2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A careful examination of the conceptual or theoretical dimension of leadership emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational effectiveness constructs indicate that the chosen concepts are relatively broader in nature. Over the decades, they have emerged as few of the most complex and controversial issues in academia and management. Various models and theoretical approaches have been developed by varied researchers to understand and assess these concepts. This chapter thoroughly examines the methodological dimensions of the constructs. Methodological dimensions of the research constructs include, critically analyzing the empirical experiences of other researchers on evaluating the relatedness of leadership emotional intelligence and motivation and critically evaluating the impact of leadership on organizational effectiveness with the help of the existing studies and presenting their contribution to the wider body of knowledge of the research constructs. Thereby, gathering empirical solution to the research problems identified in the current study.

2.1. Emotional Intelligence

2.1.1. History of Emotional Intelligence

The earliest roots of emotional intelligence can be traced to Charles Darwin's work on the importance of emotional expression for survival and, second, adaptation (Bar-On, 2006). In the 1900s, even though traditional definitions of intelligence emphasized cognitive aspects such as memory and problem-solving, several influential researchers in the intelligence field of study had begun to recognize the importance of the non-cognitive aspects. For instance, as early as 1920, E.L. Thorndike used the term social intelligence to describe the skill of understanding and managing other people (Thorndike, 1920).
Similarly, in 1940 David Wechsler described the influence of non-intellective factors on intelligent behavior, and further argued that our models of intelligence would not be complete until we could adequately describe these factors (Bar-On, 2006). In 1983, Howard Gardner's Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences (Gardner, 1983) introduced the idea of multiple intelligences which included both interpersonal intelligence (the capacity to understand the intentions, motivations and desires of other people) and intrapersonal intelligence (the capacity to understand oneself, to appreciate one's feelings, fears and motivations). In Gardner's view, traditional types of intelligence, such as IQ, fail to fully explain cognitive ability (Smith, 2002). Thus, even though the names given to the concept varied, there was a common belief that traditional definitions of intelligence were lacking in ability to fully explain performance outcomes.

The first use of the term "emotional intelligence" is usually attributed to Wayne Payne's doctoral thesis, A Study of Emotion: Developing Emotional Intelligence from 1985. However, prior to this, the term "emotional intelligence" had appeared in Leuner (1966). Greenspan (1989) also put forward an EI model, followed by Salovey and Mayer (1990), and Goleman (1995). The distinction between trait emotional intelligence and ability emotional intelligence was introduced in 2000 (Petrides & Furnham, 2000).

2.1.2. Multiple theories of emotional intelligence

People are often surprised to find that within the emotional intelligence paradigm there exist not one, but several theories (e.g. Bar-on, 2002; Goleman, 1995:1998; Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Each theory has been put forward in an attempt to better understand and explain the skills, traits, and abilities associated with social and emotional intelligence. While some might argue that the goal of research should be to identify and define a singular theoretical framework to be labeled as the “correct” version of emotional intelligence, another approach would be to acknowledge that having
multiple theories can often serve to elucidate additional aspects of complex psychological constructs.

While each theory represents a unique set of constructs that represents the theoretical orientation and context in which each of these authors have decided to frame their theory, all share a common desire to understand and measure the abilities and traits related to recognizing and regulating emotions in ourselves and others (Goleman, 2001). As Ciarrochi, Chan and Caputi, (2000) point out, although definitions within the field of emotional intelligence vary, they tend to be complementary rather than contradictory. All theories within the emotional intelligence paradigm seek to understand how individuals perceive, understand, utilize and manage emotions in an effort to predict and foster personal effectiveness. A critical examination of the Goleman’s mixed model of EI alongside the other two major theories viz. Bar-On (2000) and Mayer and Salovey (1997) has been presented here to better understand the purpose and implications of the Goleman’s most recent model of EI i.e. ESCI which has been adopted in the current research.

2.1.3. Goleman’s Model of Emotional Intelligence

The most recent addition to theory within the emotional intelligence paradigm is the framework of emotional intelligence put forward by Goleman (1998) in his book Working with Emotional Intelligence, and clarified in a later article (Goleman, 2001). This theory represents a framework of emotional intelligence that reflects how an individual’s potential for mastering the skills of Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, and Relationship Management translates into success in the workplace (Goleman, 2001). Goleman’s model of emotional intelligence, then, offers these four major domains. He then postulates that each of these domains becomes the foundation for learned abilities, or competencies, that depend on underlying strength in the relevant EI
domain. The EI domain of Self-Awareness, for example, provides the underlying basis for the learned competency of “Accurate Self-Assessment” of strengths and limitations pertaining to a role such as leadership.

Grounding his theory specifically within the context of work performance separates Goleman’s model from those of Bar-On, and Mayer and Salovey. Where the latter frame their theories as general theories of social and emotional intelligence and emotional intelligence respectively, Goleman’s theory is specific to the domain of work performance. According to the test manuals of both the MSCEIT v2.0 (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002) and the Bar-On EQ-i (Bar-On, 1997), these measures are applicable to a wider range of settings such as clinical assessment, educational settings, in addition to the workplace. Where Bar-On seeks to develop a general measure of social and emotional intelligence predictive of emotional well-being and adaptation, and Mayer and Salovey seek to establish the validity and utility of a new form of intelligence, the model of Goleman seeks to develop a theory of work performance based on social and emotional competencies. This “competency” based approach reflects a tradition that emphasizes the identification of competencies that can be used to predict work performance across a variety of organizational settings, often with an emphasis on those in leadership positions (Boyatzis, 1982; Bray, Campbell, & Grant, 1974; Kotter, 1982; Luthans, Hodgetts, & Rosenkrantz, 1998; McClelland, 1973; McClelland, Baldwin, Bronfenbrenner, & Strodbeck, 1958; Spencer & Spencer, 1993; Thornton & Byham, 1982).

2.1.3.1. Emotional Competency Inventory 2

The most popular measure of Goleman’s theory of emotional competence is the Emotional Competence Inventory 2 (ECI 2). According to the ECI technical manual, “The ECI is a 360-degree tool designed to assess the emotional competencies of individuals and organizations. It is based on emotional competencies identified by Daniel
Goleman in Working with Emotional Intelligence (1998), and on competencies from Hay/McBer’s Generic Competency Dictionary (1996) as well as Richard Boyatzis’s Self-Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ)” (Sala, 2002). Goleman’s theory of emotional competence reflects an extension, refinement, and re-conceptualization of previous research and theory in an effort to better understand complex affective processes in order to predict relevant criterion, in this case work performance. As such, the theory of emotional competence and the instrument designed to measure its constructs (i.e. Emotional Competence Inventory 2) have been refined based on empirical research (Sala, 2002). This model reflects the results of statistical analysis (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 1999; Sala, 2002) intended to gain additional insight into the structure of social and emotional competencies.

2.1.3.2. The Emotional and Social Competency Inventory (ESCI)

Emotional and Social Competency Inventory (ESCI) is the most recent model of EI developed by Daniel Goleman, Richard Boyatzis and Hay Group as a re-conceptualization of ECI 2 with the help of the findings from a pilot study to achieve a higher psychometric standard with the ECI (Boyatzis, 2007). Though the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI 2) and the ECI U (University Version) showed acceptable validity and reliability in a variety of studies, there were some criticism of the approach to conceptualizing and measuring EI in the professional research community. In some studies the competency scales did not appear valid as separate scales and the clusters did not differentiate themselves from each other, hence, there was a need to seek out a higher psychometric standard (Boyatzis, 2007).

The pilot study affirms that the ESCI measures the behaviors that matter: those that contribute to effective performance. The psychometric standards achieved in the statistical analyses provide reassurance that the ESCI focuses on behaviors – and the
relationships between them – that are observable, recognizable and distinct. The removal of developmental levels delivers a behavioral model which can be applied more satisfactorily to a wide range of work contexts, job roles and levels (Boyatzis, 2007).

The new Emotional and Social Competency Inventory (ESCI) contains 12 competencies organized into four clusters same as the ECI 2. However, certain changes have been made to the competency scales in the ECI 2, that are as follows: (1) Emotional Self-Awareness as the result of merging it and Accurate Self-Assessment, (2) Dropping Self-Confidence, Transparency, Service Orientation & Change Catalyst, (3) Achievement Orientation as the result of merging it and Initiative, and (4) Change in the name: Optimism scale to Positive Outlook; Developing Others to Coach and Mentor.

2.1.4. Domains of Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is divided into four domains, two that address how we manage ourselves, and two that determine how we manage relationships. In the area of personal competence, or how we manage ourselves, the domains include self-awareness and self-management (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Goleman, 1995, 1998; Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2002). Self-awareness involves a deep understanding of one’s emotions, strengths, weakness, beliefs and values. Not only does the self-aware person understand her emotions, she also recognizes the impact those emotions have on her thought processes and behaviors.

The second domain within the area of personal competence is self-management. Those who can self-manage or self-regulate can control disruptive emotions and impulses. They are honest, trustworthy and flexible in the face of change. Self-management involves approaching challenges with a positive outlook and a readiness to seize opportunities that these challenges often reveal. While displays of emotion often are associated with the powerful, charismatic leader, research suggests that these behaviors, if
engaged in with any regularity, are never the hallmark of good leadership (Goleman, 1998).

Within the area of social competence, two other domains emerge from Goleman’s work. Social awareness involves being attuned to the thoughts and feelings of those around them. The socially aware individual not only understands, but also can empathize with the perspective of others. The socially aware individual also understands the bigger picture with respect to networks of decision-making and politics at the organizational level. This skill set is crucial toward driving resonance as leaders who have an awareness of what others are thinking and how they are feeling can do and say what is appropriate given the situation (Goleman, Boyatzis & McKee, 2002).

The final social competence domain in Goleman’s model is relationship management. The ability to manage relationships requires a healthy combination of skills included in each of the three other domains. Additionally, the skillful leader motivates others with an exciting vision and persuades followers through a range of tactics while supporting the development of new skills, abilities and improved performance. The ability to manage conflict effectively within the web of relationships also is critical toward moving the organization forward in a positive direction. Research indicates that those with high emotional intelligence have better quality relationships with others who tend to view them as more sensitive and competent as compared to individuals with lower skills and abilities (Brackett, Warner & Bosco, 2005). Even when controls are placed upon the traditional personality variables and intelligence outcomes, significant relationships continue to exist between emotional intelligence and the other variables measured (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2008). Better relationships in the workplace also result with leaders who possess higher levels of emotional intelligence. Other-rater assessment of leaders shows that those with higher emotional intelligence demonstrate
greater integrity, more productive relationships, and a higher frequency of behaviors that support the goals of the organization (Cote & Miners, 2006; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005).

2.1.5. Critiquing the Emotional Intelligence Construct

Although, emotional intelligence has grown exponentially in terms of its popularity, it has been criticized as lacking empirical validity (Davies et al., 1998). Of late, management science scholars have taken a more serious academic interest in the emotional intelligence construct (Dasborough & Shkanasy, 2002). Conte (2005) notes that, interest in EI has increased greatly over the last decade. In reviewing psychometric properties of EI measures and reflecting on the low relationships between different measures, he contends that one is left with serious questions as to whether they are indeed measuring the same construct. Validity evidence for EI measures are also lagging behind reliability evidence. Content validity is also lacking due to the vague theoretical development underpinning many of the measures. Construct validity evidence, namely convergent and discriminant validity, is lacking since “EI measures have failed to converge on a common construct”. Self-report measures seem to assess existing personality characteristics or even emotional competencies, but not intelligence.

Despite the differences in the theory and measurement, EI is the buzzing phenomena in management, academia and organizations. Growing research in the area of EI has constantly and consistently supported the fundamentals of all the theories i.e. recognizing and regulating emotions in ourselves and others (Goleman, 2001) for the personal and organizational effectiveness. However, Goleman’s model (1998) of work performance was an appropriate choice for the current study as the aim is to evaluate organizational effectiveness using leaders EI as the predictor variable, since EI has proven predictive value with wide range of leadership and organizational outcomes
(Goleman, 1995; 1998; 2001; Haygroup, 2005). Hence, the most recent measure of Goleman’s model of EI namely ESCI is obtained and applied in the current study.

