Chapter 6

SUMMARY

The term "emotional intelligence" first coined by Salovey and Mayer (1990) explained a different type of intelligence. Many have noted the distinction between academic intelligence and social intelligence (Neisser, 1976). While the standard intelligence quotient (IQ) tended to be static, emotional intelligence can be learned (Salopek, 1998). Specifically, emotional intelligence as explained is the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Gardner (1983) described what is now recognized as emotional intelligence as being a deep awareness of one's own emotions and the ability to label and draw upon those emotions as a resource to guide behavior.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) categorized emotional intelligence in five domains. Their domains include self-awareness, managing emotions, motivating oneself, empathy, and handling relationships. Goleman (1995) later developed his four dimensions of emotional intelligence to include knowing and managing one's emotions, self-motivation, empathy toward others, and social deftness.

When reviewing the literature, the work of particular researchers often appears. Some of the most recognized authors like Edward Thorndike was credited with the initial study of emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995). The term had not yet been coined, but Thorndike (1920) researched dimensions of emotional intelligence as a form of "social intelligence". Howard Gardner (1983) continued to expand the knowledge of interpersonal and intrapersonal skills in the mid-1980s. Marlowe (1986) defined social intelligence as the ability to understand other people and social interactions and to use this knowledge to lead and guide others to
mutually satisfying outcomes. Researchers agreed that social intelligence is important for academic and career achievement (Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986; Wentzel, 1991). Walker and Foley (1973) identified two elements of social intelligence. Cognitive skill in drawing accurate conclusions from social interactions and the effectiveness of social behavior based on such observations express the foundation of social intelligence (Walker & Foley, 1973).

Later, Sternberg (1985) concurred with Thorndike’s findings stating that social intelligence is not only distinct from academic abilities but is also an integral part of what makes people do well in the practicalities of life. He noted that conventional IQ tests assess only the analytical aspect of intelligence (Sternberg, 1996). Goleman (1995) outlined several dimensions of emotional intelligence. The dimensions included knowing and managing one’s emotions, self-motivation, empathy toward others, and social deftness. Knowing and managing one’s emotions involves being observant of oneself and the emotions one is feeling as well as handling the feelings appropriately. Goleman described self-motivation as the channeling of emotions in the service of a goal, delaying gratification, and stifling impulses. Empathy speaks to the appreciation of the differences in people and the sensitivity to others’ feelings and concerns. It is the ability to comprehend another’s feelings and to re-experience them one’s self (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Rogers (1951) considered an act of striving to understand other people and to empathize with them a priceless gift as well as a prerequisite for helping another grow. Goleman portrayed social deftness as the ability to manage emotions in others. Kelly and Moon (1998) defined intrapersonal abilities as personal talents that enable one to take constructive action with respect to both people and tasks. Such abilities help an individual develop self-awareness, capitalize on personal strengths, minimize personal weaknesses, make effective life decisions, and set and achieve goals.

Goleman (1998b) reported that virtually all effective leaders have motivation. He also noted that people with high motivation remain optimistic even when the score is against them. Self-awareness is the part of intrapersonal skills that speaks to one understands of one’s own emotions (Goleman, 1998b). Individuals who experience honest self-awareness also recognize their strengths, weaknesses, needs, and drives. Additionally, these people know how their
feelings affect themselves, other people, and their job performance. People who experience a high degree of self-regulation reflect a propensity for thoughtfulness, integrity, comfort with ambiguity, and an ability to say no to impulsive urges (Goleman, 1998b). Goleman (1998c) advocates self-regulation as an important attribute of leaders. Finally, self-awareness and self-regulation help enable an individual to experience positive affect within themselves and others, and so contribute to well-being. Thus, "the emotionally intelligent person is often a pleasure to be around and leaves others feeling better" (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 201). What role do variables such as age and sex play in the development of emotional intelligence? The developmental nature of emotional intelligence might have some bearing in this study when one considers the age of the participants. Salopek (1998) noted in an interview with Goleman that emotional intelligence abilities are learned and tend to improve as one ages and matures. Mayer et al. (as cited in King, 1999), found that emotional intelligence abilities increased from adolescence to early adulthood. Studies revealed that major gender differences exist in the measurement of emotional intelligence (Mayer et al., as cited in King, 1999, Mayer & Geher, 1996).

