, inherent traits and behaviors combined. Conceivably, the inherent traits are necessary to exhibit behaviors viewed as effective leadership. Past research by both behavioral and trait theorists provides a better understanding of the concept of leadership from two different perspectives, leaders' behaviors and leader traits.

The purpose of the current study is to identify how leadership effectiveness is related to Emotional Intelligence, which is mediated by the use of consideration behaviors.

### Leadership Behaviors

Numerous taxonomies of leadership behaviors have been proposed over the years. Yukl's (1998) list is the broadest. It identifies fourteen categories of leader behavior, including planning and organizing, problem solving, clarifying, informing, monitoring, motivating, consulting, recognizing, supporting, managing conflict and team building, networking, delegating, developing and mentoring, and rewarding (Hogan et al, 1994). The famous Ohio State Leadership Studies provided extensive research on the identification of leadership behaviors. (Yukl, 1998 p.47). "The researchers compiled a list of 150 items that appeared to be good examples of important leadership functions." "Factor analysis of the questionnaire responses indicated that subordinates perceived their supervisor's behavior primarily in terms of two broadly defined categories, which were subsequently labeled "consideration" and "initiating structure" (Yukl, 1998

p.47). These two categories were found to be relatively independent behavioral categories. That is, a leader may receive a high score on consideration and a low score on initiating structure. Or a high score on initiating structure and a low score on consideration (Yukl, 1998, p.48). The construct of "consideration" is the degree to which a leader acts in a supportive, friendly manner. This includes showing concern for subordinates, and looking out for subordinate welfare (Yukl, 1998, p.48). "Examples include doing personal favors for subordinates, finding time to listen to subordinates' problems, backing up or going to bat for a subordinate, consulting with subordinates on important matters, being willing to accept subordinate's suggestions, and treating a subordinate as an equal." (Yukl, 1998 p.47).

Initiating structure is the degree to which a leader structures and defines his or her own goals, and the goals of subordinates in alignment with the groups' formal goals. "Examples include criticizing poor work, emphasizing the importance of meeting deadlines, assigning subordinates to tasks, maintaining definite standards of performance, asking subordinates to follow standard procedures, offering new approaches to problems, coordinating the activities of

subordinates, and seeing that subordinates are working to capacity" (Yukl, 1998 p.47). Most leaders will probably fall along some continuum between extreme high and low scores on both categories.

In 1962 Fleishman and Harris performed a correlational study using field research on the constructs of consideration and initiating structure. Criteria of leadership effectiveness included the number of written grievances and the amount of voluntary turnover during an eleven-month period. Findings of the research study indicated that supervisors who were very considerate had less grievances and turnover in their work units than supervisors who were low on consideration. The relationship was in the opposite direction for initiating structure; supervisors who used a lot of structuring behavior had more turnover and grievances (Fleishman and Harris, 1962). A statistical analysis confirmed the existence of a significant curvilinear relationship between consideration and the rate of turnover and grievances. Fleishman and Harris (1962) found that there appear to be certain critical levels beyond which increased consideration or decreased initiating structure have no effect on turnover or grievance rate. Other survey



research on the effects of consideration and initiating structure on leadership effectiveness found many inconsistencies. "The only mostly consistent finding was a positive relationship between consideration and subordinate satisfaction" (Yukl, 1998 p49). A study by Lowin, Hrapchak, & Kavanagh (1969) found considerate leaders had more satisfied and productive subordinates, but there was no significant effect of leader structuring behavior (Yukl, 1998, p.51). Another study by Gilmore, Beehr & Richter (1979) found neither type of leadership behavior had a consistent, significant effect on subordinate productivity or quality, perhaps because the manipulation of leader behavior was very weak (Yukl, 1998 p.51).

### Leadership Traits

The trait approach to leadership emphasizes the personal attributes of leaders (Yukl, 1998, p.8). The term "trait" refers to a number of attributes an individual may possess, including aspects of personality, temperament, needs, motives, and values. Personality traits are relatively stable dispositions causing people to behave in a particular way. Some examples include, self-confidence, emotional maturity, emotional stability, energy level and

stress tolerance" (Yukl, 1998, p. 234). There is an abundance of evidence that traits are determined by both learning and an inherited capacity to gain satisfaction from particular types of stimuli or experiences.

The trait approach assumes that some people are natural born leaders who possess certain traits that are not possessed by all people. "Early leadership theories attributed managerial success to extraordinary abilities such as tireless energy, penetrating intuition, uncanny foresight, and irresistible persuasive powers" (Yukl, 1998, p.8).

Early research on leader traits and skills were rooted in the belief that the traits essential for leadership effectiveness could be identified by empirical research. The most frequently studied traits in the early leadership research focused on physical attributes such as height and appearance, aspects of personality such as self-esteem, dominance, and emotional stability, and aptitudes measured using general intelligence tests. "Stogdill (1948) reviewed 124 trait studies conducted from 1904 to 1948 and found that the pattern of results was consistent with the conception of a leader as someone who acquires status through demonstration of ability to facilitate the efforts

of the group in attaining its goals" (Yukl, 1998, p. 236). Relevant traits included intelligence, alertness to the needs of others, understanding of the task, initiative, and persistence in dealing with problems, self-confidence, and desire to accept responsibility and occupy a position of dominance and control. The importance of these traits was found to be dependent upon the situation. Thus, Stogdill (1948, p.64) concluded: "A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits...the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities and goals of the followers" (Yukl, 1998, p. 236). These findings produced mixed results in regards to trait theories of leadership requiring further research. Once again, in 1974, Stogdill reviewed 163 trait studies conducted from 1949 to 1970 and found mixed results. Many of the same traits were again found to be related to leadership effectiveness, with some additional traits and skills also found to be relevant. The traits and skills, which differentiate leaders from non-leaders, include, adaptable to situations, alert to social environment, ambitious, achievement oriented, assertive, cooperative, decisive, dependable, dominant

(power motivation), energetic (high activity level), persistent, self-confident, tolerant of stress, and willingness to assume responsibility. Skills include, cleverness (intelligence), conceptually skilled, creative, diplomatic and tactful, fluent in speaking, knowledge about the work, organized (administrative ability), persuasive, and socially skilled (Yukl, 1998, p.237).

McClelland and associates conducted extensive research on managerial motivation and need strength using a projective measure called the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). This test was used to obtain measures of three underlying needs: power, achievement, and affiliation. The general findings concluded that the optimal pattern of needs for managerial effectiveness in large organizations includes a strong socialized power orientation, a moderately high need for achievement, and a relatively low need for affiliation (Yukl, 1998, p.239). In 1965, Miner conducted a series of research experiments on managerial motivation. Miner's research over a period of 30 years included more than 33 studies on the relationship between managerial motivation and advancement. In summary, Miner found that managerial motivation predicted advancement in

large organizations, but found inconsistent results for smaller organizations (Yukl, 1998, p. 240).