The following sections review the extant literature on the links between the research constructs of the study namely leadership emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational effectiveness. The latter sections of this chapter review the literature on the influence of demographic or extraneous variables on EI, motivation and OE and a rationale for the study is drawn.

2.2. Leadership and Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence has been recognized as a key determinant to leadership and/or managerial success in today’s high stress environment both in life and at work. The available research conducted on the subject shows that people with high emotional intelligence are happier, healthier and more effective on the job. This is because they have an awareness of their feelings and are able to strike a balance between reason and emotions, which makes them good leaders and team players. Leadership or managerial effectiveness on the other hand is defined as achieving the organizational goals and objectives effectively.

Goleman asserts “it is the level of a leaders understanding of the powerful role emotions play in the workplace that separates the best leaders from the rest. The higher one goes in an organization, technical skills and cognitive ability become less important while emotional intelligence becomes increasingly so. It is competence in emotional intelligence that distinguishes top performers in leadership (Goleman, 1998). Leaders that demonstrate more emotional intelligence than their peers outperform and advance quicker in their careers (Bar-On & Parker, 2000; Higgs & Rowland, 2002).

George (2000; 2006) deems not only are feelings an integral part of leadership, it is the multiplicity of mood and emotion that influences leadership effectiveness. He
asserts there are five critical elements to effective leadership: Development of collective goals and objectives; instilling in others an appreciation of the importance of work activities; generating and maintaining enthusiasm, confidence, optimism, cooperation, and trust; encouraging flexibility in decision making and change; and establishing and maintaining a meaningful identity for an organization.

A review of some of the key studies that have established links between leadership effectiveness and EI have been discussed here.

Singh (2006) explored the nature of management practices existing in the organizations managed by Indian, Japanese, American and European managerial system. The correlation analysis has revealed that there is positive relationship between emotional intelligence and managerial effectiveness. For instance, the managers high on emotional intelligence would generally be high on managerial effectiveness and vice-versa.

Higgs (2003) studied possible linkages between emotional intelligence and leadership by developing a framework to uncover a potential relationship between the concepts of both. Regression analysis showed a relationship with elements of emotional intelligence and leadership and that leadership is the amalgamation of personal characteristics and areas of competence (Mayer & Caruso, 2002). This was supported in a study by Chen (2008) on a sample of 194 professors from universities in Taiwan, who examined the relationship of personal traits (thought, emotions, and behavior) and leadership style to innovative operations. Factor analysis and correlation analysis revealed that leadership style has a significant relationship to innovative operations. In addition, personal traits have a considerable positive relationship to innovative operations.

Rahim and Psenicka (2005) investigated the relationships of two components of emotional intelligence, empathy and social skills, to leader effectiveness. Results indicate that empathy was a mediator of the relationship between social skills and leader
effectiveness in the United States. In order to improve their own effectiveness, managers must develop, use, and improve upon their social skills and empathy as a leader in the organization.

Cavallo and Brienza (2002) conducted a study with 358 managers across the Johnson & Johnson Consumer and Personal Care Group to determine whether leadership competencies distinguished high- from average performance and also high- and average-potential. Based on the 360-degree feedback on the ECI, high-performance managers were rated significantly higher than average performing Managers.

Similarly, an analysis of more than 300 top-level executives from fifteen global companies showed that six emotional competencies distinguished stars from the average: Influence, Team Leadership, Organizational Awareness, self-confidence, Achievement Drive, and Leadership (Spencer and Spencer, 1993). Competency research in over 200 companies and organizations worldwide suggests that about one-third of this difference is due to technical skill and cognitive ability while two-thirds is due to emotional competence (Goleman, 1998). In top leadership positions, over four-fifths of the difference is due to emotional competence. Yukl (1998) contends that leaders’ behaviour is frequently evaluated in terms of its consequences for their followers. Transformational leader’s help followers look at old problems in new ways and can excite, arouse and inspire followers to walk the extra mile in pursuit of success (Robbins, 2001).

Vrab (2007) rated 60 front line managers at a South African insurance company, examining the relationship between emotional intelligence skills and leadership behavior. Correlation analysis revealed a significant relationship between emotional intelligence skills and all the outcomes of leadership. More specifically, a significant positive relationship exists between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. He
posits that individuals with strong emotional intelligence skills assert higher levels of transformational leadership proficiency, consequently leading to higher performance.

A number of studies such as Barbuto and Burbach (2006) tested the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership, and found evidence consistent with previous studies that demonstrated positive considerable relationships between the two (Yukl, 1998; Barling et al., 2000; Leban & Zulauf, 2004). George (2000) also supports the notion that transformational leadership is essentially based on emotional processes.

Sosik and Megerian (1999) found four junctions between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership, and suggest these components are necessary both to create and to maintain strong emotional relationships with followers: Adherence to professional standards of behavior and interaction, which relates to idealized influence or charisma; Motivation, which is related to the inspirational motivation component of transformational leadership; Intellectual stimulation; and, Individual focus on others, which is related to individualized attention. He further extends the literature by examining the relationships among emotional quotient (EQ), transformational leadership, and managerial performance. Results of the study imply that self-awareness may offer individuals greater perceived control over interpersonal experiences and outcomes in their life. In addition, the study reports that transformational leaders who are self-aware benefit from high levels of self-efficacy and self confidence, and also provide clear direction for followers.

Leadership increasingly features in team contexts since teams have taken on heightened importance in more recent times. The challenge for managers is therefore how to become effective team leaders. Prat et al. (as cited by Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005) argues that EI skills are critical to effective team leadership and its outcomes. Leaders,
example, need to acquire skills such as trusting others, giving up authority, the patience to share information together with knowledge on when to intervene (Pirola-Merlo, Härtel, Mann & Hirst, 2002). Leaders need to be sensitive to the cultural preferences and taboos in working with divergent followers. Change-centered leadership relates to leaders who are involved in organizational renewal, increased organizational efficiency, growth and the continued survival of the organization. They initiate new projects, create new ideas and ways of doing things, are willing to take risks and are future orientated (Ekvall & Arvonen, 1991; Robbins, 2001).

In contrast, Brown, Bryant and Reilly (2006) examined the probability of relationships between emotional intelligence, leadership, and desired outcomes using Bar-On’s (1997) emotional quotient inventory. Although results of the study confirmed previous studies of transformational leadership predicting organizational outcomes (Avolio & Bass, 1997), there was no evidence to support the relationship between emotional intelligence and desired outcomes nor was there evidence to support a relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. The authors make clear it is impossible to explain the precise reason for dissimilar outcomes to previous studies noted, however, they do attribute methodological differences as a possibility.

Leaders frequently use emotions to influence the affective states of others, a significant part of charisma when considering organizational leaders (Kelly & Barsade, 2001). The emotional component of leadership requires the ability to perceive emotions, facilitate emotions in thought, and understand and manage emotions. Leaders possessing these abilities are considered emotionally intelligent (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Ciarrochi et al. (2000) connected coping with emotional intelligence arguing that the ability to cope with aversive affect and stressful situations is related to one's ability to manage emotions.
However, there is no recipe of competencies that works in every situation. “The same competencies can make people excel in different jobs” (Goleman, 1998). Additionally, “The competencies one needs for success may change as one rises through the ranks; in most large organizations, senior executives need a greater degree of political awareness than middle managers. Specific positions require specific skills. For the best nurses, it’s a sense of humor; for bankers, respecting customers’ confidentiality,” and so forth.

Emotional intelligence is necessary for measuring, selecting and developing managers (Cherniss, 2001). It is assumed that the rudiments of emotional intelligence are among the important attributes required for effective leaders (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2003) and the extant studies reveal that, EI is related to actual leadership performance (Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005).

2.3. Leadership and Motivation

According to Butkus and Green (1999), motivation is derived from the word “motivate”, means to move, push or influence to proceed for fulfilling a want. It is an internal strength that drives individuals to pull off personal and organizational goals. Motivation is a powerful tool in the work environment that can lead to employees working at their most efficient levels of production (Steinmetz, 1983). Most motivation theorists assume that motivation is involved in the performance of all learned responses; that is, a learned behavior will not occur unless it is energized (Lusier & Achua, 2010).

According to Adair (2006), “fifty per cent of motivation comes from within a person and 50 per cent from his or her environment, especially from the leadership encountered there.” It is more to identify that a substantial part of the motivation is within the person and on the other hand, a substantial part is beyond the person’s control. Motivation is what occurs internally in individual in terms of wanting to do something and also, what occurs externally as the individual is being influenced by others or by
circumstances. Employees are motivated intrinsically as well as extrinsically. Intrinsic motivation is crucial when tacit knowledge in and between teams must be transferred. Organizational forms enable different kinds of motivation and have different capacities to generate and transfer tacit knowledge (Osterloh & Frey, 2000).

According to the findings of Howard and Wilson (1982), there is also some evidence that leaders must have a desire to lead. In order to be effective, a person must want to lead. Even if an individual has the talent and training to lead but no motivation to work for a leadership position, success is unlikely. Sometimes a desire for popularity or a wish to avoid stress and responsibility cause an individual to seek non-leadership roles (Howard & Wilson, 1982). Brooks (2008) states that 'entrepreneurs and emergent leaders develop passions for ideas, ideals, or tasks that give them the enthusiasm to "go for it" even when others criticize, object, resist, or ignore an opportunity or threat. A self-starter takes the initiative and the risk to transform their ideas or ideals into results that benefit others. All leaders have to rely upon their own instincts and establish an environment that motivates others; sometimes in lonely and uncertain conditions. They must influence others to motivate themselves who, in turn may become leaders in their own right’.

Motivation is a powerful tool in the work environment that can lead to employees working at their most efficient levels of production (Steinmetz, 1983). Leadership is about getting things done the right way, influencing people to follow the leader, creating trust in the organization and motivating the organizational team members. Theories imply that leader and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation (Rukhmani, 2010). Motivation is purely and simply a leadership behavior. It stems from wanting to do what is right for people as well as for the organization. Leadership and motivation are active processes. According to Bass (1998), transformational leaders – in his view a superior form of leadership - inspire their followers to achieve a vision since
members are highly motivated and committed to the leader. Both motivation and inspiration stem from the leader’s displayed confidence and enthusiasm together with his sensitivity to member needs.

Leaders need to be self-aware of how their actions are perceived by those they manage (Moment, 2007). Employees will sometimes mirror the behavior of managers. Aghdaei talks about the philosophy of “Shadow of a Leader”, where the leader demonstrates the wanted behavior. Leaders should model hard work for employees (Weiss, 2000), when they repeatedly demonstrate meaningful, positive behavior, people are motivated to follow.

An analysis of leadership traits identified six core characteristics that the majority of effective leaders possess: Drive - Leaders are ambitious and take initiative; Motivation - Leaders want to lead and are willing to take charge; Honesty and integrity - Leaders are truthful and do what they say they will do; Self-confidence - Leaders are assertive and decisive and enjoy taking risks. They admit mistakes and foster trust and commitment to a vision. Leaders are emotionally stable rather than recklessly adventurous; Cognitive ability - Leaders are intelligent, perceptive, and conceptually skilled, but are not necessarily geniuses. They show analytical ability, good judgment, and the capacity to think strategically; and, Business knowledge - Leaders tend to have technical expertise in their businesses (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991).

Researchers report that people stay if they are satisfied with their jobs and are committed to their organizations and leave if they are not satisfied. Satisfaction with one’s boss is an important part of job satisfaction. Poor leaders drive employees to quit. Thus, job dissatisfaction progresses into employee turnover. Unmotivated employees are usually not satisfied with their jobs. A survey found that 77 percent of workers in America are not satisfied with their jobs. Many employees do enough work to get by, but
they are not satisfied with their jobs and they don’t try to excel at their jobs (Lussier & Achua, 2010).

