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.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A Review of the literature is exactly that — a review, synthesis, or summary of literature on a research problem. A literature review is usually a highly synthesized critique of the status of knowledge on a carefully defined educational topic. Although the field of research on EI has broadened over the last decade. Furthermore, personality theories and models have been around for quite some time in mainstream psychology but have been poorly understood or defined until recently. Very few studies have been conducted on the connections between EI and leadership and conflict management particularly in Indian context. This review of literature includes (1) a framework for the context of the problem, (2) current understanding and research in the field of EI as related to the workplace, (3) connections between EI and leadership, (4) connections between EI and leadership, and (5) the value of this study.

Context of the problem

Despite the recent popularity of EI, there has yet to be a standard and universally-accepted definition. In the present research literature many models classified in two categories namely ability model and trait or mixed models are present. The EI models of Goleman and Bar-On are often referred to as mixed models. Salovey and Mayer (1993) are credited with the
development of a model of EI that is separated from personality traits and focuses strictly on mental abilities. Such mental abilities include perception and expression of emotion, assimilation of emotion, analyzing emotions, and emotional regulation (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000b). They argue that separating personality dispositions from emotional abilities would allow them to analyze EI to the degree it independently contributed to a person's behavior overall life competence (Mayer & Salovey, 1997 b). The adoption of this definition of EI allows it to be viewed as a true intelligence that meets three empirical criteria. First, an ability-based model allows for right and wrong answers to emotional challenges. Second, mental abilities are measurable and can be correlated to other mental abilities. Third, absolute mental ability level tends to increase with age (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000b). The Mayer and Salovey model is built around four levels of EI, and each level contains a number of discrete emotional abilities. These levels are:

1. **Perception and expression of emotion** This level is the most basic and involves the identification and expression of emotions in one's physical states, feelings, and thought in addition to recognizing emotional expression in other people.

2. **Assimilating emotion in thought** The ability allows people to weigh emotions against one another and allows emotion to direct and prioritize attention. At this level, emotions also aid in memorization by tying specific emotions with specific events.

3. **Understanding and analyzing emotion** This level addresses how people are able to label emotions, recognize why they occur, and how to reason with the complexity of emotions and simultaneous feelings. In addition, there is an ability to understand relationships associated with shifts of emotion.

4. **Reflective regulation of emotion** The highest level of EI, this level deals with the ability to stay open to feelings and reflectively monitor and regulate emotions that promote emotional and intellectual growth. (Mayer & Salovey, 1997 b, p. 11)

Largely due to the competing models of EI (mixed models developed by Goleman & Bar-On and the ability-based model developed by Mayer & Salovey), the key issue quickly becomes what part, if any, does personality play in predicting outcomes? For instance, Goleman (1995)
referred to a study of Bell Laboratory engineers in which the top performers had a greater EI despite have the same IQ as lower performing engineers. This seems to be a great claim in support of EI being a predictor of success. Goleman also states that if IQ predicts 20% of personal success, then EI can fill the 80% gap. However, Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2000b) argue such extravagant claims “appear to fly in the face of our existing research base” (p. 104).

Due to a large overlap between personality types and EI in Goleman and Bar-On’s model, it is necessary to differentiate between the two in order to determine which factor has a greater influence in predicting success. In this case, success is defined by the principal’s ability to effectively implement and lead professional learning communities within his or her campus.

Current research on emotional intelligence

Since the publication of the bestselling book Emotional Intelligence by Daniel Goleman (1995), the topic of emotional intelligence has witnessed unparalleled interest. Programmes seeking to increase emotional intelligence have been implemented in numerous settings and courses on developing emotional intelligence have been introduced in universities and schools. But what exactly is emotional intelligence? As in the case with all constructs several schools of thought exist which aim to mock accurately describes and measure the notion of emotional intelligence. At the most general level, emotional intelligence refers to recognize and regulate emotions in ourselves and others (Goleman, 2001). Peter Solvey and John Mayer, initially defined emotional intelligence as:

A form of intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feelings and emotions, to discriminate them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Later the definition was revised and was thus defined as The ability to perceive emotion integrate emotion to facilitate thought, understand emotions and to regulate emotions to promote personal growth (Mayer & Solvey, 1997)

Another prominent researcher of the emotional intelligence construct is Reuven Bar-On, the originator of the term “emotional quotient”. Possessing a slightly different outlook, he defines emotional intelligence as being concerned with understanding oneself and others,
relating to people, and adapting to coping with the immediate surroundings to be more successful in dealing with environment demands (Bar-On, 1997). Regardless of the discrepancies between definitions of emotional intelligence, it is clear that what is being referred to is distinct from standard intelligence, or I.Q.

**Emotional intelligence and social intelligence**

The concept of general intelligence has its roots in educational research and research on individual differences which began at the close of the 19th century (Gardner, Krevevsky, Stenberg, & Okagaki, 1994). Since this early research, the concept of intelligence has been exploded into many other facets and perspectives, including practical intelligence (Stenberg, 1985). Thorndike was one of the first scientist to explore the idea of multiple intelligences stating “that man has not someone amount of one kind of intelligence, but varying amounts of different intelligences” (Thorndike, 1920, p. 228). Mechanical, social and abstract intelligence were identified as being for “ordinary practical purposes”, the three major intelligences (Thorndike, 1920).

The research by Sternberg (1985) demonstrates; in support of Thorndike’s earlier work that social intelligence is distinct from academic abilities and helps equip people to do well in the practicalities of everyday living. From these practical perspectives, one of the hallmarks of a positron of leadership is a people orientation in a social interaction domain. At lower, non-management levels of the organizational hierarchy, production or tactical skills can create successful work experiences. These tactical skills are typically not sufficient in top leadership positions where deliberation, information gathering, and decision making take place within a social framework (House & Baetz, 1979). The importance of the social aspects of management have been recognized for the first-line supervisory level and continue into top management (Kaye & Jordan-Evans, 1999). Given the importance of the social aspects of leadership capacity, it is relevant to differentiate between the social intelligence and emotional intelligence constructs.
For Thorndike (1920), the concept of social intelligence included the ability to perform with wisdom in human relations and an ability to understand others. His definition encompassed both an ability to actively cope with others and an inactive perception or cognitive appreciation for others (Walker & Foley, 1973). Zirkwl (2000) suggests that central to the “social intelligence perspective is that people are reflective, thinking beings and their behavior can be understood in terms of the ways that they actively seek to engage in their social environment and pursue desired outcome in the important domains of their lives” (p. 3). According to Zirkel, social intelligence assumes that behavior is purposive and strategic, people are active rather than passive participants, behavior is contextual and development, and that a premium is placed on cognition, as people are both imaginative and creative in their efforts at adaptation.

Definition of social intelligence falls into two categories: Social cognitive and social behavioral skills (Walker & Foley, 1973). Social cognitive skills include the ability to decode social information, social knowledge, social memory and the ability to make accurate social inferences. When defined as a “cognitive” measure, there appears to be a relatively clear distinction between social intelligence measures and the big five personality dimensions with correlation and factor analyses data in support of separateness (Buffer, 1997). The social behavioral skills include the ability to respond adaptively and to perform effectively in social situations. These social behavioral skills appear to present considerable overlap with both the ability and mixed model emotional intelligence theoretical approaches.

The construct of social intelligence has been closely aligned with the construct of emotional intelligence. Mayer et al. (2000a) believe emotional intelligence to be a broader construct than social intelligence, including the identification and expression of internal, private emotions, thoughts, and physical states important for personal growth. From another point of view, emotional intelligence can also be viewed as more focused than social intelligence pertaining more specifically to the emotional aspects of problems rather than social or political aspects.

Researchers have suggested a theoretical overlap between social and emotional
intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1993; Salovey and Mayer, 1990). Some have concluded that emotional intelligence was subsumed under the social intelligence construct and added no variance beyond the later (Kobe, Reiter-Palmon, & Rickers, 2001).

Each theoretical paradigm conceptualizes emotional intelligence from one of two perspectives: ability or mixed model. Ability models regard emotional intelligence as a pure form of mental ability and thus as a pure intelligence. In contrast, mixed models of emotional intelligence combine mental ability with personality characteristics such as optimism and well-being (Mayer, 1999). Currently, the only ability model of emotional intelligence is that proposed by John Mayer and Peter Salovey. Two mixed models of emotional intelligence have been proposed, each within a somewhat different conception. Reuven Bar-On has put forth a model based within the context of personality theory, emphasizing the co-dependence of the ability aspects of emotional intelligence with personality traits and their application to personal well-being. In contrast, Daniel Goleman proposed a mixed model in terms of performance, integrating an individual's abilities and personality and applying their corresponding effects on performance in the workplace (Goleman, 2001).

**Salovey and Mayer: An Ability Model of Emotional Intelligence**

Peter Salovey and John Mayer first coined the term “emotional intelligence” in 1990 and have since continued to conduct research on the significant of the construct. Their pure theory of emotional intelligence integrates key ideas from the fields of intelligence and emotion. From intelligence theory comes the idea that intelligence involves the capacity to carry out abstract reasoning. From emotion research comes the notion that emotions are signals that convey regular and discernable meanings about relationships and that at a number of basic emotions are universal (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002). They propose that individuals vary in their ability to process information of an emotional nature and in their ability to relate emotional processing to a wider cognition. They then posit that this ability is seen to manifest itself in certain adaptive behaviors (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002).

Mayer and Salovey's conception of emotional intelligence is based within a model of
intelligence, that is, it strives to define emotional intelligence within the confines of the standard criteria for a new intelligence (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003). It proposes that emotional intelligence is comprised of two areas: experiential and strategic. Each area is further divided into two branches that range from basic psychological processes to more complex processes integrating emotion and cognition. The first branch, Emotional perception, is the ability to be self-aware of emotions and to express emotions and emotional needs accurately to others. Emotional perception also includes the ability to distinguish between honest and dishonest expression of emotion. The second branch, emotional assimilation, is the ability to distinguish among the different emotions one is feeling and to identify those that are influencing their thought processes.

The third branch, Emotional understanding, is the ability to understand complex emotions and the ability to recognize transitions from one to the other, lastly, the fourth branch, Emotional Management, is the ability to connect or disconnect from an emotion depending on its usefulness in a given situation (Mayer and Salovey, 1997).

Mayer and Salovey began testing the validity of their four branch model of emotional intelligence with the Multibranched Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS). Composed of 12 subscale measures of emotional intelligence, evaluations with the MEIS indicate that emotional intelligence is a distinct intelligence with 3 separate sub factors: emotional perception, emotional understanding, and emotional management. The MEIS scale found only limited evidence for the branch of emotional intelligence related to integrating emotions. There were, however, certain limitations to the MEIS, not only it was a lengthy test consisting of 402 items, but it also failed to provide satisfactory evidence for the integration branch of the Four Branch Model (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002). For these reason a new measure was designed.

The new measure of Mayer and Salovey model of emotional intelligence, the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) aims to measure the four abilities outlined in Salovey and Mayer's model of emotional intelligence. Each ability is measured using specific tasks. Perception of emotion is measured by rating the extent and type of emotion expressed on different types of pictures. Facilitation of thought is measured by asking people to draw
parallels between emotions and physical sensations like light, color, as well as emotions and thoughts. Understanding is measured by asking the subject to explain how emotions can blend from other emotions. Regulation of emotion is measured by having people choose effective self and other management techniques (Brackett & Mayer, 2003).

With less than a third of the items of the original Multibranch Emotional Intelligence Scale, the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test is compromised of 141 items. The Scale yields six scores: an overall emotional intelligence score, two area scores and four branch scores corresponding to the four branches of emotional intelligence. Each score is expressed in terms of a standard intelligence with a mean score of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Additionally, the manual provides qualitative ratings that correspond to each numeric score.

Bar-On: A Mixed Model of Emotional Intelligence

Reuven Bar-On developed one of the first measures of emotional intelligence that used the term “Emotional Quotient”. Emotional Intelligence Test model of emotional intelligence relates to the potential for performance and success, rather than performance or success itself, and is considered process oriented rather than outcome oriented (Bar-On, 2002). It focuses on an array of emotional and social abilities, including the ability to be aware of, understand, and express oneself, the ability to be aware of, understand and relate to others, the ability to deal with strong emotions and the ability to adapt to change and solve problems of a social or personal nature (Bar-On, 1997). Bar-On outlines 5 components of emotional intelligence: intrapersonal, interpersonal, adaptability, stress management and general mood. He posits that emotional intelligence develops overt time and that it can be improved through training, programming and therapy (Bar-On, 2002).