The benefits of emotional intelligence are many and varied. A group of four-year old children - found to resist impulse - were tracked through high school and were found to be more self-assertive, socially skilled, independent, and persevering than their more impulsive peers. In addition, they achieved significantly higher SAT scores (Shoda, Mischel, & Peake, 1990). Harrington-Lueke (1997) found in her research that being emotionally intelligent is just as important to success in life as good grades. Essentially, people with high levels of emotional intelligence experience more career success, build stronger personal relationships, lead more effectively, and enjoy better health than those with low levels of emotional intelligence (Cooper, 1997). Bass (1990) found many components of emotional intelligence. The most common factors included social and interpersonal skills, technical skills, administrative skills, leadership effectiveness and achievement, social nearness, friendliness, support of the group task, and task motivation and application.
Emotional intelligence model of present study

Drawing upon the support from various sources of research and training in emotional intelligence, EI theory has tended to take two different approaches to model building. Academic researchers viewed EI as an abstract concept whereas training specialists looked at it as a combination of practical competencies acquired by the individual. This study, while drawing heavily upon the insights from academic research, approaches EI from the competency perspective and hence presented a model that construes EI as a constellation of competencies.

Some researchers suggest that emotionally intelligent people may be believed to behave in rationally and emotionally balanced ways because they are in possession of certain attributes called EI competencies (Mayer et al., 2004; Salovey et al., 1999). These competencies can be classified into two broad categories:

1. personal competence in understanding and managing one’s “own self”; and
2. social competence in knowing and dealing with the “self of others” (Feist and Barron, 1996; Goleman, 1995; Mayer and Salovey, 1997 b; Sternberg, 1996; Van Rooy and Viswesvaran, 2004).

Personal competence was defined as the ability of a person to sense one’s own internal mental moods and processes and regulate the operations of the mind in such a way that emotions do not disturb or deter the rational mind from executing its actions rationally and to the best of its intellectual capacity. Personal competence is divisible into two sub-competencies, namely, self-awareness and self-regulation.

Self-awareness was defined as the ability to detect the internal emotions and feelings, in real time, as they occur within us. Self-aware individuals are able to read and “link” their feelings with what they think and act. In EI terms, it is called “emotional literacy” (Mayer and Salovey, 1993; McGarvey, 1997).

Self-regulation was defined as the ability of a person to use self-awareness (or emotional literacy) to manage one’s own emotions. The person uses self-awareness to regulate
the rational and emotional operations of the mind in balanced ways so as to provide an emotionally supportive pathway for the reasoning mind to make logically correct and socially acceptable decisions and judgments (Martinez, 1997; Tischler et al., 2002).

Research indicated that people possessing personal competence managed their impulsive feelings and disturbing emotions well and stay composed, positive, and unflappable even during trying moments (Martinez, 1997; Mayer and Salovey, 1995). Thus such people could think clearly, stay focused under pressures and were able to take sound, decisive decisions despite uncertainties and demands, shifting priorities, and changes in their life (Slaski and Cartwright, 2002). Moreover, they show remarkable tact in adapting to fluid circumstances.

Concepts related to personal competence have been discussed in psychology previously. For example, personal competence may appear similar to self-monitoring - a concept in psychology proposed by Snyder (1974). Self-monitoring theory referred to the process through which people regulate their own behavior so as to appear and “look good” so that they will be perceived by others in a favorable manner. Self-monitoring theory distinguishes between high self-monitors, who monitor their behavior to fit different situations, and low self-monitors, who are more cross-situationally consistent (Snyder, 1974). However, while self-monitoring takes care of one’s behavior and appearance in public/social situations, it does not fully enable a person to handle and regulate his/her deeper, disturbing internal feelings and emotions—a feat that EI can achieve. EI should, accordingly, be viewed differently from self-monitoring.

**Social competence** was defined as the ability of a person to gain psychological insight into the emotional world of others and to use one’s empathic capabilities and “relationship skills” (such as leadership, assertiveness, and communication) to produce socially desirable and productive behavioral outcomes both for themselves and others. Social competence includes two distinct sub-competencies: social-awareness and social influence.

**Social awareness** referred to the competence of a person in getting a “true feel” of the emotional mind of others. He/she enters into a covert “emotional dialogue” with the interacting partners (Salovey et al., 1999) and is able to empathize or “feel like” the other
person. Empathy forges emotional connection (Kellett et al., 2002) and in many cases bonds people even far deeper and stronger than shared values, ideologies, and beliefs. Goleman believes that empathy underlies many interpersonal aptitudes like teamwork, persuasion and leadership (Goleman, 1998c).