A number of studies in the area of leadership and motivation have focused on the impact of leader behavior on follower motivation, while there are very few studies that have tested the influence of leader’s motivation on follower motivation. Wieseke et al. (2011) developed and tested a multilevel framework for the motivation spillover principle, which holds that the three components of Vroom’s motivation theory transfer from managers to customer service representatives (CSRs). The authors applied this framework to the context of service technology adoption and tested it with a matched multilevel sample of 387 service unit managers, 1,018 CSRs, and objective company records. The results support the notion of a motivation spillover from managers to CSRs, which exists incrementally beyond the direct effect of manager’s adoption behavior on CSR’s adoption. However, not all motivation components transfer unconditionally but are contingent on charismatic leadership and manager-CSR similarity - a finding that implies for researchers that an undifferentiated view of motivation in multilevel settings might not suffice. For organizations, the findings suggest that managers are important multipliers of motivation and thus organizations should direct their motivation efforts toward middle-level managers, as they might turn into serious roadblocks to CSR motivation.

Barbuto, Fritz and Marx (2002) in their field examination of two measures of work motivation tested the Motivation Sources Inventory (Barbuto & Scholl, 1998) and the Job Choice Decision-Making Exercise (Harrell & Stahl, 1981) as predictors of leaders' influence tactics. The authors sampled 219 leader-member dyads from a variety of organizations and communities throughout the central United States. Results strongly favored the MSI as a predictor of influence tactics. Limitations of the study include low
power of relationships, sample size as limited by the research design, and education levels of participants. Future researchers should use larger and more diverse samples and test other relevant antecedents of leaders' behaviors.

A meta-analysis of 128 studies examined the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. As predicted, engagement-contingent, completion-contingent, and performance-contingent rewards significantly undermined free-choice intrinsic motivation \((d = -0.40, -0.36, \text{ and } -0.28, \text{ respectively})\), as did all rewards, all tangible rewards, and all expected rewards. Engagement-contingent and completion-contingent rewards also significantly undermined self-reported interest \((d = -0.15, \text{ and } -0.17)\), as did all tangible rewards and all expected rewards. Positive feedback enhanced both free-choice behavior \((d = 0.33)\) and self-reported interest \((d = 0.31)\). Tangible rewards tended to be more detrimental for children than college students, and verbal rewards tended to be less enhancing for children than college students (Deci et al., 1999).

Review of extant literature on leadership motivation reveals that, motivation is anything that affects behavior in pursuing a certain outcome. If the organizational objectives have to be achieved the leaders need to motivate one-self and others. Thus, the ability to motivate oneself and others is critical to the success of a leader (Lussier & Achua, 2010). High levels of performance occur when leaders establish motivational environments that inspire followers to achieve objectives. Motivating workers produces distinctive firm competencies that give advantages over competitors. Hence, the ability to motivate others, or motivational skills, are critical to leadership success.

### 2.4. Emotional Intelligence and Motivation

Mayer et al. (2000) in an attempt to clarify the plethora of definitions of emotional intelligence suggested that there are mixed and mental ability model of emotional intelligence. Mixed models encompass social and emotional competencies that include
aspects of social skills and personality (Goleman, 1995; 1998), while mental ability model explore the interaction between emotion and cognition. Based on Goleman’s (1995; 1998) mixed model, motivation forms a subset of emotional intelligence. Other emotional intelligence researchers reject this notion, arguing that they are related, yet separate constructs (Jordon et al., 2003; Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The link between emotions and motivation has been explicitly stated in a broad range of research (Frijda, 1994; Zurbriggen & STurman, 2002). Goleman saw motivation as a prime antecedent of behaviour while formulating his concept of emotional intelligence. According to Mayer and Salovey (1997), motivation co-varies but is not a part of the emotional intelligence construct.

Christie et al. (2007) conducted an empirical study to test these two different conceptualizations. One hundred and thirteen individuals completed measures of emotional intelligence and McClelland's (1987) three motivational needs using Wong and Law's (2002) four dimensional self-report measure of EI (emotional awareness, emotional understanding, emotional management and emotional facilitation) and Needs Assessment Questionnaire (NAQ), a validated measure of motivational needs in the workplace developed by Heckert et al. (1999). Structural equation analyses clearly supported Mayer and Salovey's (1997) conceptualization that motivation is a factor related to emotional intelligence but is not a component part of the emotional intelligence construct. Structural equation modeling indicates that motivation is not a factor of emotional intelligence but that it is related to the construct particularly through the regulation of emotion and the appraisal of others’ emotions. Based on this finding, motivation should not be viewed as a factor of emotional intelligence. In conclusion to the study, Christie et al. (2007) assert that, “areas for further research in relation to motivation and emotional intelligence could include looking at motivation in relation to ability measures of emotional intelligence as
well as other self-reporting and peer-reporting measures of emotional intelligence. This research would also be benefitted from examining alternate measures of motivation. Additional research in relation to definitional claims about competencies that have been linked to emotional intelligence would be beneficial as they did not claim their study to be the definitive test of the link between emotional intelligence and motivation”.

However, many research like those of Goleman and Lanser have showed a relationship between emotional intelligence and motivation (Goleman, 1998; Lanser, 2000). They reiterated that through the positive and negative aspects of working life we can comprehend motivation which is an essential factor of emotional intelligence. Also, Dijk and Freedman proved the relationship between emotional intelligence and motivation in a study that concluded that those who require extrinsic support for motivation are always are helpless without the consent or reward system of other (Dijk & Freedman, 2007).

Some of the studies that dealt with emotional intelligence and have examined the role that emotional intelligence play in motivation, self regulation and variety of achievement behaviors were by Frijda (1994), Zurbriggen and Sturman (2002). Most of these studies showed a relationship between emotional intelligence and motivation. For example, a study by Wong and Law showed that workers EI influenced their job satisfaction and performance (Wong and Law, 2002). Gyanani and Kushwaha (2001) opined that self-motivation is necessary for emotional intelligence. Other researchers are of the opinion that emotions are critical ingredient for motivation (Kusche & Greenberg, 2006). Sabath (2010) opined that emotional intelligence is the basic stuff out of which all motivation arises. People with high emotional intelligence have the characteristic of motivating oneself (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Emotional intelligence directly influences motivation.
Similarly, motivation among students encompasses both academic motivation and achievement motivation. Academic motivation is one’s determination to succeed in the academic studies (Srivastava, 1974). It includes academic aspiration and attitude towards schools. Achievement motivation refers to a pattern of actions and feelings connected to striving to achieve some internalized standard of excellence in performance (Vidler, 1977). Achievement oriented behaviour is a function of a number of factors including the motive to succeed, the motive to avoid failure, the perceived probability of success and the incentive value of success. All these are influenced by an individuals’ emotional state of mind. Students low on emotional intelligence may find failure more difficult to deal with, which undermines their academic motivation (Drago, 2004).

A study conducted on 647 second year students in two public and two private universities in Malaysia found that students from the Public Higher Institutions perform better academically from the Private Higher Institutions. Study reveals that, EQ and Academic Achievement (except a dimension of EI) were not correlated but a positive correlation was reported between Achievement Motivation and Academic Achievement. Also, significant positive correlation was observed between EQ and Achievement Motivation (Mahyuddin et al., 2012). Similar research by Dubey (2012) reported that, academic motivation is positively related to emotional intelligence and students differing with respect to academic motivation differ from one another on emotional intelligence.

Most recently, Mount (2006) has investigated Emotional Competencies such as achievement motivation and impact and influence and found these to be positively and significantly associated with superior performance in international business dealings.

Thus, it is evident from the literature review that emotionally intelligence has been positively and significantly associated with motivation specially achievement motivation at industry as well as academia. People with higher levels of emotional intelligence have
higher potential for self-motivating also influencing others to be motivated to achieve the personal and organizational outcome resulting in the effectiveness and success in one’s personal life and the organization.

2.5. Organizational Effectiveness

Organizational effectiveness is perhaps the most critical dependent variable in all organizational analyses and almost all organizational theories include the notion of effectiveness (Cameron & Whetten, 1983; Goodman & Pennings, 1977). Despite this significance, the construct has eluded a clear definition and/or description. Instead it has emerged as one of the most complex and controversial issues in management (Chelladurai, 1987). Organizational effectiveness is a broad concept. It implicitly refers to a range of variables at different organizational levels. However, organizational Effectiveness is a term that is complicated, controversial, and difficult to conceptualize (Chelladurai, 1987). There appears to be no universal agreement on precisely what organizational effectiveness means, as organizational effectiveness means different things to different people. Although there is no definitive meaning of organizational effectiveness, the majority of authors agree that organizational effectiveness requires measuring multiple criteria and the evaluation of different organizational functions using different characteristics, and it should also consider both means (processes) and ends (outcomes).

2.5.1. Theoretical Approaches to Organizational Effectiveness

Organization effectiveness is not limited to just productivity, but it certainly encompasses it. Productivity, which has been a human concern for centuries, is defined narrowly as the amount of physical output for each unit of productive input. Defining the output for non-manufacturing service activities, commonly termed as ‘knowledge work’ which include IT services and products, transportation, retail and logistics, finance and
insurance related services rendered to individuals and businesses, is tricky and problematic (Ramanujam, 2010).

Various models and theoretical approaches have been developed to assess organizational effectiveness. Herman & Renz (1997) stated that there are as many effectiveness models as there are models of organizations. Different models with their relating criteria reflect different values and preferences of schools of thought concerning effectiveness (Walton & Dawson, 2001). The best known models are the goal models (Etzioni, 1960; Price, 1972; Scott, 1977), the system resource model (Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967), the internal process approach (Pfeffer, 1977; Steers, 1977), the multiple constituency models (Tsui, 1990; Zammuto, 1984) and the competing values approach (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1981; 1983) which has been briefly illustrated in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Criteria</th>
<th>Effectiveness Defined</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity, efficiency</td>
<td>The extent to which goals are accomplished</td>
<td>Rational Goal Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale, cohesion</td>
<td>Employee satisfaction</td>
<td>Human Relations Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability, control</td>
<td>Smooth internal functioning</td>
<td>Internal Process Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource acquisition, flexibility</td>
<td>Acquisition of resources from environments</td>
<td>System Resource Open Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituencies Satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction of all Constituencies, strategic</td>
<td>Multiple Constituency Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in above criteria over time and space</td>
<td>Integration of above definitions’ effectiveness</td>
<td>Competing Values Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Approaches to Organizational Effectiveness (Hossein et al., 2011)

If this is the case, determining whose view of effectiveness is important becomes a significant issue and central to the use of constituents or stakeholders to measure effectiveness. An overview of the main theories of measuring organizational effectiveness reveals that the early focus on one-dimensional measures slowly evolving to recognize
the multidimensional nature of effectiveness. The evolution to a multi-dimensional framework to measure effectiveness is consistent with the collective need to ascertain and measure the key outcomes of organizations (Hossein et al., 2011).

Each and every employee contributes to organization effectiveness. Based on the skills, experience, and rank some have a better opportunity to play a bigger role than others. Establishing a successful and sustainable organization takes more than just management expertise. It requires genuine leadership – the ability to guide individuals and teams to their highest level of collaboration, innovation, and effectiveness. Today’s leaders play many roles, like that of a visionary, role model, architect and defender of values, team builder, coach, change agent, strategist, economist, and advocate of excellence. While productivity and economics have always been important issues, today’s leaders also understand the importance of creating a values-driven vision that becomes the benchmark for individual and organizational decision-making. Leaders seek best-practices that produce integrity, adaptability, sustainability, and execution (Ramanujam, 2010) resulting in overall organizational effectiveness.

2.6. Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness

The impact of leadership on company success continues to grow in importance. One of the primary areas of research in the area of leadership involves examining the leaders of successful companies to determine what sets them apart from their peers, as leadership effectiveness is believed to have a direct relationship to business performance (Collins, 2001; George, 2003; Bossidy, Larry, & Charan, 2002). However, the theories of what constitutes leadership effectiveness are varied, and sometimes conflicting (Kroeck et al., 2004). One theory of leadership effectiveness that has been shown to correlate well with business success results in a variety of environments is transformational leadership
In other research, authors have examined what experiences and traits might make an effective leader.

