

An Examination of the Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Style

Lisa A. Weinberger
University of Minnesota

The intention of this study is to broaden the knowledge base of HRD through the investigation of the relationships between emotional intelligence, and leadership style. This study was conducted using a correlational research design. Two surveys were administered: The MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002) and the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000) to the 151 managers of CSW and their subordinates. No relationship was found between the various dimensions of emotional intelligence and leadership style.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Leadership Style

Organizations today continually need to undergo rapid change to maintain their competitive edge. That rapid change requires an organization that has employees and leaders who are adaptive, work effectively, constantly improve systems and processes, are customer focused, and who share the need to make a profit. The continuous environment of turmoil and change has been coined the “permanent white waters” of modern life (Vaill, 1996). A key element in driving and managing these “white waters” in an organization is believed by many to be leadership. “Great leaders move us. They ignite our passion and inspire the best in us. When we try to explain why they are so effective, we speak of strategy, vision, or powerful ideas. But the reality is much more primal: Great leadership works through the emotions” (Goleman, Boyatzis, McKee, 2002, p. 3).

Emotional Intelligence has been identified, through the popular press and some researchers as that critical element needed for effective leadership. Goleman (1998, p. 94) has said that, “the most effective leaders are alike in one crucial way; they all have a high degree of what has come to be known as emotional intelligence.” Others have said, “By now, most executives have accepted that emotional intelligence is as critical as IQ to an individual’s effectiveness” (Druskat & Wolff, 2001, p.81). The challenge with these statements is twofold, (1) the study of leadership and what makes leaders effective has been found to be much more complicated than a single dimension like emotional intelligence; and (2) organizations have incorporated many of these emotional intelligence beliefs into their work systems and performance expectations without it being shown that it truly can accomplish what some authors are claiming. The study of leadership, its effectiveness and its impact on organizational performance is a key interest to Human Resource Development (HRD) scholars (Hamlin, 2003; Holton & Lynham, 2000; Kuchinke, 2000; Zehner & Holton III, 2003).

The intention of this study is to broaden the knowledge base of HRD through the investigation of emotional intelligence, and leadership style. The problem is the recognition that while a significant amount of research on leadership exists (see Yukl, 1998; Yukl & VanFleet, 1992), the emotional intelligence research is comparatively thin and the relationship between the two is smaller yet. What is most troubling is the notion that it is critically important for leaders to be emotionally intelligent for organizational success without the scholarly support behind it.

Theoretical Framework

“One of the most universal cravings of our time is a hunger for compelling and creative leadership” (Burns, 1978, p.1). Beginning in the 1980’s, many of the conceptions of leadership recognized the importance of emotions as a basis of influence (Yukl, 1998). It is those emotional, value-based aspects of leadership that are believed to influence the achievements of groups and organizations. Much of this leadership research, with its recognition on the importance of emotion, concentrated on the characteristics and effects of charismatic and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Kanungo, 1998; Tichy & Devanna, 1990).

The development of effective leaders is recognized as a high priority for business organizations. One only needs to look at some of the more popular recent publications in the areas of leadership and organizational success such as *Good to Great* (Collins, J., 2001) which speaks to those critical components for an organization to be “great”, as defined in cumulative stock return as compared to the general market and *Results Based Leadership* (Ulrich, Zenger & Smallwood, 1999), which speaks to the importance of connecting leadership skills with real business results. These business books use “unconventional wisdom” as their foundation. They are challenging the status quo, and reinforce the notion that “leadership ranks among the most researched and debated topics in the organizational sciences” (George, 2000, p. 1028).

Copyright © 2004 Lisa A. Weinberger

Recently, there have been a number of articles in the popular press espousing the benefits of emotional intelligence to organizations, leaders and individual contributors. This has contributed to a significant influx of popular books and seminars on the topic and consultants ‘training’ individuals to become more emotionally intelligent. Though there exists large amounts of research on leadership (see Stogdill, 1974; Yukl, 1998; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992 for examples), there is comparatively little for emotional intelligence. And though the popular press speaks to the importance of emotional intelligence and leadership, there is little researched support for their premise.