Bar-On hypothesizes that those individuals with higher than average E.Q.’s are in general more successful in meeting environmental demands and pressures. He also notes that a deficiency in emotional intelligence can mean a lack of success and the existence of emotional problems. Problems in coping with one’s environment is thought, by Bar-On, to be especially common among those individuals lacking in the subscales of reality testing, problem solving,
stress tolerance and impulse control. In general, Bar-On considers emotional intelligence and cognitive intelligence to contribute equally to a person’s general intelligence, which then offers an indication of one’s potential to succeed in life (Bar-On, 2002).

Reuven Bar-On’s measure of emotional intelligence, the Bar-On Emotion Quotient Inventory (EQ-i), is a self-report measure of emotional intelligence for individual sixteen years of age and over. Developed as a measure of emotionally and socially component behavior that provides an estimate of one’s emotion and social intelligence, EQ-I is not meant to measure personality traits or cognitive capacity, but rather to measure one’s ability to be successful in dealing with environmental demands and pressures (Dawada & Hart, 2000; Bar-On, 2002). Bar-On ha developed several versions of the EQ-I to be used with various populations and in varying situations. Among these are the EQ-interview, the EQ-I Short Version, the EQ-i:125, the EQ-I Youth Version and the EQ-360Assessment.

**Goleman: A Mixed Model of Emotional Intelligence**

Daniel Goleman, wrote Emotional Intelligence (1995), the landmark book which familiarized both the public and private sectors with the idea of emotional intelligence. Goleman’s model outlines four main emotional intelligence constructs. The first, self-awareness, is the ability to read one’s emotions and recognize their impact while using gut feelings to guide decisions. Self-management, the second construct, involves controlling one’s emotions and impulses and adapting to changing circumstances. The third construct, social-awareness, includes the ability to sense, understand, and react to other’s emotions while comprehending social networks. Finally, relationship management, the fourth construct, entails the ability to inspire, influence, and develop others while managing conflict (Goleman, 1998).

Goleman includes a set of emotional competencies within each construct of emotional intelligence. Emotional competencies are not innate talents, but rather learned capabilities that must be worked on and developed to achieve outstanding performance. Goleman posits that individuals are born with a general emotional intelligence that determines their potential for learning emotional competencies. The organization of the competencies under the various
constructs is not random; they appear in synergistic clusters or groupings that support and facilitate each other (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 1999). Several measurement tools have been developed based on Goleman’s model of emotional intelligence and its corresponding competencies. Included among these are the Emotional Competency inventory (ECI: Boyatzis, 1994), the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (EIA: Bradberry, Greaves, Emmerling, et al., 2003), and the Work Profile Questionnaire-Emotional Intelligence Version (WPQei: Performance Assessment Network, 2000).

Emotional Competency inventory: Daniel Goleman developed the Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI) as a measure of emotional intelligence based on his emotional intelligence competencies as well as earlier measures of competencies for managers, executives and leaders (the self-assessment questionnaire) by Richard Boyatzis (1994). The Emotional Competency Inventory is a multi-rater (360 degree) instrument that provides self, manager, direct report, and peer ratings on a series of behavioral indicators of emotional intelligence. It measures 20 competencies, organized into four constructs outlined by Goleman’s model: self awareness, social awareness, self management and social skills. Each respondent is asked to describe themselves or the other person on a scale from 1 to 7 for each item, and in turn these items are composed into ratings for each of the competencies. The respondent is left with two ratings for each competency: a self rating and a total other rating (made up of an average of all other ratings; Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 1999).

Emotional Intelligence Appraisal: The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (EIA) measure was developed by Travis Bradberry and Jean Greaves along with the members of the Talent Smart Research Team in an effort to create a quick and effective measure of emotional intelligence for use in variety of settings. Based on Daniel Goleman’s model of emotional intelligence, the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal uses 28 items to measure the four main components of the model and takes an average of 7 minutes to complete. Items target the existence of skills reflective of the above components and are rated using a six point frequency scale where 1 reflects “never” exhibiting a behavior and 6 reflects “always” exhibiting a behavior.
Work Profile Questionnaire-Emotional Intelligence Version: The emotional intelligence version of the Work Profile Questionnaire was designed as a self report measure of seven competencies in the Goleman model of emotional intelligence. Intended as a measure of competencies essential for effective work performance, the 84 item Work Profile Questionnaire- Emotional Intelligence Version gives participants a score for total emotional intelligence and a score for each of the seven competencies of interest: innovation, self-awareness, intuition, emotions, motivation, empathy and social skills (Performance Assessment, Network, 2000).

Comparing Models of Emotional Intelligence

Despite the existence of three distinct models of emotional intelligence, there are theoretical and statistical similarities between the various conceptions. On a global level, all of the models aim to understand and measure the elements involved in the recognition and regulation of one's own emotions and the emotions of others (Goleman, 2001). All models agree that there are certain key components to emotional intelligence, and there is even some consensus on what those components are. As all three models of emotional intelligence implicate the awareness of emotions and the management of emotions as being key elements in being an emotionally intelligent individual.

A relationship between elements of the models has been established through statistical analyses. As outlined in the description of the measures of emotional intelligence, there is evidence that different measures of emotional intelligence are related and may be measuring similar components. Brackett and Mayer (2000) found significant similarities between the regulation of emotion subscale of the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test and the interpersonal EQ scale of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory. Considerable similarities have been found between self-report measures of emotional intelligence. Brackett and Mayer (1998) found that two self-report measures, Emotional Quotient Inventory and Self Report Emotional Intelligence Test, were highly correlated ($r = .43$).

There is a significant amount of debate within the emotional intelligence literature
concerning the two models of emotional intelligence; many researchers have attempted to address the issue of which model represents emotional intelligence in the most accurate manner. Supporters of the ability model propose that the mixed model of emotional intelligence is less "pure". Ability model supporters argue that research based on ability measures has demonstrated that emotional intelligence is a distinct and clearly defined construct with evidence of incremental validity (Brackett & Mayer, 2003). However, proponents of the mixed models chastise the ability model for focusing too strictly on traditional intelligence-based psychometric criteria. They argue that many theorists have recommended broadening the traditional notion of intelligence so that it incorporates many facilities which have conventionally been beyond its scope. Researchers, such as Howard Gardner, note that standardized intelligence tests do not necessarily measure success in school or life as support for a mixed model of emotional intelligence (Gardner, 1999).

**Emotional intelligence in the workplace**

Linking EI to workplace performance is a leading area of research in worker productivity and effectiveness. Cherniss (2000) outlines four main reasons why the workplace would be a logical setting for evaluating and improving emotional intelligence competencies:

1. Emotional intelligence competencies are critical for success in most jobs.

2. Many adults enter the workforce without the competencies necessary to succeed or excel at their job.

3. Employers already have the established means and motivation for providing emotional intelligence training.

4. Most adults spend the majority of their waking hours at work.

A strong interest in the professional applications of emotional intelligence is apparent in the way organizations have embraced E.I. ideas. Considerable research in the emotional intelligence field has focused on leadership, a fundamental workplace quality. Even before research in the area of E.I. had begun, the Ohio State Leadership Studies reported that leaders
who were able to establish mutual trust, respect, and certain warmth and rapport with members of their group were more effective (Fleishman and Harris, 1962). This result is not surprising given that many researchers have argued that effective leadership fundamentally depends upon the leader’s ability to solve the complex social problems which can arise in organizations (Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs & Fleishman, 2000).

One of the most extensive studies on performance involved the effectiveness of 1,171 United State Air Force recruiters. These recruiters were divided into high-performing groups (those who met or exceeded 100% of their recruiting goals) and low-performing groups (those who met less than 80% of their recruiting goals). An EQ-i was administered to the recruiters, and the results indicated the EQ-i instrument predicted 28% of the variance in the performance between the two groups. The EQ-i correctly classified 81% of the recruiters in the high-performing and low-performing groups. Furthermore, recruiters with high levels of EI had a greater ability to place recruits in positions that closely matched their knowledge and skills (Bar-On, Handley, & Fund, 2006).

EI, however, affects more than the individual’s performance and can be correlated to group productivity. Group EI can be analyzed in two ways – by examining each individual’s contribution to the team and the interaction within the team as a whole. By doing so, one can understand both the emotional resources available for teamwork and how teams manage the collective dynamics of the group’s members (Elfenbein, 2006). Teams whose members collectively have a higher-than-average level of EI score higher on tests of team psychological safety, collaborative decision making, team training and improvement, and lower on levels of group conflict. In contrast, teams that have a high level of variability in EI suffer negative consequences such as conflict and member attrition (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002).

Some scholars’ models on group performance seem to be in conflict with Elfenbien’s framework and suggest that focusing solely on EI within a team is detrimental to performance. For instance Michel and Jehn (2006) claim that social intelligence, as defined as effective adaptation to the social context, is a better predictor of team effectiveness. Their study of two banks’ employees revealed very different personal attributes in regards to social relations.
Employees of the less-effective, first bank could elaborate extensively on their personal emotional abilities while employees of the highly-effective second bank had great difficulty at verbalizing their self-concept. However, the employees at the second bank were much more situational in their responses to the researcher's questions. They rarely used the term "I" or spoke of their strengths and weaknesses, unlike the employees of the first bank. Michel and Jehn claim that Ei is only one part of a larger social intelligence model. Their model combines self-awareness with self-regulation in a concrete situation.

The development of a group-level Ei model helps combine and compliment the findings of Efenbien's research with that of Michel and Jehn. This model, proposed by Druskat and Wolff (2001) is based on the assumption that teams are greater than the sum of its individuals, and member Ei alone cannot manage group dynamics. They argue that the group as a whole must be aware of and effectively manage emotion within the established social norms. The team norms, nine of which are defined, provide an emotional structure for the group's interaction with one another (Wolff, Druskat, Koman, & Messer, 2006). In other words, a team's effectiveness and sustainability depends on the strength of the social norms developed by the Ei contribution each member makes.

Emotional Intelligence of Teams

Much of the work in today's organizations, even at top management levels, is done in teams rather than by individuals. Although most studies of emotional intelligence have focused on individuals, research is beginning to emerge concerning how emotional intelligence relates to teams. For example, one study found that untrained teams made up of members with high emotional intelligence performed as well as trained teams made up of members who rated low on emotional intelligence (P.J.Jordan, N.M.Ashkanasy, C.E.J.Hartel and G.S.Hooper, Human Resource Management Review 12, no. 2, 2002, p. 195-214.) The high emotional intelligence of the trained team members enabled them to assess and adapt to the requirements of teamwork and the tasks at hand.

Moreover, research has suggested that emotional intelligence can be developed as a
team competency and not just an individual competency. That is, teams themselves—not just their individual members can become emotionally intelligent leaders build the emotional intelligence of teams by creating norms that support emotional development and influence emotions in constructive ways. Emotionally intelligent team norms are those that

1. Create a strong group identity

2. Build trust among members

3. Instill a belief among members that they can be effective and succeed as a team.

Leaders “tune in” to the team’s emotional state and look for unhealthy or unproductive norms that inhibit cooperation and team harmony (Daniel Goleman, Richard Boyatzis and Annie McKee, *Journal of Organizational Excellence*, 2002, p. 55-56). Building the emotional intelligence of the team means exploring unhealthy norms, deliberately bringing emotions to the surface, and understanding how they affect the team’s work. Raising these issues can be uncomfortable, and a leader needs both courage and individual emotional intelligence to guide a team through the process. Only by getting emotions into the open can the team build new norms and move to a higher level of group satisfaction and performance. Leaders continue to build emotional intelligence by encouraging and enabling the team to explore and use emotion in its everyday work.

**Emotional intelligence, gender and age**

Bar-On (1997) suggests that there are “no significant differences between males and females in overall emotional intelligence” (p. 93) based on a correlational study between age and gender and scores on the EQ-i. However, Allen (2003) indicates female principals tend to slightly outscore male principals on the EQ-i by one-half of a standard deviation, but there is no significant difference between principals’ age and EQ-i scores.