Effective leaders influence followers to think not only of their own interests but the interest of the organization. Leadership occurs when followers are influenced to do what is ethical and beneficial for the organization and themselves. Taking advantage of followers for personal gain is not part of leadership. Members of the organization need to work together toward an outcome that the leader and followers both want, a desired future or shared purpose that motivates them toward this more preferable outcome. Leaders need to provide direction; with the input of followers, they set challenging objectives and lead the charge ahead to achieve them. Setting specific, difficult objectives lead to higher levels of performance (Lussier & Achua, 2010).

Research in the area of leadership seems to point to the existence of four basic dimensions of leadership: support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis, and work facilitation. Data from a recent study of 40 agencies of one of the leading life insurance companies were used to evaluate the impact of both supervisory and peer leadership upon outcomes of satisfaction and factorial performance measures. Results from the study suggest that this conceptual model was useful and that leadership's relation to organizational outcomes may best be studied when both leadership and effectiveness are multidimensional. Both peer and supervisory leadership measures related to outcomes. In most instances, the ability to predict was enhanced by taking simultaneous account of certain non-leadership variables (Bowers & Seashore, 1966).

A Gallup Organization study of two million employees at 700 companies found that how long an employee stays at a company and how productive she is was determined by her relationship with her immediate supervisor (Zipkin, 2000). Another study quantified this effect further. Spherion, a staffing and consulting firm in Fort Lauderdale,
Florida, and Lou Harris Associates, found that only 11 percent of the employees who rated their bosses as excellent said that they were likely to look for a different job in the next year. However, 40 percent of those who rated their bosses as poor said they were likely to leave. In other words, people with good bosses are four times less likely to leave than are those with poor bosses (Zipkin, 2000) resulting in less attrition and increased productivity.

In their dissertation Murphy (2002) studied the leadership styles within the Navy and correlated those styles to the effectiveness of Navy reengineering programs. Using a sample of 289 respondents, the study found that transformational leadership behaviors had a significant correlation with respondent perceptions of employee satisfaction, effort and effectiveness as well as organizational effectiveness. However, no significant relationship was found between actual goal attainment and any of the leadership styles measured.

The results of a study on 29 organizations indicate that certain managerial strategies are strongly associated with high static scores and with improving effectiveness over time. Managerial strategies, in fact, were found to be more important than structure, demographics, finances, and other factors. Proactive strategies and those with an external emphasis are more successful than internal and reactive strategies. Managerial strategies that are multifaceted are more likely to lead to effectiveness than monolithic strategies (Cameron, 1986).

Leadership increasingly features in team contexts since teams have taken on heightened importance in more recent times. The challenge for managers is therefore how to become effective team leaders. Prat et al. (as cited by Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005) argues that EI skills are critical to effective team leadership and its outcomes. Leaders, for example, need to acquire skills such as trusting others, giving up authority, the patience to
share information together with knowledge on when to intervene (Pirola-Merlo, Härtel, Mann & Hirst, 2002). Leaders need to be sensitive to the cultural preferences and taboos in working with divergent followers. Change-centered leadership relates to leaders who are involved in organizational renewal, increased organizational efficiency, growth and the continued survival of the organization. They initiate new projects, create new ideas and ways of doing things, are willing to take risks and are future orientated (Ekvall & Arvonen, 1991; Robbins, 2001).

Empowerment is found to be an approach to leadership that empowers subordinate as a main constituent of managerial and organizational effectiveness (e.g., Honold, 1997; Bennis, 1989; McClelland, 1975). Empowerment as a site to permit employees to formulate decisions. Empowering is giving authority and liberating potential of employees. The main driving force of empowerment is having larger control over ‘how’ jobs are done and carried for more growth and productivity (Smith, 1997). Tannenbaum (1968) in their study of internal organization power and control illustrated that the distribution of power and control enhances organizational effectiveness (as cited in Honold, 1997). Smith (1997) found that, empowering made employees feel that they are appreciated. Matthew (2009) revealed that, continuous and positive feedback on employee performance i.e. on the employee contribution and their energetic participation in configuring up the organization are tremendously essential to the hale and hearty place of work.

In contrast to the previous findings discussed, Pruijn and Boucher (1995) tested the applicability of Bass' (1985) Transformational Leadership Theory in the sport environment of The Netherlands. Bass (1990) suggested that there are universal principles in transformational leadership which apply across cultures, yet the majority of previous research results are derived from the North American setting. To collect
information about leadership, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was used, both the Self and the Rater versions. Organizational effectiveness was considered to be the dependent variable and data were collected using the Organizational Effectiveness Questionnaire (OEQ). The response rate for returned questionnaires was 94.25 percent. Most results dealing with the influence of transformational leadership on organizational effectiveness were not significant and these findings led the researchers to fail to reject the null hypothesis. Six sub hypotheses were developed to test the influence of six leadership factors. Only two significant outcomes were found in 42 manipulations of the data and therefore the null hypotheses for each leadership factor could not be rejected. In addition to the analyses of variance, Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test was used to determine exactly where the difference between groups existed. The test uncovered that medium transformational leaders were more effective than high transformational leaders. The results of this study do not provide general support for Bass' (1990) argument that transformational leadership is universally applicable. Studying these factors in the Dutch sport setting with its specific characteristics, might have prevented the researchers from supporting the results of previous investigators.

In summary, research, experience, and common sense all point to a direct relationship between a company’s financial success and its commitment to leadership practices that treat people as assets. There is little evidence that being a mean, tough manager is associated with leadership success (Lussier & Achua, 2010). It is the collective efforts of people that make things happen. Leaders’ ability to respond both appropriately and in an effective way in a given context, significantly impacts individuals, groups, and organizational outcomes (Bass, 1990).
2.7. Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Effectiveness

Emotions are the primary sources of “motivation, information (feedback), personal power, innovation, and influence. They inspire and enliven good judgment and reasoning and are linked to success and profitability” (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997).

The internal environment of an organization includes a social setting that requires continued and substantial interpersonal interaction among the employees and it is here that emotions form a core ingredient. It is therefore assumed that an individual’s ability to accurately perceive his/her emotions, being able to effectively control and regulate such emotions and interact effectively with others, will, to a large extent, influence the individual’s workplace effectiveness (Bosman, 2003). The same assumption applies to leadership in organizations in which the volatility, spiraling change and diverse organizational environment require leaders to effectively interact with their subordinates and followers.

Emotionally intelligent leaders are believed by many to be critically important for organizational success. There is however, little scholarly support behind this notion. Studies reveal that, most effective bosses are those who have the ability to sense how their employees feel about their work situation and to intervene effectively when those employees begin to feel discouraged or dissatisfied. Effective bosses are also able to manage their own emotions, with the result that employees trust them and feel good about working with them. In short, bosses whose employees stay are bosses who manage with emotional intelligence (Cherniss, 2001).

Emotional intelligence plays an important role in satisfying the intense organizational needs. For instance, coping with massive change involves, among other things, the ability to perceive and understand the emotional impact of change on ourselves and others. To be effective in helping their organizations manage change,
leaders first need to be aware of and to manage their own feelings of anxiety and uncertainty. Then they need to be aware of the emotional reactions of other organizational members and act to help people cope with those reactions. At the same time in this process of coping effectively with massive change, other members of the organization need to be actively involved in monitoring and managing their emotional reactions and those of others (Cherniss, 2001).

Emotional intelligence enables leaders to tune into the gut feelings that are most accurate and helpful in making difficult decisions. Emotional intelligence influences organizational effectiveness in a number of areas: Employee recruitment and retention, Development of talent, Teamwork, Employee commitment, morale, and health, Innovation, Productivity, Efficiency, Sales, Revenues, Quality of service, Customer loyalty, Client or student outcomes, etc. The influence of EI begins with the retention and recruitment of talent. For instance, the extent to which candidates’ emotional intelligence is considered in making top executive hiring decisions has a significant impact on the ultimate success or failure of those executives. The emotional intelligence of the persons doing the hiring is also crucial for good hiring decisions. Emotional intelligence also affects the development of talent. However, not all relationships are equally effective in doing so. The emotional intelligence of the mentor, boss, or peer will influence the potential of a relationship with that person for helping organizational members develop and use the talent that is crucial for organizational effectiveness (Cherniss, 2001).

George (2000) proposes emotional intelligence may contribute to leaders’ foresight in their organization by using their emotions to boost their thought process regarding internal challenges and opportunities. Leaders will be better equipped to use positive emotions to facilitate improvements and influence followers so that they are receptive to change and supportive of the leader. In addition, leaders high in emotional
intelligence will have the ability to manage their emotions and followers so that followers are secure and optimistic about where they are going and their personal contribution to the organization.

2.8. Motivation and Organizational Effectiveness

Employee motivation is one of the policies of managers to increase effectual job management amongst employees in organizations (Shadare et al., 2009). A motivated employee is responsive of the definite goals and objectives he/she must achieve, therefore he/she directs its efforts in that direction. Rutherford (1990) reported that motivation formulates an organization more successful because provoked employees are constantly looking for improved practices to do a work, so it is essential for organizations to persuade motivation of their employees. Getting employees to do their best work even in strenuous circumstances, is one of the employees most stable and greasy challenges and this can be made possible through motivating them.

Empowerment provides benefits to organizations and makes sense of belonging and pride in the workforce. In fact, it builds a win-win connection among organizations and employees; which is considered an ideal environment in numerous organizations and their employees. Empowering can flourish virtual human capacities. Empowered employees focus their job and work-life with and additional importance and this leads to constant progress in coordination and work procedures. Employees execute their finest novelties and thoughts with the sense of belonging, enthusiasm, and delight, in empowered organizations. Adding up, they work with a sense of responsibility and prefer benefits of the organization to theirs (Yazdani et al., 2011)

Trust is defined as the perception of one about others, decision to act based on speech, behavior and their decision (Hassan et al., 2009). If an organization wants to improve and be successful, trust plays a significant role so it should always be preserved.
to ensure an organizations existence and to enhance employees’ motivation (Annamalai, 2010). It can make intrapersonal and interpersonal effects and influence on the relations inside and out the organization (Hassan et al., 2009). No matter how automated an organization may be, high productivity depends on the level of motivation and the effectiveness of the workforce. So staff training is an indispensible strategy for motivating workers. One way managers can instigate motivation is to give appropriate information on the sentences of their actions on others.

Employee satisfaction and motivation towards work refers to prospects of the employee about the organization and his approaches frontward his service. A study was done to examine the relationship of organizational effectiveness and employee performance and motivation in the telecommunication and banking sector of Pakistan. A sample of 103 respondents was taken and Pearson correlation was applied. The results showed that there exists significant positive correlation (0.287) between employee motivation and organizational effectiveness (Muhammad et al., 2011).

The autocratic leadership styles, mechanistic design of organization and authoritarian rules as practiced in African organizations, are all where decision making is concerned only to top management and employees are just given orders to accomplish different tasks. In these types of organizational environment the employees may suppress innovativeness and their motivation hinders which has a direct negative effect on organizational performance, growth and effectiveness (Constant et al., 2001). An internally satisfied, delighted and motivated worker or employee is actually a productive employee in an organization which contributes in efficiency and effectiveness of organization which leads to maximization of profits (Matthew et al., 2009).

Thus from the literature and various studies it is fully supported that there exists a positive relationship between employee motivation and organizational effectiveness.
2.9. Linking Leadership Emotional Intelligence, Motivation and Organizational Effectiveness

As competition in the workplace heightens, what separates highly effective and successful organizations from others? Discovering distinguishing features between effective and ineffective organizations is the major challenge for organizational evaluation and the issue is as old as organizational research itself. In spite of the extensive academic interest in the topic, there still remains confusion and controversy about what constitutes organizational effectiveness and how it should be measured. The lack of a universal definition sharpens this problem (Hossein, et al., 2011). However extensive review of literature reveals that many factors contribute to success in organizations, but a common entity involved significantly in all the factors cited to contributing to success is effective leadership.

