3.1 BRIEF BACKGROUND

Is emotional intelligence as important as claimed? Are emotionally intelligent managers possessing transformational leadership behavior and are more satisfied, committed and successful? Many popular press articles juxtapose emotional intelligence with traditional intelligence by making claims—usually attributed to Goleman or others—such as: “Success at work is 80% dependent on emotional intelligence and only 20% dependent on IQ”. (*HR magazine*, 1997). This claim, which is not unique in the popular press on EI, is somewhat of an overstatement of the potential power of emotional intelligence. This reflects, perhaps, a desire to find a construct other than intelligence that can be used to further understand and predict performance at work. There is still much research to be done to know how emotional intelligence can be related with transformational leadership, satisfaction, commitment and success. The data that exists does suggest EI can be as powerful, and at times more powerful, than IQ (Goleman, 1998). In the promotional materials for their own emotional intelligence test, the originators of the concept, Mayor and Salovey (1997), clarify the role of emotional intelligence state. “Psychologists have yet to understand what predicts the other 80% of success in these areas of life. We believe that Emotional Intelligence is one of the abilities, which are related to life success, but we are as yet unable to determine just how important Emotional Intelligence is”. They further add that their best guess is that Emotional Intelligence will make a unique contribution in the 5% to 10% range.

Various research studies have revealed that leaders with higher emotional intelligence perform better at work places (Goleman, 1998), and use their ability to perceive and regulate their emotions to build trust and team spirit among subordinates. This phenomenon of paradigm shift has prompted further examination of the role of emotional intelligence in the leadership process. Given the usefulness of transformational leadership, attention has turned to other issues such as how it develops (Avolio & Gibbons, 1988), and associated factors such as moral development that may predispose individuals to use transformational behaviors. First,
leaders who know and can manage their own emotions, display self-control, and delay gratification, could serve as role model for their followers, thereby enhancing followers’ trust and respect for their leaders. This would be consistent with the essence of idealized influence. Second, with its emphasis on understanding others’ emotions, leaders high in emotional intelligence would be ideally placed to realize the extent to which followers’ expectations could be raised, a hallmark of inspirational motivation. Third, a major component of individualized consideration is the ability to understand followers’ needs and interact accordingly. With its emphasis on empathy and the ability to manage relationships positively, leaders manifesting emotional intelligence would be likely to manifest individualized consideration.

Thus, the contribution of emotional intelligence to transformational leadership behavior certainly seems worthy of further empirical research and theorizing. Therefore, in the present study, it is intended to focus on emotional intelligence as a factor that might predispose managers to use transformational behaviors and are more satisfied, committed and successful at their workplace.

3.2 NEED AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The Telecommunication sector in India is growing at a very fast rate. Organizations in this sector have to work very hard in order to grow and survive. Their competitive advantage is only through people. They must have very skilled, emotionally intelligent, satisfied and committed manpower. Leadership in this sector has to be more inspirational and less supervisional. Therefore, it is very important to study Emotional intelligence, Transformational leadership behavior, Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and success in this sector. Not many studies of this nature have been conducted in this sector as yet. It is in this context, that the present study was undertaken to study emotional intelligence and its impact on transformational leadership behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and success.

3.3 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study was confined to managers of the Telecommunication Organizations of Northern region which comprises of Chandigarh, Punjab, Haryana, Himachal-Pradesh and Delhi. From the magazine, *(BW, 9 April 2007)* a list of ten highest ranking
Telecommunication organizations was used to select organizations for the purpose. This survey was conducted by market research firm IMRB. The list is attached in Annexure 1. The fundamental purpose of the survey was to find out which companies were respected the most among their peers. A selection of the top ten companies was made on the basis of seven parameters. These parameters were: Innovativeness, Quality & depth of top management, Financial performance and return to shareholders, Ethics & transparency, Quality of products or services, People practices/talent management and Global competitiveness. For each parameter, the mean rating score was weighted with the number of times that company was chosen on that particular parameter. The summation of the score for any company for each parameter gave the total score* for the company. This total score* was used to assess the ranking of the company. On the basis of these ranks, two organizations from private sector (Bharti Airtel and Reliance Infocomm) with highest scores and two organizations with highest scores from public sector (BSNL and MTNL) were selected for the present study. Table no.3.3 gives the detailed information of select highest ranking organizations.

**TABLE 3.3**

**RANKING OF TELECOMMUNICATION ORGANIZATIONS UNDER STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>NAME OF THE ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BHARTI AIRTEL</td>
<td>PRIVATE SECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(TOTAL SCORE 2196.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RELIANCE INFOCOMM</td>
<td>PRIVATE SECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(TOTAL SCORE 1891.33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BSNL</td>
<td>PUBLIC SECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(TOTAL SCORE 1766.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MTNL</td>
<td>PUBLIC SECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(TOTAL SCORE 1682.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Business World Magazine (9th April 2007). India’s Most Respected Companies by Sector. (pp 42-47)

*Total score constitutes innovativeness, quality & depth of top management, financial performance & return to shareholders, ethics & transparency, quality of products or services, people practice talent management and global competitiveness.
3.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main purpose of this study was to examine the impact of Emotional Intelligence on, Transformational Leadership Behavior, Success, Commitment and Job satisfaction among Managers of the Telecommunication concerns. Thus for the present study following objectives were framed;

1) To study Emotional Intelligence, Transformational Leadership behavior, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Success of Managers and measure differences with regard to their Demographic Variables namely, public and private sector, age, gender, birth-order, marital status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary in the select Telecommunication Organizations.