In 1982, Boyatzis conducted research in a wide range of private and public sector organizations to discover competencies related to managerial effectiveness. The competencies included personality traits, motives, skills, knowledge, self-image, and some specific behaviors. The method used to measure these competencies was the "behavioral event interview," similar to the critical incidents technique. Several competencies were found to differentiate between effective and ineffective managers, and many of these competencies involved interpersonal skills (Yukl, 1998, p.240). Longitudinal research using assessment centers have also yielded helpful insights regarding traits related to managerial advancement in an organization. The most commonly used measures in these assessment center studies included the use of in-basket exercises and leaderless group discussions. AT&T conducted longitudinal research with a group of candidates to determine if assessment center scores predicted a candidates progress in terms of advancement to middle management. "Prediction of advancement was computed after 8 years and after 20 years. The personal attributes that

predicted advancement best after 20 years (from 0 to year 20) included desire for advancement, dominance (need for power), interpersonal skills (e.g. oral communication), cognitive skills (e.g. creativity, critical thinking), and administrative skills (e.g. organizing, planning)" (Yukl, 1998, p.243). Another important discovery found in the AT&T research was the impact of the job situation on the relevance of individual traits for managerial success. Findings indicated that managerial advancement was a product of the combination of relevant personal qualities and the opportunity for these qualities to be transformed into effective managerial behavior.

Leadership may be conceptualized and researched from many different perspectives such as the behavioral approach or the trait approach, but is there a common factor or component among these different approaches that may offer further insight into understanding what qualities or behaviors make a leader effective? Strong social and interpersonal skills appear to be a component of success for leaders across the different research approaches.

## Emotional Intelligence

Emotional Intelligence is a fairly recent construct in the field of psychology. This may be a fundamental component in many leaders who are effective. Perhaps leaders with higher levels of Emotional Intelligence exhibit more consideration behaviors, leading to greater effectiveness. To gain an understanding of Emotional Intelligence requires examining its two component terms, intelligence and emotion (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). "For years psychologists have recognized an influential three part division of the mind into cognition (or thought), affect (including emotion), and motivation (or conation)" (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Functions such as memory, reasoning, judgment, and abstract thought are included in the cognitive sphere. Intelligence is often used to characterize how well the cognitive sphere functions. Thus, intelligence embodies abilities such as the power to combine and separate concepts, to judge and to reason, and to engage in abstract thought (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Emotions are a part of the second so-called affective sphere of mental functioning including, emotions, moods, evaluations, and other feeling states including fatigue or energy (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). "Emotions are internal

events that coordinate many psychological subsystems including physiological responses, cognitions and conscious awareness" (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey 2000). Emotional Intelligence should then, in some way, refer to heightened emotional or mental abilities. Therefore, a definition of Emotional Intelligence combines the ideas that emotion makes thinking more intelligent and that one thinks intelligently about emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Emotional Intelligence is a construct which has been defined as "the ability to monitor one's and others' emotions, to discriminate among them, and use the information to guide one's thinking and actions" (Davies, Stankov, and Roberts 1998 p.992). Mayer, Caruso & Salovey (2000) define Emotional Intelligence as "the capacity to perceive emotions, assimilate emotion-related feelings, understand the information of those emotions, and manage them." Goleman (1998) found that effective leaders are alike in one crucial way: they have a high degree of Emotional Intelligence. Goleman (1998) goes on to state it is not that IQ and technical skills are irrelevant; they do matter, but mainly as "threshold capabilities." That is they are the entry-level requirements for executive positions.



What is known about Emotional Intelligence (EQ) today is grounded primarily in psychobiology and modern neuroscience. One of the first to point out the distinction between intellectual and emotional capacities was a Harvard psychologist named Howard Gardner, who introduced the theory of "multiple intelligences" in 1983 (Kemper, 1999). "Emotional Intelligence," as it is referred to today was formally conceptualized in 1990 by Jack Mayer, Ph.D. (now a psychology professor at the University of New Hampshire) and Peter Salovey, Ph.D. a psychologist at Yale University (Kemper, 1999). Daniel Goleman's first book "Emotional Intelligence" and his second book "Working with Emotional Intelligence" brought this construct into the mainstream business world (Kemper, 1999). The framework on Emotional Intelligence by Salovey and Mayer (1990) states "Emotional Intelligence is a set of skills hypothesized to contribute to the accurate appraisal and expression of emotion in oneself and in others, the effective regulation of emotion in self and others, and the use of feelings to motivate, plan and achieve in one's life."

Over the years, intelligence has been defined in several different terms. "Perhaps the most often cited

definition is Wechsler's statement that "intelligence is the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally, and to deal effectively with his environment" (Salovey and Mayer 1990). Emotional Intelligence is a subset of social intelligence. Social intelligence was initially defined as the ability to understand and manage people, these social/intellectual skills might also be directed inward and so social intelligence might include by extension, the ability to understand and manage oneself (Salovey and Mayer 1990 p.194). Thorndike defined social intelligence as "the ability to perceive one's own and others' internal states, motives, and behaviors, and to act toward them optimally on the basis of that information." Social intelligence, however, was often defined in a more negative fashion. Weinstein noted that social intelligence "boils down to the ability to manipulate the responses of others" (Salovey and Mayer, 1990). Presently, there has been a resurgence of interest in social intelligence and how to measure it accurately. Salovey and Mayer (1990) found that a social intelligence component could be distinguished from general academic abilities. Research done by Epstein and Meier (1985), found that constructive thinking, defined as

dealing adaptively and effectively with the environment, is a core component of personality. They believe that people who lead their lives successfully have, for example, learned the advantages of flexible thinking (Salovey and Mayer, 1990). As Salovey and Mayer (1990) have stated, "Emotional Intelligence is therefore a subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions."

The core capacity at work here is access to one's own feelings and range of affects or emotions. The capacity to discriminate among these feelings, label them, enmesh them into symbolic codes, and to draw upon them as a means of understanding and guiding one's behavior. In its most primitive form, the intrapersonal intelligence amounts to little more than the capacity to distinguish a feeling of pleasure from one of pain. At its most advanced level, intrapersonal knowledge allows one to detect and to symbolize complex and highly differentiated sets of feelings (Salovey and Mayer, 1990). "Interpersonal intelligence involves, among other things, the ability to monitor other's moods and temperaments and to enlist such

knowledge into the service of predicting their future behavior" (Salovey and Mayer 1990).

Theoretically, Davies, Stankov and Roberts (1998), point out that the construct of Emotional Intelligence encompasses a set of conceptually related psychological processes involving the processing of affective information. These processes include "(a) the verbal and nonverbal appraisal and expression of emotion of oneself and others, (b) the regulation of emotion in oneself and others, and (c) the use of emotion to facilitate thought."

The "emotional brain," as pointed out by Goleman (1998), scans everything happening to us from moment to moment to see if something that happened in the past that made us sad or angry is like what is happening now (Pool, 1997). What controls our emotions is the limbic brain, right in the middle of the three main layers of the human brain: the cortex, limbic brain, and brain stem. In the middle of the limbic area, behind our eyes, are two amygdalae. Neurological research has shown that these almond-shaped organs receive and send all emotional messages (Pool, 1997). Our analytical thinking is always influenced by our emotions. "Studies with children who are chronically sad, or angry, or anxious find constant

interference by the amygdala, making it harder for these children to concentrate" (Pool, 1997). Other studies on children's Emotional Intelligence provide interesting insight in longitudinal research. Abraham (1998), cited a longitudinal study by Shoda, Mischel and Peake (1990) "which tracked through high school a group of 4-year olds who resisted impulse and found them more self-assertive, socially skilled, independent, persevering, and achieving significantly higher SAT scores than their more impulsive counterparts." In longitudinal studies of social skills, Nowicki and Duke (1989) found children lacking social skills suffered both socially and academically (Abraham, 1999).