Over the few years, the impact of leadership on company success continues to grow in importance. One of the primary areas of research in the area of leadership involves examining the leaders of successful companies to determine what sets them apart from their peers, as leadership effectiveness is believed to have a direct relationship to business performance (Collins, 2001; George, 2003; Bossidy, Larry & Charan, 2002). Bass, (1990) asserts that leadership may be regarded as the single most important factor in organizational success or failure. However, the theories of what constitutes leadership effectiveness are varied, and sometimes conflicting (Kroeck et al., 2004). Goleman (2001) believes that emotional intelligence may be the long-sought missing link that will unite the ability and motivational or dispositional determinants of job performance.

A person with high emotional intelligence has the ability to understand themselves and others and adapt behaviors to a given context. Individuals with high emotional intelligence and thus demonstrable personal and social competence may be oriented
towards a transformational leadership style with emphasis on motivating and influencing others (Barling, Slater & Kelloway, 2000; Gardner & Stough, 2002). Research shows that an organization that was characterized by emotional intelligence had increased cooperation, motivation, and productivity and increased profits, an association also reflected in transformational leadership literature (Bass, 1990).

George and Brief (1992) assert: “Leaders who feel excited, enthusiastic, and energetic themselves are likely to similarly energize their followers, as are leaders who feel distressed and hostile likely to negatively activate their followers”. Transformational leaders apply emotion in motivating employees in respect of the organizational vision (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996). These leaders may use strong emotions to influence employees. Bass (1990) and Conger and Kanungo (1998) argue that a leader’s expression of positive emotion may have both motivational and inspirational consequence via emotional contagion (Hatfield, Cacioppo & Rapson, 1994). Furthermore, followers transcend their own self-interest for the good of the organization. Leaders activate followers’ higher order needs and promote trust leading to emotional identification with these leaders, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation (Yukl, 1989; Bass & Avolio, 1994) ultimately resulting in the effectiveness of the organization.

According to Robbins (2001), an important component of the transformational theories of leadership is the emotionally appealing aspect of leader behaviour. George (2000) argues that the majority of research still needs to identify the effect of leaders’ emotions on their subordinates. Cacioppe (1997) holds the opinion that successful leaders have the ability to manage their own emotions while being responsive to others’ emotions. He believes leaders who are capable of regulating their own emotions may be more able to create an environment of fairness and trust. Emotional intelligence has been
shown to have a strong link with Transformational Leadership. However, according to Palmer, Walls, Burgess and Stough (2001), the amount which emotional intelligence contributes to effective leadership is unknown, despite much interest in this relationship. But a review of plethora of leadership studies and growing interest among researchers in all the facet of one’s life and work point out that emotional intelligence is sin qua non of effective leadership (Goleman, 1998) and it’s become a ‘must have’ skill among leaders.

What makes a leader effective? Much research has been devoted to identify the determinants of effective leadership (Yukl, 1998). As Goleman (1995; 1998) and others (Cherniss and Adler, 2000; Cooper and Sawaf, 1997; Druskat, 2001; George, 2000) contend, an effective leader has more than the technical skills to do a job. He or she employs qualities, such as initiative and empathy, adaptability, and persuasiveness—competencies of emotional intelligence. Researchers (Cavallo & Brienza, 2002; George, 2003; George & Bettenhausen, 1990; Goleman, 1998) have found relationships between emotions and competencies and performance and leadership.

EI competencies influence organizational effectiveness in areas such as employee recruitment and retention, development of talent, employee commitment, morale, and health (Bar-On, 1997). Research has shown that managers with high emotional intelligence obtain results from employees that are beyond expectations, developing and using talent crucial for organizational effectiveness. Effective leaders manage and steer their own feelings, acknowledge subordinates’ feelings about their work situation, and intervene effectively to enhance morale (Cherniss, 2001). According to Goleman (2001), the higher the position in an organization, the more EI matters. He emphasizes the importance of the link between EI strengths in a leader and the organizational climate for EI theory. He believes that emotional intelligence may be the long-sought missing link that will unite the ability and motivational or dispositional determinants of job
According to him, it is plausible that emotional intelligence assessment “could become a staple of a personnel selection battery”.

What do leaders do? Batten (1989) contrasted managers and leaders: “Managers manage inventories, supplies, and data. They are number crunchers. Leaders catalyze, stretch, and enhance people. They provide transcendent goals, creating a motivational climate. Managers push and direct. Leaders pull and expect. Leaders are exhilarated by identifying and enhancing their people’s strengths”. “Leadership is about tapping the wellsprings of human motivation and about fundamental relations with one’s fellows” (Kouzes & Posner, 1997). However, among Indian organizations ‘manager’ and ‘leader’ has been constantly used interchangeably and both perform the managerial as well as leadership roles alike.

Among other responsibilities, Truskie (1999) explains that leaders perform two tasks: (1) Establish organizational direction. Where is the organization headed? And how is it going to get there? It is the leader’s responsibility to establish direction by determining vision, mission, business strategy, objectives, and goals; and (2) Develop organizational effectiveness. Once direction is determined, the strength, stamina, competencies, and agility of the organization must be developed by the leader. This enables the organization to serve its mission, achieve its objectives, meet its goals, and move in its intended direction.

Many approaches to leadership have been proposed—researchers have analyzed what leaders are like, what they do, how they motivate followers, how their styles relate to situations, and how they can make major changes in their organizations (George, 2000). While most studies have been fairly recent, Cherniss (2001) cited studies from as far back as the 1940s as linking emotional characteristics and leadership. He contended that the Ohio State Leadership Studies surmised that "consideration" was an
important aspect of effective leadership. The research suggested that leaders who are able to establish "mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport" with members of their group would be more effective.

According to Cavallo and Brienza (2002), the outcome is consistent with conclusions reached by McClelland (1998), in a study of leaders in 30 organizations. McClelland determined that the most powerful leadership differentiators were self-confidence, achievement drive, developing others, adaptability, influence, and leadership.

Based on a review of approximately 200 competency models, Goleman (1998) identified 25 social and emotional competencies that most accurately predict superior performance in many occupations. He organized the competencies into five dimensions of EI: self-awareness, self-regulation, self-motivation, social awareness, and social skills (Goleman, 1995). Cherniss and Adler (2000) added that research employing the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI), a measure of emotion intelligence, by Boyatzis, Goleman and Rhee (1999), led to a refined version of the original model followed by two more revisions to the ECI versions namely Emotional Competency Inventory 2 (ECI 2) and the most recent Emotional and Social Competency Inventory (ESCI). The competency framework consists of four dimensions (Self-awareness, Self-management, Social Awareness, and Relationship Management) comprising of 18 (ECI 2) and 12 (ESCI) competencies including Empathy, Achievement Orientation, Optimism, Self-confidence, and Adaptability (Boyatzis, Goleman & McKee, 2002; Haygroup et al., 2005; Boyatzis, 2007). The competencies were distilled in large part from studies by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (1996); Spencer and Spencer (1993); Rosier and Jeffrey (1994; 1995), Sala (2002), and Boyatzis (2007).

Many of the traits described in the literature on leadership are included or implied in the ECI competency framework based on the work of Boyatzis, Goleman and
McKee (2002), Haygroup et al. (2005), and Boyatzis (2007). For example, achievement-orientation, inspiration, adaptability and self-confidence are listed specifically. Others are implied within framework (such as cooperative, which is related to the characteristics listed in teamwork and collaboration cluster; coping with change (adaptable); encourage (influence); opportunistic (optimism); motivation (developing others and achievement); persistence (achievement); and so forth. Cherniss and Adler (2000) explained that more people now appreciate the importance of EI for individual and organizational effectiveness.

Second important factor contributing to effectiveness among organizations is motivated high-performing people. According to Rodriguez, Patel, Bright, Gregory, and Gowing (2002), a distinguishing element is superior employees. “High-performing people are critical to high-performing organizations”. Cherniss and Adler (2000) contended that because of a growing body of research in competencies as well as personal experiences, employers are modifying their ideas about what qualifications of an employee are most important. They cited results of a survey conducted by the Department of Labor and American Society for Training and Development. The survey sought to determine characteristics employers required for entry-level positions. Results showed that the most important qualities were personal management (self-esteem, goal setting and motivation, and personal and career development); interpersonal skills (negotiation and teamwork); and organizational effectiveness and leadership. The authors referenced a study by Dowd and Liedtka that found that employers value the same competencies in entry-level managers.

Motivation, initiative, and cooperation also may be lacking among today’s employees and may be resulting in less-than-effective organizations. Cherniss and Adler (1991) research findings indicated that more than half of employees in the surveyed
organizations “lacked the motivation to continue learning and improving on the job. Four of 10 were not able to work cooperatively with fellow employees, and just 19 percent of those applying for the entry-level jobs had enough discipline in their work habits”.

According to Batten, one of the most consistent characteristics of high-performing people is the “ability to take a hit in stride and bounce back”. Batten contended that leadership is finally being recognized as a differentiator between success and failure in organizations. “It is finally being perceived by large and small organizations alike that a company's profit and future are only as strong as its corporate culture. And an excellent corporate culture can be envisioned and built only by excellent leaders” (Kouzes & Posner, 1997).

Lussier and Achua (2010) assert that, motivation is anything that affects behavior in pursuing a certain outcome. If organizational objectives have to be achieved, leader does have to motivate self and others. Thus, the ability to motivate oneself and others is critical to the success of a leader. Effective leaders influence followers to think not only of their own interests but the interest of the organization. Leadership occurs when followers are influenced to do what is ethical and beneficial for the organization and themselves. Emotional intelligence and motivation have been shown to have a strong link with transformational leadership. However, according to Palmer, Walls, Burgess and Stough (2001), the amount which emotional intelligence contributes to effective leadership is unknown, despite much interest in this relationship.

The review of extant links between leadership, emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational effectiveness reveal that, effective leadership governed by higher levels of key emotional intelligence competencies required for a type of job and industry influences the organizational teams to be highly motivated to achieve the
organizational goals and objectives leading to improved effectiveness resulting in profitability and success.

2.10. Demographic Variables on Leader’s Emotional Intelligence

One of the important factors contributing to the popularity of theories of emotional intelligence is the assumption that, EI can be developed (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003) and learned at all ages (Shapiro 1997, Goleman, 1998). Unlike cognitive intelligence (IQ) which increases up until late adolescents and then begins to mildly decline in the second and third decades of life (Wechsler, 1958); EI is neither hereditary, nor its development occur in early childhood ages; as one gets older, one becomes more emotionally and socially intelligent (Bar-On, 2006). Though there has been a great degree of skepticism on this point, growing research related to outcome studies and program evaluations reported by the popular measures of EI construct namely, ECI (Boyatsis, Goleman, & Hay/McBer, 1999; Hay Group, McClelland Center for Research and Innovation, & Wolff, 2005), EQ-i (Bar-on, 1997), MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002), SEI 2 (Fariselli, Ghini & Freedman, 2006), ie-Q (Maddocks & Sparrow, 1998) and other equivalent measures of EI provide evidences that EI competencies can be developed (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003) with increasing age and life experiences (Singh, 2006); However, additional evaluation studies would be a welcome addition to the literature (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003).

2.10.1. Age and Emotional Intelligence

Reviews of popular theories on the relatedness of EI and age reveal that, emotional intelligence is a developing ability; there is a positive relationship between age and EI and that EI increases or develops with age and experience (Goleman, 1998; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; 1993; Maddocks & Sparrow, 1998); the influence of age proposes that EI goes up with age, at least up to the fourth or fifth decade in life.
(Kafetsios, 2004; Stein, 2009; Bradberry & Greaves, 2005; Singh, 2006); some of the aspects of EI can only be developed through training (Fariselli, Ghini & Freedman, 2006).