2) To study the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence, Transformational Leadership behavior, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Success of Managers and measure differences with regard to their Demographic Variables namely, public and private sector, age, gender, birth-order, marital status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary in the select Telecommunication Organizations.

3) To compare the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence, Transformational Leadership behavior, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Success among managers at various levels (i.e. top, middle and low level) of public as well as private sector.

   a) among managers at various levels (i.e, top, middle and low level) between public and private sector.

4) To study the relationship and impact of Emotional Intelligence of Managers on their Transformational Leadership behavior in the select Telecommunication Organizations.

5) To study the relationship and impact of Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers on their Transformational Leadership behavior in the select Telecommunication Organizations.
6) To study the relationship and impact of Emotional Intelligence of Managers on their Job Satisfaction in the select Telecommunication Organizations.

7) To study the relationship and impact of Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers on their Job Satisfaction in the select Telecommunication Organizations.

8) To study the relationship and impact of Emotional Intelligence of Managers on their Organizational Commitment in the select Telecommunication Organizations.

9) To study the relationship and impact of Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers on their Organizational Commitment in the select Telecommunication Organizations.

10) To study the relationship and impact of Emotional Intelligence of Managers on their Perceived Success in the select Telecommunication Organizations.

11) To study the relationship and impact of Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers on their Perceived Success in the select Telecommunication Organizations.

12) To suggest and make recommendations for enhancing Emotional Intelligence of the Managers in the select Telecommunication Organizations.

3.5 HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

On the basis of the research studies the following hypotheses were framed for the present study.

**H1:** There is a significant difference in Emotional Intelligence of managers with regard to Socio-demographic variables viz. public and private sector, age, gender, birth-order, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary.

**H1(a):** There is a significant difference between Emotional Intelligence of Managers of Public and Private Sector

**H1(b):** There is a significant difference between Emotional Intelligence and Age
H1(c): There is a significant difference between Emotional Intelligence and Gender

H1(d): There is a significant difference between Emotional Intelligence and Birth Order

H1(e): There is a significant difference between Emotional Intelligence and Marital Status

H1(f): There is a significant difference between Emotional Intelligence and Socio-economic Background

H1(g): There is a significant difference between Emotional Intelligence and Academic Qualification

H1(h): There is a significant difference between Emotional Intelligence and Years of Experience

H1(i): There is a significant difference between Emotional Intelligence and the Level of Management

H1(j): There is a significant difference between Emotional Intelligence and Salary

H2: There is a significant difference in all the dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers with regard to Socio-demographic variables viz. public and private sector, age, gender, birth-order, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary.

H2(a): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers with regard to Public and Private Sector

H2(b): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers with regard to Age

H2(c): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers with regard to Gender
H2(d): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers with regard to Birth Order

H2(e): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers with regard to Marital Status

H2(f): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers with regard to Socio-economic Background

H2(g): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers with regard to Academic Qualification

H2(h): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers with regard to Years of Experience

H2(i): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers with regard to Level of Management

H2(j): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of Managers with regard to Salary

H3: There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of public and private sector managers among various levels of management (i.e. top, middle and low level)

H3(a): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of public sector managers among various levels of management (i.e. top, middle and low level)

H3(b): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of private sector managers among various levels of management (i.e. top, middle and low level)

H4: There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of managers (i.e. top, middle and low level) between public and private sector

H4(a): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of top level managers between public and private sector
H4(b): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of middle level managers between public and private sector

H4(c): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of low level managers between public and private sector

H5: There is a significant difference in Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers with regard to Socio-demographic variables viz, public and private sector, age, gender, birth-order, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary

H5(a): There is a significant difference between Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers of Public and Private Sector

H5(b): There is a significant difference between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Age

H5(c): There is a significant difference between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Gender

H5(d): There is a significant difference between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Birth-Order

H5(e): There is a significant difference between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Marital-Status

H5(f): There is a significant difference between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Socio-Economic Background

H5(g): There is a significant difference between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Academic Qualification

H5(h): There is a significant difference between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Years of Experience

H5(i): There is a significant difference between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Level of Management

H5(j): There is a significant difference between Transformational Leadership Behavior and Salary
H6: There is a significant difference in all the dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers with regard to Socio-demographic variables viz. public and private sector, age, gender, birth -order, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary

H6(a): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers of Public and Private Sector

H6(b): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers with regard to Age

