CHAPTER 8
SUMMARY, SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 SUMMARY

The aim of the present study was to examine the impact of Emotional Intelligence on Transformational Leadership Behavior, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Success. To study the Emotional Intelligence of the managers, a questionnaire developed by Mohan Malhotra and Mangla (2003) was used. Emotional Intelligence had twenty-nine dimensions namely- Emotional Self Awareness (ESA), Emotional Expression (EE), Emotional Awareness of Others (EAO), Interpersonal Relationships (IPR), Stress Tolerance (ST), Impulse Control (IC), Intentionality (INT), Creativity/Innovativeness (C/I), Outlook (OUT), Intuition (INT), Trust Radius (TR), Quality of Life (QL), Optimal Performance (OP), Adaptability to Change (AC), Assertiveness (ASS), Self Regard (SR), Self Actualization (SA), Independence (IND), Compassion (COMP), Constructive Discontent (CD), Social Responsibility (SR), Leadership (LD), Integrity/Ethics, Communication (COMM), Conflict (CON), Attitude Towards Self & Others (ATSO), Motivation (MOT), Team Spirit & Collaboration (TS/C) and Spirituality (SP). These were treated as independent variables. The dependent variables incorporated in the study were Transformational Leadership Behavior, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Success. Transformational Leadership Behavior was studied through a scale by Podsakoff et al. (1990). Job Satisfaction was studied through a scale by Spector (1985). Organizational Commitment was studied through scale by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) and Perceived Success of the managers was studied through a scale by Pareek & Rao (1991). The socio-demographic variables namely, public and private sector, age, gender, birth order, marital status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, levels of management and salary were included to examine their impact on Emotional Intelligence, Transformational Leadership Behavior, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Success.
The primary objectives of the study were:

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

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

   b) 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.

The sample was 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 had more than 10 years of experience followed by 27.2% of the managers who had less than 5
years of experience and only 6.3% of managers had 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, 35001-45001 and above 45000 there were 27.9%, 32.6%, 27% and 12.5% of the respondents respectively.

**Emotional Intelligence and Socio-Demographic Variables**

The comparative analysis of overall Emotional Intelligence (EI) and socio-demographic variables showed that there was significant difference between overall EI of the managers with regard to age, marital status, academic qualification, level of management, salary (significant as \( p < 0.01 \)) and years of experience (significant as \( p < 0.05 \)). While there was no significant difference between total EI of the managers with regard to public & private sector, gender, birth-order and socio-economic background. Therefore, hypothesis \{H1\} is accepted as majority of the socio-demographic variables shows significant differences with emotional intelligence of managers. It can thus be concluded that there is a significant difference in emotional intelligence of managers with regard to socio-demographic variables.

The t-test was computed to examine the differences in dimensions of Emotional Intelligence of the managers of public and private sector. It was found that there were significant differences in dimensions of EI viz. emotional self awareness, impulse control, quality of life, adaptability to change, assertiveness, self-regard, independence (significant as \( p < 0.01 \)), outlook, attitude toward self & others and spirituality (significant as \( p < 0.05 \)). While there were non-significant differences in emotional intelligence dimensions viz. emotional expression, emotional awareness of others, interpersonal relationships, stress tolerance/resilience, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, intuition, trust radius, optimal performance, self actualization, compassion, constructive discontent, social responsibility, leadership, integrity/ethics, communication, conflict, motivation and team spirit & collaboration.

Hence, the hypothesis is rejected as nineteen out of twenty nine dimensions of EI show non-significant differences among managers of public and private sector.

With regard to the comparative analysis of dimensions of EI and age, it was found that there were significant differences between them on certain dimensions of EI viz.
emotional awareness of others, interpersonal relationships, stress tolerance/resilience, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, quality of life, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization, independence, compassion, social responsibility, leadership, integrity/ethics, communication (significant as p < 0.01), impulse control, optimal performance, conflict, motivation, team spirit & collaboration and spirituality (significant p < 0.05). The result further reveals that the managers above 50 years have shown significantly higher emotional resources than their counterparts in most of these dimensions. Thus, it can be inferred that Emotional Intelligence increased with age and one continues to develop it through learning and experiences. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted as twenty three out of twenty nine dimensions of El show significant difference with regard to age. While there were non-significant differences in the dimensions of El viz. emotional self awareness, emotional expression, trust radius, adaptability to change, constructive discontent and attitude towards self & others.