**Social influence** refered to the potential of a person to influence and effect positive changes and outcomes in others by using his or her interpersonal skills. The term social influence, as a component of EI, has received only rudimentary treatment in EI literature. In the classic EI models, the second component of social competence is represented by “social skills”. Social skills are a misnomer in the study and analysis of EI, so far. A review of 18 journal websites reveals that EI theorists and training specialists have bundled a large repertory of (historically known) interpersonal skills under the competence “social skills” – making it difficult to define as well as measure this competency.

This study, however, assumed that there are prominent interpersonal skills that need to be focused and developed in individuals if EI is to produce desirable effects and impacts on their social environment. While the skills required for effectively influencing others could be many, a few could be rated as important, considering the significance attached to these skills in management development and career counseling circles. Chief among these skills that contribute to a person’s social influence are assertiveness, communication, and empowering leadership. Assertiveness helps a person in establishing a mutually respectful, win-win, I am ok-You are ok relationship with others. Communication skills enable the person to listen carefully to others as well as negotiate successfully to produce desirable outcomes in social transactions. Empowering leadership equips the person with the abilities of guiding and motivating others in situations that involve leadership and group management.

Though these core social influence skills might appear as independent of each other, in actual use they merge and blend with each other and have to be used in a highly synchronized manner to be productive and effective in the social environment.

Social influence might appear akin to the so-called political skill but the two should be
viewed as related but different attributes. Political skill is the ability of a person to influence others and get them to buy into one’s own ideas and objectives (Ferris et al., 2000). Political skill in itself is a virtue that is increasingly being advocated today as necessary competency to be effective in organizations (Ferris et al., 2007); but, the possibility exists that it could also be used, at times, for personal gains than for mutual benefits. Social influence on the other hand uses one’s relationships skills in an empathic manner and focuses on buying others into one’s ideas by building trust and pursuing means that mutually benefit each other. These additional elements of empathy coupled with mutuality of benefits to each other in social transactions perhaps demarcate social competence from political skill and distinctly distinguish it from the latter.

This study proved that in an emotionally intelligent person, the above four competencies work together and in unison. Absence of one or more of these reduces the EI competence of the person and possibly inflicts damages both to the person and to his/her social functioning. However, a word of caution is due. The first three of the EI competencies, namely, self-awareness, self-regulation, and social-awareness are basically functions of the rational-emotional mind of the person and could be enhanced by a person through rigorous training and practice in EI techniques. The fourth competency, social-influence, on the contrary, is highly interpersonal in nature, and, therefore, the success of this competency is dependent, also, on the attitudes and attributes of the other parties involved in social interactions. Furthermore, while engaging in and deploying the skills of social influence, the person is under pressure to keep aloof from the tendencies to engage in politicking because the means and goals of the latter often conflict with those of emotionally intelligent behavior. Thus it was concluded that developing one’s social influence skills is more difficult than the acquisition of other competencies of EI.

**Emotional Intelligence and Leadership**

Leadership was defined as a process of influencing other people’s orientation towards and achievement of goals (Greenberg, Baron, Sales, & Owens, 2000; Johns & Saks, 2001). Transformational leadership involves inspiring followers and communicating a vision.
Intuitively, it may appear logical to expect aspects of the ability-based model of EI to have important consequences for the study of leadership.

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

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

Although charismatic leadership has been associated with positive outcomes,
charismatic leaders are ineffective for several reasons. A leader may fail if he or she is unable to cope with the difficulties that s/he faces, if the leader is overly confident and unwilling to compromise his or her principles, or if the leader is cold or arrogant (Bass, 1985). Charismatic leaders who are also sensitive to their followers, who have a good understanding of their own emotions (as well as the emotions of their followers), and who are capable of managing their own emotions (i.e., having high EI) are less likely to fail. That is, it is possible that EI moderates the relationship between charisma and leadership effectiveness. Future research must examine this issue. Moreover, charismatic leaders are not necessarily effective, and there is a potential dark side of charismatic leaders, which is evident if the number of charismatic leaders who manipulated their followers for their own gain (e.g., Adolf Hitler, Charles Manson, etc.). Some EI researchers have also suggested that an individual who was extremely high in EI may be excellent at impression management to the extent of negatively influencing people.