Goleman (1998) states that there are five core dimensions of Emotional Intelligence, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. These components of EQ can be found in children, teens and adults. "Emotional Intelligence matters for school achievement, job success, marital happiness, and physical health. Goleman discussed the recent research finding that "people who are chronically sad, anxious, or depressed have double the risk of getting a major disease—a higher risk than smoking" (Pool, 1997).

The importance of Emotional Intelligence in the workplace is evident. With all of the changing dimensions of the workplace today a leader needs much more than cognitive skills to effectively manage an organization. As pointed out by Yukl (1998), interpersonal skills such as empathy, social insight, charm, tact, diplomacy, persuasiveness and oral communication ability are essential to develop and maintain cooperative relationships with subordinates, superiors, peers and outsiders. Kemper (1999) found, "some studies indicate that EQ is more than twice as important as standard IQ abilities." Kemper (1999) also found that the higher one goes in an organization, the more important EQ can be. For those in leadership positions, Emotional Intelligence skills account for close to 90% of what distinguishes outstanding leaders from those judged as average (Kemper, 1999).

Organizations and businesses have recognized the importance of EQ in leadership positions. "Emotional Intelligence is helping us truly understand what effective leadership is and how people develop it; why we've not gotten the expected results from change work in organizations; and why really smart people do really dumb things that end up derailing their careers" (Kemper, 1999).

Cherniss (1998) points out that "IQ accounts for only 20% of the factors that determine success in life." Due to the fact that many leaders are selected based on technical and cognitive abilities this may impact the way we chose leaders in the future. Perhaps, we need to incorporate measures of EQ into traditional assessments of leaders. A very powerful example of the importance of EQ in the workplace was cited by Cherniss (1998) from a chapter in Goleman's book (1995).

McBroom was a domineering airline pilot whose temper intimidated subordinates. One day in 1978, his plane developed a problem with the landing gear as it approached the airport. McBroom turned the plane over to the co-pilot and began trying to fix the problem. As the plane circled the airport, the cockpit crew noticed that the fuel gauges were approaching empty. But they were so fearful of McBroom's wrath that they said nothing. The plane crashed, killing 10 people. While this case is admittedly extreme, the FAA estimates that in 80% of crashes, pilots make mistakes that could be prevented if the crew worked better together. (Cherniss, 1998).

Another powerful example of EQ in the workplace is found in studies of educational administrators and leaders. Cherniss (1998) describes a high EQ school principal, "his ability to remain calm no matter how turbulent the situation became a model for his staff. And his outlook was the key to his stress management." Rather than fearing disagreement, he valued the expression of differing views

and saw the diversity of opinions as vital for positive change. The ability to get along with others is a crucial aspect of leadership. Effective leaders are particularly skilled at building consensus, coordinating team efforts, appreciating multiple perspectives, and avoiding unproductive conflicts. These abilities enable them to develop the positive relationships necessary to achieve goals (Cherniss, 1998). At the level of the work group, Emotional Intelligence is manifested in harmonious relationships among workers (Abraham, 1999). Emotional Intelligence was also found to be an important component in performance feedback (Abraham, 1999).

In a study of 108 managers, Baron (1990) found "the principal reason for conflict in the work place was inept criticism, or the inability to provide subordinates with a balanced view of their performance" (Abraham, 1999). Although criticism is a necessary component of feedback that provides information to employees about maintaining current performance, improving performance, or re-orienting their efforts in a new direction, the delivery of criticism is often inappropriate (Abraham, 1999). "People who are happy in an organization will work for 10%-15% less (than they would earn in competing institutions) and stay where



they are rather than go elsewhere. On the bottom line, it's worth 14% to keep your employees happy. And that's part of Emotional Intelligence, knowing how to do that" (Fleming, 1999). Studies of Emotional Intelligence and organizational commitment found "over time, the continuous substitution of positive emotion for negative energy improves satisfaction with the job, and in turn commitment to the organization" (Abraham, 1999). Abraham (1999) also found that Emotional Intelligence was a powerful predictor of organizational commitment. Emotional Intelligence explained 15% of the variance in organizational commitment. "Emotions, properly managed, can drive trust, loyalty and commitment—and many of the greatest productivity gains, innovations, and accomplishments of individuals, teams, and organizations" (Cooper, 1997). Cooper (1997) found three components of business leaders and organizations related to a competitive advantage: building-trusting relationships, increasing energy and effectiveness, and creating the future. These EQ related components are often overlooked by traditional management development, yet Cooper (1997) has found these aspects crucial to exceptionally successful work in leadership and organizations.

Technique and technology are important, but adding trust is the issue of the decade. In addition to Motorola, some of America's most successful companies have built their market strength and profitability on a foundation of trust such as, Southwest Airlines, Nordstrom, and Ritz-Carlton hotels. Wal-Mart's CEO David Glass has said that founder Sam Walton was able to move forward with optimism, and admit and correct mistakes, largely because he had so much trust in others (Cooper, 1997).

Cooper (1997) found that leaders in organizations of all shapes and sizes are beginning to realize that the price of mistrust is steep and can be lethal to an organization's future. Trust has economic value. We can measure its impact on the bottom line in a variety of ways (Cooper, 1997). Other researchers have confirmed that Emotional Intelligence not only distinguishes outstanding leaders, but can also be linked to strong performance (Goleman, 1998). "In a 1996 study of a global food and beverage company, McClelland found that when senior managers had a critical mass of Emotional Intelligence capabilities, their divisions outperformed yearly earnings goals by 20%. Meanwhile, division leaders without that critical mass under performed by almost the same amount

(Goleman, 1998, p.94).” It was once thought that the components of Emotional Intelligence were “nice to have” in business leaders. But now we know that for the sake of performance, these are ingredients that leaders need to have (Goleman, 1998).

In a recent study of leadership, Goleman (2000) found six leadership styles, each springing from different components of Emotional Intelligence including, Coercive, Authoritative, Affiliative, Democratic, Pacesetting, and Coaching Leadership styles. Findings indicate that the most effective leaders switch flexibly among the leadership styles as needed. This fluidity in leadership style can enhance job performance and satisfaction. Even if a leader does not have all six styles of leadership in their repertory, they can build a team with members who employ styles he/she lacks (Goleman, 2000).

Research supports the fact that Emotional Intelligence can be increased through training. “Well-designed training programs are a starting point to help managers improve their personal and interpersonal abilities” (Cherniss, 1998). For instance, one large company taught first-level supervisors interpersonal skills such as active listening, giving corrective feedback, involving employees in problem

solving, and using positive reinforcement. Compared to a control group, the supervisors who participated in the training increased the use of all of their skills and recorded significant declines in turnover and absenteeism among their workers. They also showed a 17% increase in production (Cherniss, 1998). The construct of Emotional Intelligence may then allow us to pose the question: Will high levels of Emotional Intelligence lead to higher consideration tasks, thus predicting a higher level of leadership effectiveness? We need to clarify and define what is meant by leadership effectiveness.