Primarily two perspectives of emotional intelligence have emerged over the past decade: one that is based more on a mixed perspective, which defines emotional intelligence largely through personality characteristics; the second perspective is an ability perspective, which defines emotional intelligence as a set of distinct abilities. Since there has been more research in the area of personality characteristics and leadership, this study evaluated the relationships between emotional intelligence from an ability perspective and leadership style. The ability model of emotional intelligence is framed as a type of intelligence, hence it is intended to co-exist with, supplement, and clarify existing models of leadership – not replace them (Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey, 2002). Though the model is too new to have extensive data in support of its predictive validity, it is believed that it will make significant contributions to our understanding of leadership (Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey). “Leadership, which embraces the emotional side of directing organizations, pumps life and meaning into management structures, bringing them to full life” (Barach & Eckhardt, 1996, p.4).

“Leadership theory and research have not adequately considered how leader’s moods and emotions influence their effectiveness” (George, 2000, p.1028). This study aims to get at part of that question. A wide diversity of approaches to leadership has been proposed, from analyzing what leaders are like, what they do, how they motivate their followers, how their styles interact with situational conditions and how they can make major changes in their organizations are only a few examples (Yukl, 1998; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). A great deal of research has been conducted surrounding these many theories and has led to a better understanding of leadership. But understanding how and why leaders have (or fail to have) positive influences on their followers is still a compelling question for researchers (George, 2000). Feelings and moods have been shown to influence the judgments people make, attributions for success and failure and inductive and deductive reasoning. It is likely then, that feelings play an important role in leadership. Other components of leadership, such as charisma, includes the leader regulating the emotions of its team members (Freidman, Riggio & Casella, 1988; Wasielewski, 1985), appears to require the ability to enhance pleasant emotions and de-emphasize unpleasant emotions in others. Charismatic leadership, a form of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985, 1997) may also have its roots in managing emotions (Ashkanasy & Tsee, 1998). These emotion/mood capabilities have been addressed by emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence describes that ability to join emotions and reasoning, using emotions to facilitate reasoning and reasoning intelligently about them (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Several researchers have begun to evaluate this role of emotional intelligence and leadership.

Since the publication of *Emotional Intelligence* (Goleman, 1995), the business writings in this area have exploded. The scholarly support of the claims made in these books however is behind the business leaders perceptions of the impact of high emotional intelligence on their effectiveness and success. This issue of leadership and its effectiveness is core to the field of HRD.

A better understanding of emotional intelligence and its relationship to leadership style can begin to address the gaps currently existing in the literature today and provide a more informed link between theory and practice. This understanding can also better inform the practitioner, and hence their leadership development programs, and staffing within their organizations.

Research Questions

The major research questions are briefly stated as follows:

What is the relationship between the emotional intelligence of leaders and their leadership style?

1. *What is the relationship between the emotional intelligence of leaders and their transformational leadership style?*
2. *What is the relationship between the emotional intelligence of leaders and their transactional leadership style?*
3. *What is the relationship between the emotional intelligence of leaders and their laissez-faire leadership style?*

Research Design

This study was conducted using a correlational research design. Two commercially available survey instruments were administered. One survey, the MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002) was administered to all the top managers (N = 151) of a single US based manufacturing organization referred to as CSW. The MSCEIT measured the variable of emotional intelligence. This instrument reported five scores in the areas of: (a) perceiving emotions, (b) facilitating emotions, (c) understanding emotions, (d) managing emotions, and (e) overall emotional intelligence. The second survey, the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000) was administered to the subordinates of those 151 managers. This instrument measured the variables of transformational leadership style, transactional leadership style and laissez-faire leadership style. Transformational leadership consists of four factors as measured by the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000): (a) intellectual stimulation, (b) individualized consideration, (c) charisma (idealized attributes and idealized behaviors), and (e) inspirational motivation. Transactional leadership consists of two factors as measured by the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000): (a) contingent reward, and (b) management-by-exception (which includes management by exception – passive and management by exception – active). Laissez-faire leadership is the negation of or a no leadership factor (Bass & Avolio, 1993). The surveys were collected and then sent to the respective publishers for scoring. The results were entered and analyzed using correlational statistics.