The dimensions of El viz. constructive discontent, integrity/ethics, team spirit & collaboration (significant as p < 0.01), optimal performance and self-regard (significant as p <0.05) shows significant differences with regard to gender. Females scored high on optimal performance, self-regard, integrity/ethics and team spirit & collaboration while males scored high on constructive discontent. While there were non-significant differences in most of the El dimensions viz. emotional self awareness, emotional expression, emotional awareness of others, interpersonal relationships, stress tolerance/resilience, impulse control, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, trust radius, quality of life, adaptability to change, assertiveness, self-actualization, independence, compassion, social responsibility, leadership, communication, conflict, attitude towards self & others, motivation and spirituality. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected as twenty four out of twenty nine dimensions of El show non-significant difference with regard to gender.

The birth order showed a significant difference only in the dimension of attitude toward self and others as the younger ones had the highest mean score followed by the eldest and middle born. While other dimensions of El viz. emotional self awareness, emotional expression, emotional awareness of others, interpersonal
relationships, stress tolerance/resilience, impulse control, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, trust radius, quality of life, optimal performance, adaptability to change, assertiveness, self regard, self actualization, independence, compassion, constructive discontent, social responsibility, leadership, integrity/ethics, communication, conflict, motivation, team spirit & collaboration and spirituality shows non-significant differences with regard to birth-order. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected as twenty eight out of twenty nine dimensions of EI show non-significant differences with regard to birth-order.

The results reveal that there were significant differences in the dimensions of emotional intelligence with regard to marital status viz, married managers scored high on interpersonal relationships, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, trust-radius, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization, independence, social-responsibility, leadership, integrity/ethics (significant as $p < 0.01$), communication and team-spirit & collaboration (significant as $p < 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis is accepted as fifteen out of twenty nine dimensions of EI show significant difference with regard to marital status. While there were non-significant differences in dimensions of EI viz. emotional self awareness, emotional expression, emotional awareness of others, stress tolerance/resilience, impulse control, quality of life, optimal performance, adaptability to change, compassion, constructive discontent, conflict, attitude towards self & others, motivation and spirituality.

There exist significant differences in the dimensions of emotional intelligence with regard to socio-economic background viz. impulse control, integrity/ethics, team spirit & collaboration (significant as $p < 0.01$), emotional awareness of others, interpersonal relationships, trust radius, adaptability to change and leadership (significant as $p < 0.05$). The data reveals that the managers from urban areas are marching ahead on emotional awareness of others, interpersonal relationships, leadership, integrity/ethics and team spirit & collaboration as compared to their semi-urban and rural counterparts. On the other hand, semi-urbanites are high on trust radius and rural counterparts are high on impulse control and adaptability to change. While there were non-significant differences in dimensions of EI and socio-demographic background viz. emotional self awareness, emotional expression, stress tolerance/resilience,
intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, quality of life, optimal performance, assertiveness, self regard, self actualization, independence, compassion, constructive discontent, social responsibility, communication, conflict, attitude towards self & others, motivation and spirituality. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected as twenty one out of twenty nine dimensions of EI shows non-significant differences with regard to socio-economic background.

It was found that the p-values are significant for most of the Emotional Intelligence dimensions with regard to academic qualification viz. emotional awareness of others, interpersonal relationships, stress tolerance/resilience, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, trust-radius, quality of life, adaptability to change, self-regard, self-actualization, social-responsibility, leadership, integrity/ethics, attitude toward self & others (significant as p < 0.01), emotional self-awareness, independence and team spirit & collaboration (significant as p < 0.05). Hence, the hypothesis is accepted as majority of the dimensions of EI i.e nineteen out of twenty nine show significant differences with regard to academic qualification. On the other hand, there were non-significant differences in dimensions of EI viz. emotional expression, impulse control, optimal performance, assertiveness, compassion, constructive discontent, communication, conflict, motivation and spirituality.

With regard to significant difference between all the dimensions of EI and years of experience, it was found that the ‘p’ values are significant for the emotional intelligence dimensions viz. interpersonal relationships, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, adaptability to change, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization, independence, compassion, leadership, integrity/ethics (significant as p < 0.01), emotional awareness of others, impulse-control, quality of life, communication and spirituality (significant as p < 0.05). Hence, it is concluded that the managers differ significantly in eighteen out of twenty nine dimensions of EI with regard to their years of experience in the organization. Thus, hypothesis is accepted. The data further reveals that the managers with more than 10 years of experience in the organization had higher score in most of these dimensions as compared to their counterparts. It might be due to the fact that growing age and
experience increases the ability of the managers to regulate their emotions. On the other hand, there were non-significant differences in dimensions of EI and years of experience viz, emotional self awareness, emotional expression, stress tolerance/resilience, trust radius, optimal performance, constructive discontent, social responsibility, conflict, attitude towards self & others, motivation and team spirit & collaboration.