### Leadership Effectiveness

While we have an understanding of what leaders do, how effective a leader is has been harder to pinpoint. Fiedler (1967, p.9) found that leadership effectiveness has been defined in a number of ways. "Stogdill (1957) proposed that group effectiveness be defined in terms of (1) the group's output, (2) its morale, and (3) the satisfactions of its members" (Fiedler, 1967, p.9). Some researchers assume that any task performance may be used as a criterion of leadership effectiveness.

When using task performance as the criterion, morale and member satisfaction are viewed as by-products rather than tangible measures of leadership effectiveness.

There are several rater instruments to measure how often certain behaviors are performed, but that still doesn't tell us how effective a leader is. As pointed out by Yukl (1998), the most commonly used measure of leader effectiveness is the extent to which the leader's organizational unit performs its task successfully and attains its goals. "Objective measures of performance or goal attainment include profits, profit margin, sales increase, market share, sales relative to targeted sales, return on investment, productivity, cost per unit of output, and costs in relation to budgeted expenditures. Subjective measures include ratings of effectiveness obtained from the leader's superiors, peers or subordinates" (Yukl, 1998). Effectiveness concerns judgments about a leader's impact on an organization's bottom line (i.e., the profitability of a business unit, the quality of services rendered, market share gained, or the win-loss record of a team) (Hogan et al, 1994). Effectiveness is often hard to measure accurately. Yukl (1998, p.503) did however find several recurrent themes in

the literature capturing the essence of effective leadership.

(1.)...Leadership is about creating alignment around a shared objective and general strategies to attain it...when success turns to failure, leadership is about finding new ways and influencing people to change how things are done.

(2.)...Leadership is about increasing enthusiasm and excitement about the importance of the work, and about maintaining optimism and confidence that the quest for a meaningful objective will be successful.

(3.)...Leadership is about helping people understand and appreciate each other, and helping them learn how to confront and resolve difficulties in a constructive way.

(4.)...Leadership is about helping people find ways to coordinate activities and perform them more efficiently. Continuous improvement and development of capabilities is essential for survival in a highly competitive environment. Leadership is about encouraging flexibility, objective analysis of processes, and collective learning of better ways to work together.

(5.)...Leadership is about representing the interests of the group or organization, helping protect its reputation, helping to establish and maintain cooperation and trust

with external stakeholders, and helping reconcile conflicts between internal and external parties.

(6.) The continued existence of the group or organization requires definition and maintenance of boundaries...

Leadership is about creating a unique identity and helping to resolve issues of membership in a way that is consistent with this identity. Leadership may be viewed as an influential and decisional process necessary to ensure survival of a group or organization. It is important to note that the way in which leadership functions are performed in an organization are influenced by stakeholders interests, cultural norms and societal laws (Yukl, 1998, p.503).

Leaders are rated from all different levels; including their bosses, subordinates, and peers. Hogan, et al. (1994) found "research by D.P. Campbell (1991), Harris and Hogan (1992) and Lombardo, Ruderman and McCauley (1988) indicates that a leader's credibility or trustworthiness may be the single most important factor in subordinates' judgments of his or her effectiveness." This issue of trust is very important in leader/subordinate relations. Murphy and Cleveland (1991) noted that the evaluation of a manager's performance depends, in part on the relationships

that the person has established with his or her subordinates (Hogan et al, 1994). In 1993, W. Edwards Deming said, "Trust is mandatory for (the) optimization of any system. Without trust, there can be no cooperation between people, teams, departments, divisions" (Cooper, 1997). "Effectiveness is the standard by which leaders should be judged; focusing on typical behaviors and ignoring effectiveness is an overarching problem in leadership behavior" (Hogan, et al. 1994). The most common complaints from direct reports on managerial incompetence were (a) a managers' unwillingness to exercise authority (e.g., is reluctant to confront problems and conflict,) (b) managers tyrannizing their subordinates (e.g., manages his/her employees too closely, breathes down their necks, treats employees as if they were stupid) (Hogan et al, 1994). These negative aspects of leadership behavior seem to envelop some aspects of behavior not related to cognitive skills or expertise. Perhaps there is something beyond technical skills that makes a leader effective.

Research on derailed leaders is important, as it helps explain why some leaders are not successful. Early research found several factors primary to leader derailment. Yukl (1998), found that research on derailed



managers "did not reveal any full proof formula for success, but it provided some important insights." The major findings about managers who derailed are as follows: (1.) Emotional stability and composure: managers who derailed were less likely to handle pressure, were more prone to moodiness, angry outbursts, and inconsistent behaviors that undermined their interpersonal relationships. (2.) Defensiveness: managers who derailed were more likely to be defensive about failure, and reacted by attempting to cover up mistakes or blame other people. (3.) Integrity: unsuccessful managers had a weaker sense of integrity. (4.) Interpersonal skills: The most common reason for derailment was insensitivity, which was reflected in abrasive or intimidating behavior toward others. (5.) Technical and cognitive skills: "at higher levels of management this strength (in technical and cognitive skills) could become a weakness if it led to overconfidence and arrogance" (Yukl, 1998). Many of these reasons for managers' lack of success are directly related to low levels of Emotional Intelligence. An interesting component of these factors is that many relate to "managing people" and interpersonal aspects of leadership, or in the case of derailed managers, the lack there of.

Hogan et al. (1994) reports managerial incompetence to be associated with untrustworthiness, over control, exploitation, micromanagement, irritability, unwillingness to use discipline, and an inability to make good staffing or business decision (or both). Studies on emergent leadership and leaderless groups have found several personality factors to be important components. Research reviewed by Stogdill (1948) found a variety of personality factors including measures of dominance, extraversion, socialibility, ambition or achievement, responsibility, integrity, self confidence, mood and emotional control, diplomacy, and cooperativeness (Hogan et al., 1994).

For many years it was common to view leadership as a process wherein leaders influence followers to believe it is in their best interest to cooperate in achieving a shared task objective. Until the 1980's, few conceptions of leadership recognized the importance of emotions as a basis for influence. In contrast, many recent conceptions of leadership emphasize the emotional aspects of influence much more than reason. According to this view, only the emotional, value-based aspects of leadership influence can account for the exceptional achievements of groups and organizations. Leaders inspire followers to willingly sacrifice their selfish interests for a higher cause. (Yukl, 1998).

As demonstrated by past research, effective leadership in organizations is necessary and important. Research on derailed managers has provided information regarding what components have lead to their unsuccessful experiences.

Most of them have lacked empathy, understanding, and regard for their subordinates welfare. Further, research on Emotional Intelligence has found that there is much more involved in leadership effectiveness than technical skills and knowledge. Knowing how to handle and manage one's own emotions and the emotions of others could be a valuable resource in managing and leading people. This review of past research then leads to the question of the importance of Emotional Intelligence (EQ) in leadership.

#### Purpose of the Study

Will a leader with a higher level of EQ, demonstrate more consideration behaviors, thus enhancing leadership effectiveness? The present study is an attempt to understand the relationship between these variables.

H1: There will be a significant positive relationship between leaders' levels of Emotional Intelligence (EQ) and their leadership effectiveness. In other words, the higher the leaders' EQ scores, the higher their levels of leadership effectiveness; the lower the leaders' EQ scores, the lower their leadership effectiveness.