Other studies also suggest females score higher than males on tests of EI (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999; Mayer & Geher, 1996). Hoffman, 1977; Hojat et al., 2001, van Rooy et al., 2005 also confirmed gender differences in EI and empathy. Women have been found to
display more complexity and articulate their emotional experience more than men, even after controlling for verbal intelligence (Barrett, Lane, Sechrest, & Schwartz, 2000). Lopes, Salovey, and Straus (2003) confirm this finding and suggest higher EI in women may be linked to mother-child interactions where female children tend to receive greater emotional expression from their mothers than male children. The part of the brain designated for emotional processing may also be larger in women (Gur, Gunning-Dixon, Bilker, & Gur, 2002). However, women are more likely to be perceived negatively in the leadership role when compared to men when women do not use their emotional abilities and act as autocratic leaders, typically a male stereotype, rather than as democratic leaders (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). More interestingly, women more often underestimate their EI, whereas men overestimate (Petrides & Furnham, 2000).

Intrapersonal skills generally increase with age (Bar-On, 1997, 2002; Bar-On & Handley, 1999; Bar-On & Parker, 2000, Hartup & Stevens, 1997). Labouvie-Vief, Dovoe & Bulka (1989) reported that emotional maturation is pronounced during the pre-adult years. Further, according to Bretherton, Fritz, Zahn-Waxler and Ridgeway (1986) the expression of emotions develops from external (i.e. actions, physical processes) to internal representations (i.e. linked to memories, wishes and other inner states).

**Emotional Intelligence and Personality**

Personality, One’s characteristic pattern of thinking, feeling and acting (Myers, 1998), has been explored using a variety of theories including Psychoanalytic, humanistic, social-cognitive and trait theory. One of the most predominant and well accepted personality theories, trait theory attempts to explain personality in terms of the dynamic and the underline behavior. Traits are characteristic patterns of behavior or disposition to feel and act in a certain way which distinguish one person from the next. They are hypothesized to be consistent and stable across a lifetime, acting as a type of template for an individual’s behavior (Myer’s, 1998). Research by Mc Crea and Costa (among others) has supported this hypothesis. In a longitudinal study of American Adults, Costa and Mc Crea (1982) found that for the majority of people, personality at age 30 was predictive of personality at age 80.
Several traits theorists have proposed models of personality based on the factor analyses of traits expressed through personalities inventories. For example, Hans and Sybil Eysenck's model of personality outlined two genetically influenced dimensions of personality: introversions-extroversions and stability-instability (Myer, 1998). A more recent, and widely accepted trait model is the "Big Five" Personality Factor Model.

Big Five Personality Model, is an empirically derived model of personality based on the early work on traits by Gordon Allport, Raymond Cattell, and Hans and Sybil Eysenck. It proposes that personality can be factored into five dimensions: neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness. Further, it proposes that each individual falls between the two extremes of each dimension. Neuroticism contrasts elements of emotional stability with those of negative emotionality. Extraversion implies an energetic approach to the world as opposed to a passive approach, while openness examines an individual's openness to experiences versus their level of close-mindedness. Agreeableness seeks to measure whether one has a prosaically, Co-operative orientation towards others or if they act with antagonism. Lastly, conscientiousness includes the control of impulses which facilitates tasks and other goal-directed behavior (Hergenhahn & Olson, 1999).

Several models of emotional intelligence are closely tied with personality theory, specifically the mixed models of Bar-On and Goleman. Both models list components and sub-components of their theory of emotional intelligence which are similar to areas which have been previously studied under personality theory. Bar-On's sub-components of assertiveness, interpersonal effectiveness, empathy, impulse control, social responsibility and reality testing have all been considered parts of personality, and are consequently measured as such by popular personality inventories. The overlap between components of emotional intelligence models and personality theory is especially evident in empirical comparisons of the construct. When comparing Bar-On's measures of emotional intelligence to the NEO-PI-R, a measure of the Big Five Personality Factors, the Emotional Quotient Inventory was found to correlate significantly with each factor. Highly significant correlations were found between the Emotional Quotient Inventory and neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness.
factors and moderately significant correlations were found with the openness factor of the Big Five. Goleman’s measure of emotional intelligence, the Emotional Competence Inventory, has been found to correlate significantly with three of the Big Five Personality factors: extroversion, openness, and conscientiousness.

**Emotional intelligence with rising leadership levels.**

Knowing that EI is tied to successful leadership, it follows that skills of emotionally intelligent people, like flexibility, conflict management, persuasion and social reasoning, become increasingly important with advancing levels in leadership hierarchy (Mandell and Pherwani, 2003). Initial research in this area compared EI scores of middle and senior level managers to determine promotion readiness, explored EI as an explanation for the advancement of managers, and weighed EI against intellect and managerial skills in assessing outstanding versus average senior level leaders. Specifically, a comparison of senior managers with middle managers targeted for promotion resulted in significantly higher scores among senior managers in EI and the competency areas of innovation, commitment, political awareness, leadership, change catalyst, and team capabilities, supporting EI as a measurement tool for promotion readiness (Langley, 2000). Also, a seven-year longitudinal study (Dulewicz and Higgs, 2003) revealed EI as more important than intellect and other management competencies in the advancement of managers. Results indicated that intellect accounted for 27 percent and management competencies for 16 percent, while EI explained 36 percent of the variances in advancement. The same study further analyzed the skills of senior directors and managers. The director group presented significantly higher scores on overall EI and on interpersonal sensitivity and emotional resilience. The authors found no difference amongst the directors and managers at all, however, in intellect or other managerial competencies. Finally, not only is EI an increasingly indicative reason for stellar performance as rank rises in an organization, but as opposed to cognitive or technical abilities, it explains 85 percent of the variance between outstanding and average senior leaders (Goleman et al., 2002).
These initial studies yield telling results that offer support for the relationship between effective leaders and EI, as well as for the theory that with increasing leadership levels in an organization, one will find increasing levels of EI. Further, particular EI competencies appear as especially crucial for directors of organizations; “motivation, interpersonal sensitivity, intuitiveness, conscientiousness and integrity” are undoubtedly relevant for a director’s role in “determining the company’s vision, mission and values” (Dulewicz and Higgs, 2003, p. 206).

**Emotional intelligence across career arenas.**

Theoretical speculations on EI research of leaders in divergent career fields consider the leader’s role in driving the organizational culture, the workplace culture’s role in developing emotionally intelligent leaders, and initial career interest by people with high EI. It is estimated that 50 to 70 percent of employees trace the organizational climate specifically to the actions of the leader (Goleman et al., 2002), this demonstrating a direct effect of the leader on workplace culture. Alternatively, the organizational culture may have an effect on the EI levels of employees. Organizational values define ground rules that must be followed in order to anticipate promotion (Langley, 2000), thus, rules based on EI competencies will lead employees to embrace EI if their goal is to attain a leadership position. Leaders in different career arenas may have a greater or lesser amount of EI nurturing by their various organizational missions, visions, values, and cultures. Lastly, people with high EI may be drawn to particular types of professions. Recall the contention that those who are interested in the construct of EI may be defined along disciplinary lines (Gardner, 1999). Some assertions have been made that people who are high in EI may be more likely participants in leadership experiences, and also may be more effective leaders (Kobe et al., 2001). Perhaps just as highly emotionally intelligent people are interested in and more likely to participate in leadership, they may also be more likely to participate in particular types of career fields and professions. This study seeks to begin to infuse initial empirical research into this burgeoning theoretical discussion.

**Applicability of Emotional Intelligence to Everyday Living**

Several studies have found that emotional intelligence can have a significant impact on
various elements of everyday living. Palmer, Donaldson and Stough (2002) found that higher emotional intelligence was a predictor of life satisfaction. Additionally, Pelletier (2002) reported that people higher in emotional intelligence were also more likely to use an adaptive defense style and thus exhibited healthier psychological adaptation. Performance measures of emotional intelligence have illustrated that higher levels of E.I. are associated with an increased likelihood of attending to health and appearance, positive interactions with friends and family, and owning objects that are reminders of their loved ones (Brackett, Mayer, & Warner, in press). Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (1999) found that higher emotional intelligence correlated significantly with higher parental warmth and attachment style, while others found that those scoring high in E.I. also reported increased positive interpersonal relationships among children, adolescents and adults (Rice, 1999; Rubin, 1999).

Negative relationships have likewise been identified between emotional intelligence and problem behavior. Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (2000) found that lower emotional intelligence was associated with lower self-reports of violent and trouble-prone behavior among college students, a correlation which remained significant even when the effects of intelligence and empathy were partial out. Lower emotional intelligence (as measured by the MSCEIT) has been significantly associated with owning more self-help books (Brackett et al., in press), higher use of legal drugs and alcohol, as well as increased participation in deviant behavior (i.e. involvement in physical fights and vandalism). No gender differences were observed for those associations (Trinidad & Johnson, 2002; Brackett and Mayer, 2003). Finally, a study of 15 male adolescent sex offenders (15-17 years old) found that sex offenders have difficulty in identifying their own and others feelings, two important element of emotional intelligence (Moriarty, Stough, Tidmarsh, Eger, & Dennison, 2001).

Emotional Intelligence and Leadership

The close of the twentieth century witnessed an increased awareness of the importance of leadership by industry, and resurgence in the study of leadership. Research have suggested that the development of executives has taken on new meaning as corporations are challenged to adopt a worldwide perspective and that the ability to interact effectively with people may be
one of the most important leadership skills (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). The phenomenon coincides with a prolonged economic expansion, motivated by the expectation that improved leadership would make the difference between profit and loss, competitive advantage or disadvantage, success or failure in the new information age. Leaders are needed who can guide these changes as rapidly as they occur and who can respond to the most valuable resources of the day- knowledge capital (Cherniss, 2000). In many cases, the value of the product springs from the innovative ideas brought to the table by an organization’s human asset. Guiding, molding, facilitating, inspiring and encouraging these most valuable organization assets is the leadership challenge of the new millennium.

Goleman (1998) states that close to 90% of the competencies relevant for leadership success are social and emotional in nature. In work environments characterized by rightsizing, change, and competitive pressures, people draw on these competencies to provide effective leadership (Cherniss, 2000).

The ability to engage in accurate emotional self-assessment and to tune into the emotional state of others, social awareness, emotional management of oneself and others, and an ability to use this entire increasingly important role in leadership. These abilities have been pulled together under the umbrella of emotional intelligence (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Although the construct of intra-personal intelligence (Gardner, 1983) and Social Intelligence (Thorndike & Stein, 1937) have been around for some time, Salovey and Mayer (1990) were among the first researchers to examine a cluster of behaviours as an emotional intelligence theoretical construct. However, it wasn’t until the publication of Daniel Goleman’s book on emotional intelligence in 1995 that the term and construct of emotional intelligence became widely known outside the research community (Goleman, 1995).

As is typical with the emergence of a new construct, researchers conceptualize and define emotional intelligence differently (Bar-on, 1996; Coooper & Sawaf, 1997; Goleman, 1995). Cooper and Sawaf envision emotional intelligence as comprising for main components: emotional literacy, emotional fitness, emotional depth, and emotional alchemy. In cooper and Sawaf’s view, emotional literacy refers to emotional honesty, emotional energy and
the valuing of feelings. Emotional fitness refers to trust, authenticity and resilience. The emotional depth component focuses in influencing others without exercising control over them through personal integrity, self awareness, commitment and accountability. Emotional alchemy refers to the synthesis of all previously mentioned components to discern innovative opportunities and to transform small ideas into larger ones (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997; Cooper, 1997).

From a theoretical perspective, Goleman identifies the components of emotional intelligence to include a personal competence area that determines how we manage ourselves, and a social competence area which focuses on how we handle relationships (Goleman, 1998). Personal competence includes self-awareness, self-regulation and motivation. Goleman believes these emotional capabilities are both independent and interdependent. He states that each trait or capacity has the potential to make unique contribution to job performance. However, he also recognizes that many of these capabilities interact. That is why; Goleman views an underlying emotional intelligence capacity as being necessary but not sufficient to guarantee work performance success, acknowledging that an individual’s interest in their work and the work environment will have an impact on whether or not the emotional intelligence competence is used. In addition, Goleman recognizes that this capacity, while applicable to some extent to all jobs, will be more important or necessary for some jobs than others.

Other researchers have also taken this workplace performance approach in their recommendations for development and application of emotional intelligence. Weisinger (1998) follows Goleman’s theoretical approach in focusing on the development of self-awareness, emotion management and self-motivation. In addition, he includes a major area that calls on emotional intelligence in relation with others suggesting the development of skills in area of communication, relationship building, and mentoring or helping others help themselves.