The results revealed that there were significant differences in the dimensions of emotional intelligence and level of management viz, emotional self awareness, emotional awareness of others, interpersonal relationships, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, trust radius, quality of life, optimal performance, assertiveness, self regard, self actualization, independence, compassion, constructive discontent, social responsibility, leadership, integrity/ethics, communication, attitude toward self & others, team spirit & collaboration, spirituality (significant as p < 0.01), stress tolerance/resilience and adaptability to change (significant as p < 0.05). Hence, the hypothesis is accepted as twenty five out of twenty nine dimensions of EI show significant difference with regard to level of management. In most of these dimensions of EI the top level managers had the highest mean score followed by the middle and low level managers. On the other hand, there were no significant differences in the dimensions of EI viz. emotional expression, impulse control, communication and motivation.

With regard to differences in all the dimensions of EI and salary, it was found that p-values are significant for dimensions of EI namely emotional awareness of others, interpersonal relationships, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, trust radius, quality of life, optimal performance, adaptability to change, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization, independence, compassion, constructive discontent, social-responsibility, leadership, integrity/ethics, communication, attitude toward self & others, team spirit & collaboration, spirituality (significant as p < 0.01), and stress tolerance/resilience (significant as p < 0.05). Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, there were no significant differences in the dimensions of EI viz, emotional self awareness, emotional expression, impulse control, conflict and motivation.
In nutshell, it was found that there were significant differences in dimensions of Emotional Intelligence (EI) and socio-demographic variables viz, age, marital status, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary. While there were non-significant differences in dimensions of EI with regard to public and private sector, gender, birth-order and socio-economic background. Therefore, it can be said that there were significant differences between dimensions of emotional intelligence and socio-demographic variables. Hence, hypothesis \( H_2 \) is accepted.

While analyzing the dimensions of emotional intelligence among all levels of management of public sector, the results of analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed that there were significant differences on the dimensions of EI viz, emotional self awareness, emotional awareness of others, interpersonal relationships, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, trust radius, quality of life, optimal performance, assertiveness, self regard, self actualization, independence, compassion, constructive discontent, social responsibility, leadership, integrity/ethics, communication, attitude toward self & others, team spirit & collaboration and spirituality of public sector managers (significant as \( p < 0.01 \)). It was further found that in public sector, top level managers had the highest mean score in most of these dimensions as compared to their counterparts. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, dimensions of EI viz. interpersonal relationships, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, trust radius, quality of life, self regard, self actualization, compassion, constructive discontent, social responsibility, leadership, integrity/ethics, communication, conflict, team spirit & collaboration (significant as \( p < 0.01 \)), emotional awareness of others, impulse control, independence and spirituality (significant as \( p < 0.05 \)) shows significant differences between top, middle and low level managers of private sector. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. It can thus be concluded: that there were significant differences 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). Hence, hypothesis \( H_3 \) is accepted.

While analyzing the significant differences in all the dimensions of EI of public and private sector top level managers, it was found that there were no significant differences in most of the dimensions of EI. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected. With regard to significant differences in all the dimensions of EI of public and private
sector middle level managers, it was found that there were no significant differences in most of the dimensions of EI viz, emotional self awareness, emotional expression, interpersonal relationships, stress tolerance/resilience, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, intuition, trust radius, optimal performance, adaptability to change, self regard, self actualization, independence, compassion, constructive discontent, leadership, integrity/ethics, communication, attitude towards self & others, motivation, team spirit & collaboration and spirituality. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected as twenty two out of twenty nine dimensions of EI shows non-significant difference between public and private sector middle level managers. On the other hand, while analyzing the significant differences in all the dimensions of EI of public and private sector low level managers, it was found that there were no significant differences in most of the dimensions of EI viz, emotional expression, emotional awareness of others, stress tolerance/resilience, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, trust radius, quality of life, optimal performance, self regard, self actualization, compassion, constructive discontent, social responsibility, integrity/ethics, communication, attitude towards self & others, motivation, team spirit & collaboration and spirituality. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected as twenty one out of twenty nine dimensions of EI shows non-significant difference between public and private sector low level managers. It can be concluded: that there were no significant differences in all the dimensions of emotional intelligence of managers viz, top, middle and lower level between public and private sector. Therefore, hypothesis {114} is rejected.

**Emotional Intelligence and Transformational Leadership Behavior**

The differences in transformational leadership behavior of the managers across socio-demographic variables revealed that transformational leadership behavior of the managers differed significantly with regard to public and private sector, birth-order, level of management (significant as p < 0.01), age and years of experience (significant as p < 0.05). On the other hand, there were no significant differences in total TLB of the managers with regard to gender, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic-qualification and salary. Therefore, hypothesis is accepted as majority of the socio-demographic variables show significant differences with transformational
leadership behavior of managers. It can thus be concluded that there is a significant difference in transformational leadership behavior of managers with regard to socio-demographic variables. Hence, hypothesis \( H_5 \) is accepted.