H2: There will be a significant positive relationship between leaders' levels of consideration behaviors and

their leadership effectiveness. In other words, the higher the levels of the leaders' consideration behaviors, the higher their leadership effectiveness; the lower the levels of the leaders' consideration behaviors, the lower their leadership effectiveness.

H3: There will be a significant positive relationship between leaders' levels of Emotional Intelligence (EQ) and their levels of consideration behaviors. In others words, the higher the leaders' EQ scores, the higher their levels of consideration behaviors; the lower the leaders' EQ scores, the lower their levels of consideration behaviors.

The relationship between Emotional Intelligence and leadership effectiveness may be direct and/or indirect. It is hypothesized that leaders' levels of Emotional Intelligence will influence their leadership effectiveness through two routes (i.e., consideration behaviors mediates the relationship between Emotional Intelligence (EQ) and leadership effectiveness, and consideration behaviors does not mediate the relationship between EQ and leadership effectiveness.)

The expected interrelations among leaders' levels of Emotional Intelligence, their leadership effectiveness, and their levels of consideration behaviors are illustrated as follows: EQ---→CB---→LE (indirect effect) or EQ---→LE (direct effect).

## CHAPTER TWO

### METHODOLOGY

#### Methods

##### Design

In this study, a correlational-regression approach was adopted to test the proposed hypotheses. The predictor variable was the leader's level of Emotional Intelligence, the criterion variable was leadership effectiveness, and the mediating variable was the leader's level of consideration behaviors. In this study the focus was on subordinates' perceptions of these constructs. Leaders' levels of Emotional Intelligence were assessed by subordinates using a survey developed for this study; leaders' levels of consideration behaviors were evaluated by subordinates using the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ XII); a measurement tool for leadership effectiveness was also completed measuring subordinates' perceptions of leadership effectiveness. All three variables were quantitative and continuous variables.

##### Participants

A total of 76 subordinates were recruited on a volunteer basis from both public and private organizational

settings and the population of working students at California State University, San Bernardino. This sample size was sufficient to insure a power of .80 for a medium effect size at the  $p < .05$  level (Cohen, 1992). In order to participate in this study, participants needed to be currently working a minimum of 30 hours per week in their current position. A minimum age of 18 years old was required in order to participate in the study.

Demographic data was coded into categories prior to analysis. Fifty percent of participants fell between the ages of 18-31 years old. Approximately 80% of participants were female, and 20% were males. Most participants had completed some college or had earned a Bachelor's Degree. 48.7% of the participants were Caucasian, 28.6% were Hispanic, 11.7% were African American, 1.3% were Asian, and 9.7% were Pacific Islander. The mean for time employed under current supervisor was 3.62 years. The mean for number of hours worked per week was 32.5 hours, with the majority of participants' (73.7%) working between 30 to 40 hours per week. All volunteers were treated in accordance with the "Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct" (APA, 1994).

## Materials

In this study the following materials were used: one informed consent form (see Appendix G), a survey assessing levels of Emotional Intelligence (see Appendix H), the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ XII) (see Appendix I), a leadership effectiveness survey (see Appendix J), one demographic sheet (see Appendix K), and a debriefing statement (see Appendix L).

The Emotional Intelligence survey used in this study was modeled after research and Emotional Intelligence measures constructed by Dr. John Mayer, Dr. David Caruso, and Dr. Peter Salovey. The Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS), and information from Daniel Goldman's book "Working with Emotional Intelligence", were used as references in constructing the Emotional Intelligence measure. The MEIS is a self-report survey that uses a four-branch model of skills involved in Emotional Intelligence. These skills include, reflectively regulating emotions, understanding emotions, assimilating emotion in thought, and perceiving and expressing emotion. The Emotional Intelligence survey constructed for this study was adapted to be used as a rating instrument where subordinates were asked to rate their leader's level of



Emotional Intelligence. Five dimensions identified by Daniel Goleman were used to tap concepts related to each of these four skills. Survey items were categorized under each of the five dimensions in order to effectively tap each skill related to Emotional Intelligence. The dimensions were, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. There were a total of 27 items in a seven-point Likert scale format. A high score, such as seven, represented "Strongly Agree" and a low score, such as one, represented "Strongly Disagree". The scale range was between one and seven, progressively representing stronger levels of agreement as the numbers increase. The midpoint of the scale, four represents a neutral response, in the middle of agree and disagree. Participants' responses were averaged for each item in order to establish an overall score.

The Emotional Intelligence measure was subjected to pilot testing prior to distribution. The pilot testing was arranged to make sure the survey items were clear and understandable. Feedback from participants indicated that they easily understood the wording and the meaning of the items. Since there were no problems in interpretation or understanding of the statements associated with this scale

it did not undergo any changes prior to distribution. The overall reliability of the Emotional Intelligence (EQ) scale was tested to ensure adequate reliability. The EQ scale had an overall alpha reliability of .98, indicating a high magnitude of internal consistency. Separate analyses were run for each of the five dimensions to capture the reliability of each specific dimension that encompasses Emotional Intelligence (self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills). The alpha reliability for self-awareness was .87. For self-regulation the alpha reliability was .86. For motivation, the alpha reliability was .92. For empathy, the alpha reliability was .94. For social skills, the alpha reliability was .92. All magnitudes of reliability for the dimensions were high.

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ XII Stogdill, 1963), developed by Ohio State University researchers, was used to measure leader behaviors. This questionnaire included two independent categories of leadership behaviors: Consideration and Initiating Structure. Reliability of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) has been well-established (Schriesheim & Kerr, 1974). Schriesheim and

Kerr (1974) found reliabilities between .70 and .80 (Fleishman, 1969), while those for the early and later versions of the LBDQ have generally been slightly higher (e.g., Fleishman, 1957a; Halpin, 1957; Stogdill, 1963). Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) report one study by Greene (1974) that examined the test-retest reliability of the LBDQ form XII. Greene (1974) found coefficients for one-, two- and three- month intervals vary between .57 and .72 for initiating structure and between .71 and .79 for consideration. Using an experimental design, Stogdill (1969) tested the validities of the independent subscales used in the LBDQ. Stogdill (1969) found support in the results of this research indicating that the subscales of the LBDQ measure what they are purported to measure. In the current study, a total of 18 items were used in a five-point Likert scale format. Nine items representing behaviors of initiating structure, and nine items representing consideration behaviors were included in this survey. A high score of five indicated "Always", and a low score of one indicated "Never". The scale range was between one and five, progressively representing stronger levels of always as the numbers increase. The midpoint of the scale, three represents a neutral response, in the

middle of never and always. Participants' responses were averaged for each item in order to establish an overall score. Two items representing consideration behaviors were reverse coded as a check for rater accuracy. The first dimension, initiating structure, had an alpha reliability of .92. The second dimension of the LBDQ consideration had an alpha of .85. Both dimensions had high internal consistency.