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

One of the high performance leadership competencies that Schroder and colleagues (Schroder 1997; Spangenberg, Schroder, & Duvenage, 1999) identified was Interpersonal learning. It is feasible that EI (especially the Interpersonal Skills factor of the EQ-i, Bar-On, 1997) would overlap significantly with this factor. Again, these studies on leadership competencies may reinforce the idea that certain factors of the mixed-model measures of EI are not truly EI, but are effective leader competencies. Future research should examine these issues and relate
them to existing validated measures (e.g., 5-factor model of personality, self-monitoring ability, empathy, self-control, and delayed gratification).

**Emotional Intelligence and Conflict management styles**

The integrating style has been considered a valuable way to manage interactions with other individuals in conflict situations, facilitating proper resolution of conflict and producing more productive results (Gross and Guerrero, 2000). For example, the integrating and compromising styles were the styles most frequently used by Korean respondents when they faced conflicts (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991; Cho and Park, 1998). Scholars have noted that EI plays an important role in resolving conflict functionally (Borisoff and Victor, 1998; Jordan and Troth, 2002, 2004). Jordan and Troth (2004, p. 196) argued that “the ability to be aware of and manage emotions is also thought to facilitate functional than dysfunctional, conflict resolution and consequently contribute to better team performance”. Emotionally intelligent people have the ability to better manage and regulate their own emotions and the emotions of others (Mayer and Salovey, 1997; Davies et al., 1998; Ng et al., 2007; Mayer et al., 2008). In addition, emotionally intelligent people are those who consider their own emotions and the emotions of others as a basis in framing their relationships with other people (Mayer and Salovey, 1993, 1997).

This characteristic might generate the empathy (Mayer et al., 1999; Schute et al., 2001) that encourages individuals to consider other interests when they want to solve conflicts. Moreover, this empathy can lead people to be altruistic (Singer and Fehr, 2005; Declerck and Bogaert, 2008), cognizant of the existence of other people's needs (Kamdar et al., 2006) and more skillful in anticipating what other people will behave and act (Singer and Fehr, 2005; Declerck and Bogaert, 2008). With these characteristics, emotionally intelligent people may regard other people's needs and interests in solving conflict. Thus, a win-win solution produced by integrating and compromising styles may become a priority in resolving the conflicts among individuals in order to satisfy everyone's interests.

In addition, emotionally intelligent people are more like to select integrating and
compromising styles because those styles may have more beneficial outcomes in terms of the efficacy and suitability (Gross and Guerrero, 2000). This idea departs from the notion that “the whole point of emotion was to alert us to danger or to opportunity and to focus our cognitive processing upon it” (Andrade and May, 2004, p. 216). This may lead to the signal that emotionally intelligent people may have abilities to plainly think and focus on more advantageous styles of handling interpersonal conflicts as those will benefit for them. As integrating and compromising styles have positive effects on conflict resolution (Hocker and Wilmot, 1998; Gross and Guerrero, 2000), we expect that the integrating and comprising styles may become a preference for a person high in EI in solving conflicts.

**Needs and significance of the study**

Researchers have described the benefits of possessing a high EI. Such individuals are found to be healthier and more successful than their less emotionally intelligent peers (Cooper, 1997). Many characteristics owned by emotionally intelligent people coincide with the characteristics desired in leaders. Emotionally intelligent individuals are found to have strong personal relationships (Cooper), monitor and evaluate others’ feelings (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), empathize with others (Kelley & Caplan, 1993), and excel in interpersonal skills (Goleman, 1998a). The only two studies to examine EI and leadership have utilized mixed-model measures of EI. Barling, Slater, and Kelloway (2000) found that EI scores were related to subordinates’ ratings of transformational leadership. Because of the large overlap of the mixed-model measures of EI and personality, the link between EI and leadership may be due solely to the shared variance with personality. Research has indicated that personality may predict effective leadership behaviours. For example, Judge and Bono (2000) found that extraversion and agreeableness uniquely predicted transformational leadership, while controlling for the effects of the other Big 5 factors. Openness to experience had a significant zero-order correlation with transformational leadership, although this relationship disappeared when the five factors were examined jointly. Neuroticism and conscientiousness were unrelated to transformational leadership.
One of the high performance leadership competencies that Schroder and colleagues (Schroder 1997; Spangenberg, Schroder, & Duvenage, 1999) identified is Interpersonal learning. It is feasible that EI (especially the Interpersonal Skills factor of the EQ-i, Bar-On, 1997) would overlap significantly with this factor. Again, these studies on leadership competencies may reinforce the idea that certain factors of the mixed-model measures of EI are not truly EI, but are effective leader competencies. Future research should examine these issues and relate them to existing validated measures (e.g., 5-factor model of personality, self-monitoring ability, empathy, self-control, and delayed gratification).