Research findings reported in ECI manuals (Boyatsis, Goleman & Hay/McBer, 1999; Hay Group, McClelland Center for Research and Innovation & Wolff, 2005) reveal that, self and total others ratings were positively correlated with age; self-others ratings for older participants were higher in all the EI competencies than younger participants. Research conducted on Bar-on model of EI (Bar-On, 1988) using the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) on the population sample of 3,891 consisting people from ages 20 to 50 showed that the older groups scored significantly higher than the younger groups on most of the EQ-i scales; and respondents in their late 40s obtained the highest mean scores (Bar-On, 1997b; Bar-On, 2004). Also, a study on the youths aging 7 to 18 revealed that EI was significantly higher among the oldest group of subjects (Bar-On & Parker, 2000).

Overall research data collected between 2001 to 2010 from the users of the Individual Effectiveness (ie) questionnaire of EI by JCA (Maddocks & Sparrow, 1998) on the sample of 12,417 working individuals, mainly from the UK managerial population reveal that, overall scores on EI increase consistently with age (from 16 to 50+). However, review of a study conducted on 405 American people between 22 and 70 years old using the Six Seconds’ Emotional Intelligence Assessment (SEI 2) finds that some parts of emotional intelligence do increase with age \([r=.13 \ (p<.01)]\), though the effect is slight but significant. In addition there are elements of EQ that do not increase with age indicating some competencies must be developed through training (Fariselli, Ghini & Freedman, 2006).
2.10.2. Gender and Emotional Intelligence

Emotional Intelligence does not respect the gender. The popular belief is that, women are not more emotionally intelligent than men. They are, however, emotionally intelligent in different ways. An analysis of emotional Intelligence was found in thousands of men and women which showed that women, on average, are more aware of their emotions, show more empathy, and are more adept interpersonally. Men, on the other hand, are more self-confident, optimistic, and adaptable. It was found that men are also able to handle stress better than women. In general, however, far more similarities exist than differences. Some men are empathetic as the most interpersonally sensible women are, while some women are just as able to withstand stress as the most emotionally resilient men. After taking into account overall ratings for men and women, the strengths and weaknesses average out, so it is a competition between both sexes (Ahmad et al., 2009).

Findings of studies reported by King (1999), Sutarso (1999), Wing and Love (2001) and Singh (2002) revealed that females have higher emotional intelligence than that of males. Since females tend to be more emotional and intimate in relationships as compared to males, so their emotional intelligence ought to be higher than that of males. Society is responsible for this, which socializes the two genders differently as has been found in studies by Duckelt and Raffalli (1989), and Sandhu and Mehrotra (1999). Moreover, higher emotional intelligence among girls can also be explained in terms of some of their personality characteristics. Similar findings were reported in studies by Tapia (1999) and Dunn (2002). They observed that girls score higher with regard to empathy, social responsibilities and interpersonal relationships than boys. More sensitivity was found towards their relationships with parents, friends and siblings. All
these traits help them to acquire more emotional intelligence as compared to boys. This study is only a stepping stone in the field of emotional intelligence.

A study based on integrative model of Petrides and Furnham’s (2001) examined the relationships between trait EI and work related constructs. Gender specific perspective was adopted in order to take into account existing gender differences in work related variables as well as in perception of EI (Furnham, 1994; Petrides, Furnham & Martin, 2004). Male and female data has been merged by many empirical studies even though there are reasons to believe that systematic differences in the ways in which the two genders experience the workplace and its demand exist (Roxburgh, 1996). It has been affirmed that women tend to be more emotionally expressive than men, that they understand emotions better and that they have a greater ability as regards certain interpersonal skills. Women, for instance, recognize other people’s emotions better, are more perceptive and have greater empathy. In addition, some evidence exists that certain areas of the brain dedicated to processing emotions could be larger in women than in men and that there is a difference in cerebral activity based on sex (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003).

In some cases, no clear significant differences in self-reported emotional intelligence have been found among men and women, while in others women turn out to be more skillful at directing and handling their own and other people’s emotions. At times, just the opposite happens. Women turn out to be better at emotional attention and empathy, while men are better at regulating emotions. This lack of uniformity in the results could be due to the sample’s socio-demographic characteristics or the kind of tool used. This is linked to the different skills comprising the construct, which depend on the theoretical model being dealt with. Nonetheless, when performance indicator like the
MEIS or MSCEIT are used, clear significant differences in EI are seen with a predominance for women when compared to men (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003).

A study by Purkable and Terry Lyn (2003) reveal that, men and women did not differ in their EI. However, significant difference (p < 0.05) was found in the emotional intelligence scores of male and female managers (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003). Females typically score comparatively higher on EI tests compared to males (Goldenberg, Matheson & Mantler, 2006; Naghavi & Redzuan, 2011). Although, Goleman (1995) considered males and females to have their own personal profiles of strengths and weaknesses for emotional intelligence capacities, studies conducted by Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (1999) and Mayer and Geher (1996) indicate that women score higher on measures of emotional intelligence than men.

2.10.3. Work Experience and Emotional Intelligence

In Working with Emotional Intelligence, Goleman (1998) writes: Our level of emotional intelligence is not fixed genetically, nor does it develop only in early childhood. Unlike IQ, which changes little after our teen years, emotional intelligence seems to be largely learned, and it continues to develop as we go through life and learn from our experiences—our competence in it can keep growing. In fact, studies that have tracked people’s level of emotional intelligence through the years show that people get better and better in these capabilities as they grow more adept at handling their emotions and impulses, at motivating themselves, and at honing their empathy and social adroitness. There is an old fashion word for this growth in emotional intelligence: maturity.

In agreement with Goleman’s assertion about the relationship between emotional intelligence and experience, research suggests that there is a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and work experience. Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (1999) asserted...
that in order for emotional intelligence to be considered a standard intelligence, it should increase with age and experience. The authors compared adolescents’ and adults’ performance on the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale. Results showed that the adult group functioned at a significantly higher level of emotional intelligence than the adolescent group.

In a study conducted by Day and Carroll (2004), experience was positively correlated with three of the four emotional intelligence scales, as measured by the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test. Van Rooy, Alonso, and Viswesvaran (2005) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and age using the 33-item Emotional Intelligence Scale. There was a significant positive correlation between emotional intelligence and age. Despite these findings, there is a limited amount of research that has examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and work experience. Intuitively, one might assume that emotional intelligence will increase as work experience increases. However, empirical research is needed to test this hypothesis.

2.10.4. Job Level and Emotional Intelligence

Practitioners and organizational consultants, based on their experiences with clients firmly believe that multi-rater or 360-degree feedback systems enhance self-knowledge and consequently improve managerial behavior (Hazucha, Hezlett & Schneider, 1993; London & Beatty, 1993). Scholarly research has confirmed these sentiments and found that higher levels of congruence between managerial “self” and “other” behavioral ratings is associated with managerial effectiveness and performance (Atwater & Yammarino, 1992; Van Velsor et al., 1993). It is also widely believed that this self-other discrepancy is greater for those that are higher-level managers; although empirical studies have failed to validate this observation. Sala (2002) reported that participants with higher-level positions (senior-level manager versus entry-level manager)
rated themselves higher on the ECI than those with lower-level positions. Results indicated that there is no relationship between job levels and total others’ ratings on the ECI.

2.11. Demographic Variables on Leader’s Motivation

A person gets intrinsically motivated to perform his or her task because the activity in itself is interesting and spontaneously satisfying. “One who derives pleasure from the task itself or experiences a sense of competence or self determination is said to be intrinsically motivated” (Buelens et al., 2010). Intrinsic motivation arises from a psychological reward that comes from within and not as a result of external forces (Buelens et al., 2010). To be more specific, it can be said that any motivation that arises from the individual’s positive reaction to qualities of the task itself is intrinsic. Intrinsic motivation can be experienced as interest, involvement, curiosity, satisfaction or positive challenge (Amabile, 1996). When people are motivated because the activity is valued for its own sake and appears to be self-sustained they are said to be intrinsically motivated (Calder & Staw, 1975). To distinguish between the two it helps to think of the source of the motivation; if the source is outside of the task itself, i.e. from the environment, it is extrinsic, whilst if it comes from within the motivation is intrinsic (Amabile, 1996).

It is no longer questioned that motivation plays an important part in influencing employees’ performance (Buelens et al., 2010). Intuitively, it can be understood that being driven and engaged will support a higher work effort. Therefore, it is clear that motivating employees is an important challenge facing all types of managers today. Endless theories over the past 80 years (Buelens et al., 2010) have attempted to map out how motivation works and what steps managers need to take in order to inspire an effective workforce. Theories have stretched from wanting to determine universally applicable drives, like Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and Alderfer’s ERG theory, to
creating practical models of do’s and don’ts within motivation, like Locke’s goal-setting theory or Vroom’s expectancy theory (Buelens et al., 2010). The following sections will review the influence of demographic factors such as age, gender, length of service, designation, pay on motivation of leader’s and employees.

2.11.1. Age and Leader’s Motivation

In terms of the relationship between age and job satisfaction, most studies indicate a positive association between age and satisfaction, at least up to age 60 (Pearson, 1991; Robbins et al., 2001). Oosthuizen (2001) identified that there are statistically significant differences between age groups and the motivators – achievement, advancement and the possibility of growth, as well as the hygiene factors - company policy, status and security. Findings indicated that employees under the age of forty experienced the most satisfaction in terms of achievement, advancement and the possibility of growth whereas, those over forty indicated dissatisfaction with the possibility of growth and advancement. According to Menyennett (1999) cited in Oosthuizen (2001), the latter group also experienced the most dissatisfaction with company policy and procedure, status and security.

Schulze and Steyn (2003) found that there are significant differences in motivational factors for educators of diverse age groups. In general, older educators were significantly more motivated than the younger educators by factors such as a sense of professional growth, power and authority as well as explicit role definition. Mould (2004) found that in a study conducted in the information technology industry in South Africa, that the job itself was consistently the highest ranked factor across all groupings except for respondents below age 27, or above age 50, and respondents with no post-metrics qualifications. For each of these three groups, salary was ranked the highest, and the job itself was ranked second. Similarly, Newstrom and Davis (1989) found a statistically
significant difference between employees under thirty who were motivated by good wages, job security and promotion and growth, and older employees (that is, thirty-one to forty) were more concerned with job security. This illustrates Maslow’s theory - the younger employees need to fulfill their basic needs; these basic needs become less important as individuals move through the age groups and more emphasis is placed on their social and ego needs. Robbins et al. (2001) add that other studies have found a U-shaped relationship. In general, research indicates decreased satisfaction as employees move towards middle age, but increased satisfaction from around age forty and above. Furthermore, considering professionals and non-professionals separately, satisfaction tends to increase continually among professionals as they age, whereas it falls among non-professionals during middle age and then rises again in the later years leading to retirement. Possible reasons for this could be a result of economic insecurity; the organization’s reduced interest in the employee and fewer challenging tasks.

Furthermore, Robbins et al. (2001) found that older or tenured employees are less likely to leave an organization. They state that as workers get older, they have fewer alternative job opportunities and older workers are usually more satisfied with their jobs because of higher income, paid vacations, and pension benefits. The degree of satisfaction may also decrease because prospects for promotion are reduced, as is future job security.

There is also a widespread assumption that productivity declines with age. It is believed that an individual’s skills – particularly speed, agility, strength and co-ordination - deteriorates with time, and that prolonged job boredom and lack of intellectual stimulation all contribute to reduced productivity. However, evidence contradicts these beliefs and assumptions. Other reviews of the research indicate that age and job performance are unrelated and this finding seems to be true for all types of jobs, professional and non-professional (Robbins et al., 2001).
2.11.2. Gender and Leader’s Motivation

Differences in the levels and nature of motivation between males and females are expected, based on a few assumptions. Firstly, the Needs Fulfillment Theory postulates that job motivation is determined by the biological, psychological and social needs of an individual. These needs are believed to influence the behaviour of an individual on the job. As males and females differ at least on the biological aspects, the possibility of differences in job motivation, in terms of this theory, can be expected. Secondly, Social Learning Theory accentuates environmental factors as opposed to individual factors. In line with this, societal norms and social interactions could lead to males being reared with expression of aggression being encouraged and achievement being rewarded, whilst females might be reared being docile and behaviour supporting others is rewarded. This could explain the gender differences in job motivation.