Reuven Bar-On (1996) builds his theoretical approach around intra-personal skills, interpersonal skills, cognition-oriented skills, stress tolerance, impulse control and optimism. This approach is very inclusive, identifying 15 major emotional intelligence capabilities. Under the umbrella of Intrapersonal Skills, Bar-On identifies emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, self-
regard, self-actualization, and independence. Interpersonal Skills encompasses interpersonal relationships, social responsibility, and empathy. Bar-on also includes several Adaptability capabilities including problem, reality testing, and flexibility as well as impulse control and stress tolerance under a Stress Management heading. Also included in Bar-On theoretical approach is a somewhat unique component that others have not typically included; a general mood factor that includes happiness and optimism.

Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2000a) also challenge the broadening of the emotional intelligence to include such components as optimism, happiness and motivating oneself into a state of flow, considering such to be mixed models. These mixed models include both personality, motivational, and ability components. Mayer et. Prefer to more narrowly define emotional intelligence as a set of mental abilities that mark the convergence of emotion and cognition. These authors conceptualize emotional intelligence as a construct that incorporates both emotion and cognition as: emotional perception, emotional understanding, and emotional management. This conceptualization has not changed substantially from Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) earlier research where they defined emotional intelligence as ‘the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s emotions, to discriminate among them and to use the information to guide one’s thinking and actions’ (p.185).

The key word in Salovey and Mayer conceptualization is “ability”. This approach differentiates their model from the mixed model approach. The theoretical approach has clearly diverged in two main directions with Mayer and Salovey following an ability model and most other researchers following a mixed model which combines personality and socio-emotional factors (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2000a).

Leadership Theory and Emotional Intelligence

Leadership Studies subsumes much of what some previously considered to be management theory. There are those leadership theorists who adamantly draw large distinctions between leadership and management as constructs while others support that leadership theory has evolved from management theory.
Leadership studies are an emerging discipline and the concept of leadership, along with relevant definitions continues to evolve. According to Daft, Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who have shared purposes (Daft, 1999). He states that leadership has been a topic of interest to historian’s philosophers since ancient times (Daft, 1999).

Leadership as a discipline touches on a variety of other disciplines: management studies, personality, education, intelligence, and business and organizational development. In its current infancy state, little quantitative research has been done to establish the validity of the predictive claims of the multiple models and theories that abound.

There are at least two separate schools of Leadership Studies that divide the various models: Transformational versus the Transactional Schools.

Transformational versus the Transactional Leadership Model

Transactional Leadership involves maintaining stability within the organization rather than promoting change. These skills are important for all leaders but to transcend stability and achieve change, transformational leadership is a skill set that may be more effective. Transactional leadership involves an exchange or transaction process for both leaders and followers. The transactional leader identifies and recognizes specific follower desires and provides goods and services that meets those desires in exchange for the followers meeting specific objectives or performing certain duties (Daft, 1999).

It is basically a quid pro quo relation that is mutually beneficial for both leader and follower in a form of market exchange value, without any type of intrinsic change in their existing value system (Daft, 1999) Marti Chemers adds to this theory of transactional leadership with the concept that a transactional relation of good quality must first be present in order to transcend to transformational leadership. He queried, what is the currency of goods exchanged? He offered that power and influence tactics suggest some common relational features. He notes that in these transactions between followers and leaders the most powerful transactional exchanges involve rational appeals, expert and referent power and influence.
based on shared objectives and mutual respect (Chemers, 1997).

Transformational leadership, on the other hand, is characterized by the ability to bring about significant change. "The focus is on intangible qualities such as vision, shared values, and ideas to build relationships....Transformational leadership is based on the personal values, beliefs and qualities of the leader rather than on an exchange process between leaders and followers" (Daft, 1999, p. 427).

The four key differences of transformational leadership are:

- Transformational leadership develops followers into leaders.

- Followers concerns are elevated from the lower Maslow Hierarchy of physical to the higher levels of self-esteem. Self-actualization and self-transcendence.

- Followers who are inspired go beyond their own self interest for the good of the group.

- Leaders who are transformational paint pictures of desired future and communicate this future in such a way it transforms followers into willing journeyers (Daft, 1999).

Multiple leadership theories and theorists are subsumed under the umbrella of Transformational Leadership: Bass (1985), Kotter (1996), Blanchard (2001), and Goleman (1998). Daft propounds that in the concept of leadership theory of Emotional Intelligence is the axiom that leaders should acknowledge that emotional understanding and skills can impact, harness, and direct the power of emotions. He believes that applying Emotional Intelligence theories in the workplace will lead to an improvement in employee satisfaction, productivity, effectiveness and motivation (Daft, 1999, p. 345).

Goleman on Transformational Leadership

Working with Emotional Intelligence (1998) is another Goleman addition to the application and integration of the theory of emotional intelligence into the organization. His book jacket states, "For leaders, emotional intelligence is almost 90% of what sets the stars
apart from the mediocre" (Goleman, 1998). He asserts that it is an essential ingredient for reaching and staying at the top of the field.

Goleman cites John Kotter, "Motivation and inspiration energize people, not by pushing them in the right direction as control mechanisms but by satisfying the human needs for achievement, a sense of belong, a feeling of control over one's life, and the ability to live one's own ideals. Such feelings touch us deeply and elicit a powerful response." Goleman argues that leadership of this kind is an emotional craft (Goleman, 1998, pp.196-197).

Goleman draws the conclusion that "emotional competence is particularly central to leadership, a role whose essence is getting others to do their jobs more effectively". Goleman states that Transformational leadership is inspiring individuals and groups with the competencies provided by emotional intelligence; A Transformational leader is one who is highly emotionally intelligent (Goleman, 1998).

**Transformational leadership and team effectiveness**

Managers are faced with a requirement to develop, implement and if necessary challenge a range of new tasks, business processes, projects to be managed and teams to be led (Hull, 2006). Perhaps the most difficult aspect for a supervisor of being a work team leader is motivation of team members. Work teams may be more successful in achieving organizational goals if their members are empowered to do their jobs (Latham and Gary, 2004). Conversely, if their authority and responsibility are restricted, employees may well reduce their levels of commitment. They might continue to perform satisfactorily but with little enthusiasm for improving quality and productivity (Steers et al., 2004). Informal meetings between supervisors and subordinates on a regular basis empower joint decision-making and participative management. Moreover, the existence of accurate job description on departmental basis is associated positively with effective task allocation and the absence of role conflict (Polychroniou, 2005). Team effectiveness within the organization is achieved further when tasks are allocated to employees through a transparent process that takes into account the organizational goals as well as the subordinates' abilities and preferences. Successful
management actively not only promotes a team spirit, but also installs team mechanisms and the means to develop in team skills (Harris and Harris, 1996).

Teamwork is also enhanced when such a process also considers training and skills development. The job design literature has been clear in suggesting that a favourable climate is necessary for job design efforts to be successful since it moderates the relationship between job complexity and satisfaction (Hackman and Oldham, 1980; Ferris and Gilmore, 1984). Moreover, defining factors for team effectiveness refer to leadership style of supervisors. The role of leadership in management is largely determined by the organizational culture of the company. It has been argued that supervisor' beliefs, values and interpersonal competences are of critical importance to the overall style of leadership that they adopt. Theoretical contributions suggest that components of EQ may be associated with effective leadership (Morris and Feldman, 1996; Goleman, 1998, 2001; Bass, 2002). Existing literature support that dimensions of supervisors’ EQ influence supervisor’s transformational leadership, subordinates’ outcomes and job performance (Megerian and Sosik, 1996; Rahim et al., 2002, 2006). Following Burns (1978), Bass (1985; see also Bass and Avolino, 1993) proposed that transformational leadership is associated with distinct dimensions of charisma or idealised influence (extent of pride, trust, and respect engendered by and emotional identification with the leader), intellectual stimulation (extent the leader encourages followers to question their own way of doing things and become innovative), and individualised consideration (extent the leader provides personal attention and encouragement for self-development of followers).

The transformational leader has the capacity to motivate subordinates to do more than normally expected. Transformational leaders raise subordinates consciousness about new outcomes and motivate them to transcend their own interests for the sake of the team. They create an atmosphere of change, and they may be obsessed by visionary ideas that excite, stimulate, and drive other people to work hard. The true transformational leader often does not fit within a traditional organisation and may lead a social movement rather than a formal organisation (Hellriegel and Slocum, 2004; Hellriegel et al., 2005). Leaders who possess empathy are likely to recognise subordinates' need, take active interest in them, respond to
changes in their emotional states, and to work together to attain goals on team basis (Rahim et al., 2002). Empathy is likely to be associated with individualised consideration. Social skills that are associated with enabling followers to engage in desirable behaviours are likely to be associated with intellectual stimulation (Goleman, 2001; Rahim et al., 2006). Employees are likely to respect and emotionally identify with a leader who is considerate and is willing to help subordinates to be effective, enhance utilisation of integrating style for handling conflict and improve their job performance (Rahim et al., 2002, 2006).

**Transformational Leadership and Emotional Intelligence Studies**

Using Salovey and Mayer's original classification, after acknowledging that there is currently no consensus about the exact nature of emotional intelligence, researchers Barling, Slater, and Kelloway investigated whether there was an association between leadership and emotional intelligence in 49 managers of a large pulp and paper organization. The Bar-On Emotional Intelligence Inventory an emotional intelligence questionnaire and Seligman Attributional Style Questionnaire were distributed and completed. MLQs was distributed to 157 respective subordinates. The researchers acknowledge that their sampler was small and they have noted what may be excessive sampling error because of this: “The absences of a relationship between emotional intelligence and intellectual; stimulation also bears further investigation. Previous research has supported the role of intellectual stimulation as a predictor of subordinate attitudes and performance (Barling et al., 1996) making it a central concept in transformational leadership theory” (Barling et al., 2000, p. 4)

The researchers stated their study has shown emotional intelligence to be associated with three aspects of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivational individualized consideration. In essence the study was conducted to see if scores on the Bar-On EQ-I scale were correlated to MLQ (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) scales of transformational qualities of leaders. They stated that if Goleman's theory is that emotional intelligence can be developed through training, and if this quality can be measured, it would
provide organizations an indication of leadership potential and would provide organizations with a means to select leaders. In other words, it will provide a predictive measurement of leadership ability. They continue that if Goleman’s claims are correct that emotional intelligence develops early on in life, it may be used to predict the ability to use transformational leadership behaviors (Barling, et al., 2000, p. 5). According to Sosik and Sosik (1999) the correlation between the attributes of transformational leadership and emotional intelligence varied as a function of self awareness of managers. They argue that one aspect of emotional intelligence, self awareness, on integral to transformational leadership effectiveness (Sosik and Sosik 1999, p. 2). In their study of 63 managers and 192 subordinates, data were collected to assess EQ predictor/leader behavior and leader behavior performance relationships. They were particularly concerned with the aspect of leader self awareness and its relationship to transformational leadership. Their study revealed that using a self other rating as surrogated measure for self-awareness, coupled with the size and range restrictions of their sample population, may not be appropriate. They concluded that self-awareness was a key aspect of both EQ and effective performance and those organizations should promote training programs that include EQ training, with emphasis on self-awareness, transformational leadership and performance.

They stated that such training enhanced the capacity of team members to learn leadership skills, develop new sets of emotion based skills to learn to improve self-learning, and develop and assess emotional competencies of organizational members (Sosik and Sosik 1999, p.12). Newsome et al. (1999) noted that over 70 years ago, Thoendike (1929) proposed the existence of a construct very much like that of emotional intelligence-social intelligence which could be organized under three broad dimensions: mechanical, abstract, and social. Mechanical ability referred to level able to manage things and mechanics: abstract intelligence was the idea to manage symbols and ideas; and social intelligence was the ability to understand and manage people (i.e. an ability to handle interpersonal situation). Leadership characteristics and the various capabilities that support effective leadership have long been a topic of research and debate in leadership literature. Studies by Connelly, Gilbert, Zaccaro, Threfall, Victoria, Marks and Mumford (1991), reveal that background data measures that focuses on
achievement, motivation, social skills, social adjustment, dominance, reasoning and creativity were strong and stable predictors for success of young adults in high school college.

In this longitudinal study the research found that “achievement, motivation, social skills, social adjustment, dominance, reasoning and creativity are some of the strongest and most stable predictors across different criteria including success in high school” (Connelly, et al., 2000, p. 2). They reviewed the work of Friedman, and Fletcher (1992) that found the contributions of complex cognitive abilities, thinking skills, and social judgments support the performance of critical leadership tasks.