H6(c): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers with regard to Gender

H6(d): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers with regard to Birth Order

H6(e): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers with regard to Marital Status

H6(f): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers with regard to Socio-economic Background

H6(g): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers with regard to Academic Qualification

H6(h): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers with regard to Years of Experience
H6(i): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers with regard to Level of Management

H6(j): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of Managers with regard to Salary

H7: There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of public and private sector managers among various levels of management (i.e., top, middle and low level)

H7(a): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of public sector managers among various levels of management (i.e., top, middle and low level)

H7(b): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of private sector managers among various levels of management (i.e., top, middle and low level)

H8: There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of managers (i.e., top, middle and low level) between public and private sector

H8(a): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of top level managers between public and private sector

H8(b): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of middle level managers between public and private sector

H8(c): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of low level managers between public and private sector

H9: There is a positive correlation between Emotional Intelligence and Transformational Leadership Behavior
H10: There is a positive correlation between all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence and Components of Transformational Leadership Behavior

H11: There is a significant effect of Emotional Intelligence on Transformational Leadership Behavior

H12: There is a significant effect of Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence on Transformational Leadership Behavior

H13: There is a significant difference in Job Satisfaction of Managers with regard to Socio-demographic variables viz. public and private sector, age, gender, birth-order, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary

H13(a): There is a significant difference between Job Satisfaction of Managers of Public and Private Sector

H13(b): There is a significant difference between Job Satisfaction and Age

H13(c): There is a significant difference between Job Satisfaction and Gender

H13(d): There is a significant difference between Job Satisfaction and Birth-Order

H13(e): There is a significant difference between Job Satisfaction and Marital-Status

H13(f): There is a significant difference between Job Satisfaction and Socio-Economic Background

H13(g): There is a significant difference between Job Satisfaction and Academic Qualification

H13(h): There is a significant difference between Job Satisfaction and Years of Experience

H13(i): There is a significant difference between Job Satisfaction and Level of Management

H13(j): There is a significant difference between Job Satisfaction and Salary
H14: There is a significant difference in all the dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Managers with regard to Socio-demographic variables viz. public and private sector, age, gender, birth -order, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary

H14(a): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Managers of Public and Private Sector

H14(b): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Managers with regard to Age

H14(c): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Managers with regard to Gender

H14(d): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Managers with regard to Birth-Order

H14(e): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Managers with regard to Marital-Status

H14(f): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Managers with regard to Socio-Economic Background

H14(g): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Managers with regard to Academic Qualification

H14(h): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Managers with regard to Years of Experience

H14(i): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Managers with regard to Level of Management

H14(j): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of Managers with regard to Salary

H15: There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of public and private sector managers among various levels of management (i.e. top, middle and low level)
H15(a): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of public sector managers among various levels of management (i.e. top, middle and low level)

H15(b): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of private sector managers among various levels of management (i.e. top, middle and low level)

H16: There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of managers (i.e. top, middle and low level) between public and private sector

H16(a): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of top level managers between public and private sector

H16(b): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of middle level managers between public and private sector

H16(c): There is a significant difference in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of low level managers between public and private sector

H17: There is a positive correlation between Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction

H18: There is a positive correlation between all the Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence and Components of Job Satisfaction

H19: There is a significant effect of Emotional Intelligence on Job Satisfaction

H20: There is a significant effect of Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence on Job Satisfaction

H21: There is a significant difference in Organizational Commitment of Managers with regard to Socio-demographic variables viz. public and private sector, age, gender, birth-order, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary

H21(a): There is a significant difference between Organizational Commitment of Managers of Public and Private Sector
H21(b): There is a significant difference between Organizational Commitment and Age

H21(c): There is a significant difference between Organizational Commitment and Gender

H21(d): There is a significant difference between Organizational Commitment and Birth-Order

H21(e): There is a significant difference between Organizational Commitment and Marital Status

H21(f): There is a significant difference between Organizational Commitment and Socio-Economic Background

H21(g): There is a significant difference between Organizational Commitment and Academic Qualification

H21(h): There is a significant difference between Organizational Commitment and Years of Experience

H21(i): There is a significant difference between Organizational Commitment and Level of Management

H21(j): There is a significant difference between Organizational Commitment and Salary

H22: There is a significant difference in Organizational Commitment of public and private sector managers among various levels of management (i.e. top, middle and low level)

H22(a): There is a significant difference in Organizational Commitment of public sector managers among various levels of management (i.e. top, middle and low level)

H22(b): There is a significant difference in Organizational Commitment of private sector managers among various levels of management (i.e. top, middle and low level)
H23: There is a significant difference in Organizational Commitment of managers (i.e., top, middle and low level) between public and private sector

H23(a): There is a significant difference in Organizational Commitment of top level managers between public and private sector

H23(b): There is a significant difference in Organizational Commitment of middle level managers between public and private sector

H23(c): There is a significant difference in Organizational Commitment of low level managers between public and private sector