According to Pearson (1991) and Robbins et al. (2001), there is no evidence indicating that an employee’s gender affects job satisfaction. Gilbert and Walker (2001) concur with this finding. They conducted an investigative survey in the construction industry in Melbourne, Australia, to evaluate the relationship between motivation at work and gender. The survey also aimed to ascertain if professional men and women in the construction industry were motivated and de-motivated by the same variables. The research concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in total motivation and de-motivation levels between male and female employees (Gilbert & Walker, 2001).

Similarly, Newstrom and Davis (1989) and Schultze and Steyn (2003) found that there were no significant differences between factors that motivated male and female employees. On the other hand, Oosthuizen (2001) found that significant differences exist between males and females regarding the motivator’s recognition and responsibility and the hygiene factors status and factors influencing their personal life. He found that
females are most satisfied with recognition and males with responsibility. Males were dissatisfied with status, while females reported the highest dissatisfaction due to work factors that were influencing their personal life. Furthermore, in a study in the information technology industry in South Africa, Mould (2004), found that male and female respondents showed some differences in their responses. The rankings by females were firstly the job itself, thereafter salary, achievement was ranked third and possibility of growth was ranked fourth. The males on the other hand, ranked the job itself first, achievement second, salary third and recognition for achievements in fourth place.

Kanters, Yardley and Nogradi (1992) indicate that results of a regression analysis using demographic variables as predictors of work motivation, identified gender as the only significant predictor. A subsequent t-test confirmed that women had significantly higher work motivation scores than men. Results of the male-subsample regression analysis indicated that satisfaction with intrinsic factors was the only significant predictor of work motivation. Results of the female-subsample regression analysis indicated that satisfaction with intrinsic factors, extrinsic factors, and co-workers were significant predictors of work motivation. Similarly, Schulze and Steyn (2003) found that female educators are significantly more motivated than their male counterparts by working with learners, by special privileges and by relations with colleagues.

Bialeschki and Henderson in Kanters et al. (1992) implied that the fact that co-workers were significant predictors of work motivation is supportive of the notion that women are more 'people-oriented' than men. According to Newstrom and Davis (1989), female employees may place greater importance on interpersonal relationships and communications than male employees. In their research, females ranked ‘appreciation of work’ as most important, whereas men ranked it second.
They argue that females in the workplace have different problems than men; many have to cope with playing a traditional role of housewives along with their roles as workers. This possible role conflict could as a result cause women to seek more appreciation of work. Similarly, Broadbridge (1999) found that female retail managers experience higher pressure levels resulting from the potential stressors in their work and family lives.

Robbins et al. (2001) further reveal that there are differences between men and women that will affect their job performance. These differences comprise inconsistent male-female differences in problem solving ability, analytical skills, competitive drive, motivation, sociability and learning ability. However, Kruger et al. (1996) do not support this view indicating that little research has been done on the difference between men and women in job performance and that most differences are based on the learned perception of a gender role that arises from a person’s cultural background.

In South Africa, research on absence as a possible consequence of job satisfaction revealed that women have higher rates of absenteeism (Robbins et al., 2001). They further state that the most logical explanation for this finding is that the South African culture has historically placed domestic and family responsibilities on women. Similarly, according to Huddleston and Good (1999), in Poland and Russia, where it is not uncommon for professionals to have more than one job, a large percentage of women in retail firms reported that they could only hold one job as there is no time for a second job due to their responsibility of taking care of the family needs. While males and females were found to be fairly similar on issues like task orientation, perseverance, future orientation and competitiveness, Murgui’s research on gender differences found that a significant difference exist between the genders on reaction to success and failure (and thus the
potential of job-achievement to motivate), fear of failure (and thus the potential of sanctions to achieve) increased productivity and social acceptance (Murgui, 1999).

2.11.3. Length of Service and Leader’s Motivation

According to Bellingan–Timmer (2004); Oosthuizen (2001) and Schulze and Steyn (2003), there is a statistically significant relationship between length of service and factors that motivate employees specially leaders. Bellingan–Timmer (2004) analyzed middle managers of the South African Police Service and discovered that middle managers with over five years service in their current rank were more dissatisfied with their advancement and independence in the organization. The middle managers with less than five years service were also more dissatisfied with their activity levels in the work, with middle managers with five years and more service in the current rank being more satisfied with the supervision in terms of human relations.

According to Robbins et al. (2001), if seniority is defined as time on a particular job, then their research demonstrates a positive relationship between seniority and productivity. Therefore, tenure expressed as work experience, appears to be a good predictor of employee productivity. Evidence indicates that tenure and satisfaction are positively related and that age coincides with experience (Schulze & Steyn, 2003). Robbins et al. (2001) adds that when age and tenure are treated separately, tenure appears to be more consistent and stable predictor of job satisfaction than chronological age.

Oosthuizen’s (2001) research revealed that there are statistically significant differences between the number of years employed at Telkom and the motivational factors, that is, advancement and possibility for growth. Further significant differences were found between the employment period at Telkom and the hygiene factors, namely, policy and procedures, status, and security. The highest level of dissatisfaction for advancement is present in employees that have been employed for more than twenty
years at the organization. Findings also indicated that while these employees are very dissatisfied with the possibility of growth, strong levels of satisfaction are present amongst employees that have been employed for less than ten years.

Riseborough and Poppleton (1991) cited in Schulze and Steyn (2003), indicated that novice educators are generally more motivated than experienced educators. However, Schulze and Steyn (2003) found that there are significant differences in motivational factors for educators for various periods of experience. This indicates that experience significantly influences what educators experience as motivational. They found that the more experienced educators were significantly more motivated than the educators with less experience. Experienced educators were especially motivated by factors such as power and authority, support from supervisors and in-service education. Furthermore, Duffy, Ganster and Shaw (1998) cited in Louw et al. (2000) found a strong negative relationship between job satisfaction and negative outcomes for high-positive affectivity in individuals with longer tenure.

2.11.4. Position/Titles/Designation and Leader’s Motivation

According to Pearson (1991), satisfaction is positively related to occupational level. Research suggests that there is a relationship between level of occupation and factors that motivate employees specially leaders. Oosthuizen (2001) found that there are significant differences between position and job level, and the motivators and the hygiene factors. Some of the findings include strong levels of no satisfaction in some levels, specifically with reference to achievement; strong levels of dissatisfaction in some levels, specifically with responsibility; and significant differences in some levels when looking at the possibility of growth.

According to Analoui (2000), evidence suggests that, in terms of motives, managers are more concerned with factors such as achievement, power, status, income
and advancement. For example, Morse and Weiss (1955) cited in Analoui (2000) found that from amongst several different occupational groups, none viewed achievement and accomplishment as more important to their motivation than the management group. Although there is evidence that achievement need may be different with respect to cultural differences, basically the similarities in the motivational needs of managers across various countries are considerable (Haire, Ghiselli & Porter, 1966; cited in Analoui, 2000).

In a study conducted on senior managers in the Romanian public sector, it was found that hygiene factors such as salary, supervision and working conditions were not perceived as the sole contributing factors for a decision to change job and move to the private sector, but the need to be effective and to do the right thing was important to them (Analoui, 2000). It was identified that senior managers stayed in their job, despite financial problems, simply because they liked their job and because they had the opportunity to maximize learning, knowledge, skills, competence and self-development. Despite this, and what makes the phenomenon of motivation so complex is that, recognition and appreciation and money and salary were identified as the main factors contributing towards increased effectiveness. In fact, factors such as improved skill, promotion, teamwork and involvement were described as “the compensatory nature of motivating factors in the absence of superior recognition, inadequate pay and increasing self and career development” (Analoui, 2000).

2.11.5. Team Size and Leaders Motivation

In workplace, where teamwork is increasingly widespread throughout complex and expanding organizations, there is no hard-and-fast rule to determine the optimal number to have on each team. Today, “teams are prolific in organizations. From a managerial perspective, there is this rising recognition that teams can function to monitor
individuals more effectively than managers can control them. The teams function as a social unit; you don’t need to hand-hold as much. And tasks are becoming more complex and global, which contributes to the need for perspective that teams provide.”

While the study of team size of concentration, management experts acknowledge that size is not necessarily the first consideration when putting together an effective team. It is important to ask what type of task the team will engage in. What are the skills of the people needed to be translated into action? That would include everything from work style to personal style to knowledge base and making sure that they are appropriate to the task. The study of optimal team size seems to fascinate a lot of businesses and academics, primarily due to the fact that “in the past decade, research on team effectiveness has burgeoned as teams have become increasingly common in organizations of all kinds,” (Klein & Lim, 2006).

Klein and Lim (2006) acknowledge that when it comes to team size, each person counts: by the time team size is over eight or nine people, it becomes cumbersome and leaders will have a team that breaks down into sub-teams. Depending on the group’s task that could be a good thing or that could not be right. There is a sense that as a team gets larger, there is a tendency for social loafing, where someone gets to slide, to hide.” The Ringelmann effect describes “social loafing” as a condition where a group or team tends to “hide” the lack of individual effort (Moede, 1927; Ringelmann, 1913; as cited in Kravitz & Martin, 1986). While the research on optimal team numbers is “not conclusive, it does tend to fall into the five to 12 range, though some say five to nine is best, and the number six has come up a few times.”

But having a good team depends on more than optimal size, in the work world, it has been “reinforced that five or six is the right number (on a team). Recent research by Mueller (2012) would seem to support this notion that preparation for team success is
vital. For decades, researchers have noted that mere changes in team size can change work-group processes and resulting performance. By studying 238 workers within 26 teams, ranging from three to 20 members in size, Mueller’s research replicates the general assertion that individuals in larger teams do perform worse, but she also offers an explanation for this conclusion.

“Understanding the reasons why individuals in larger teams in real work settings perform worse may be one key to implementing successful team management tactics in organizations, since research shows that managers tend to bias their team size toward overstaffing”. In addition, “individual performance losses are less about coordination activities and more about individuals on project teams developing quality relationships with one another as a means of increasing individual performance. Because research on teams in organizations has not examined team social support as an important intra-team process, future research should examine how team social support fits in with classic models of job design to buffer teams from negative influences and difficulties caused by larger team size” (Mueller, 2012).

But is there an optimal team size? Mueller has concluded, if companies are dealing with coordination tasks and motivational issues, that correlates to a team of six. “Above and beyond five, motivation will begin to diminish”. “After the fifth person, the leaders look for cliques. And the number of people who speak at any one time? That’s harder to manage in a group of five or more” (Mueller, 2012).

2.11.6. Pay and Leader’s Motivation

Lam et al. (2001) conducted an empirical study of work motivation and job satisfaction among managers in Chinese restaurants in Hong Kong. The findings indicated that work environment, job itself, and rewards are critical factors in predicting managers' satisfaction in this specific catering sector. Bellenger, Wilcox and Ingram
(1984, cited in Mehta et al., 2000) found that most senior managers within the retail industry, placed less emphasis on pay than did junior managers; most junior sales managers considered job security to be less important than did other more senior groups. They further found that junior sales managers were more interested in promotion opportunities and personal growth than senior managers.

Huddleston and Good (1999) found that for Russian sales employees, the most important job motivators were pay and friendliness of co-workers, while their managers thought that friendliness of co-workers was the most important motivator for sales employees. They further found that Polish sales employees rated pay, a chance to do something important and friendliness of co-workers as the most important of the motivators, while their manager thought employees would rate pay as the most important motivator. Similarly Dubinsky, Jolson, Michaels, Kotabe and Lim (1993) cited in Huddleston and Good (1999) found that American salespeople ranked pay as most desirable from a list of seven job characteristics. Furthermore, Laabs (1998) cited in Huddleston and Good (1999) also found that in terms of intrinsic rewards, employees in US companies rated appreciation for work done and feeling part of a team as the top motivators.