Review of existing literature suggests that EI plays an important role in leadership and decision making. A growing number of scholars suggest that emotional intelligence plays an important role in managing interpersonal conflicts (e.g. Rahim, 2001). However, there is little empirical data on relationship among emotional intelligence, leadership styles and handling interpersonal conflict conducted in an Indian organizational context except Singh (2007) to explore relationship between EI and leadership in Indian context based on gender with a small sample of IT professionals. Rajendran, Downey, and Stough (2007) explored the preliminary reliability of EI in Indian Context. Such a gap in the existing scene of research in the field of EI provides motivation to carry out this study.

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to explore the emotional intelligence levels among managers working at different levels of organizational hierarchy. In this pursuit, it was sought to determine the strength of the relationship that existed between the emotional intelligence scores of managers as measured by the *Emotional Competence Inventory* (ECI) (Boyatzis et al., 1999) and their perception of interpersonal conflicts, handling of interpersonal conflicts and leadership styles.
This study was designed to be correlational. It was a relationship study designed to analyze the strength of relationship between variables (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). One limitation to this type of research is the tendency to infer that one event "causes" another event. This is misleading because the impact could be the result of a third variable. Another limitation of a correlational study could be that the relationship between two variables is the result of an artifact. An example would be a false positive relationship between two scales because the scales themselves contained similar items and not because their items are causally related (Gall et al.).

An advantage to the correlational method is its usefulness in studying problems in management and in other social sciences. Correlational research permits the researcher to investigate relationships among a large number of variables. Another advantage of the correlational method is that it provides information about the degree to which certain variables are related (Gall et al., 1996).

In summary, only an experiment can prove a definitive cause-and-effect relationship. Correlation coefficients are best used to measure the degree of relationship between two or more variables and explore possible causal factors (Gall et al., 1996).

**Statement of the problem**

"Relationship among emotional intelligence, leadership styles and conflict management"

**Definitions of Terms**

For the purpose of this research, the following definitions apply

1. Emotional intelligence is the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thoughts; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote professional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 10).
2. The term conflict has been employed in different ways reflecting the different levels at which conflicts exist (Deutsch, 1990; Thomas, 1992a). According to Thomas (1992a) there are two broad uses of the term conflict. The first refers to incompatible response tendencies within an individual, e.g., behavioral conflicts where one must choose whether or not to pursue a particular course of action or a goal, or role conflict where one must choose between several competing sets of role demands. The second use refers to conflicts that occur between different individuals, groups, organizations, or other social units. Hence, the terms interpersonal, inter-group, and inter-organizational conflict are used. Putnam and Poole (1987) and Thomas (1992a, 1992b) on the basis of their analysis of numerous conceptualizations and definitions of conflict identified three general themes or properties: interdependence, disagreement, and interference.

3. Leadership is a social skill. It consists of certain attitudes and behaviour (acts) towards others and a way of conducting one self which enables a person to cause others to follow him willingly or which enables one to cause others to follow him for a common goal. The ability of a person to cause others to follow him for a goal is the mark of leadership.

Objectives of the study

In the present study the investigator has considered three variables of interest namely "emotional intelligence, leadership and conflict management.” Each of these variables was supposed to be related to each other.

The objectives of the study were:

1. To see the relationship of emotional intelligence and leadership.

2. To see the relationship of emotional intelligence and conflict management.

3. To see the relationship of leadership and conflict management.
Hypotheses

In this study following statistical null versus alternative hypotheses were investigated:

1. There is no significant relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership.

2. There is no significant relationship between emotional intelligence and conflict management.

3. There is no significant relationship between leadership and conflict management.

Population and Sample

A total of 1,125 managers working at different levels of organizational hierarchy made the sample of the study. The organizations were chosen based upon their location and sector.