The t-test revealed that certain dimensions of TLB viz. articulate vision, role model and foster acceptance of goals (significant as \( p < 0.01 \)) differed significantly amongst the public and private sector managers. It can be further inferred that in these dimensions public sector managers showed high mean score as compared to private sector managers. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. It was further found that there were no significant differences in dimensions of TLB viz. high performance expectation, individual support and intellectual stimulation with regard to public and private sector managers.

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed to examine the differences in dimensions of TLB of the managers and age. It revealed that dimensions of TLB namely articulate vision (significant as \( p < 0.05 \)), role model and foster acceptance of goals (significant as \( p < 0.01 \)) differed significantly amongst subgroups based on age. The results showed that TLB increased with age. Therefore, hypothesis is accepted. While there were no significant differences in the dimensions of TLB viz. high performance expectation, individual support and intellectual stimulation with regard to age.

The results showed that there were no significant differences between all the dimensions of TLB of the managers and gender. Therefore, hypothesis is rejected.

The results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed that there were significant differences on dimensions of TLB of the managers and birth-order. It was found that the dimensions of TLB viz. articulate vision, role model, foster acceptance of goals, high performance expectation and intellectual stimulation (significant as \( p < 0.01 \)) showed significant differences amongst subgroups of birth-order. It can also be inferred that in these dimensions the eldest born had a high score as compared to their counterparts. It might be due to the fact that elder ones being imposed with more responsibilities had such an ability which influences younger ones to follow them. Therefore, hypothesis is accepted. It was also found that only one dimension of TLB
i.e. Individual Support (INDS, p = .143) do not show any significant difference with regard to birth-order.

While analyzing the differences between dimensions of TLB of the managers and marital-status, socio-economic background and academic qualification, it was found that there were no significant differences between them. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected.

The analysis of variance computed to examine the differences in dimensions of TLB of the managers with regard to years of experience showed that dimensions of TLB viz. articulate vision, role model and foster acceptance of goals (significant as p < 0.01) differed significantly amongst subgroups based on years of experience. Further the results revealed that the managers with more than 10 years of experience in the organization had higher score in all these dimensions as compared to their counterparts. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. While there were non-significant differences in the dimensions of TLB viz. high performance expectation, individual support and intellectual stimulation with regard to years of experience.

While analyzing the differences between dimensions of TLB of the managers with regard to level of management, it was found that all the dimensions of TLB viz. articulate vision, role model, foster acceptance of goals, high performance expectation, individual support and intellectual stimulation (significant as p < 0.01) differed significantly amongst the various subgroups of level of management. The study also revealed that the middle level managers had high TLB followed by the top and low level managers. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted.

The ANOVA was also applied to check out the mean difference between dimensions of TLB of the managers with regard to salary. It was found that there were no significant differences between them. Hence, hypothesis is rejected.

In nutshell, it was found that there were significant differences in dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior (TLB) of managers and socio-demographic variables viz. public & private sector, age, birth-order, years of experience and level of management. While there were non-significant differences in dimensions of TLB and socio-demographic variables viz. gender, marital-status, socio-economic background and academic qualification.
background, academic qualification and salary. Therefore, it can be said that there were significant differences in all the dimensions of TLB of managers with regard to socio-demographic variables. Hence, hypothesis \(H_6\) is accepted.

While analyzing the comparative analysis of the dimensions of TLB among levels of management of public and private sector, using ANOVA it was found that there were significant differences in all the dimensions of TLB of the top, middle and low level public sector managers. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, there were significant differences between very few dimensions of TLB (i.e. role model, foster acceptance of goals and intellectual stimulation) of the top, middle and low level private sector managers. Therefore, hypothesis is accepted. It can thus be concluded that there were significant differences 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). Hence, hypothesis \(H_7\) is accepted.

Using t-test, it was found that there were significant differences between majority of the dimensions of TLB between public and private sector top level managers. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, there were no significant differences in the dimensions of TLB between public and private sector low level and middle level managers. Hence, hypothesis is rejected. In nutshell, it can be concluded that there were no significant differences in all the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership Behavior of managers (i.e. top, middle and low level) between public and private sector. Hence, hypothesis \(H_8\) is rejected.