Leadership effectiveness was measured using a survey constructed specifically for the current study. Past research has used several different criteria as a measure of leadership effectiveness, including grievances, absenteeism, productivity, and subordinate satisfaction. Bass (1985) provided the underlying framework for constructing the leadership effectiveness questionnaire with additional assistance from an article assessing leadership effectiveness in nurses by Trott and Windsor (1999). In order to successfully incorporate the wide range of important components related to leadership effectiveness several dimensions were identified which could measure behaviors used by effective leaders or managers. The following eight dimensions were used in the construction of the leadership effectiveness survey;

availability, inclusiveness, fairness/equity, objectivity, effectiveness, supportiveness, productivity, and conflict management. This survey consisted of 32 items in a seven-point Likert scale format. A score of seven represented "Strongly Agree", and a score of one represented "Strongly Disagree". The scale range was between one and seven, progressively representing stronger levels of agreement as the numbers increase. The midpoint of the scale, four represents a neutral response, in the middle of agree and disagree. Participants' responses were averaged for each item in order to establish an overall score. The current study utilized subordinate ratings as a measure of leadership effectiveness. The Leadership Effectiveness scale yielded an overall alpha reliability of .98, indicating a high magnitude of internal consistency.

### Procedure

Public and private organizations were contacted via phone and e-mail and were sent a data collection proposal summarizing the background, methods, procedures, and implications of the current study. Student participants were contacted through the Department of Psychology Peer Advising Center at California State University, San Bernardino. In order to take part in this study,

participants needed to be currently working a minimum of 30 hours per week. Student participants were eligible to receive two units of extra credit for their participation, as deemed appropriate by their instructors. Participants were informed about the general nature of the study. Participants completed an informed consent form, a demographic information sheet, and a questionnaire including a scale rating leaders Emotional Intelligence, a scale measuring use of consideration behaviors, and a leadership effectiveness scale. A debriefing was attached to the end of the survey packet. Participants were able to detach and keep the debriefing, which informed participants about the general nature of the study, and included information regarding who to contact for a copy of the results at the end of the study.

## CHAPTER THREE

### FINDINGS AND RESULTS

#### Results

A preliminary analysis was performed using SPSS for the evaluation of assumptions. No outliers were identified in this initial screening of histograms and residuals. The normality of distributions was also tested. The five dimensions of the Emotional Intelligence (EQ) scale all had a slightly negative skew, but not enough to warrant transformation of the data. The distributions for the two dimensions of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) were analyzed and both were found to have normal distributions. The eight dimensions of the Leadership Effectiveness scale also had a slightly negative skew, but once again, not enough to warrant transformation of the data.

The means for the five dimensions of the Emotional Intelligence scale were analyzed through descriptive statistics (see Appendix A). The means were consistently toward the higher end of the seven-point scale for each of the five dimensions of Emotional Intelligence, demonstrating fairly high ratings. The means for the

Leadership Behaviors, Initiating Structure and Consideration were around the midpoint of the scale (see Appendix B). For the Leadership Effectiveness measure, means and standard deviations were analyzed for the eight dimensions representing this construct (see Appendix C). The means were toward the moderate to higher end of the seven-point scale, representing moderately high scores of overall leadership effectiveness.

In order to test the mediation hypothesis, procedures outlined by Kenny and Baron (1986) were followed. First, it was necessary to test the relationship between leaders' levels of Emotional Intelligence (EQ) and their leadership effectiveness. The correlation coefficient between EQ and leadership effectiveness was significant ( $r = .90, p < .01$ ).

Next, it was necessary to test the relationship between leaders' consideration and their leadership effectiveness. The correlation coefficient between consideration and leadership effectiveness was significant ( $r = .78, p < .01$ ). It was also necessary to test the correlation coefficient between EQ and consideration. The correlation coefficient between Emotional Intelligence and consideration was significant ( $r = .80, p < .01$ ) (see Appendix D).



Finally, in order to test the mediation hypothesis, the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and leadership effectiveness, as mediated by consideration, was tested. The partial correlation between EQ and leadership effectiveness controlling for consideration was significant ( $\underline{r} = .73, p < .01$ ).

The partial correlation between EQ and leadership effectiveness controlling for consideration ( $r = .73$ ), is less than the correlation between EQ and leadership effectiveness ( $r = .90$ ). This indicates that, to a certain degree, the relationship between EQ and leadership effectiveness is mediated by consideration behaviors. However, EQ relates to leadership effectiveness above and beyond its mediating relationship through consideration.

To further validate the mediating effect of consideration, the effect of initiating structure on the relationship between EQ and leadership effectiveness was also tested as a contrast. It was expected that initiating structure would not mediate the relationship. The correlation coefficient between EQ and leadership effectiveness when controlling for initiating structure was significant ( $\underline{r} = .85, p < .01$ ).

In contrast to the mediating effects found with the dimension of consideration, partialling out the effect of initiating structure did not substantially reduce the correlation between EQ and leadership effectiveness ( $r=.90$  to  $r=.85$ ), thus suggesting that the relationship between EQ and leadership effectiveness is not mediated by initiating structure.

In addition to the direct relationship between EQ and leadership effectiveness, mediating effects were observed for consideration behaviors. In contrast, for initiating structure the mediating effects were not observed. These differential patterns of correlations were examined to ascertain if there was a spurious effect due to method variance (Spector, 1987). If common variance were due to procedures, similar patterns would be expected across both consideration and initiating structure. Differences in the magnitude of relationships between Emotional Intelligence and leadership effectiveness when consideration was controlled and when initiating structure was controlled suggest this was not the case.

This contrast suggests that to a certain degree, consideration does mediate the relationship between EQ and leadership effectiveness, and the observed mediating effects of consideration are not due to common variance.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Discussion

The current study has contributed to our understanding of the construct of Emotional Intelligence and how it is related to leader behaviors and their overall effectiveness. The results indicated support for the proposed hypotheses. The correlation coefficients between any two of the following three variables (leader's level of Emotional Intelligence, leadership effectiveness, and the leader's level of consideration behaviors) were calculated and their significance was tested. Since the partial correlation between EQ and leadership effectiveness ( $r = .73$ ,  $p < .01$ ) controlling for Consideration was considerably smaller than the zero order correlation between EQ and leadership effectiveness ( $r = .90$ ,  $p < .01$ ), it may be determined that the use of Consideration behaviors mediates the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and leadership effectiveness.

There was also a direct relationship between Emotional Intelligence and leadership effectiveness, indicating that other variables related to EQ, not investigated in the

current study may be interesting to test in future designs. If we can gain a better of understanding of how Emotional Intelligence operates and leads to the use of other types of behaviors, we may be able to predict a leaders ability to be effective in a wide range of situations. The relationship between EQ and leadership effectiveness supported in the current study could be further tested in future research using a Structural Equation Model with a larger sample size and a greater number of potential mediating variables. Of particular interest was the contrast between the two dimensions of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. The dimension of consideration was found to be a potential mediating variable, but no mediating effects were found for the dimension of initiating structure.

The results strongly indicate the importance of Emotional Intelligence in the workplace and the importance of managers, supervisors and leaders to be able to tap into this intelligence in order to create and sustain a productive, effective work environment. This study has raised several possible avenues for future research in the areas of Emotional Intelligence and the workplace. One might conclude that it does take more than technical

expertise be successful in business and industry and in day-to-day relations with peers and subordinates. Perhaps Emotional Intelligence is a component that may not only enhance interpersonal relations, but may also affect the overall performance and functioning of an organization.