Delimitations of the study

Certain delimitations of the study must be considered. They are listed below:

1. The study has been delimited to a sample of 1125 managers.

2. The data collected was self-reported and, therefore, subject to the limitations of that process.

Instrumentation

The indicator of emotional intelligence that was used in this study was the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) (Boyatzis et al., 1999). This inventory includes self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and social skills.

Self-awareness consists of knowing one’s internal states, preferences, resources and intuitions. This dimension contains the competencies of emotional self-awareness, accurate self-assessment, and self confidence.
**Self-management** involves the management of one’s internal states, impulses, and resources to facilitate reaching goals.

**Social Awareness** refers to being aware of others’ feelings, needs and concerns.

**Social Skills** are the basic skills in interpersonal relationships. It involves adeptness at inducting desirable responses in others.

It consists of 80 items that reflect adaptive tendency toward emotional intelligence. Each item in the questionnaire described a work-related behavior. Respondents used a 7-point Likert scale. The higher the score, the greater the tendency an individual possessed to exhibit emotionally intelligent behavior. The ECI is divided into 4 clusters. An average for each cluster was found by summing responses (1-7) to the corresponding questions that pertain to a cluster and dividing by the number of valid responses.

In addition to the ECI, A questionnaire measuring Interpersonal Conflict and Conflict Management Styles was used. Interpersonal conflict was defined as a phenomenon that occurs between interdependent parties when they experience negative emotional reactions to perceived disagreements and interference concerning the parties’ goals. Given the lack of reliable and validated measures of interpersonal conflict, items were developed to assess each of the four definitional properties: interdependence, disagreement and interference. Twenty items, adapted from previous measures (Kilmann and Thomas 1977; Rahim 1983), were used to assess the extent to which students employed five styles (problem-solving, asserting, avoiding, compromising, and accommodating). For each style, two items inquired respondent’s own behaviors, and two items asked about the behaviors of the other party(ies). Conceptually, these indices measure the overall usage of each style by everyone involved, and not only the respondent’s own usage of the style. As such, relationships between interpersonal conflicts (reflecting the interdependence, disagreement, interference, and negative emotions of all participants in the project) and conflict management styles (again reflecting the behavioral styles of all project participants) can be investigated. This questionnaire measures five different styles of conflict management: asserting, accommodating, compromising, problem-solving, and
avoiding. These styles are seen as general strategies or behavioral orientations that individuals adopt for managing and resolving conflicts.

**Asserting style** (also described as competing, controlling, distributive or contending style) occurs as individuals strive to win. In this style one party make gains at the cost of the gains of other party. Conflict, therefore, is considered a win-lose situation. Like asserting, **accommodating style** (also described as obliging style, non confrontation, yielding, or lose-win style) also occurs when individuals sacrifice their own needs and desires in order to satisfy the needs of other parties. This occurs as individuals oblige or yield to others' positions, or cooperate in an attempt to resolve conflicts. **Compromising** is a third style (also described as mixed motive in game theory) frequently splits the difference or involves give and take behaviors where each party wins some and loses some. **Problem-solving style** (also described integrating style, collaborative, cooperation, solution-oriented and win-win or positive sum style) occurs when individuals in conflict try to fully satisfy the concerns of all parties. Here, actions are aimed at the achievement of goals and objectives of all parties. Hence, it results as a win-win solution. Finally, **avoiding style** (inaction, withdrawal, or ignoring style) occurs when individuals are indifferent to the concerns of either party and refuse to act or participate in conflict. Here, one withdraws, physically or psychologically, abdicating all responsibility for the solution. The style items assessed these behaviors on 7-point scales ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (always).

Leadership styles were assessed by using *The Teal Trust Leadership Style Indicator* (2001). It comprises of 30 items assesses six styles of leadership viz. Pioneering, Strategic, Management/Administrative, Team leadership, Pastoral and Encouraging.