The relationship and impact of emotional intelligence of managers on transformational leadership behavior was studied by using Pearson’s coefficients of correlation \(r\) and Multiple regression respectively. The result of correlation showed that there was significant relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership behavior. Therefore, hypothesis \(H_9\) is accepted. Further, the there was significant relationship of most of the dimensions of emotional intelligence with transformational leadership behavior. Hence, hypothesis \(H_{10}\) is accepted. Thus, it may be concluded that the managers who considered themselves as more transformational, were able to identify their own feelings and emotional states.
and express their own feelings to others; that they utilized emotional knowledge while solving problems; that they were able to understand the emotions of others in their workplace; that they could manage positive and negative emotions in themselves and others; and that they could effectively control their emotional states. While the results of multiple regression shows that 78% of variance in the TLB could be predicted by the EI as Adjusted R-Square = .78. Hence, hypothesis {H11} is accepted. On the other hand, amongst the Emotional Intelligence (EI) dimensions namely—interpersonal relationships, creativity / innovativeness, outlook, intuition, quality of life, adaptability to change, self-actualization, independence, compassion, social-responsibility, integrity / ethics, communication, conflict, attitude toward self & others, team-spirit & collaboration, spirituality (significant as p < 0.01), impulse Control, intentionality, trust radius, optimal performance and motivation (significant as p < 0.05) were found as the significant predictor of transformational leadership behavior. Therefore, hypothesis {HI2} is accepted as majority of the dimensions of EI had significant effect on transformational leadership behavior.

**Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction**

The results revealed that job satisfaction differed significantly amongst subgroups with regard to public and private sector (significant as p < 0.01), age and years of experience (significant as p < 0.05). While there was no significant difference between overall job satisfaction with regard to gender, birth-order, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, level of management and salary. Therefore, hypothesis {H13} is rejected as majority of the socio-demographic variables show non-significant differences with job satisfaction of managers.

The findings of the study revealed that the there were significant differences in dimensions of job satisfaction viz. pay satisfaction, reward satisfaction, operating procedure satisfaction (significant as p < 0.01), promotion satisfaction, supervision satisfaction and communication satisfaction (significant as p < 0.05) with regard to sector. It can be further inferred that in all these dimensions public sector managers are more satisfied as compared to private sector managers as their respective mean score are higher than those of their counterparts. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. While there were insignificant differences in the dimensions of JS viz. benefit
satisfaction, co-workers satisfaction and work itself satisfaction with regard to public and private sector managers.

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed to examine the differences in dimensions of job satisfaction and age. It revealed that dimensions of JS namely pay satisfaction (significant as p < 0.01), benefit satisfaction and operating procedure (significant as p < 0.05) differed significantly amongst subgroups based on age. The results showed that job satisfaction increases with age. Therefore, hypothesis is accepted. While there were no significant differences in the dimensions of JS viz, promotion satisfaction, supervision satisfaction, reward satisfaction, co-workers satisfaction, work itself satisfaction and communication satisfaction with regard to age.

Using t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) it was found that there were no significant differences between all the dimensions of job satisfaction (i.e pay, promotion, supervision, benefit, reward, operating procedure, co-workers, work itself and communication satisfaction) with regard to gender and birth-order respectively. Hence, hypothesis is rejected.

While analyzing the differences in dimensions of job satisfaction with regard to marital status, it was found that there were significant differences between promotion and communication satisfaction (significant at p < 0.05). In these dimensions married persons are more satisfied as compared to their counterparts. While there were no significant differences in the dimensions of JS viz, pay satisfaction, supervision satisfaction, benefit satisfaction, reward satisfaction, operating procedure satisfaction, co-workers satisfaction and work itself satisfaction. Hence, hypothesis is rejected as seven out of nine dimensions of JS show insignificant differences with regard to marital-status.

The analysis of variance shows that there were significant differences on benefit dimension of job satisfaction with regard to socio-economic background. On the other hand, eight dimensions of JS viz, pay, promotion, supervision, reward, operating procedure, co-workers, work itself and communication satisfaction shows insignificant differences with regard to socio-economic background of the managers under study. Therefore, hypothesis is rejected.
While analyzing the comparative analysis of dimensions of job satisfaction with regard to academic qualification, it was found that there were significant differences on the dimensions of supervision and reward satisfaction (significant as p < .05). On the other hand, there were no significant differences in the dimensions of JS, vis pay, promotion, benefit, operating procedure, co-workers, work itself satisfaction and communication satisfaction. Hence, hypothesis is rejected as majority of the dimensions of JS show non-significant differences with regard to academic qualification.

The study revealed that there were significant differences on the dimensions of job satisfaction viz, pay, reward, operating procedure satisfaction (significant as p < .05) and supervision satisfaction (significant as p < .01) with regard to years of experience. Hence, hypothesis is accepted as majority of the dimensions of JS show significant differences with regard to years of experience. On the other hand, there were insignificant differences in the dimensions of JS viz. promotion, benefit, co-workers, work itself and communication satisfaction.

With regard to comparative analysis of dimensions of job satisfaction and level of management, it was found that there were significant differences on the dimensions of job satisfaction viz, pay, supervision, reward (significant as p < .01), promotion, operating procedure and communication satisfaction (significant as p < .05). Therefore, hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, there were insignificant differences in the dimensions of JS viz. benefit, co-workers and work itself satisfaction.