The target population for this study consisted of the managers of CSW; a Midwestern based manufacturing organization that employs 2300 people worldwide. Of that 2300, approximately 2000 were located within the United States. Starting at the top of the organization and working down within the hierarchy, managers (defined as those who have more than three direct reports), located within North America were identified. The total population of 151 managers participated in the study. These managers included executives and directors of CSW, managers across all functions of the organization and supervisors in customer service and manufacturing. This represented about 90% of the companies' personnel having the title of manager. From CSW human resource records, the 151 managers were made up of 27 females and 124 males.

Limitations

A wide variety of definitions of emotional intelligence exist ranging from a very broad perspective inclusive of many personality characteristics, to a very narrow restrictive perspective. This area of research is relatively new (since the early 1990's), with most of the work to date, definitional in nature. Only very recently has the research moved into how the construct of emotional intelligence impacts an individual and their relative performance. Within the area of emotional intelligence research, there exist few instruments to study it.

The Mayer Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test v2 (MSCEIT) is a limitation of this study. This newly published instrument (2002) has not had wide testing in the research community. Consequently, its reported validities and reliabilities must be heeded with caution. It is however, the only emotional intelligence instrument that is performance driven. All other emotional intelligence tests are self-inventories. Although this instrument is not widely researched, it is a starting point for research into the area of emotional intelligence and will add to the body of knowledge in this area.

To measure managers' leadership style, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 1995; 2000) was chosen. The MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 1995; 2000) is a widely used instrument in the area of leadership styles. And this instrument has wide face validity within the organization studied, which provided critical support for this research to occur.

An additional limitation to this study was the use of a convenience sample. Though there are advantages to using a single organization due to its homogeneity and minimizing the impact of external validity concerns, there are disadvantages in that the results are limited in their generalizability.

Results

The MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000) was sent out to the subordinates to gain their perceptions of their manager's leadership style. A total of 1165 subordinates were asked to participate. 791 completed surveys were returned. In addition, 17 surveys were sent back as undeliverable or a refusal to participate. The total response rate was 68.9%. The 151 managers were sent the MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey and Caruso, 2002), to evaluate their emotional intelligence. 138 completed surveys were received, 3 managers refused to participate and 10 managers did not respond. A response rate of 93.3% occurred with the management group.

The MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002) was a performance-based emotional intelligence survey instrument. Each answer was scored against a general consensus score. All scores are reported as normed standard

scores with a mean= 100, and a standard deviation of 15. Scores are obtained on the four emotional intelligence branches and an overall emotional intelligence score. The results of the data analysis found a range including acceptable reliabilities at the overall emotional intelligence level and Branch 1 and relatively low reliabilities for the balance of the dimensions. The overall emotional intelligence factor returned a reliability of .86 (Split ½) compared to the reported reliability of .91 in the test manual. The branch reliabilities ranged from an acceptable (split ½) reliability of .91 (Perceiving Emotions) to low reliabilities of .63 (Facilitating Thought), .56 (Understanding Emotions) and .61 (Managing Emotions). These reliabilities differed somewhat from that reported by Mayer, Salovey & Caruso (2002), which ranged from an overall emotional intelligence reliability (split ½) = .93 to a low reliability at the facilitating emotions (branch 2) of .79. These low reliabilities present a significant limitation to this study. Though the test authors report relatively high reliabilities, the results here bring that into question. To investigate these relationships further, the researcher looked at the intercorrelations of the respective emotional intelligence dimensions. The intercorrelations obtained ranged from a high $r = .395$ for facilitating thought (as compared to a reported $r = .50$) to a very low $r = .185$ for understanding emotions as compared to a reported $r = .51$. All of the intercorrelations obtained were significantly lower than those reported by the test authors again bringing into question the reliability of the instrumentation.