H24: There is a significant difference in Perceived Success of Managers with regard to Socio-demographic variables viz, public and private sector, age, gender, birth-order, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary

H24(a): There is a significant difference between Perceived Success of Managers of Public and Private Sector

H24(b): There is a significant difference between Perceived Success and Age

H24(c): There is a significant difference between Perceived Success and Gender

H24(d): There is a significant difference between Perceived Success and Birth-Order

H24(e): There is a significant difference between Perceived Success and Marital Status

H24(f): There is a significant difference between Perceived Success and Socio-Economic Background

H24(g): There is a significant difference between Perceived Success and Academic Qualification

H24(h): There is a significant difference between Perceived Success and Years of Experience
H24(i): There is a significant difference between Perceived Success and Level of Management

H24(j): There is a significant difference between Perceived Success and Salary

H25: There is a significant difference in Perceived Success of public and private sector managers among various levels of management (i.e, top, middle and low level)

H25(a): There is a significant difference in Perceived Success of public sector managers among various levels of management (i.e, top, middle and low level)

H25(b): There is a significant difference in Perceived Success of private sector managers among various levels of management (i.e, top, middle and low level)

H26: There is a significant difference in Perceived Success of managers (i.e. top, middle and low level) between public and private sector

H26(a): There is a significant difference in Perceived Success of top level managers between public and private sector

H26(b): There is a significant difference in Perceived Success of middle level managers between public and private sector

H26(c): There is a significant difference in Perceived Success of low level managers between public and private sector

H27: There is a positive correlation between Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Commitment

H28: There is a positive correlation between Emotional Intelligence and Perceived Success

H29: There is a positive correlation between all the dimensions of Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Commitment
H30: There is a positive correlation between all the dimensions of Emotional Intelligence and Perceived Success

H31: There is a significant effect of Emotional Intelligence on Organizational Commitment

H32: There is a significant effect of Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence on Organizational Commitment

H33: There is a significant effect of Emotional Intelligence on Perceived Success

H34: There is a significant effect of Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence on Perceived Success

3.6 METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

Collection of Primary Data:

For the purpose of present study, it was decided to use interview method for collecting the data. Personal information regarding respondents’ age, gender, birth-order, marital-status, socio-economic background, qualification, experience, level of management and salary was collected. The study employed the following measures:

A) Measure of Emotional Intelligence

The Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire developed by Mohan, Malhotra and Mangla (2003) was used for the purpose of measuring the variable of Emotional Intelligence. El questionnaire consists of statements giving an opportunity to explore and describe yourself. It indicates the degree to which each statement is true of the way you feel, think or act most of the time and in most of the situations. The questionnaire consisted of 95 statements, which were sub classified into 29 emotional competencies. These competencies are described as follows:

1) Emotional Self-Awareness: It is the ability of an individual to be aware of his feelings and being able to understand and differentiate between those feelings. It involves recognizing your feelings, being in touch with your feelings and understanding your inner-world of thoughts and emotions.
2) **Emotional Expression**: It is the ability to share one’s feeling with others. It is ability to express and articulate one’s positive as well as negative emotions with ease.

3) **Emotional Awareness of others (Empathy)**: It is the ability to be sensitive to feelings of other people. It is the capacity to put oneself in other person shoes and to understand the unsaid and unexpressed feelings and emotions of others.

4) **Interpersonal Relationships**: It is the ability to build and maintain long-term relationships with other people. It involves connecting with people at deeper level and building of strong social network.

5) **Stress Tolerance/Resilience**: It is the ability to bounce back from the stressful situations with ease. It is the ability to face distressing events with composure and employing suitable techniques to combat stress.

6) **Impulse Control**: It is the ability of an individual to delay gratification and exercise control over his impulses. It reflects the degree to which an individual is relaxed and patient.

7) **Intentionality**: It is the ability of an individual to forego short-term goals for attaining long-term objectives. It reflects the degree of focus on objectives of life.

8) **Creativity/Innovativeness**: It is the ability to come forth with new ideas to generate novel solutions to problems.

9) **Outlook**: Outlook is the ability of an individual to look at the bright side of things. It involves the ability to take advantage of the opportunities and adapting a optimistic approach towards life.

10) **Intuition**: It is one’s ability to understand or know something immediately, without conscious reasoning, to rely on one’s gut feelings and to foresee things.

11) **Trust Radius**: It means taking other people in confidence and disclosing personal feelings and thoughts to others.
12) **Quality of life:** It is the potentiality of an individual to lead purposeful and meaningful life. It is the ability to live life to the fullest and feeling energetic and motivated to pursue goals of life.

13) **Optimal Performance:** It is the capability of an individual to optimize his potentialities in every situation and achieving a sense of satisfaction from one’s performance.

14) **Adaptability to Change:** It is the ability of an individual to rapidly adjust to new situations. It reflects the degree to which an individual is able to unlearn past behavior and imbibe new methods of dealing.

15) **Assertiveness:** It is the ability to put forth one’s emotions and thoughts with conviction and belief in yourself.