Using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with regard to comparative analysis of dimensions of job satisfaction and salary, it was found that there were significant differences on the dimensions of pay, promotion (significant as p < .01) and operating procedure satisfaction (significant as p < .01). While there were insignificant differences in the dimensions of JS viz. supervision, benefit, reward, co-workers, work itself and communication satisfaction with regard to salary. Hence, hypothesis is rejected.
In nutshell, it was found that there were significant differences in dimensions of Job Satisfaction (JS) of managers and socio-demographic variables viz, public & private sector, age, years of experience and level of management. While there were non-significant differences in dimensions of JS and socio-demographic variables viz, gender, birth-order, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic qualification and salary. Therefore, it can be said that there were no significant differences in all the dimensions of JS and socio-demographic variables. Hence, hypothesis {H14} is rejected.

While analyzing the comparative analysis of dimensions of JS among levels of management of public and private sector, using ANOVA it was found that there is a significant difference between total job satisfaction (JS) of top, middle and low level managers of public sector. The data further shows that there were significant differences in dimensions of JS viz, supervision satisfaction, reward satisfaction, operating procedure satisfaction, work-itself satisfaction, communication satisfaction (significant as p< 0.01), pay satisfaction and co-worker satisfaction (significant as p < 0.05). Hence, the hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, only one of the job satisfaction dimensions i.e. reward satisfaction predicted significant differences in respect of top, middle and low level managers of private sector. While other dimensions viz. pay, promotion, supervision, benefit, operating procedure, co-workers, work itself and communication satisfaction shows insignificant differences between top, middle and low level private sector managers. Therefore, hypothesis is rejected. It can thus be concluded: that there were significant differences 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) and hence, hypothesis {H15} is accepted.

Using t-test, it was found that there was no significant difference between total job satisfaction of public and private sector top level managers. There were significant differences between them on dimensions of job satisfaction viz. communication satisfaction (significant as p < 0.01) and operating procedure satisfaction (significant as p < 0.05). On the other hand there were insignificant differences in the dimensions of JS viz. pay, promotion, supervision, benefit, reward, co-workers and work itself satisfaction. Therefore, hypothesis is rejected as majority of the dimensions of JS
show insignificant differences between public and private sector top level managers. While analyzing the JS of public and private sector middle level managers, it was found that only two of the dimensions of JS viz, pay satisfaction and reward satisfaction (significant as p < 0.01) shows significant differences. The other dimensions of JS viz, promotion, supervision, benefit, operating procedure, co-workers satisfaction, work itself and communication satisfaction shows insignificant differences between public and private sector middle level managers. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected. The results of t-test showed that there was no significant differences between total JS, promotion, supervision, benefit, co-workers and work itself satisfaction of public and private sector low level managers. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected. In nutshell, it can be concluded that there were no significant differences in all the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction of managers (i.e. top, middle and low level) between public and private sector and hence, hypothesis {H16} is rejected.

The relationship and impact of emotional intelligence of managers on job satisfaction was studied by using Pearson’s coefficients of correlation (r) and Multiple regression respectively. The result of correlation shows that the correlations are significant among few dimensions of emotional intelligence and its total. Therefore, the hypothesis {H17} and {H18} is accepted. While the results of multiple regression shows that 6% of variance in the JS could be predicted by the EI as Adjusted R-Square = .06 and amongst the Emotional Intelligence (EI) dimensions namely, emotional self awareness, compassion (significant as p < 0.01), integrity / ethics and conflict (significant as p < 0.05) had the significant impact on job satisfaction. This suggest that the emotionally intelligent managers can identify and understand their own and others emotions at the workplace. They can also manage their own and others’ emotions and use this information in solving problems. Therefore, it can be said that they are satisfied with their job. Thus, the hypothesis {H19} and {H20} is accepted.

**Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Commitment & Perceived Success**

The result revealed that organizational commitment of managers was found significantly different with regard to age, gender, level of management, salary
(significant as \( p < 0.01 \)), marital-status, academic qualification and years of experience (significant as \( p < 0.05 \)). While socio demographic variables namely-public & private sector, birth-order and socio-economic background did not showed a significant difference with organizational commitment of managers. Therefore, hypothesis \( \{H21\} \) i.e “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” is accepted.

Using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), it was found that there was significant difference between top, middle and low level managers of both public and private sector. In both of them, top managers are more committed to their work followed by middle and low level managers. Hence, hypothesis \( \{H22\} \) i.e “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)” is accepted. While using t-test it was found that there was no significant difference between public and private sector managers of top, middle and low level managers. Therefore, hypothesis \( \{H23\} \) i.e “there is a significant difference in Organizational Commitment of managers (i.e. top, middle and low level) between public and private sector” is rejected.