The nine leadership styles and composite transformational leadership score showed sufficient internal consistency ranging from $\alpha = .74$ (Management by Exception- Passive) to $\alpha = .87$ (Inspirational Motivation) and $\alpha = .94$ for Transformational Leadership. All of these results were within the range reported by Bass and Avolio (2000). The MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000) did not have the same reliability issues as that of the MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002). Additionally, the reported intercorrelations of the various components of leadership were well within the range reported by the authors (Bass & Avolio, 2000). In fact, many of the intercorrelations were greater than that reported by the authors, and all were within the expected direction.

Research question 1: What is the relationship between the emotional intelligence of leaders and their transformational leadership style? Research hypothesis 1 (H1) through hypothesis 4 (H4) stated a significant and positive correlation ($p < .05$) between the four branches of emotional intelligence and transformational leadership as perceived by subordinates. There were no significant results for the entire comparison of the various dimensions of emotional intelligence with transformational leadership. This is completely contrary to what the prevailing literature would have suggested.

Table 1. *Correlation of Emotional Intelligence and Transformational Leadership Dimensions*

None at $p < .05$	TL	IS	IA	IB	IM	IC
B1: Perceiving Emotions	-.030	.018	-.088	-.026	-.078	.001
B2: Facilitating Thought	.118	.110	.075	.157	.099	.112
B3: Understanding Emotions	.043	.049	.061	.111	-.009	.012
B4: Managing Emotions	.101	.119	.069	.038	.128	.134

TL: Transformational leadership, IS: Intellectual Stimulation, IA: Idealized Attributes, IB: Idealized Behaviors, IM: Inspirational Motivation, IC: Individualized Consideration, B1: Branch 1, B2: Branch 2, B3: Branch 3, B4: Branch 4.

The relationship between emotional intelligence and transactional leadership style was explored through the next research question: *What is the relationship between the emotional intelligence of leaders and their transactional leadership style?* Transactional leadership had not been identified as having a base in emotions, hence the Hypotheses H5-H8 were expected to show no significance in the level of relationship. Those hypotheses were supported.

Table 2. *Correlations of Emotional Intelligence and Transactional Leadership Dimensions*

None at $p < .05$	Contingent Reward	MBE- Active	MBE- Passive
B1: Perceiving Emotions	-.079	.020	-.099
B2: Facilitating Thought	.143	.040	-.005
B3: Understanding Emotions	-.024	-.092	.004
B4: Managing Emotions	.085	-.135	-.085

B1: Branch 1, B2: Branch 2, B3: Branch 3, B4: Branch 4, MBE-Active: Management by Exception – Active, MBE – Passive: Management by Exception – Passive.

The third research question was: *What is the relationship between the emotional intelligence of leaders and their laissez-faire leadership style?* The correlation between laissez-faire leadership, which is the negation of

leadership was also expected to show no significant relationship between it and the various component of emotional intelligence. These hypotheses were supported in that no relationship was found.

Table 3. *Correlations of Emotional Intelligence and Laissez-faire Leadership Dimensions*

Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence	Laissez-faire leadership
B1: Perceiving Emotions	-.035
B2: Facilitating Thought	-.051
B3: Understanding Emotions	.029
B4: Managing Emotions	-.087

none at $p < .05$ B1: Branch 1, B2: Branch 2, B3: Branch 3, B4: Branch 4

Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence, leadership style and leadership effectiveness. The general research question asked was: *What is the relationship between the emotional intelligence of leaders and their leadership style?*

Transformational Leadership and Emotional Intelligence

When comparing the dimensions of emotional intelligence and components of transformational leadership (research question 1), no significant relationships were found, which led to a finding of no support for the first set of hypotheses (H1-H4). The results of this study differed from those of Sosik and Megerian (1999) who evaluated the relationships of emotional intelligence, transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness, and found that managers who were rated more effective leaders by their subordinates possessed more aspects of emotional intelligence. Sosik and Megerian used a trait-based perspective of emotional intelligence, whereas in this study, the author limited the view of emotional intelligence to an ability based perspective. Buford (2001), also using a trait based perspective of emotional intelligence found a relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. Little relationship, however, has been found between the self-reported leadership practices of nurses and their emotional intelligence (Vitello-Ciciu, 2001) as reported by the MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002) and no support was found for the effect of emotional intelligence as a predictor of leadership success of top executives (Collins, V.J., 2001)

The findings of this study suggest that the ability-based perspective of emotional intelligence does not have any relationship to perceptions of leadership style. This finding is contrary to what one would expect from reviewing the test manual for the MSCEIT v2.0 (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, 2002) and the associated citations. A further explanation for these findings could be that the MSCEIT, still in its infancy is not effectively capturing the significant differences in emotional intelligence from one individual to the next.