16) **Self-Regard:** It is the ability of an individual to respect himself/herself. It constitutes belief in one’s potentialities and accepting one-self the way he or she is.

17) **Self-Actualization:** It is the ability of an individual to realize his talent to the fullest possible extent and making the most of one’s abilities by doing what one can do.

18) **Independence:** It is the capability of an individual to be on his own in all respects. It is the reflected in self-confidence, self-reliance, faith in your strengths and desire to meet expectations of other while still maintaining one’s individuality.

19) **Compassion:** It is the ability of an individual to feel pain of others and a tendency to help out people in trouble.

20) **Constructive Discontent:** It is the tendency to be open to feedback. It is the degree to which an individual confronts or avoids problems.

21) **Social Responsibility:** It is the ability of an individual to think and feel about others. It means being responsible for one’s action and its impact on society at large.
22) **Leadership:** It is the ability of an individual to motivate and influence others. It is the degree to which people share their mission.

23) **Integrity/Ethics:** It is the predisposition of an individual to follow the inner voice of consciousness and practice values and ethics in life.

24) **Communication:** It is the ability of an individual to share his feelings with others and to express his ideas. It is the capacity to listen other person’s point of view and also being open to feedback from others.

25) **Conflict:** It is the tendency of an individual to confront and resolve the problem and agreeing to others perspective.

26) **Attitude towards Self & Others:** It expressed as conviction of an individual in himself/herself and others. It means being self-confident and respecting your own as well as others ideas and decisions.

27) **Motivation:** It is the ability of an individual to set easy or challenging goals for himself/herself. It reflects the tendency to complete the task or excel in one’s pursuits, to be motivated by monetary factors or sense of accomplishment.

28) **Team Spirit & Collaboration:** It is the ability of an individual to work to his best, when working along with others.

29) **Spirituality:** It is the quest of an individual for meaningful and goal directed life beyond materialistic world.

The representation of different components according to the item numbers is given below:

- **Emotional Self-Awareness**  1 to 3
- **Emotional Expression**  4 to 6
- **Emotional awareness of others / Empathy**  7 to 10
- **Interpersonal Relationships**  11 to 14
- **Stress Tolerance / Resilience**  15 to 17
- **Impulse Control**  18 to 22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>23 to 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity / Innovativeness</td>
<td>26 to 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlook</td>
<td>29 to 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>33 to 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Radius</td>
<td>36 to 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>38 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal Performance</td>
<td>41 to 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability to Change</td>
<td>44 to 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>47 to 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regard</td>
<td>50 to 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization</td>
<td>53 to 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>56 to 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>59 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive Discontent</td>
<td>61 to 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>63 to 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>65 to 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity / Ethics</td>
<td>69 to 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>73 to 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>77 to 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards self &amp; others</td>
<td>81 to 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>85 to 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Spirit &amp; Collaboration</td>
<td>87 to 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>91 to 95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The items were scored on a five-point scale according to the following response categories:

1- Not true of me
2- Seldom true of me
3- Sometimes true of me
4- Often true of me
5- Mostly true of me

B) Measure of Transformational Leadership Behavior

The scale used for the purpose of measuring the Transformational Leadership Behavior of individual organizational managers was the one developed by Podsakoff et. al. (1990). Six basic dimensions of the transformational leader are profiled by this self-assessment: articulate vision, provide appropriate model, foster acceptance of goals, high performance expectations, individual support, and intellectual stimulation. This scale consist of 23 items. The dimensions of transformational leadership assessed by this scale were as follows:

1.) Identifying and Articulating a Vision: The items in this category related to behavior on the part of the leader aimed at identifying new opportunities for his or her unit/division/company, and developing, articulating and inspiring others with his or her vision of the future.

2.) Providing an Appropriate Model: The items in this category related to the behavior on the part of the leader that sets an example for employees to follow that is consistent with the values the leader espouses.

3.) Fostering the Acceptance of Group Goals: The items in this category related to the behavior on the part of the leader aimed at promoting cooperation among employees and getting them to work together toward a common goal.

4.) High performance Expectations: The items in category relate to the behavior that demonstrates the leader’s expectation for excellence, quality, and/or high performance on the part of followers.

5.) Providing Individualized Support: The items in this category relate to the behavior on the part of the leader that indicates that he/she respects followers and is concerned about their personal feelings and needs.
6.) **Intellectual Stimulation:** The items in this category relate to the behavior on the part of the leader that challenges followers to reexamine some of their assumptions about their work and rethink how it can be performed.

The representation of different components according to the item numbers is given below:

- **Articulate Vision**
  - 1 to 5
- **Role Model**
  - 6 to 8
- **Foster Acceptance of Goals**
  - 9 to 12
- **High Performance Expectation**
  - 13 to 15
- **Individual Support**
  - 16 to 19
- **Intellectual Stimulation**
  - 20 to 23

The items were scored on a four-point scale according to the following response categories.