The comparative analysis of perceived success and socio-demographic variables showed that there was significant difference between perceived success of the managers with regard to public and private sector, age, marital-status, socio-economic background, academic qualification, years of experience, level of management and salary (significant as \( p < 0.01 \)). On the other hand there was no significant difference between perceived success of the managers with regard to gender and birth-order. Hence, hypothesis \( \{H24\} \) i.e “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” is accepted.

While analyzing the comparative analysis of perceived success among various levels of management of public and private sector, using ANOVA it was found that there
was a significant difference between perceived success of top, middle and low level managers in both public and private sector. But in public sector, top level managers perceived themselves more successful as compared to middle and low level managers while in private sector, low level managers perceived themselves more successful as compared to their counterparts. Hence, the hypothesis \{H25\} is accepted. Using t-test, it was found that there was a significant difference between perceived success of public and private sector in all the levels of management. It further showed that public sector managers were more satisfied as compared to private sector managers. Therefore, hypothesis \{H26\} is accepted.

The relationship and impact of emotional intelligence of managers on organizational commitment and perceived success was studied by using Pearson’s coefficient of correlation (r) and Multiple regression respectively. The result of correlation showed that there was positive correlation between total EI and organizational commitment; and between total EI and perceived success. Therefore, hypothesis \{H27\} and \{H28\} is accepted. While few dimensions of EI showed a positive correlation with organizational commitment and perceived success. Hence, the hypothesis \{H29\} and \{H30\} is accepted. While the results of multiple regression showed that 34% of variance in the organizational commitment of managers could be predicted by the EI as Adjusted R-Square = .343 and amongst the Emotional Intelligence (EI) dimensions namely, stress tolerance/resilience, assertiveness, self regard, leadership, conflict, attitude toward self & others (significant as p < 0.01), emotional awareness of others, trust radius, independence and social responsibility (significant as p < 0.05) had the significant impact on organizational commitment. Therefore, it can be said that emotionally intelligent managers are committed to their work. Hence, the hypothesis \{H31\} and \{H32\} is accepted. The results of multiple regression also showed a 22% of variance in the perceived success of managers as predicted by the EI as Adjusted R-Square = .228 and amongst the Emotional Intelligence (EI) dimensions namely, assertiveness, self regard, social responsibility (significant as p < 0.01), optimal performance, independence and spirituality (significant as p < 0.05) had significant impact on perceived success. Therefore, the managers who were high on emotional intelligence perceive themselves successful in their career. Hence, hypothesis \{H33\} and \{H34\} is accepted.
8.2 SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the present study shall make an important contribution to the body of knowledge in terms of identification of a significant impact of emotional intelligence on transformational leadership behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and perceived success in a telecommunication organizations work setting. The suggestions and recommendations of the current study are summarized below:

1) Evaluate emotional competencies during selection process of employees

People with high EI can become better transformational leaders. There are few specific dimensions of EI like emotional self awareness, emotional expression, emotional awareness of others, interpersonal relationships, stress tolerance/resilience, intentionality, creativity/innovativeness, outlook, intuition, trust radius, quality of life, optimal performance, self regard, self actualization, compassion, constructive discontent, social responsibility, leadership, integrity/ethics, communication, conflict, attitude towards self & others, motivation, team spirit & collaboration and spirituality which were identified as an underlying attributes of transformational leaders. These dimensions must be identified and evaluated in individuals while selecting them in the organizations. Therefore, it is suggested that emotional intelligence is a necessary aid to leadership development and leadership effectiveness.

2) Design effective employee performance management system

Organizations under study are suggested to use 360 degree feedback system and self appraisal system as part of their performance management system. A 360 degree feedback is a system or process in which employees receive confidential, anonymous feedback from the people who work around them. This typically includes the employee's manager, peers, and direct reports. A 360 degree feedback: (a) measures behaviors and competencies. (b) provide feedback on how others perceive an employee (c) focuses on subjective areas such as teamwork, character and leadership effectiveness. A self appraisal is a method where the employee himself gives the feedback or views and points regarding his performance. Usually this is done with the help of a self appraisal form where the employee rates himself on various parameters.
tells about his training needs, if any, talks about his accomplishments, strengths, weaknesses, problems faced etc. Such a feedback enables an individual to identify the areas or emotional competencies in which he/she is weak. This feedback prepares individual’s mind to change himself.

(3) Use Mentoring technique for improving EI

As suggested earlier that the organizations must use 360 degree feedback and self appraisal method in their performance management system. Therefore, after the identification of competencies in which an individual is weak, mentors can be appointed within the organizations who help an individual in improving their emotional intelligence. From time to time these mentors, educates individuals how to transform.