Newstrom and Davis (1989) found a statistically significant difference when comparing lower level employees to middle and higher level non-supervisory employees. The lower organizational employees rated ‘good wages’ first and ‘job security’ second, and the middle and higher non-supervisory level rated ‘interesting work’ first and ‘appreciation of work’ second. This further supports previous evidence that basic needs must be satisfied before the higher needs are expressed.

In business, however, it seems that one particular motivational instrument is used excessively, namely money. Evidence of this can clearly be seen by the extensive use of
bonuses, provisions and stock options in companies today; money is, and always has been, the traditional go-to motivator (Dewhurst et al., 2010). But how well do these financial carrots and other extrinsic rewards really work to stimulate today’s workers? Several motivation theories have already questioned whether or not financial incentives can really work as long-term motivators; such as Herzberg’s two-factor theory and Hackman & Oldham’s job characteristic model. Herzberg’s hypothesis is that money is an important hygiene factor that needs to be fulfilled in order for the employee not to feel dissatisfaction. However, Herzberg holds that money does not work as a motivator, at least not in the long-run (Buelens et al., 2010). If this is true it holds some grave implications for many businesses’ incentive systems, but this might not be where the story ends.

Since the 1960’s a new stream of research has tried to clarify how externally controlled rewards affect motivation, and to their own surprise they found that under several circumstances rewards lead to a direct decline in motivation (Lepper & Greene, 1978; Kohn, 1999). Since then many empirical studies have supported this theory; that extrinsic rewards can crowd out intrinsic motivation and can cause several other negative effects. Consequences are particularly grave when the task at hand calls for creativity (Amabile, 1996) or complex heuristic thinking (Glucksberg, 1962).

2.12. Leadership Versus Management

There is a continuing controversy about the difference between leadership and management. Not all managers exercise leadership. Often it is assumed that anyone in a management position is a leader. Not all leaders manage. Leadership is performed by people who are not in management positions (e.g., an informal leader) (Lunenburg, 2011). Some scholars argue that although management and leadership overlap, the two
activities are not synonymous (Bass, 2010). The degree of overlap is a point of disagreement (Yukl, 2010).

Leadership and management are two distinct, yet complementary systems of action in organizations. Specifically, he states that leadership is about coping with change, whereas management is about coping with complexity (Kotter, 1987). In contrast, Bennis (1989) notes: “To survive in the twenty-first century, we are going to need a new generation of leaders—leaders, not managers. Recently, Bennis and Nanus (2007) summarized his previous quotation as follows: “Managers do things right, while leaders do the right things”.

Lunenburg (2011) presents several conclusions from his most recent study on leadership versus management. First, good leaders are not necessarily good managers, and good managers are not necessarily good leaders. Second, good management skills transform a leader’s vision into action and successful implementation. Some scholars believe that effective implementation is the driving force of organizational success, especially in relatively stable, “domesticated” organizations (Lunenburg, Thompson & Pagani, 2010). Third, organizational success requires a combination of effective leadership and management. Furthermore, team-based organizational structures are extending leadership functions to work groups and cross-department teams in most modern organizations. Thus, there is greater opportunity for more input from group members at all levels of the organization (Lunenburg, 1983). He concludes stating, organizations provide its managers with legitimate authority to lead, but there is no assurance that they will be able to lead effectively. Hence, organizations need strong leadership and strong management for optimal effectiveness.

The lines between management and leadership are fuzzy because personal connotations overpower objective denotations. Although some real differences do exist in
the perceptions of the two terms, for the purpose of this study, leaders and managers will not be distinguished, but the term leader will be used to apply to any earned or appointed role that carries with it the exercise of power and influence over others. This will allow a comparison and contrast of theories; some use the words "leadership theory" and others use the terms "managerial theory," but both addresses the power an individual has in an organization (Henman, 2011).

2.13. Upward Feedback Method

360-degree feedback is rapidly growing in popularity as leadership development and/or performance appraisal tools (London & Smither, 1995). Practitioners and organizational consultants, based on their experiences with clients, firmly believe that multi-rater or 360-degree feedback systems enhance self knowledge and consequently improve managerial behavior (Hazucha, Hezlett & Schneider, 1993; London & Beatty, 1993). Scholarly research has confirmed these sentiments and found that higher levels of congruence between managerial “self” and “other” behavioral ratings is associated with managerial effectiveness and performance (Atwater & Yammarino, 1992; Van Velsor et al., 1993). In 360-degree feedback, each rater source is believed to provide unique information regarding their perceptions and assessments of the leader (Morgeson et al., 2005; Vries, Vrignaud & Florent-treacy, 2004; Robbins, 2005) but each group on their own may not provide the full picture because they may observe the leader in different settings and thus may observe different behaviors (Mount, et al., 1998; Borman, 1974; Morgeson et al., 2005).

Upward feedback relates to a feedback given by a subordinate to an immediate supervisor. Morgeson et al. (2005) assert that direct report’s viewpoint is valuable while evaluating the individual in a leadership role (e.g., delegating tasks, delivering feedback, communicating expectations). Similarly, Robbins (2005) states that, subordinate
evaluation or upward feedback often provides accurate and detailed information about a manager’s behavior and performance but they are subject to fear of reprisal, hence anonymity has to be maintained (Antonioni, 1994).

Many leadership theorists have suggested that followers’ perspectives are necessary in-order to evaluate leadership ability (Bass, 1990; House et al., 1991). These “follower-centered” theories define leadership in terms of follower attributions. Therefore, when considering leadership attributes it may be particularly important that leaders are aware of their follower perceptions (Halverson et al., 2002). The importance of the “other” may differ with the attributes measured in the 360-degree survey. Leadership behavior (Atwater & Yammarino, 1992) may be more relevant in predicting outcomes when subordinate perceptions are the source of the 360-degree survey than when superior or peer perceptions are the source. A study conducted to test the leadership effectiveness based on follower principle found that in evaluating leader behavior, self-subordinate ratings were the best indicator of performance compared to superiors and peer ratings (Halverson et al., 2002).

On the other hand, Greguras and Robie (1998) tracked how the number of raters used in each particular category (direct report, peer, and manager) affects the reliability of the feedback. Their research showed that direct reports are the least reliable and, therefore, more participation is required to produce a reliable result.

2.14. Self – Other’s Ratings

2.14.1. Accuracy of Self-Other Ratings

Self-ratings are widely considered to be less accurate than informants’ view (e.g., Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988; Hough, Keyes, & Dunnette, 1983; Hofstee, 1994; John & Robins, 1993) and often suffer from a leniency bias (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Self-ratings may provide some insight into raters’ traits or dispositions, such as self-
esteem, or self-consciousness. Moreover, coupled with information from others’ (e.g., supervisors or peers or subordinates) ratings, self-ratings should provide insight into one’s level of self-awareness (Atwater & Yammarino, 1992). Others’ assessments offer the opportunity for individuals to understand their own personal characteristics and how these affect their work performance (Ramo & Saris, 2009).

2.14.2. Theoretical Models for Measuring Self-Other Ratings

When measuring the self-other congruence or difference the researchers can look up to two of the well suited theoretical models developed a decade ago which can be applied for all types of outcome measures.

- **4-Group Categorization Model.** This model was developed by Yammarino and Atwater (1997). The four categories they indicated were over-estimators, under-estimators, in-agreement good and in-agreement bad. They proposed good performance for in-agreement good, mixed performance for under-estimators, and poor performance for in-agreement bad and over-estimators.

- **6-Group Categorization Model.** This model was proposed by Fleenor et al., (1996), who expanded the 4-group model proposed by Atwater and Yammarino (1997) to six groups. They proposed that over-estimators and under-estimators could receive either above or below average scores from others. In their model, high and low performers are distinguished from over-estimators, under-estimators, and in-agreement estimators, resulting in six categories. Using the 6-group categorization model, they tested relationships between self-other rating congruence and concluded that variance in effectiveness for over-, under-, and in-agreement estimators could be accounted for simply by others’ ratings (i.e., whether ratings were above or below the mean), and that the degree or type of agreement was unimportant (Atwater et al., 1998).
2.14.3. Self-Other Agreement / Non-Agreement

Decades of research has suggested that self-other agreement reflects self-awareness and is related to several outcome measures including leadership and managerial effectiveness (e.g., Atwater et al., 1998; Atwater, Roush & Fischthal, 1995; Atwater & Yammarino, 1992; Van et al., 1993; Halverson et al., 2002). Self-other agreement or the similarity/difference in self-ratings compared to other ratings has been considered critical in both uses and has spurred a wealth of research in the areas of leadership (Atwater & Yammarino, 1992; Atwater, Roush, & Fischthal, 1995; Brutus, Fleenor, & Taylor, 1996; Atwater et al., 1998; Church, 2000; Dalton, 1996; Fleenor et al., 1996; Goodstone & Diamante, 1998; Johnson & Ferstl, 1999; Van et al., 1993; Halverson et al., 2002; Bradberry & Su, 2006). In addition, few of these studies further explore the importance of the direction of disagreement, suggesting that those who are in-agreement with their other receive the highest ratings, followed by under-raters (those who rate themselves below their other), and over-raters (those who rate themselves above their other) receive the lowest ratings. Fleenor et al. (1996) found that other ratings alone (whether they were above or below the mean) predicted effectiveness. He also found that self-other agreement no longer predicted effectiveness. Similarly, Brutus, Fleenor, and Taylor (1996) found that neither self-ratings alone, nor self-other agreement predicted performance, while peer ratings were a relevant predictor.

2.15. Rationale for the Study

From the extensive review of literature it can be inferred that the constructs chosen for the study namely leadership, emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational effectiveness are very broad in nature and they have remained as issues of constant and ongoing investigation among the academia and intelligentsia. Many eminent researchers such as Bass (1990) and Yukl (1994) from their vast research experience in
leadership (especially transformational leadership) claim leadership as the single most important factor in organizational success or failure. Leadership continues to be a subject of study in the modern world (Zaccaro, 2007). The extensive research during the past six or seven decades has not exhausted the topic of leadership, on the contrary, it has discovered new aspects of leadership and opened uncharted territory for further study and research (Bennis, 2007).

Methodological review of previous studies reveals that, significant research on leadership exists. So as its positive and significant unidimensional relatedness with the most popular and controversial constructs such as emotional intelligence, motivation and organizational effectiveness. But the multidimensional links between leadership emotional intelligence and motivation; leadership emotional intelligence and organizational effectiveness; and, leadership motivation (self & others) on organizational effectiveness are comparatively thin and the relationship between them is smaller yet due to the lack of universal consensus in the fundamental approach to the constructs.

A number of authors have attempted to decrease the complexity inherent in the effectiveness theory by narrowing the perspective from which effectiveness is viewed and/or measured (e.g., Cameron, 1980; Perrow, 1977; Steers, 1977; Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1981; 1983; Chelladurai, 1987) by postulating five main approaches to measuring organizational effectiveness – the goals model, the system resources model, the process model, the multiple - constituency model and competing values approach (Chelladurai, 1987). Despite the evolution, there appears to be no universal agreement on a single approach applicable for all.

Researcher in her effort to identify the suitable criteria to measure organizational effectiveness reviewed extant links established by previous studies between leadership, emotional intelligence and motivation and their impact on organizational effectiveness.
and found that, leadership effectiveness is a significant positive predictor criteria of organizational effectiveness, and that, all the organizational outcomes (positive or negative) are at some point or the other are associated with leadership. However, there are very few multidimensional studies that have evaluated organizational effectiveness based on leadership effectiveness through the use of leader’s emotional intelligence and leader’s motivating self and others. But, their indirect links do exist in the transformational leadership literature.

On the whole, it appears that the present ‘body of knowledge’ regardless of the framework, is somewhat deficient, so far as investigating the OE based on leadership effectiveness through emotional intelligence and motivation is concerned. Hence, empirical research is imperative.