Connelly, et al. (2000) used a sample of 1807 Army officers who filled out cognitive, motivational and personality measures. The results were that leader skills and knowledge measurements all correlated significantly with leader achievement. Positive correlations were found. Cognitive abilities had positive correlations with the exception of verbal reasoning and leader achievement (Connelly, et al., 2000).

In their development of a theoretical model, the result indicated that problem solving, social judgment and knowledge measures account for significant variance in leadership criteria. The results of their study provided findings that provided “support for the contributions of complex cognitive abilities, creative thinking skills, and social judgment skills to the performance of critical leadership tasks” (Connelly, et al. 2000).

In their original hypothesis they expected to have findings support a mediated model of leadership, where problem solving skills, social judgment skills and knowledge mediate the relationship of general cognitive abilities, motivation and personality to leadership performance. Specifically the co variation between cognitive abilities, motivation and personality and leader performance was expected to diminish when problem-solving skills, social judgment and knowledge were controlled (Connelly, et al., 2000).

The theoretical model retained core aspects in that motivation, personality and general cognitive abilities were held to directly influence complex leader problem solving skills and that complex problem solving skills and cognitive, motivation and personality variables are proposed
to directly influence leader behavior. Although the model in development does not particularly cite emotional intelligence and transformational leadership style per se, the inclusion of cognitive ability, social judgment and leadership skills as variables provide a correlative study and information about the attributes ascribed to assess the predictive variables of leadership abilities. With Goleman’s claims that emotional intelligence us a better predictor of life’s success (1995) and with his definition of success restricted to success within the world of employment, it is extremely important to review the literature regarding general cognitive ability and the predictive value of this construct, how it has been measured and analyzed to support the claims of prediction, and to construct those studies with ones that have been done with EI. Graves (1999) studied emotional intelligence and cognitive ability in his dissertation using three pivotal questions:

- Is emotional intelligence subsumed under cognitive ability or does it constitute a distinct, albeit related construct
- Does emotional intelligence predict behaviors that would likely generalize to effective job performance?
- If so, would emotional intelligence explain a unique portion of the criterion space that traditional cognitive ability measures would otherwise miss?

Graves concluded that, "..... contrary to some findings (e.g., Goleman, 1998), emotional intelligence does not seem to overshadow cognitive ability in predicting performance. It appears that emotional intelligence and cognitive ability play equally important roles in explaining differences in people’s ability to influence and demonstrate interpersonal competence”(Graves, 1999, p. 190)

**Personality trait and ability models in EI**

Many researchers are currently taking an inclusive approach to emotional intelligence and its measurement, attempting to capture almost everything except IQ (Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1998). Such mixed models include personality traits along with motivation
factors and are considered by some to be hindered by the inclusive nature (Hedlund & Sternberg, 2000). Further, the measurement approaches employed by the mixed model theorists have taken two different pathways. One has focused on self-assessment personality inventories (Bar-On, 1997; Cooper, 1997) and the other, has focused on informant assessment personality inventories (Boyatzis, Goleman & Hay/McBer, 1999).

In contrast, the ability model identifies emotional intelligence as a set of mental abilities that mark the convergence of emotion and cognition. The transitions of this theoretical approach into a measurement approach differ from the mixed model by assessing the quality and extend to which people engage in certain processes or judgments (Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 2000b), or how people think, decide, plan, and credit (Caruso, Mayer & Salovey, 2001), and the extent to which this approach is skill based. The ability theorists measure the ability to detect emotion in a face, a landscape, or an abstract design, uncontaminated with verbal content. Or, they measure the ability to judge the similarity between an emotional feeling such as fear and other internal experience such as temperature taste.

It is not surprising that the theoretical underpinning and subsequent measurement approach differ widely. In the investigation of a new construct, it is not unusual for science and scientist to move in different directions in pursuit of their version of truth. A great deal is now known about emotional intelligence that could only be guessed at in the early 90's. To some extent, the interaction, divergence, and convergence of the emotional intelligence constructs with other well-established psychological construct has been explored for the past ten years, shedding some light on the role emotional intelligence may play in the future.

**Personality traits and Leadership**

A full cycle of research into the discovery of traits as precursors to effective leadership, or "great man" trait theories (Bass, 1990) was laid to rest decades ago. An individual difference or trait approach to leadership evolved through a time of discreditation (Landy, 1989; Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1948) as research failed to produce predictive validity coefficient of sufficient strength to support the theoretical constructs (Hemphill, 1949). More recently,
however, with renewed confidence in the psychometric properties of their research, studies have identified personality traits or behaviors that appear to support successful leadership behavior. Personality traits have been the focus of substantial research over the past few decades with general agreement among researchers that personality trait common variance can be understood in terms of five major personality dimensions. These dimensions, known as the "big five", have been identified as: neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (e.g. Costa & McCrae, 1976, 1978; Costa, McCrae & Dye, 1991; Digman, 1990). Building on Norman's (1963) taxonomy, using cluster and factor analysis, researchers found clear support for the generality of this factor analysis, researchers found clear support for the generality of this five-factor model (Goldberg, 1990; McCrae & John, 1992). The five-factor model allows for many personality traits to be subsumed under the five major dimensions providing a sound depiction of individual differences in personality at the uppermost level (Costa, & McCrea, 1995).

Researchers have sought an understanding of the relationship between job performance and personality employing the five-factor model. Overall, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness demonstrated a moderate positive relationship to job performance. The Barrick and Mount study found the conscientiousness dimension to be a valid predictor across occupational groupings including sales, management, police, professionals, and skilled/semiskilled personnel. They also found that people who scored high on openness achieved greater success in a training environment. Those who scored high in extroversion demonstrated a similar success pattern.

The Barrick and Mount (1991) meta–analysis also found conscientiousness and extraversion to be sufficient predictors of job performance. Both objective (e.g. salary, status, change, tenure) and subjective criterion data (e.g., supervisory ratings) were used to clarify the nature of these trait-performance relationships. For the management group, the extraversion dimension was predictive across all job performance criteria.

Unlike conscientiousness or agreeableness, for many of the studies included in meat–analytical research, the assumption can be made that people functioning in the critically
unstable range of behavior have self-selected out of the workforce, effectively restricting the range for this dispositional construct. From a workplace perspectives, neuroticism (emotional stability) appears to be a rather unique personality dimension in that there is a non-linear relationship between this dimension and many of the work-relevant criteria against which it has been measured. Barrick and Mount (1991) suggest there is a point where having more emotional stability, beyond the “critically unstable range”, does not provide a value-added factor. In fact, in some cases, more neurotic professional outperformed their more stable peers.

Emotional intelligence and personality traits

In a broader context, Yukl (1981) identified 14 traits and behaviours supportive of leadership success including consulting, monitoring, recognizing, networking, rewarding, planning and organizing, clarifying, informing, motivating, delegating, team building and conflict resolution, problem solving and supporting. Yukl also lists guidelines for supportive management. Some of these behaviors are showing acceptance and positive regard, being polite and diplomatic, bolstering other’s self-esteem, providing assistance with work as needed, willingness to help with personal problems, engaging in active listening, and showing empathy. This list is similar to the behaviors identified in emotional intelligence construct (Goleman, 1998; Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey, 2001) and is particularly noticeable in research with mixed models of emotional intelligence and the major personality dimensions (McCrae, 2000) Agreeableness, extraversion, and to some extent neuroticism all appear to have some facets in common with the mixed model of emotional intelligence. These correlations were examined in the Davies, Stankov, and Roberts (1998) research which demonstrated substantial overlap between the EQ Test based on Goleman’s (1995) mixed model of emotional intelligence and various personality measures including the NEO Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1985), considered to be one of the best measures of the big five personality dimensions. Openness and conscientiousness did not appear to be substantially correlated with the mixed model of emotional intelligence measures used in the study.
When reviewing studies in an attempt to investigate a "trait theory" of leadership, Bird (1940) noted that one characteristic that appeared repeatedly in studies of leaders was intelligence. The leaders were found to be, on the whole, more intelligent than their followers. Bird warns, however, that intelligence is only a contributing factor to leadership, and without assistance from other traits, it does not solely account for successful leadership. Similarly, Bass (1960) found that leaders usually have higher intelligence scores than followers, but not significantly higher. Might a high emotional intelligence be a more accurate descriptor of a successful leader than the standard intelligence quotient?

When attempting to clarify and define leadership, there appears to be a quality in the emotional realm that distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders (Hoyle & Oats, 1998). The concept of emotional intelligence may offer some insights into effective educational leadership (King, 1999). Salovey and Mayer's (1990) initial definition of emotional intelligence described it as an intelligence that involves the ability to understand and assess one's own and other's emotions as well as use that information to regulate one's thoughts and actions. This definition inherently relates to the interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences discussed by Gardner (1983).

What is the importance of interpersonal skills to a leader? Bass (1990) reported that in several studies, he found interpersonal skills to be important in leadership. He defined interpersonal competence as "involving empathy, insight, heightened awareness, and the ability to give and receive feedback" (Bass, p. 10). Interpersonal skills endow a person with the ability to identify and accurately report one's feelings, or to empathize with the feelings of another in order to achieve cooperation rather than isolation (King, 1999).

Additionally, interpersonal skills involve the ability to act with generosity and understanding toward others (King). Goleman (1998) reported that companies waste vast sums of money each year on worker education and training programs that are ineffective because they omit vital interpersonal skills. Salopek (1998) found that a July 1998 survey of human resource directors at Fortune 1000 companies identified interpersonal skills as vital to an organization's success. Emotional competencies, Goleman stated, can be learned by any worker
at any career stage.

One of the behaviors that Callahan (1990) mentioned on his checklist of eight effective principal behaviors was high interpersonal skills. Cherniss (1998) noted that educational leaders, like airline pilots, have always needed people skills, but today they need them more than ever. In addition, King (1999) found that the very concept of leadership implies a working relationship with other people who follow and are influenced by the leader.

The ability to communicate effectively is often mentioned by researchers as an integral link to interpersonal skills and thus effective leadership (Kanter, 1983). Most of the literature on school leadership supports the importance of good communication as necessary to effective leadership (Lashway, Mazzarella, & Grundy, 1997).

Covey (1990) purported that understanding others is fundamental to interpersonal relations. Rost (1991) stated that one of the attributes of great leaders is honest communication. This includes the ability to intelligently deliver criticism so that valuable information may be shared with the employees to enhance their performance (Abraham, 1999).

Wright and Taylor (1994) looked at what constitutes effective communication. They stated that reading the members of the group, comprehending issues, and suiting a message to an audience are essential to good communication. In an interview with Goleman, Salopek (1998) explained communication - the sending of clear and convincing messages - as a vital part of interpersonal skills. McDowell and Bell (1998) found that interpersonal skills and communication are strong components of emotional intelligence and leadership.

Empathy comprises a second piece of effective interpersonal skills and may be the most easily recognized (Goleman, 1998b). Empathy enables one to consider others' feelings (Goleman, 1998a). It is the ability to be aware of others' feelings, needs, and concerns (Salopek, 1998).

In the case of leadership, empathy permits emotionally intelligent managers to place
themselves in the position of the employee, understand the distress he or she is undergoing, experience those feelings themselves, and modify their communication appropriately (Abraham, 1999). Empathy enables the leader to be attuned to what is being said, measure its impact on the recipient, and prevent hurtfulness and humiliation (Levinson, 1992). In an interview with Goleman, Salopek (1998) revealed that empathy is one of the most important parts of a manager's tool kit. Goleman (1998a) found that trainers who are warm, genuine, and empathic are best able to engage learners in the change process. Greenleaf (1977) contended that follower trust is established if the leader displays empathy, understanding, and acceptance of the followers.

In terms of the follower, an empathic employee will be able to view weaknesses in his/her performance from the organization's perspective, perceiving them as detrimental to organizational success (Abraham, 1999).

Finally, Daniel (1998) advocated that great leadership involves huge social intelligence, including a well-developed sense of empathy.

A third component of interpersonal skills involves the ability to work and function within a team (McDowelle & Bell, 1997). Interpersonal expertise of a leader has been offered as an integral part in empowering others and building strong relationships (Kouzes & Posner, 1987). Teaming refers to the ability to create group synergy in the pursuit of collective goals (Salopek, 1998). Kelley and Caplan (1993) observed that optimum performing groups had members who built consensus, empathized with other members, promoted cooperation, and avoided conflicts. Daniel (1998) noted that the majority of the abilities necessary for success in over 121 companies worldwide involved teaming attributes such as trustworthiness, adaptability, and a talent for collaboration. Nelton (1996) reported that managers are learning that the necessity for teaming in the modern day work world requires greater EQ skills. William and Sternberg (1988) noted that dysfunctional interaction among the group lessened the group's ability to solve problems and act creatively.