(4) Design effective training and development programmes for enhancing EI

The results of the study reveal that there is a positive relationship of emotional intelligence with transformational leadership behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and perceived success. Therefore, EI of individuals in the organizations must be high. For enhancing EI, organizations must educate, train and develop their employees so that they can be effective in their respective jobs. These training programmes inculcate new knowledge, skills and manners and transform these into employees’ job function. Therefore, in order to make effective training and development programmes an organization must conduct workshops with the help of organizational/industrial counseling psychologists. Workshop methodology is a combination of expert input, interactive practical exercises, self assessment, lots of hands- on role play, group discussions, exercise worksheets, practical projects, presentations etc. It also includes activities on empathy training, personality enhancement training, self management and motivation training etc. Upon completion of the workshop, an individual will be able to:

- Learn to apply EI at work and understand why he/she need to develop this important skill.
- Identify his/her personal strengths and blind spots which are revealed through self assessment.
• Gain an honest and accurate awareness of oneself to perform more effectively.
• Monitor and adapt one’s own emotions for the benefit of oneself, his/her team and department.
• Master self management skills in ways that boost productivity and accomplishment.
• Apply relationship management skills in ways that enhance the ability to work collaboratively, resolve conflicts and achieve dramatic results.
• Be able to use practical EI techniques in work-related applications including communication, leadership, management, coaching, working with others, sales, customer service and supervision.
• Have a positive influence on the emotion and motivation of others.
• Develop cohesive, emotionally intelligent working relationships.

Hence, through training and development an individual starts understanding and managing his/her emotions and that of others which result in increased job satisfaction, commitment and performance of the organization. Furthermore, with such training and development programmes there are chances of increasing new knowledge, problem solving skills, analytical skills and decision making skills in an individual.

(5) **Provide supportive climate and culture in the organization**

Organizations under study must provide supportive climate and culture by: (a) encouraging employees to participate, (b) providing opportunities to individuals to make meaningful contribution (c) involving employees in teamwork planning & administration and (d) providing appropriate feedback to individuals regarding their emotional competencies and incompetencies. This effort will enhance person’s EI which in turn lead to increased job satisfaction, commitment and performance in the organization.
RECOMMENDED MODEL FOR EVALUATING AND ENHANCING EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE (EI)

- **Evaluate EI Competencies During Selection Process**
  - Emotional Self-Awareness
  - Emotional Expression
  - Expressing Feelings
  - Understanding of others
  - Interpersonal relationships
  - Stress Tolerance
  - Empathy
  - Creativity
  - Innovation
  - Trust
  - Humility
  - Self-Actualization
  - Compassion
  - Leadership
  - Team spirit & collaboration

- **Use Effective Performance Management System to Evaluate Emotional Competencies**
  - 360 Degree Feedback
  - Self Appraisal Method

- **Use Effective Programmes to Enhance EI**
  - Proper Mentoring Programmes
  - Training and Development Programmes

- **Provide Supportive Climate and Culture**
  - Encouraging employees to participate
  - Providing opportunities to employees
  - Involving employees in teamwork planning
  - Recognition of achievements
  - Providing feedback to employees
  - Providing their emotional competencies and incompetencies

**High Level of**
- Transformational Leadership Behavior
- Job Satisfaction
- Organizational Commitment
- Perceived Success
8.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. Every research initiative has some limitations. Therefore, the exploratory nature of the study and the methodology used for the collection and analysis of the data, certain limitations were identified. They are:

2. The number of completed questionnaires obtained was smaller in number than desired. This was due to non-cooperation and resistance of the managers to evaluate their emotional intelligence.

3. The sample included relatively a small number of managers from private sector. This was due to non-cooperation of the staff in such organizations. Thus, findings of the analysis cannot be generalized for the private sector managers at large.

4. The sample was drawn from the Telecommunication Organizations of Northern region; a more diverse sample drawn from other organizations of other regions with diverse cultures would facilitate better understanding and generalizations of the findings.

8.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The findings of the current study suggests that emotional intelligence contributes towards transformational leadership behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and perceived success, and therefore worth consideration for further empirical research. However, this notion should be approached with caution. The results are exploratory in nature and require replication with a larger, more diverse sample plan. Some suggestions are offered for future research for a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of this relationship.

1. It is apparent from the literature and proponents of various models of emotional intelligence that there is no consensus on the construct of EI. Therefore future research should endeavour to crystallize the construct of emotional intelligence.

2. Future research should examine the relationship between EI, transformational leadership behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and perceived success with a sample of executives from a diverse range of
industries/organizations across both public and private sectors for better
generalization.

3. The future research should also explore if EI can be taught and developed
    through training? If so, what should be its duration and content to facilitate
    leadership development.