1. Does not apply
2. Applies to a little extent
3. Applies to a moderate extent
4. Applies to a great extent

C) **Measure of Job Satisfaction**

For the purpose of measuring Job Satisfaction, the scale developed by Spector (1985) was used. It was designed to assess employee attitudes about the job and aspects of the job. It consist of 36-items which describe nine job facets (four items per facet). The job facets include pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication. It was originally developed to assess job satisfaction in human service, non-profit, and
public organizations. The dimensions of job satisfaction assessed by this scale were as follows:

1. **Pay Satisfaction:** The items in this category related to how a person feels satisfied in terms of pay/wage/salary which he/she is getting for the work done by him.

2. **Promotion Satisfaction:** The degree to which an employee is satisfied with the company’s promotion policy, including frequency of promotions, and the desirability of promotions.

3. **Supervision Satisfaction:** The extent to which an employee is satisfied with his or supervision, as measured by consideration and employee-centered actions of the supervisor and the perceived competency of the supervisor by the subordinate.

4. **Benefits Satisfaction:** The items in this category relate to whether subordinates are satisfied with the benefits provided to them by the organization. Some of these benefits are: housing (employer-provided or employer-paid), group insurance (health, dental, life etc.), disability income protection, retirement benefits, daycare, tuition reimbursement, sick leave, vacation (paid and non-paid), social security, profit sharing, funding of education, and other specialized benefits.

5. **Reward Satisfaction:** The items in this category relate to whether subordinates are recognized, appreciated and involved in decision making process for the work they done for the organization.

6. **Operating Procedure Satisfaction:** The items in this category relate to how much persons are satisfied with the rules, regulations and procedures adopted by the organization.

7. **Co-workers Satisfaction:** The items in this category relate to work related interaction and the mutual liking or admiration of fellow employees.

8. **Work Itself Satisfaction:** The extent to which an employee is satisfied with work, including opportunities for creativity and task variety, allowing an
individual to increase his or her knowledge, changes in responsibility, amount of work, security and job enrichment.

9.) Communication Satisfaction: The items in this category relate to whether goals and work assignments are cleared to every individual with the help of appropriate communication methods.

The representation of different components according to the item numbers is given below:

- **Pay Satisfaction** 1 to 4
- **Promotion Satisfaction** 5 to 8
- **Supervision Satisfaction** 9 to 12
- **Benefit Satisfaction** 13 to 16
- **Reward Satisfaction** 17 to 20
- **Operating Procedure Satisfaction** 21 to 24
- **Co-worker Satisfaction** 25 to 28
- **Work itself Satisfaction** 29 to 32
- **Communication Satisfaction** 33 to 36

The items were scored on a six-point scale according to the following response categories.

1- Disagree very much
2- Disagree moderately
3- Disagree slightly
4- Agree slightly
5- Agree moderately
6- Agree very much
D) Measure of Organizational Commitment

For the purpose of measuring Organizational Commitment, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) which was developed by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) was used. It uses 15 items to describe global organizational commitment. This widely used measure has been modified to examine professional commitment by replacing the word organization with profession. It has also been used to assess job commitment by changing the wording from organization to job. The 15 statements represent possible feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work.

The items were scored on a seven-point scale according to the following response categories.

1- Strongly disagree
2- Moderately disagree
3- Slightly disagree
4- Neither disagree nor agree
5- Slightly agree
6- Moderately agree
7- Strongly agree

E) Measure of Perceived Success

Many factors contribute to success of people. For the purpose of measuring Success, the questionnaire developed by Pareek & Rao (1991) was used. This scale consists of only 5 items. The perceived success was used to measure items like how successful is the respondent in his own eyes, in the eyes of colleagues etc.
The items were scored on a five-point scale according to the following response categories.

1- To a very great extent
2- To a great extent
3- To some extent
4- To a small extent
5- To almost no extent

**Reliability and Validity Analysis:**

Reliability can be defined as the extent to which a variable is consistent in what it is intended to measure. Several measures of reliability can ascertain the reliability of the measuring instrument. These include test-retest methods, equivalent forms, split halves method and internal consistency method. In the present research the reliability of the scales was determined by using Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha (α) as shown in table 3.8. The reliability coefficient indicated that the scale used for measuring Emotional Intelligence (EI), Transformational Leadership Behavior (TLB) and Job Satisfaction (JS) is quite reliable as their respective alpha value is .917, .912 and .877. An alpha value of 0.60 and 0.70 or above is considered to be the criterion for demonstrating internal consistency of new scales and established scales respectively. As the value exceeded the minimum requirement, it thereby demonstrates that all the dimensions of emotional intelligence, transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction are internally consistent.