For the leader, the ability to forge working relationships with many people and function
as mediator, negotiator, and networker is vital to success (Cherniss, 1998). A team's leader must be able to sense and understand the viewpoints of everyone involved. With a teaming spirit, people can be motivated to agree on a new marketing strategy or generate enthusiasm about a new product (Goleman, 1998b).

While the term 'interpersonal skills' describes interactions among people, intrapersonal skills refers to the feelings and actions within an individual (Gardner, 1985). McGarvey (1997) reported that emotional control is a key skill for successful leaders. 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 (Kelly & Moon). Bocchino (1999) described intrapersonal intelligence as the sense of self-awareness that enables us to assume the third person, to observe ourselves, our emotions, our behaviors, and to be conscious of the insights we receive as a result of that observation.

An insightful leader exhibits intrapersonal aspects of emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1998a). Among them are included self-awareness, self-regulation, and the motivation to succeed. Goleman proffered that the higher one goes up the leadership ladder, the more important these emotional intelligence competencies become.

Personal initiative was one of the three most desired capabilities reported by employers of MBA's (Daniel, 1998). Salopek (1998) defined motivation as emotional tendencies that guide or facilitate the reaching of 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).

Comparison of EI abilities to leadership traits

Several of the traits and behaviours associated with effective leaders (e.g., emotional stability, self-confidence, adaptability, and tenacity) overlap with the trait-based view of EI. An integral part of impression management is managing own emotions (which requires an ability to perceive others’ emotions and one’s own emotions). Theoretically, an individual who is high on impression management must also be adept at managing his or her own emotions and must also be able to correctly perceive others’ emotions and one’s own emotions. Charismatic leaders must have “insight into the needs, values, and hopes of their followers” (Bass, 1985, p.46). This insight may be facilitated through a higher level of emotional awareness and sensitivity. Bass (1985) also claimed that charismatic leaders are great actors, because they are engaging in impression management. Charismatic leaders create, communicate, and instill commitment toward a common vision (Bass, 1985). They create emotional responses (e.g., sense of excitement) in followers. Charismatic leaders create shared norms and tend to “actively shape and enlarge audiences through their own energy, self-confidence, assertiveness, ambition, 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 behaviours (e.g., encourages delegation), conduct individual counseling, and become a mentor and role model for followers. Emotional intelligence may also help leaders understand the emotions of followers and understand how to manage his or own emotions. This emotional knowledge helps the leader become an effective mentor by modeling appropriate emotional responses. The emotional perception ability of leaders is critical to the counseling and mentoring role.

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

**Mixed-model EI and leadership**

Despite the view that mixed-model measures of EI do not actually assess EI, it may be worthwhile to examine these measures in conjunction with leadership. Even if these measures are not really EI, they could be very useful to organizations if they are associated with more effective leader (and organizational) performance. Traditional theories of leadership suggested that leaders must plan and think rationally without the influence of their emotions (George, 2000). Researchers have made reference to the notion that transformational or charismatic leaders “emotionally engage their followers” and “display emotions” in order to motivate their
followers to adopt the goals and values of the organization (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Bass, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Shamir et al., 1993). Furthermore, leaders form an emotional attachment with their followers that enhance the quality of their relationships and the effectiveness of the team and organization (e.g., Bass, 1998). Effective processing of emotional information may help leaders to deal with complex ambiguous information by directing their attention to the issues or threats that require immediate attention (George, 2000). Furthermore, Bass (1990) suggested that there is a social or emotional element inherent in transformational leadership.

Researchers have questioned for many years what predisposes certain individuals to adopt a transformational style of leadership, and what makes some leaders more effective than others (e.g., Barling et al., 2000; George, 2000; Judge & Bono, 2000; Mumford, Zaccaro, Johnson, Diana, Gilbert, & Threlfall, 2000). Several researchers have suggested that emotional intelligence may be a useful predictor of transformational / charismatic leadership behaviours (e.g., Barling et al., 2000; George, 2000; Goleman, 1995; Goleman, 1998; Sosik & Dworakivsky, 1998). However, there have been few attempts to determine the emotional processes involved in effective transformational leadership behaviours (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Barling et al., 2000; Gates, 1995; Megerian & Sosik, 1996). The limited evidence suggests that emotional intelligence is positively associated with transformational leadership (i.e., idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and contingent reward; Barling et al., 2000).

Nevertheless, the importance of social or emotional relationships are more evident in transformational versus transactional theories of leadership (Barling et al., 2000; Megerian & Sosik, 1996). Transactional leaders are reactive and do not tend to be concerned with engaging in interpersonal relationships with followers or being empathetic to follower's needs (Barling et al., 2000). The present review of emotional intelligence and leadership is concerned with effective leadership behaviours. Thus, in this paper, a theoretical link will be made between ability-based emotional intelligence (i.e., emotional perception, emotional facilitation / integration, emotional understanding, and emotional management; Mayer & Salovey, 1997) and elements of effective leadership as operationalized by the theory of transformational
leadership (i.e., idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation).

**Perceiving, Appraising & Expressing Emotions**

A leader displays idealized influence when he acts as a role model to followers through behaviours and personal accomplishments in order to earn the respect and admiration of followers (Bass, 1985). Leaders who possess the ability to perceive their own emotions and the emotions of their followers may be more effective at recognizing how their emotions can be used to earn the respect of their followers (Barling et al., 2000; George, 2000). Such a leader may utilize self-expression in order to accurately communicate, both verbally and nonverbally, the goals of the organization in order to earn the respect of followers (e.g., Shamir et al., 1993).

The leader’s ability to accurately perceive, appraise, and express their own emotions and to perceive and appraise their follower’s emotions may also result in the leader successfully communicating and instilling an organizational vision in followers (George, 2000). Individuals with heightened levels of emotional expression will more accurately express their beliefs and values to their followers providing followers with a greater understanding and identification with the organization’s mission (e.g., George, 2000; Wasielewski, 1985). Emotionally intelligent individuals tend to be aware of their own emotions and moods (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Research suggests that a leader with heightened self-awareness may be more effective at inspiring followers (e.g., Atwater & Yammarino, 1997; Bass & Yammarino, 1989; Fleenor & McCauley, 1996; Sosik & Dworakivsky, 1998). Leaders who possess heightened levels of self-perception have been shown to be more effective leaders (Roush & Atwater, 1992). When the leader accurately perceives his / her follower’s emotions and responds appropriately, the followers may be more receptive (George, 2000).

Individuals with an ability to accurately express emotions may be more likely to communicate in an emotionally expressive manner (Mayer et al., 2000c). An organizational vision communicated in an emotionally expressive manner, rather than a technical manner, may be more appealing to followers (Megerian & Sosik, 1996). Transformational leaders tend to
arouse emotional responses in their followers in order to inspire them to believe in the organization’s cause or mission (Bass, 1985). The ability to perceive and express emotions may be of particular importance when a leader engages in individualized consideration. Leaders who are sensitive to the needs of their followers and can accurately read their followers’ emotions may be more likely to identify areas in which their followers may need development, thereby increasing the effectiveness of the group and organization (e.g., George, 2000). Emotionally intelligent individuals tend to be aware of their emotions and the impact that their emotions have on others (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Leaders who are self-aware tend to possess heightened levels of interpersonal control (Sosik & Megerian, 1999) and may be more empathetic toward followers’ needs (Mayer & Geher, 1996; Sosik & Megerian, 1999). Individuals who can accurately read other people’s emotions tend to be more effective at interpersonal interactions with co-workers (Mayer et al., 2000b). Research suggests that leader emotional expression tends to have an impact on both follower affect and perceptions of leader effectiveness (Lewis, 2000). When CEOs displayed an active negative emotion (i.e., anger) as opposed to passive negative emotion (i.e., sadness) followers tended to have a higher level of nervousness and a lower level of relaxation (Lewis, 2000). Furthermore, leaders who engaged in a neutral emotional tone received higher leader effectiveness ratings from followers than those leaders who displayed anger or sadness (Lewis, 2000).

A leader engages in intellectual stimulation when he / she encourage followers to think critically and to derive innovative solutions for dealing with problems (Bass, 1985). Leader’s who possess the ability to perceive their followers’ emotions will be more effective at understanding how to encourage them to engage in imaginative thinking and creative problem-solving (Megerian & Sosik, 1996). Furthermore, knowing when to encourage creative thinking among followers may be dependent upon the leader’s ability to perceive and appraise emotional information (George, 2000). An effective leader recognizes that particular moods and emotions may hinder creative thought in followers and through perceiving and appraising their followers’ emotions understand when it is appropriate to encourage creative thought in followers (George, 2000). Effective leaders possess the ability to accurately interpret non-verbal cues from their followers in order to determine the needs of the situation (George, 2000). It is
important for leaders to be aware of followers' emotions in order to inspire them to solve problems (Barling et al., 2000; George, 2000). Emotional perception has been found to be associated with performance on a cognitive decision-making task that involved deciding on the order in which employees should be laid off in a hypothetical organization (Day & Carroll, 2002).

Using Emotions to Facilitate Thought

Leaders who engage in idealized influence may use their emotions in order to gain the respect and admiration of followers. Leaders who possess heightened levels of emotional intelligence may facilitate the experience of positive emotions in order to enhance the organization's functioning (George, 2000). In visualizing organizational improvements, leaders may earn the respect and trust of followers (George, 2000). Leaders who accurately appraise emotions may be more effective at utilizing emotional information to make decisions about how to gain the respect of their followers (George, 2000). Leaders use emotional content in stories and myths in order to communicate their values and beliefs to followers (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995).

In order for leaders to inspire and motivate their followers, they may utilize emotions to enhance the cognitive processing of events or issues that pose a threat to the organization (George, 2000; Sosik & Megerian, 1999). In turn, this enhanced cognitive processing may result in the leader having a clearer vision of the organization's future (George, 2000). Using this emotional information a leader may be able to successfully promote this vision to followers (George, 2000; Megerian & Sosik, 1996). Emotional information may be used by leaders to determine future courses of action (George, 2000). Furthermore, leaders use their emotions to promote a sense of optimism and enthusiasm among followers (Bass, 1985).

A leader displays individualized consideration when he / she acts as a mentor and supports followers. Effective leaders may use their emotions in order to promote the experience of positive emotions among their followers (George, 2000). Individuals with enhanced emotional integration skills possess the ability to use emotions to promote critical
thinking (Mayer et al., 2000d). Thus, leaders who are skilled at using their emotions may be more effective at intellectually stimulating their followers. In addition, leaders may use their emotions to direct their attention and their followers’ attention to the problems that need resolving and use them to prioritize tasks (George, 2000).

**Understanding and Reasoning with Emotions**

Understanding and analyzing emotional knowledge is important for leader’s instilling idealized influence or a sense of trust and reverence in followers (Barling et al., 2000; George, 2000). Followers may perceive leaders who are adept at understanding their own and others’ emotions as role models (Barling et al., 2000). Effective leaders possess the ability to understand emotional information and can use this information to elicit positive emotions in followers. In turn, followers may be more likely to identify with the leader’s moral and ethical values (George, 2000).

Leaders who possess the ability to understand followers’ needs and expectations may have an advantage in terms of inspiring and motivating followers (Barling et al., 2000). It is important for leaders to understand their followers’ emotions in order to inspire them to solve problems (George, 2000). Furthermore, the more skilled at understanding the influence that the leader’s emotions can have on followers in problem situations the more likely the leader is too successfully inspire followers to overcome challenges and organizational issues (George, 2000). High emotional understanding individuals possess the ability to anticipate how others will respond in different situations (Mayer et al., 2000b). Accurate appraisal of followers’ emotions and understanding why followers feel different emotions in different situations may result in the leader successfully conveying a sense of the organization’s vision to followers (George, 2000).

Individualized consideration emphasizes focusing on follower needs and developmental goals (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Emotionally intelligent individuals possess the ability to be empathetic and to manage interpersonal relationships, thus it is expected that leaders with heightened levels of emotional intelligence would be successful transformational leaders.
(Mayer et al., 2000c). Bass (1990) suggested that transformational leaders possess the ability to understand and interact with their followers, and can accurately recognize their followers' needs by being empathetic. Bass (1998) indicated that those individuals with heightened levels of individualized consideration tended to have positive relationships with co-workers, subordinates, and clients, and had expressed an interest in helping others and encouraging others to discuss their problems.