### Significance and Implications

The present research has added to the existing literature on Emotional Intelligence by providing directions for future research in the identification and use of Emotional Intelligence in the workplace. It may assist researchers in the ability to demonstrate which abilities and skills make up the greater part of competencies necessary for excellence in an organizational setting, especially in regards to leadership. This study may provide valuable information for business and industry in selecting leaders. If we can identify in advance which leaders will be more effective as a function of Emotional Intelligence, it may provide additional insight in the selection, promotion and recruitment of future leaders. An even greater contribution may be the ability to train leaders who are low on Emotional Intelligence. Training may help leaders strengthen current skills and build more

consideration type behaviors. If leaders are aware of the importance of such skills, they might be more likely to use these skills. This research may provide a springboard for further research into the area of Emotional Intelligence. In many applied settings selection is an important issue. Perhaps research concerning Emotional Intelligence in selecting applicants may give organizations an added advantage for selecting and retaining employees. There are numerous possibilities that may be pursued following this research. As we move into a more service-oriented economy, this component of Emotional Intelligence will be more important than ever before. Customer service and employee relations may be greatly improved using a measure of Emotional Intelligence in conjunction with traditional pre-employment selections measures.

#### Limitations

There are several possible limitations that may have impacted the findings in this study. First, due to the nature of the study whereby participants were subordinates rating their current supervisors and managers, there could have been some distortion, either inflated or deflated ratings for reasons beyond the scope of the current study.

Even though the data collected is only reported in aggregate form, many participants may have been hesitant to give their honest ratings due to fear of the information somehow getting back to their managers and supervisors. Similarly, some ratings may have been subject to the halo effect, where participants rated their supervisors highly on several similar dimensions.

A second limitation of the current study is in regards to the sample. The response rate of 77% might indicate that participants who had more favorable impressions of their managers and supervisors were more willing to participate. Also, participants who had unfavorable impressions of their managers and supervisors may have chosen not to participate in the study, which may be a potential reason for the relatively high magnitude of means of the three measures found with the current sample. A majority of the data came from public organizations and a minority of the data came from private organizations. In future studies it would be important to determine if there are significant differences in the ratings given by participants from public organizations as compared to ratings from participants in private organizations.



A final limitation could be the way the predictor, mediating and criterion variables were measured in this study. Subjective ratings of leaders and supervisors were used as the data for the Emotional Intelligence, Consideration and leadership effectiveness scales. Future studies may analyze differences in self-report ratings obtained from the leaders, as compared to subjective ratings by peers and subordinates. The dimensions of leadership effectiveness were also subordinates' subjective ratings of their leaders. No objective criteria, such as grievances, absenteeism or productivity reports were utilized in the current study. Future studies may focus on combining objective and subjective criteria to capture a more inclusive overall picture of leadership effectiveness.

APPENDIX A:

TABLE 1

TABLE 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Emotional Intelligence Scale

Dimension	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Self-awareness	5.09	1.34	76
Self-regulation	4.97	1.49	76
Motivation	4.79	1.45	76
Empathy	5.01	1.53	76
Social skills	5.06	1.37	76

APPENDIX B:

TABLE 2

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Leadership Behaviors Scale

<u>Dimension</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Consideration	3.62	.81	76
Initiating Structure	3.89	.91	76

APPENDIX C:

TABLE 3

TABLE 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Leadership Effectiveness Scale

Dimension	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Availability	4.76	1.54	76
Inclusiveness	4.89	1.51	76
Fairness/Equity	4.76	1.58	76
Objectivity	4.74	1.60	76
Effectiveness	4.76	1.78	76
Supportiveness	4.43	1.73	76
Productivity	4.94	1.63	76
Conflict Management	4.65	1.67	76

APPENDIX D:

TABLE 4



TABLE 4

Intercorrelations Between Scales

Scale	1	2	3	4
Participants (n=76)				
1. Emotional Intelligence	--	.90**	.80**	.54**
2. Leadership Effectiveness		--	.78**	.62**
3. Consideration			--	.54**
4. Initiating Structure				--

Note. \*\*p<.01

APPENDIX E:  
PARTICIPANTS INFORMED CONSENT FORM

### Participants Informed Consent Form

The study in which you are about to participate is designed to investigate leadership behaviors. This study is being conducted by Janice Evelyn and Dr. Janelle Gilbert, Associate Professor of Psychology as required for the Master's of Science degree. The Psychology Department Human Participants Review Board California State University, San Bernardino, has approved this study. The University requires that you give your consent before participating in a research study.

The study is in the form of a questionnaire. It should take you about 20-30 minutes to complete. There are a few demographic questions along with the questions pertaining to leadership behaviors. Please be assured that any information you provide will remain anonymous. At no time will your responses be identifiable. All data will be reported in aggregate form only. At the study's conclusion, you may receive a report of the results, which will be made available in the Summer of 2001. The risks to you of participating in this study are minimal, and participants can terminate involvement without penalty at any time. Please understand that your participation in this research is totally voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time during this study without penalty. You may also remove any personal data at any time during this study. If you have concerns or questions about the study, or would like a report of the results, please contact Janice Evelyn at (909) 880-5587. By placing a mark in the space provided below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and understand, the nature and purpose of this study and that I freely consent to participate. By this mark I further acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

**Give your consent to participate by making a check or 'X' mark here: \_\_\_\_\_**

Today's date is \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX F:  
LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS SURVEY

## Leadership Characteristics

The following items are trying to identify leadership characteristics. Please rate your immediate manager or supervisor on the following items. Please indicate the extent to which you strongly disagree or strongly agree by writing a number from 1 to 7 in the space in front of the following statements.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7  
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

- \_\_\_\_\_ Understands his/her own strengths and weaknesses.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Handles stressful situations in a constructive manner.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Able to recognize different emotions in self and others.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Seeks mutual understanding and welcomes sharing of information.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Promotes a friendly and cooperative climate.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Able to regulate temper and outbursts.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Communicates effectively when a problem arises.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Handles stressful situations effectively.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Ability to energize and direct a project.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Willing to take initiative and set goals.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Is patient and persistent in the face of setbacks.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Makes everyone around him/her enthusiastic about assignments.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Guides the performance of others while holding them accountable.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Articulates and arouses enthusiasm for a shared vision and mission.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Is attentive to emotional cues and listens well.

Please rate your immediate manager or supervisor on the following items. Please indicate the extent to which you strongly disagree or strongly agree by writing a number from 1 to 7 in the space in front of the following statements.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7  
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

\_\_\_\_\_ Shows sensitivity and understands others' perspectives.

\_\_\_\_\_ Fosters open communication and is receptive to bad news as well as good.

\_\_\_\_\_ Cultivates relationships with people.

\_\_\_\_\_ Shows concern for others' needs.

\_\_\_\_\_ Encourages understanding points of view of other people.

\_\_\_\_\_ Develops interpersonal relationships with people.

\_\_\_\_\_ Respects and relates well to people from varied backgrounds.

\_\_\_\_\_ Understands diverse worldviews and is sensitive to group differences.

\_\_\_\_\_ Able to detect social networks.

\_\_\_\_\_ Cultivates and maintains extensive informal networks.

\_\_\_\_\_ Seeks out relationships that are mutually beneficial.

\_\_\_\_\_ Makes and maintains personal friendships among work associates.