**TABLE 3.6**

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS OF THE SCALES USED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Emotional Intelligence (EI) Scale</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership Behavior (TLB) Scale</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction Scale (JS) Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha (α)</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a Values of 0.70 and above testifies strong reliability of the scale
The validity represents the extent to which a measure correctly represents the concept of the study. Several different forms of validity can serve as a criterion for assessing the psychometric soundness of a scale: face validity, content validity, convergent validity and divergent validity. The content validity of the scales was developed on the basis of detailed analysis of the literature and was also supported through the thorough review by both the academicians and practitioners in the field. The present research instrument is also having a high convergent validity, which pertains to the extent to which the scale items assumed to represent a construct do in fact “converge” on the same construct. The reliability of scales as measured by coefficient alpha, which is .917, .912 and .877 for EI scale, TLB scale and JS scale respectively, reflects the degree of cohesiveness among the scale items and is an indirect indicator of convergent validity.

Collection of Secondary Data:

Secondary data was collected from books, magazines, journals, periodicals, libraries, different websites and respective Telecommunication Organizations.

3.7 SELECTION OF SAMPLE

As there were Head Offices and many branches of Telecommunication organizations in the Northern Region under study. For the purpose of present study, Head Offices and one branch from each Telecommunication organizations under study was chosen. The branch which was chosen was the one with maximum number of managers. A list of managers was obtained from the HRD Departments of all Telecommunication Organizations under study.

In the public sector, the total universe was N= 1310, with 570 managers in the BSNL and 740 managers in the MTNL. Out of which approximately 30% of the managers were chosen on the basis of simple random sampling, making a total sample of n = 393 managers and the questionnaires were administered to them. The total number of questionnaires which were received from the managers of public sector was 243, making a response rate of 62%. Similarly in the private sector, the total universe was
N = 286, with 152 managers from Bharti Airtel and 134 managers from the Reliance Infocomm. Out of which 30% of the universe was drawn as the sample, which is equal to 85. The total number of questionnaires received from the managers of private sector was 77, making a response rate of 90%. The detailed information about the selection of managers of public and private sector telecommunication organizations is given in the table 3.8.

**TABLE 3.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR NO.</th>
<th>SECTOR (PUBLIC)</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF MANAGERS</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF MANAGERS TO WHOM QUESTIONNAIRES WERE ADMINISTERED</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF MANAGERS FROM WHOM QUESTIONNAIRES WERE RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Sector (BSNL)</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Sector (MTNL)</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 1310</strong></td>
<td><strong>n = 393</strong></td>
<td><strong>243</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Private Sector (Bharti Airtel)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Private Sector (Reliance Infocomm)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 286</strong></td>
<td><strong>n = 85</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Public +Private Sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 1596</strong></td>
<td><strong>n = 478</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.8 ANALYSIS OF DATA**

To arrive at pertinent analysis, the collected data was put to a planned statistical analysis using SPSS package. After scoring the questionnaires the data of all the managers from both public sector and private sector was pooled and tabulated. To
arrive at certain conclusions regarding the hypothesis advanced in the present investigation, the description of the statistical tools, which were applied for the analysis of the data, is as follows:

a) **Descriptive Analysis:** Measures of central tendency such as Means, Standard Deviation, etc. were worked out to study the nature and distribution of scores on the various variables.

b) **T-test:** In order to study the significance of difference between two groups t-test was carried out.

c) **Analysis of Variance (ANOVA):** To study the significance of difference between more than two groups ANOVA was carried out.

d) **Correlation Analysis:** The relationship between the dimensions of independent variables viz. Emotional Intelligence and dependent variables viz. transformational leadership behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and perceived success was analyzed by the correlation matrix. Pearson’s correlation has been used.

e) **Multiple Regression Analysis:** The multiple regression analysis was done to examine the significant effect of independent variables on the dependent variable.

### 3.9 SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE MANAGERS

Table 3.9 shows a breakdown of the managers who responded to our questionnaire. The table shows the distribution of respondents according to sector, age, gender, birth order, marital status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, levels of management, working hours and salary. The data analyzed are presented in the form of pie-charts, followed by a description of the most salient sample characteristics by means of frequencies and percentages.
(a) Sector

Figure 3.9 (a) illustrates the sector wise classification of the sample. The sample consisted of 320 managers, whereby 243 (76%) were from public sector and 77 managers (24%) were from the private sector.

(b) Age

As depicted in figure 3.9 (b), age wise the sample was grouped into four categories i.e 21-30 yrs, 31-40 yrs, 41-50 yrs and above 50 yrs. Further it reveals that, 29.1% of the managers were in the age group of 31-40 yrs, 27.8% were in the age group of 41-50 yrs, 22.8% of the managers were in the age group above 50 yrs and 20.3% of the managers were in the age group of 21-30 yrs.
TABLE 3.9
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE MANAGERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth-Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldest</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital-Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Urban</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Phil/Ph.D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 yrs</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 yrs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 yrs</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Level</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Level</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15000 – 25000</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25001 – 35000</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35001 – 45000</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45001 &amp; Above</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Gender
The figure 3.9 (c) presents the gender distribution of the sample. The sample was representative of a larger number of male respondents to that of female respondents. Male respondents comprised of 90.6% compared to 9.4% female respondents.