A high emotional understanding leader possesses the ability to understand followers' emotions and to interact with followers in order to achieve their desired goals (Barling et al., 2000; George, 2000). A leader's ability to understand the impact that his / her behaviour can have on the emotions of his followers, and the ability to understand that certain situations may elicit particular emotional responses, would be important in situations in which the leader was providing feedback to followers. When a leader possess the ability to understand the emotions of their followers, he / she may be more likely to take care when providing criticism (Megerian & Sosik, 1996). Effective leaders possess the ability to distinguish between emotions that are genuine and those that are not genuine, and to distinguish between real emotions and expressed emotions (George, 2000). That is, understanding that followers may not express their true feelings in certain situations in order to appear socially appropriate is important for effective leadership (George, 2000). In order to communicate with followers despite obstacles a leader must understand their follower's emotions and the impact that their emotions will have on their followers' well-being (Megerian & Sosik, 1996). High emotional understanding leaders may also be more effective at intellectually stimulating their followers. Effective leader problem solving involves understanding people and social systems (Marshall-Meis, Fleishman, Martin, Zaccaro, Baughman, & McGee, 2000; Zaccaro, Mumford, Connelly, Marks, & Gilbert, 2000). Leaders who understand their own emotions and the emotions of their followers may be more skilled at solving problems and encouraging their followers to engage in problem-solving activities (George, 2000).

**Managing / Regulating Emotions**

A leader who possesses the ability to manage his / her emotions may be more likely to
exercise self-control in problem situations thus earning the respect and trust of followers (e.g., Barling et al., 2000; Megerian & Sosik, 1996). High emotional management leaders possess the ability to adapt their behaviour to match their followers’ emotional needs in order to gain the admiration and respect of their followers (George, 2000). Transformational leaders are said to engage in self-sacrificial behaviours in order to benefit the group and / or organization (Bass, 1985). Leaders who possess the ability to manage / regulate their emotions may be more apt to engage in self-sacrifice (Megerian & Sosik, 1996). A leader who displays self-discipline and self-control may be more likely to delay gratification and be more committed to his / her morals and values (Megerian & Sosik, 1996). Sosik and Dworakivsky (1998) found that ratings provided by subordinates on leaders’ level of self-monitoring ability or ability to manage / regulate emotions were positively related to charismatic leadership behaviours. Leaders who can manage emotions in others may be successful at instilling motivation and enthusiasm in followers (George, 2000). Emotionally intelligent individuals tend to manage emotions in oneself and others by regulating the expression of negative emotions and enhancing the expression of positive emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Leaders’ moods and emotions at work can have an impact on their followers. For example, George and Bettenhausen (1990) found that leaders’ positive mood was positively associated with groups’ prosocial behaviour and negatively associated with groups’ turnover rate. Furthermore, George (1995) found that followers who were led by sales managers who experienced positive moods tended to provide higher quality customer service than those followers who were led by sales managers who did not experience positive moods at work.

High emotional management leaders may be more likely to manage negative emotions in order to express positive emotions to their followers that will promote a sense of enthusiasm and optimism in a stressful situation (e.g., Goleman, 1995; Megerian & Sosik, 1996). Effective leaders tend to engage in behaviours that result in their followers viewing them as self-confident and effective (House, 1995; Sosik & Dworakivsky, 1998). A leader who understands the impact that his / her emotions can have on behaviour would take action to modify their behaviour in order to portray a confident image. Leaders may engage in emotional self-
regulation in order to regulate the feelings of their followers (Sosik & Dworakivsky, 1998). By successfully managing interpersonal relationships a leader may also be able to promote a collective effort among followers (Megerian & Sosik, 1996).

A leader who cannot successfully manage his / her emotions in complex situations may have difficulty focusing on the needs of followers (Megerian & Sosik, 1996). Leaders who are able to regulate their own emotions in order to attend to the needs of their followers may be viewed as more effective (George, 2000). For example, an effective leader would be able to detach themselves from the experience of negative emotions in order to support the needs of followers. Effective leaders possess the ability to successfully interact with their followers (Bass, 1990) and tend to be skilled at relationship management (Megerian & Sosik, 1996). Warech and Smither (1998) found that leaders ability to monitor / regulate their emotions was positively associated with ratings of interpersonal effectiveness. High emotional management individuals also possess the ability to resolve conflict situations (Mayer et al., 2000b).

Intellectual stimulation involves questioning the status quo and developing new approaches to dealing with problem situations (e.g., Bass, 1998). Leaders who possess the ability to control their moods / emotions or express positive moods may be more likely to engage in creative and innovative thinking and to encourage this type of thinking among their followers (Isen, Daubman, & Nowicki, 1987). That is, by managing their emotions in order to promote the experience of positive moods / emotions, leaders may be more successful at engaging in innovative thought and problem solving (George, 2000; Sosik & Megerian, 1999). Leaders who possess enhanced emotional intelligence may be more adept at repairing their moods / emotions in order to engage in creative thought to improve organizational functioning (George, 2000). Furthermore, an effective leader possesses knowledge of the impact of their moods / emotions on their behaviour, and can modify their emotions to fit the needs of the situation (George, 2000).

A high emotional management leader may be more effective at intellectually stimulating followers as a result of utilizing positive emotions to promote enthusiasm and creativity among followers (Megerian & Sosik, 1996). Ciarrochi et al. (2000) found that individuals who scored
highly on an ability-based emotional intelligence tended to retrieve positive moods when they were in both a positive and negative mood. Individuals who are in positive moods tend to provide more favourable evaluations, remember positive information, and provide more help to others (George, 1991).

**Emotional intelligence and Conflict management**

Conflict is a pervasive phenomenon that permeates a multitude of organizational processes and outcomes. Its omnipresence and the importance of conflict management has been acknowledged in diverse fields including psychology, communication, organizational behavior, information systems (IS), and marketing (e.g., Deutsch 1990; Greenhalgh 1987; Pondy 1967; Pruitt and Rubin 1986; Putnam and Poole 1987; Robey et al. 1989; Thomas 1976, 1992b; Wall and Callister 1995). Numerous symptoms of conflict have been identified including hostility and jealousy (e.g., Smith and McKeen 1992), poor communication (e.g., Franz and Robey 1984), a proliferation of technical rules, norms, and regulations (e.g., Franz and Robey 1984), and frustration and low morale (e.g., Glasser 1981). As Smith and McKeen noted:

"...conflict is a very real part of corporate life and a major obstacle to effective computerization... conflict appears between IS and almost all other departments in a wide variety of contexts...Lack of trust and understanding, hostility, and frustration with the other group are typical of these conflict relationships and these symptoms were evident between business managers and other personnel (p. 55)."

Research into behavior in organizations can be divided into two categories: normative and descriptive. This dual perspective is most apparent in approaches to the issues of conflict and conflict management in organizations. Normative approaches reflect attitudes and beliefs which identify all conflicts as destructive and promote conflict-eliminate as the formula for organizational success. Descriptive approaches accept conflict as inevitable and consider its proper management the primary responsibility of all administrators. Conflict is a natural disagreement resulting from individuals or groups that differ in attitudes, beliefs, values or needs. It can also originate from past rivalries and personality differences. Other causes of
conflict include trying to negotiate before the timing is right or before needed information is available.

Literature indicates that cooperative styles (problem solving, accommodating and compromising) are positively associated with constructive conflict management and with individual and organizational outcomes (Rahim and Magner, 1995) and show substantial concern for the other party. Among the three, problem solving style is generally perceived as the most appropriate, wh most effective, and highly competent style in managing conflicts (Gross and Guerrero, 2000; Papa and Canary, 1995). Based on their empirical study, Weider-Hatfield and Hatfield (1995) found problem-solving positively related to interpersonal outcomes. Burke (1970) suggested that, in general, problem solving style was related to the effective management of conflict, while asserting and avoiding were related to the infective management of conflict. Lawrence and Lorsch(1967) indicated that a confrontation style dealing with intergroup conflict was used to a significantly greater degree in higher than lower performing organizations.

Scholars believe that an individual’s EI influences one’s way of handling interpersonal conflict. Individuals with high EI may be more effective in resolving conflict than those with low EI (Goleman, 1998; Mayer et al., 1997). Likewise, Jordon and Troth’s (2002) study showed that individuals with high EI prefer to seek cooperative solutions when confronted with conflict. Goleman (1998) suggests that emotionally intelligent employees are better able to negotiate and effectively handle their conflicts with organizational members.

As discussed above, a growing number of scholars suggest that emotional intelligence (EI) plays an important role in managing interpersonal conflicts (e.g., Rahim, 2001). However, there is little or no empirical data on relationships between EI and handling interpersonal conflicts conducted in an Indian organizational context. To fill the gap, the present study seeks to explore the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and conflict management styles as conceptualized by Kilmann and Thomas (1977), Putnam and Wilson (1982) and Rahim (1983). It is expected that the present study will help to generate knowledge on EI to improve conflict management in the Indian context.
Conflict Management and Gender Differences

Gender is one of the individual variables that have received much attention in conflict research (Gayle, Preiss & Allen, 1994; Walters, Stuhlmacher & Meyer, 1998) for its potential moderating effect. Some researchers are attracted to this area of research in response to the fact that "skepticism surrounding women's ability to adopt managerial roles and responsibilities has prevailed since the advent of women within the corporate hierarchy" (Portello & Long, 1994). The researchers have explored and exploded the traditional view, along with impediment to women's progress through the managerial ranks, that women are not "as good as men" at handling conflict or at negotiating. Other researchers, taking to heart either traditional cultural stereotypes or the theories of cultural feminists, have sought to explore whether women really do speak in "a different voice" than men when negotiating or handling conflict (Korabik, Baril, & Watson, 1993).

Gender has been the focus in many aspects of communication. Scholars have disagreed about what differences exist and to what degree they exist between male and female managers concerning preferred conflict resolution style. Some scholars do not believe that gender significantly impacts communication strategies at all (Conrad, 1991; Korabik, Baril, & Watson, 1993). Korabik et al (1993) found that women managers do not differ from male manager in preferred conflict resolution style, but they do differ from their non-managerial counterparts (Korabik, Baril, & Watson, 1993). The situation demands investigation into the contradictory views to expose reality.

The contemporary view of conflict is that it can be a positive force in organizations if it is managed properly (Jameson, 1999; Pelled, Eisenhardt & Xin, 1999; Rahim, 2001, 2002; Rahim, Manger & Shapiri, 2000; Wall & Callister, 1995). As a positive force conflict can help maintain an optimum level of stimulation and activation among organizational members, can contribute to an organization's adaptive and innovative capabilities, and can serve as a basic source of feedback regarding critical relationships, the distribution of power, and the problems that require management attention (Miles, 1980). Conflict management styles have been and continue to be measured by a variety of different taxonomies. One of the first conceptual
schemes for classifying conflict revolved around a simple cooperation-competition dichotomy (Deutsch, 1949). While numerous researchers proposed revision of this framework, Rahim and Bonoma's (1979) conceptualized has been one of the most popular. They differentiate the styles of resolving interpersonal conflict on two basic dimensions: concern of self and concern for others. The first dimension explains the degree to which an individual tries to satisfy the needs or concerns of others.

Combining the two dimensions mentioned above results in five specific styles of conflict management i.e. integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding and compromising. Integrating is characterized by both high concerns for self and for others, while an avoiding style is associated with both low concerns for self and for others. An obliging style involves low concern for self and high concern for others; conversely a dominating style is characterized by high concern for self and low concern for others. Compromising is associated with intermediate concern for both self and others. It has been argued that individuals select among three or four styles (Pruitt, 1983; Putnam & Wilson, 1982), but evidence from confirmatory factor analysis suggests that the five factor model has a better fit with data than models of two, three and four styles (Rahim & Magner, 1994, 1995). Shockley & Morley (1984) assessed male-female preferences for conflict styles using 61 university students (20 males and 42 females) and 100 employed adults (28 males, 72 females). They completed a conflict mode instrument developed by K. Thomas and R.H. Kilman (1974) measuring preference for competing, collaborating, compromising avoiding, and accommodating conflict styles. Results show significant differences between males and females for competitive and compromising conflict styles.