Transactional Leadership and Emotional Intelligence

A comparison of the perceived transactional leadership styles of the CSW managers and their emotional intelligence (research question 2) showed no significant relationships, as was hypothesized (H5-H8). The primary purpose for the hypotheses of no relationships was due to the lack of research support in this area. This study contributes to that literature void. Similar to the findings for the transformational leadership dimensions, none of the transactional leadership dimensions (contingent reward, management by exception- active and management by exception- passive) had any significant relationships to any of the components of emotional intelligence. One could conclude that indeed no relationships exist and therefore, the importance of emotional intelligence in day-to-day leadership is grossly exaggerated.

Laissez-faire Leadership and Emotional Intelligence

Hypotheses H9-H12 suggested no relationship between Laissez-faire leadership and the various dimensions of emotional intelligence, answering research question 3. Again, the lack of research in this area required the hypotheses to posit no relationship. In this study, the hypotheses were not rejected, as no relationship between these various dimensions was found. This suggests that the emotional intelligence of a leader has no relationship to their lack of leadership tendencies (laissez-faire leadership).

Implications for Practice

The results of the study, relate to the employees who participated in this study. This presents a limitation as to the generalizability of the implications for the study; therefore, it is inappropriate to draw general implications for

practice based on the results of this single study. However, the sample was a homogenous one, and should be considered in light of the limitations that this is a single study. Further replication of this type of study and empirical verification would determine the significance of the recommendations beyond the boundaries of CSW.

CSW has identified emotional intelligence as a key competency for evaluating its leadership and professional employees. The results of this study would suggest that CSW might want to further evaluate that practice and determine whether or not it would still be appropriate to attempt to measure their leaders against this competency. This study limited the view of emotional intelligence to an ability based perspective, one that can be measured using a performance based instrument, the MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002). Within that restrictive perspective, the lack of significant relationships between the various components of leadership style and emotional intelligence can be significant to this organization. Organizational efforts may be expended in the wrong areas (that of improving emotional intelligence) and could be used in other areas to provide more significant contributions to the organizations management team. CSW may want to explore the variable of emotional intelligence more closely in light of these results, and determine whether or not this is a critical competency that they can measure and hold their managers accountable to. These results would suggest that that practice is not based on sound data. And those types of practices tend to label organizations as chasing a new corporate 'fad', with negative connotations to the employees and managers of CSW.

CSW however, has defined their emotional intelligence concept more broadly than that measured in this study. Their definition is more inclusive of some of the personality characteristics. Hence, another suggestion for this organization is to redefine their emotional intelligence dimension as personality components or be aware of the limitations of their definition and what it really is. It also may be possible that an ability based definition of emotional intelligence has little utility from an organizational perspective, and the broader, personality based definitions may be closer aligned to what many organizations are really seeking. For specifics in language however, understanding exactly what the HRD practitioners and managers are defining and looking for, is and will continue to be critically important.

Though this study's results cannot be broadly generalized, the results are still important to consider for today's practitioners. It appears that many of the benefits espoused regarding emotional intelligence to an individual's leadership success still need to be empirically confirmed. This study showed in this sample, that those relationships do not exist. Hence, further research is needed in the areas of this construct and associated measurement tools before this author would support its use in practice.

Implications for Theory

According to this study, there is no relationship between emotional intelligence of managers and their leadership style as perceived by subordinates. This study was intended to address a gap existing in the literature today in providing a more informed link between the theory of the relationship between leadership style and emotional intelligence to the practice. The results of this study would indicate that they are not related. This is one study however, and others would need to be completed to see if this premise holds true.