**Pioneer leaders** are those who are willing to push themselves, and take appropriate risks in striving to move forwards to discover and reach long term goals. Pioneering leaders are passionate about the vision, and are wholly committed to it. Pioneering leaders are at their strongest in the early stages of a vision or project. However as time passes they may lose interest in the implementation of a vision, eager to be looking ahead to the next challenge. Strategic Leaders can break down visions and large aims into manageable chunks that are vital
for the project. Strategic leaders have the insight and focus to work out ways of achieving the vision, the "how", and are able to persuade the rest of the group to accept this plan. Strategic leaders can bring common sense to a difficult task - able to help people see how the seemingly impossible can be achieved. However, like pioneers, they can be less engaged with the implementation of a task, preferring to leave this to others. Any vision or change will require people able to plan and problem solve, delegate and organize. Without this gift, the best plans may well not get implemented. Managers are often underappreciated, having a leadership style which is less "up-front" than some of the other styles. However, much of the work simply would not get done without Management/Administration leaders. They are able to organize, and follow through on all the necessary tasks and activities to ensure that the project is completed on time. They may struggle to relate to the visionary pioneers - dreaming of achieving the impossible is not their home ground. Team Leadership includes leadership in a group context, whether the leader has a formal leadership role in a group or not. The key strengths of team leaders are a desire to work with others, and an ability to trust them. Team leaders need great humility and servanthood - their sole aim is that the team achieves its goals. What they as individuals achieve is secondary. Team leaders are invaluable - if the church is truly to function as a body, team leaders are needed to ensure harmony and effectiveness in the way the team works. Pastoral leaders are real "people people", who have an important role in supporting the pioneers, strategists, team leaders and the rest of the organization, particularly when times are hard. Vision and moving into vision seem less important to pastoral leaders. Pastoral leadership is often unseen, and often unappreciated publically, yet hugely important. Those who are pastoral leaders can sometimes be threatened by the pioneers and strategists - and at times are irritated by the attention to detail shown by the managers. Yet their contribution to a team is invaluable - take time for a moment to think of a pastoral leader - and you will probably find that they command huge respect and support. Encouraging leaders are able to motivate teams and individuals. They have great discernment into people's gifts, their feelings and what motivates them, able to release them into fulfilling their goals. Encouraging leaders have the knack of knowing when a quiet word can spur people on, when to challenge and when to support, when to coach and when to give space. Occasionally they may irritate people by
appearing less "involved" than other leadership styles - sometimes people want more than just encouragement

**Data Collection**

The study was limited to 1125 managers working at different levels of organizational hierarchy. All the participants were contacted and requested to fill their responses in the questionnaire provided to them by the research scholar. The purpose of the study was explained to them and they were encouraged to give frank and honest responses to all questions. Amongst all the responses gathered 981 were usable for the purposes of the study. Snow

**Data Analysis**

For the purpose of data analysis SPSS software is used. The following statistical were used:

1. Descriptive statistics
2. Cronbach Alpha, to check the reliability
3. P-P plot to check the normality of the data
4. Pearson product-moment Correlation
5. Linear regression

Level of significance to accept the results is 0.05 or higher than 0.05

**Main Findings**

1. Emotional intelligence is positively correlated with pioneering, strategic, management, and team, pastoral and encouraging styles of leadership. Even the subscales self-awareness, self management, social awareness and social skills are positively correlated with pioneering, strategic, management, team, pastoral and encouraging styles of leadership.
2. Self awareness is significantly correlated with asserting and compromising styles of conflict management, and there is no relationship between problem solving, avoiding and accommodating styles of conflict management. Self management is significantly and positively correlated with problem solving, asserting, compromising and accommodating styles of conflict management. It has no significant relationship with avoiding styles of conflict management. Social awareness is positively and significantly correlated with problem solving, asserting, compromising and accommodating styles of conflict management. It has no relationship with avoiding style of conflict management. Social skills are positively correlated with problem solving, asserting, compromising and accommodating styles of conflict management.

3. Strategic leadership style is positively correlated with problem solving and asserting styles of conflict management it is negatively correlated with avoiding style of conflict management. It has no relationship with compromising and accommodating style of conflict management. Management style of leadership has positive correlation with problem solving, asserting, compromising and accommodating styles of conflict management. It has no relationship with avoiding style of conflict management. Team leadership is positively correlated with problem solving, asserting, compromising and accommodating styles of conflict management. It is negatively correlated with avoiding style of conflict management. Pastoral leadership is positively correlated with problem solving, asserting, compromising and accommodating styles of conflict management. It has no correlation with avoiding style of conflict management. Encouraging leadership is positively correlated with problem solving, asserting, compromising and accommodating styles of conflict management. It has no correlation with avoiding style of conflict management.

4. Self-awareness, social-awareness and self management are significant predictors of pioneering style of leadership. Self-awareness and social-awareness are significant predictors of strategic style of leadership. Self-awareness and social-awareness are significant predictors of management style of leadership. Self-management and social skills are significant predictors of team leadership. Social-awareness and social skills are
significant predictors of pastoral style of leadership. Social-awareness and social skills are significant predictors of encouraging style of leadership.