![Gender Distribution](image)

**Figure 3.9 (c): Distribution of Respondents According to Gender**

(d) Birth - Order
The managers profile further reveals that a major chunk of 43.2% of the managers were of middle birth order while 30.9% of the managers were the eldest in the families and 25.9% were the youngest in the families as shown in figure 3.9 (d).

![Birth-Order Distribution](image)

**Figure 3.9 (d): Distribution of Respondents According to Birth Order**
(e) Marital - Status

According to marital-status, the respondents were classified into three categories viz, married, unmarried and single. The figure 3.9 (e) reveals that overwhelming majority 87% of the managers were married while 13% were unmarried.

![Marital Status Pie Chart]

Figure 3.9 (e): Distribution of Respondents According to Marital-Status

(f) Socio-Economic Background

As far as the socio-economic background of the managers is concerned, figure 3.9 (f) reveals that 60% of them were urbanites followed by 27% of managers belonging to semi-urban background and 13% of them were of rural background.

![Socio-Economic Background Pie Chart]

Figure 3.9 (f): Distribution of Respondents According to Socio-Economic Background
(g) Academic Qualification

Figure 3.9 (g) illustrates the education level of the sample. Thus, with regard to academic qualification the respondents were classified into three categories viz, graduate, post-graduate, and any other. The graph depicts that majority of 57% managers were graduates, 39% were post-graduates and 4% of the managers were having M.Phil/Ph.D qualification.

(h) Years of Experience

The respondents were classified under three subgroups according to their years of experience viz, less than 5 yrs, 5-10 yrs and more than 10 yrs. It can be viewed in figure 3.9 (h) that the majority of 67% managers have more than 10 years of experience followed by 27% of the managers having less than 5 years of experience and only 6% of managers having an experience of 5-10 years.
(i) Level of Management

Figure 3.9 (i) show the managerial levels where it was found that 42.2% of the managers were at the low level followed by 38.8% at the middle level and 19% were at the top level. This shows that most of the managers are in the low level of management in selected organizations.

![Level of Management](image)

**Figure 3.9 (i): Distribution of Respondents According to Levels of Management**

(j) Salary

Figure 3.9 (j) displays the graphic presentation of salary distribution of the sample. The sample was grouped under four subgroups according to their salary for the purpose of data analysis. The number of respondents in each subgroup and their percentage is shown in table 3.9. It was found that in the salary bracket of 15000-25000, 25001-35000, 35001-45000 and above 45000 there were 28%, 32%, 27% and 13% of the respondents respectively.

![Salary](image)

**Figure 3.9 (j): Distribution of Respondents According to Salary**
3.10 SUMMING UP

To recapitulate, the major objective of the present study was to examine the impact of Emotional Intelligence on Transformational Leadership Behavior, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Success of the managers in the Telecommunication industry in the northern part of India.

Emotional Intelligence was treated as ‘independent’ variable having twenty nine dimensions and ‘dependent’ variables were transformational leadership behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and success. The ‘moderating’ variables namely sector, age, gender, birth-order, marital status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management, working hours and salary were included to examine their relationship with emotional intelligence, transformational leadership behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and success respectively. To study the Emotional Intelligence of the managers a questionnaire framed by Mohan, Malhotra and Mangla (2003) was used. The Transformational Leadership Behavior was determined through a scale developed by Podsakoff et. al (1990). The level of Job Satisfaction was measured using the scale developed by Spector (1985) and Organizational Commitment is determined by using the scale developed by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979). Finally Perceived Success was studied through standardized scale which was developed by Pareek and Rao (1991).

The data were subjected to a number of statistical analyses for drawing inferences. Data were analyzed using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). In order to test the objectives of this study, mainly means, standard deviations, t-ratio, analysis of variance (ANOVA), correlation and multiple regression analysis were performed.

The sample consisted of 320 managers, whereby 76% were from public sector and 24% were from private sector. Of the sample, 29.1% of the managers were between the ages of 31-40 yrs, 27.8% were between the ages of 41-50 yrs, 22.8% were between the ages of above 50 yrs old and remaining 20.3% ranged in age of 21-30 yrs old. The sample was composed of 90.6% male and 9.4% female managers while 43.2%, 30.9% and 25.9% were of middle, eldest and youngest birth order groups respectively. Of the managers surveyed, 87% were married and 13% were unmarried.
As far as the socio-economic background is concerned, 60.6% of managers were urbanities followed by 26.6% of managers belonging to semi-urban background and 12.8% of them were of rural background. 57% of the managers were graduates, 39% were post-graduates and remaining 4% of the managers were classified as other. With regard to years of experience, 66.6% managers have more than 10 years of experience followed by 27.2% of the managers having less than 5 years of experience and only 6.3% of managers having an experience of 5-10 years. It was also found that 42.2% of the managers were at the low level followed by 38.8% at the middle level and 19% were at the top level. Of the sample it was found that in the salary bracket of 15000-25000, 25001-35000, 35001-45000 and above 45000 there were 27.9%, 32.6%, 27% and 12.5% of the respondents respectively.