APPENDIX G:  
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS SURVEY

### Leadership Behavior Descriptions

The following items are trying to identify consideration and initiating structure behaviors your manager or supervisor demonstrates. Please rate your immediate manager or supervisor on the following items. Please indicate the extent to which you think your manager or supervisor exhibits these behaviors from never to always by writing a number from 1 to 5 in the space in front of the following statements.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5  
NeverAlways

- \_\_\_\_\_ Tries his or her ideas in the group.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Makes his or her attitudes clear to the group.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assigns group members to particular tasks.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Encourages the use of uniform procedures.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Maintains definite standards of performance.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Makes sure that his or her part in the group is understood by the group members.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Lets group members know what is expected of them.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Schedules the work to be done.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Gives advance notice of change.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Puts suggestions made by the group into operations.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Is friendly and approachable.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Treats all group members as his or her equals.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Acts without consulting the group.



Please rate your immediate manager or supervisor on the following items. Please indicate the extent to which you think your manager or supervisor exhibits these behaviors from never to always by writing a number from 1 to 5 in the space in front of the following statements.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5  
NeverAlways

\_\_\_\_\_ Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.

\_\_\_\_\_ Is willing to make changes.

\_\_\_\_\_ Looks out for the personal welfare of group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ Refuses to explain his or her actions.

APPENDIX H:  
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

### Leadership Effectiveness

The following items are trying to identify the overall effectiveness of your manager or supervisor. Please rate your immediate manager or supervisor on the following items. Please indicate the extent to which you strongly disagree or strongly agree by writing a number from 1 to 7 in the space in front of the following statements.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7  
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

- \_\_\_\_\_ Provides assistance in solving problems in a timely manner.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Is often available to assist with daily problems.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Offers guidance and support when needed.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Gives personal attention to employees when they feel neglected.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Readily shares information of organizational interest.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Spends time talking about the goals and mission of the organization.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Seeks and incorporates group suggestions.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Encourages me to express my ideas and opinions.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Gives credit where credit is due.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Makes clear what I can expect if my performance meets designated standards.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Makes sure that rewards for good employee performance are made as quickly as possible.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Holds everyone to the same standards of performance.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Able to address both sides of an issue.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Is able to promote a win/win situation when conflict arises.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Sets challenging, yet attainable standards of performance.

Please rate your immediate manager or supervisor on the following items. Please indicate the extent to which you strongly disagree or strongly agree by writing a number from 1 to 7 in the space in front of the following statements.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7  
**Strongly Disagree** **Strongly Agree**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Teaches you to identify issues or mistakes.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Teaches you to identify what you have learned from mistakes.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Inspires loyalty to the organization.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Able to delegate responsibilities to employees.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Effectively negotiates and resolves disagreements.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Mentors for professional growth.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provides feedback for professional growth.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Enables you to think about old problems in new ways.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Excites employees with his/her visions of what we may be able to accomplish.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Increases my optimism for the future.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Provides both positive feedback and constructive criticism.
- \_\_\_\_\_ The overall work effectiveness of your unit can be classified as highly effective.
- \_\_\_\_\_ In meeting the job-related needs of the subordinates, my superior is highly effective.
- \_\_\_\_\_ My superior is highly effective in meeting the needs of the organization.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Handles difficult people and tense situations with diplomacy and tact.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Spots potential conflict, brings disagreement into the open, and assists in resolving conflict.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Encourages debates and open discussion.

APPENDIX I:  
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET

## Demographic Information Sheet

Please answer each general information question listed below.

1. Age \_\_\_\_\_

2. Gender (please check one)

Male \_\_\_\_\_

Female \_\_\_\_\_

3. Highest level of education completed (please check one)

High school \_\_\_\_\_

Some college \_\_\_\_\_

College \_\_\_\_\_

Master's \_\_\_\_\_

PhD \_\_\_\_\_

4. Race or Ethnicity (please check one)

Black \_\_\_\_\_

Hispanic \_\_\_\_\_

White \_\_\_\_\_

Asian \_\_\_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_

5. Please indicate the length of time you have worked with the manager/supervisor

you just rated: From: (month/year) \_\_\_\_\_ To: (month/year) \_\_\_\_\_

6. How many hours per week do you work in your current position: \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX J:  
DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

### **DEBRIEFING STATEMENT**

#### **PLEASE DETACH AND KEEP**

Thank you for your participation in this study. The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of Emotional Intelligence and consideration behaviors on leadership effectiveness. If your participation in this survey has raised any issues for you and you feel you need someone to talk to, please contact the CSUSB Counseling Center at (909) 880-5040. If you have any questions or would like a copy of the results made available in Summer 2001 reported in aggregate form, you may contact Janice Evelyn at (909) 880-5587.



## REFERENCES

Abraham, R. (1999). Emotional Intelligence in Organizations: A Conceptualization. Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs, 2, 209-225.

American Psychological Association. (1994). Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Baron, R.M., & Kenny, D.A. (1986). The Moderator Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic and Statistical Considerations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1172-1182.

Bass, B.M., (1985). Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Inc.

Cherniss, C. (1998). Social and Emotional Learning for Leaders. Educational Leadership, 7, 26-31.

Cohen, J. (1992). A Power Primer. Psychological Bulletin, 112 (1), 155-159.

Cooper, R.K. (1997). Applying Emotional Intelligence in the Workplace. Training and Development, 51, 311-342.

Davies, M., Roberts, R., & Stankov, L. (1998). Emotional Intelligence: In Search of an Elusive Construct. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75 (4), 989-1015.

Elder, L. (1997). Critical Thinking: The Key to Emotional Intelligence. Journal of Developmental Education, 21 (1), 402-442.

Fiedler, F. (1967). A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Fleishman, E.A., & Harris, E.F. (1962). Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. Personnel Psychology, 15, 43-56.

Fleming, C. (1999). Creating a High-EQ Workplace. Credit Union Executive, May 1999, 27-34.

Goleman, D. (1998). Working with Emotional Intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (1998). What Makes a Leader? Harvard Business Review, 76 (6), 93-102.

Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that Gets Results. Harvard Business Review, 92, (2), 78-90.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about Leadership: Effectiveness and Personality. American Psychologist, 49, (6), 493-504.

Kemper, C.L. (1999). EQ vs. IQ. Communication World, Oct/Nov '99, 15-19.

Mayer, J.D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is Emotional Intelligence? In P. Salovey & D.J. Sluyter (Eds.) Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence. New York: Basic Books.

Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D.R., & Salovey, P. (2000) Emotional Intelligence Meets Traditional Standards for an Intelligence. Intelligence, 27 (4), 267-298.

Pool, C. (1997). Up with Emotional Health. Educational Leadership, 54, (8), 123-131.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9 (3), 185-211.

Schriesheim, C. & Kerr, S. (1974). Psychometric Properties of the Ohio State Leadership Scales. Psychological Bulletin, 81 (11), 756-765.

Schriesheim, C. & Stogdill, R.M. (1975). Differences in Factor Structure Across Three Versions of the Ohio State Leadership Scales. Personnel Psychology, 28, 189-206.

Spector, P.E. (1987). Method Variance as an artifact in self-reported affect and perceptions at work: Myth or significant problem? Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 438-443.

Stogdill, R.M. (1963). Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII. Ohio State University-Bureau of Business Research.

Stogdill, R.M. (1969). Validity of Leader Behavior Descriptions. Personnel Psychology, 22, 153-158.

Yukl, G. (1998). Leadership in Organizations (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.