5. Social-awareness is significant predictor of problem solving style of conflict management. Social-awareness and social skills are significant predictors of asserting style of conflict management. EI cannot predict about compromising style of conflict management. Social-awareness is a significant predictor of avoiding style of conflict management. Social-awareness is significant predictors of accommodating style of conflict management.

Managerial implications

Today, diversification is the face of Indian industry. The demographics of Indian workforce is changing more and younger workforce from different regions and cultures is coming together to work together. This change in workforce is changing the work culture of organizations and posing a challenge of leading this diverse workforce to the leaders. In such a scenario emotional intelligence can be of great help to the leaders. Rosete and Ciarrochi (2005) reported that executives having better understanding of their own feelings and that of their subordinates are more likely to achieve business outcomes and are considered effective leaders by their subordinates and direct manager. Diggins (2004) emphasized that good managers need emotional intelligence (EI) to make decisions that based on a combination of self-management and relationship skills and an awareness of how their behavior affects others in the organization. He argued that emotional intelligence plays a greater role than “traditional” intelligence in determining leaders’ and organizations’ success. According to Brown and Brooks (2002, p. 327) “an understanding of emotion, both our own and those of other people, plays an important part in organizational life”. In this context, Mayer et al. (2004) stated that superiors need to manage the mood of their organizations and that a mysterious blend of psychological abilities known as emotional intelligence is what leaders need to accomplish that goal. Kellet, Humphery and Sleeth (2002) report that perceiving other’s feelings and empathizing with them may establish an effective bond that is beneficial for leadership. Leaders’ use of emotions can enhance cognitive processes and decision making (George, 2000). The investigator also emphasizes that for effective leadership the EI skills of leaders should be honed through proper training.
Further, the results reflect that emotional intelligence has positive relationship with collaborative styles of conflict management. It means that people with high EI levels opt for collaborative styles to handle conflicts which results in positive outcomes. Scholars have noted that EI plays an important role in resolving conflict functionally (Borisoff and Victor, 1998; Jordan and Troth, 2002, 2004). Jordan and Troth (2004, p. 196) argued that “the ability to be aware of and manage emotions is also thought to facilitate functional than dysfunctional, conflict resolution and consequently contribute to better team performance”.

The privatization of the workplace has lead to increasing organizational change and organizational contextual volatility, which, in turn, has produced increasing differences and conflicts (Dana and Dana, 2003; Sommer, 2003) as cited in (Yu, Sardessai, Lu and Zhao (2006). Furthermore, Indian organizations are involved in mergers and acquisitions taking place at global level will result in workforce diversity and cultural differences that is another major reason of conflicts among employees. Therefore, the findings of this study have some importance to Indian organizations in leadership and managing conflicts.

The results showed significant influence of EI on strategic, management, team, pastoral and encouraging styles of leadership. EI has no significant relationship with pioneering style of leadership. Social awareness or empathy refers to the awareness of others’ feelings, needs, and concerns. According to Goleman (1995), empathy involves understanding others, developing others, and having a service orientation. It implies that the more an individual understands others/colleagues, the more likely he or she will use the team and encouraging styles of leadership.

The problem-solving style is generally perceived to be a more appropriate, more effective, and more competent style in managing conflict. Individuals who experience honest self-awareness also recognize their strengths, weaknesses, needs, and drives. Additionally, these people know how their feelings affect themselves, other people, and their job performance (Goleman, 1999). Self-regulation is an important component of social development and it contributes to the quality of interpersonal relationships (Saarni, 1999). Empathy involves understanding others, developing others, and having a service orientation (Goleman, 1995). Self-
regulation and empathy can be developed (Davis, 1983; Kestenbaum et al., 1989). If managers want to be effective at managing conflict, then it becomes necessary for them to adopt and develop an integrative style. Salopek (1998) noted in an interview with Goleman that emotional intelligence abilities are learned and tend to improve as one ages and matures. Therefore, organizations will have to consciously and continuously strive to inculcate self-regulation and empathy among their managers through an effective programme of training and development.

To reduce the conflict, organizations must increase the levels of EI for their employees' which will help them to manage these conflicts properly and reduce its negative impact on their life and work.