Duane (1989) compared the extent to which 63 men and 7 women used 5 method of conflict management in resolving 1st step grievances of employees. Women were less inclined to avoid grievances related issues, tended to be more competitive, and were less willing to accommodate their opponents demands compared with men. However, Shockley & Morley did not seem to differ significantly in their use of collaborative or compromising modes of conflict management. Nelson & Lubin (1991) explore how legislators share power by administering the Conflict Mode Instrument by R. H. Kilman and K.W..Thomas to 49 Democratic and 49 Republic
Legislators (87 males and 11 females). No political party differences were found, but females were significantly higher on the Conflict Mode Instrument Accommodating subscale.

Therefore we conclude that conflict is an unavoidable component of human activity. Organizations are confronted with both internal & external sources of conflict. Internally, the conflict can range from disagreement over workloads to large union disputes. Whether the source of conflict is internal or external, it is important for manager, as the application of ineffective conflict strategies or styles can result in high stress, high turnover rates and litigations that can ultimately undermine the overall health of organization (Hirschman, 2001; McKenzie, 2002. The purpose of this research was to investigate gender differences in conflict management styles in work setting as well as to identify the primary and secondary conflict management styles of men and women.

The study shows that there is no significant difference between men and women in handling of interpersonal conflicts. However, the women apparently excelled than men in terms of mean scores on obliging and compromising, whereas on the other hand the men have apparently higher mean scores on integrating and avoiding styles of conflict management as compared to women. The most preferred style for men managers is integrating and the least preferred is that of dominating. Whereas in case of women the most preferred style or the primary style is that of integrating as similar to men, but as far as the secondary style is concerned the women have avoiding style of conflict management, Gire (1993) obtained the similar findings showing a greater preference for neither negotiations nor collaboration. Duane (1989) also reported that gender did not seem to differ significantly in their use of collaborative or compromising modes of conflict management.

In the integrating style of conflict management it involves the high assertiveness and high cooperativeness, i.e. high concern for self as well as other party involved in conflict, that is why it is more used. Where as in the case of dominating, there is high concern for self and low concern for the other party involved. Cetin and Hacifazlioglu (2004) found that however gender play significant role in determining the conflict management style and female try to be less offensive towards their colleagues whereas, male convey a more flexible and tolerant attitude.
Feminine group scored higher than masculine for avoiding, and the masculine group was found to be significantly higher on dominating.

Conflict management styles and job performance

Organizational scholars have different perspectives about the relationship between conflict and organizational performance. Some scholars have contended that organizational conflict tended to hinder organizational performance and therefore should be avoided (Merton, 1949; Dyck et al., 1996; Robbins, 1991). Other scholars have regarded conflict as functional to organizations if it is managed properly (Jehn, 1995, 1997). They argue that conflict has an important role in optimizing organizational performance through developing “critical evaluation which decreases the groupthink phenomenon by increasing thoughtful consideration of criticism and alternative solutions” (Jehn, 1995, p. 260). To make conflict more productive, Jordan and Troth (2002) further suggest that the style used to handle interpersonal conflict is a crucial factor in successful conflict resolution.

The integrating style of conflict management improves job performance when the solution to a conflict would benefit both parties. Both conflicting parties are encouraged to satisfy their interests through exchanging information (Meyer, 2004). Satisfaction from resolving conflicts may lead individuals to exert greater efforts in achieving performance. For example, Weider-Hatfield and Hatfield (1995) found that the integrating style had a strong association with job satisfaction and job performance. However, that study did not provide any clear link between integrating style and job performance so that it lacked of theoretical and practical explanations. Rahim et al. (2001) also demonstrated that problem solving measured in terms of using more integrating style and less avoiding style, had a positive effect on the job performance.

Although no empirical studies have presented the connection between compromising style and job performance, many studies have found that employees prefer to use the compromising style in resolving conflict (e.g. Lee, 2003; Trubisky et al., 1991). Kim et al. (2007) compared three different groups in term of conflict management styles at the workplace and
found that the compromising style was used often when conflicts existed between employees and supervisors. The compromising style may produce beneficial results due to the fact that this style helps conflicting people quickly find solutions and provide benefits to both sides through concessions (Hocker and Wilmot, 1998; Gross and Guerrero, 2000; Rahim, 2002). Quick and acceptable solutions resulting from using the compromising style may simulate individuals to exert greater effort in achieving performance. Based on those arguments, we propose that both the integrating and compromising styles of conflict resolution will be positively related to job performance. It is generally accepted that the workplace is changing rapidly and that organizations need to adapt management practices to accommodate the increasing pace and growing diversity of their global environments.

Conflict in cooperative and competitive context

In addition to obscuring the reality that people with completely compatible goals not only can but often do have conflict, conflict as opposing interests is confounded with competition defined as incompatible goals. This confounding makes it unclear whether effects theorized or found are due to conflict or to competition.

The irony is that the literature has had an un-confounded definition of conflict for several decades. Morton Deutsch’s (1973) theory of cooperation and competition indicated that defining conflict as opposing interests is fundamentally flawed. Although Deutsch is one of the most prominent conflict researchers (e.g., the first recipient of the International Association for Conflict Management’s Life-Time Achievement Award), the implications for his definition of conflict have been largely missed. There does not appear to have been enough direct, open conflict about definitions to generate questioning of traditional definitions and developing more effective ones!

Deutsch defined conflict as incompatible activities; one person’s actions interfere, obstruct or in some way get in the way of another’s action. Incompatible activities occur in both cooperative and competitive contexts. Whether the protagonists believe their goals are cooperative or competitive very much affects their expectations, interaction, and outcomes.
How they negotiate their conflict in turn affects the extent to which they believe they have cooperative or competitive goals with each other. A great deal of evidence from various researchers underlines that cooperative conflict captures many benefits of conflict and is the basis for constructive conflict management whereas assuming goals are incompatible interferences. Previous articles have summarized our own studies (Tjosvold, 1991; Tjosvold et al., forthcoming). This section briefly notes how research studies document that cooperatively managed conflict very much contributes to productive teamwork, including top management teams, and leadership.

Cooperative conflict discussions helped Hong Kong accountants and managers dig into and resolve budget issues, strengthen their relationships, and improve budget quality so that limited financial resources were used wisely (Poon et al., 2001). Over 100 teams working in Chinese organizations who discussed issues cooperatively and openly were able to deal with biases and took risks effectively (Tjosvold and Yu, forthcoming). According to their managers, these risk-taking groups were able both to innovate and to recover from their mistakes. Cooperative conflict management can very much contribute to effective top management teams. Executives from 105 high technology firms around Beijing who indicated that they relied on cooperative rather than competitive or and avoiding conflict were rated by their CEOs as effectiveness and their organizations as innovative (Chen et al., 2005). Cooperative, open conflict helped Hong Kong senior accounting managers effectively lead employees in mainland China (Tjosvold and Moy, 1998) and Chinese employees work with their American and Japanese managers (Chen, Tjosvold and Su, forthcoming). Cooperative, constructive controversy interactions were also found critical for Chinese staff to work productively and developed relationships with Japanese managers, outcomes that in turn built commitment to their Japanese companies (Tjosvold et al., 1998). Cooperative conflict facilitated employees development of effective relationships with their Western managers (Chen, Su and Tjosvold, forthcoming).

More than 200 Chinese employees from various industries indicated that cooperative, but not competitive or independent, goals helped them and their foreign managers develop a
quality leader-member exchange relationship and improve leader effectiveness, employee commitment, and future collaboration (Chen and Tjosvold, forthcoming). Cooperative, open-minded discussion of opposing views appears to be an important aid for overcoming obstacles and developing effective leader relationships within and across cultural boundaries.

Field and experimental studies in North America and Asia provide strong internal and external validity to central hypotheses of cooperative and competitive conflict. Whether protagonists emphasize cooperative or competitive goals drastically affects the dynamics and outcomes of their conflict management. Contrary to traditional theorizing, Chinese participants appear to appreciate others who speak their minds directly and cooperatively.

Making choices in Conflict is often experienced as something that happens to people and that conflict escalation is built into the situation. The kind of conflict has been theorized to be critical. Specifically, value, emotional, and relationship conflicts are thought to result, nearly inevitably, in destructive outcomes. The more frequent and intense the relationship compared to the task conflict, the more negative the effects on group productivity. But the research support for this theorizing is unconvincing (De Dreu and Weingart, 2003).

Conflict does not just happen nor does conflict escalate by itself. People make choices that escalate conflict or lead to more constructive outcomes. They can, for example, manage their angry conflicts effectively or ineffectively (Averill, 1982; Tjosvold and Su, forthcoming). It may be that certain kinds of conflicts are generally more difficult for people to make effective choices, although documenting this idea might prove highly difficult. What counts though are the choices the participants make and the skills they use to implement them? People control conflict; conflict does not control people. Alas, controlling conflict productively is much easier accomplished through the combined efforts of all protagonists.

Critical choices begin with how people understand and frame the conflict. They construct whether they are in conflict, the issues at stake, indeed, and their feelings. They feel angry at another's incompatible action if they believe they have been deliberately and
unjustifiably frustrated, but not if they accept that the other did not intend or was justified in frustrating them (Averill, 1982; Tjosvold and Su, forthcoming).

Impact of leadership on conflicts

While some researchers (Bass and Riggio, 2006) stress the central role leaders can play in conflict management, research on transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership and conflict in situations of organizational change is rather scarce. The few studies that have addressed this issue remain mostly theoretical in nature.

Transformational leadership and conflict

In this section, we expose how the four dimensions associated with transformational leadership can diminish conflict. In general, Bass and Riggio (2006) argue that by emphasizing the organization’s interests over the individual’s own interests, transformational leaders find ways to resolve conflict between subordinates. More specifically, as of 1978, Burns has postulated that, although conflict is inherent to human relationships, a shared vision developed by the transformational leader could contribute to reducing conflict. Moreover, by acting as role models, transformational leaders are able to show how subordinates can gain from cooperating with one another rather than holding rigid positions. Through intellectual stimulation, these leaders can also move employees involved in a conflict situation toward integrative and collaborative solutions, thus transforming the conflict into a mutual problem to be solved (Bass and Riggio, 2006, p. 69). Moreover, some research studies have shown that transformational leadership is linked to higher rates of cohesion and that it strengthens the collective identity of a group of employees (Carless et al., 1995; Shamir et al., 1993). Transformational leaders can also reduce conflict by being sensitive to their subordinates’ needs. This individualized consideration could therefore encourage their employees to respect and understand the position and needs of others and, at times, overcome any rigid positions they may hold (Bass and Riggio, 2006). For their part, Parent and Gallupe (2001) argue that transformational leaders reduce conflict levels among employees involved in a group support system (i.e. an interactive-based tool that helps decision making and task completion in a
Finally, Xin and Pelled (2003) established a negative relationship between emotional conflict and supervisors' emotional support and creativity encouragement, two leadership behaviors that are respectively similar to the inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation dimensions of transformational leadership. More specifically, they found that employees who experience this kind of conflict perceive their leaders as expressing less confidence in achieving goals and encouraging their creativity to a lesser extent.

**Transactional leadership and conflict**

By clarifying certain objectives and rewarding good performance, a transactional leader can maintain positive interactions among his/her subordinates, therefore reducing emotional conflict. Kotlyar and Karakowski (2006) argue that leaders who promote clear rules of conduct and are able to manage subordinates’ expectations in a team could reduce the level of frustration that could emerge from their interactions. These two authors find that the behaviors of transactional leaders are associated with lower levels of affective conflict when compared with transformational leadership. For Bass and Riggio (2006) transactional leaders should reduce conflict because they look for expedient compromises that are rewarding. This search for neutral solutions could often be more satisfactory for both parties and therefore diminish potential conflicts. However, Parent and Gallupe (2001) find that, in a group support system environment, a leader who adopts a management by exception style tends to increase conflict among subordinates.

**Laissez-faire leadership and conflict**

We found a lot less in terms of evidence in the literature respecting the relationship between laissez-faire leadership and conflict. The only study we identified was the one by Bass and Riggio (2006), who propose that laissez-faire leadership could sometimes be a good alternative as it allows conflicts to be resolved by themselves. This positive relationship
between laissez-faire leadership and conflict could nevertheless be viewed in the opposite light, as it could be argued that not intervening in a conflict situation could effectively lead to higher levels of conflict. Indeed, if frustrations, problems or frictions are allowed to pile up, then even minor disagreements may very well degenerate into major conflicts and even expand, involving other individuals. Because it seems that laissez-faire leadership can go both ways on conflict

**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.