Researchers in the field of HRD have started looking at the role of emotions and emotional intelligence. It's been suggested that emotional intelligence might be an aide to leadership development, and leadership effectiveness (Drodge & Murphy, 2002). This study has found that the various dimensions of emotional intelligence of a leader have no relationship to how that leader is perceived to be leading. And although it's results are contrary to what has been suggested by some researchers in HRD and other disciplines, it is another piece of information to this body of knowledge. In addition to contributing to the knowledge base in HRD, these results add to the knowledge within the emotional intelligence body of work.

The MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002) was designed to measure emotional intelligence. This instrument, still in its infancy, but commercially available, appears to have some limitations. The reliabilities and intercorrelations found in this study were substantially lower than that reported in the test manual and hence bring in to question the reliability of the instrumentation. The results obtained were marginally acceptable. These low reliabilities bring into question the entire MSCEIT and the results obtained here. Based on this data, additional research and work is needed in the development of the MSCEIT to ensure that repeatable reliabilities can be obtained.

Several conclusions can be drawn from this study to the implications for the theory base. This body of work in emotional intelligence is growing; there have been however, few empirical studies to date. Several recent studies have been completed using the MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002) with mixed results as to the relative contribution of emotional intelligence to predictions of general personality, life criteria, and leadership. One could conclude from this study that due to reliability results obtained, further work is needed on the MSCEIT, and hence

the relationship results found are not significant to the knowledge base, or this brings into question the importance of emotional intelligence and its relationship to leadership style. Interestingly, though the reliability data found for the MSCEIT was substantially lower than that reported in the test manual, primarily the opposite was found on the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000) leadership assessment. Within the population assessed and the results obtained on the MLQ5x (Bass & Avolio, 2000), the reliabilities and intercorrelations of the various leadership dimensions was fairly consistent with that reported in the test manual in most cases.

Future Research Needs

This study investigated the relationships between the emotional intelligence of managers and their leadership style as perceived by their subordinates. This study was intended to contribute further to the theory base surrounding emotional intelligence and its application to practice. Due to the incorporation of emotional intelligence concepts into practice, and as yet, limited amount of empirical research in the area of emotional intelligence, the following paragraphs outline some future research needs.

Several areas of potential research for emotional intelligence and its role in the field of HRD have been previously outlined (Weinberger, 2002b). This study was intended to evaluate one of those research agenda's. Questions on how to measure emotional intelligence have resulted in a lot of dialogue in the literature. Most measurement tools however are self-report in nature. The MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2002) was one of the first attempts at a performance-based instrument. These results would indicate however, that more work is needed in this area. Reliable instrumentation is critical to identifying core relationships between variables and to further explore research agenda's in regard to emotional intelligence, leadership and management.

The construct of emotional intelligence itself also needs to be investigated further. This construct is viewed very broadly in some bodies of work and very narrowly in others. Part of the challenge lies in the term emotional intelligence, which has many definitions. For clarity purposes, and in order to assist future researchers and practitioners, a closer aligned definition of emotional intelligence would be helpful. These broad arrays of definitions, which are almost on opposite sides of a spectrum approach this construct very differently, with differing assumptions and different methods to measure it. Careful reading is required of the associated research domains in emotional intelligence to determine what perspective the author is coming from.

In addition to clarity around the definition of emotional intelligence, the uniqueness of this construct needs to be investigated further. As has been articulated in other areas, the question of whether or not emotional intelligence is contributing anything unique is an important one to answer. It may be, that these concepts of emotion perception, understanding and managing emotion are captured in other constructs already in use.

Another recommendation for future research is to explore the concept of emotional intelligence from a qualitative perspective. It may be that this construct is difficult to measure in the positivistic perspective and a better understanding may be acquired through looking at this construct differently. The nuances around individuals' behavior and approach to others could be explored through this perspective and would contribute additional knowledge in this body of work.

The topic of emotional intelligence has generated a great deal of interest in the practitioner community and a divergence of perspectives in the research community. A better understanding of this construct from a multitude of perspectives, along with tools to effectively measure it, will contribute significantly to this phenomenon of emotional intelligence and further clarify whether it provides a unique contribution to our understanding of individuals and to the field of HRD.

References

- Ashkanasy, N., & Tse, B. (1998). Transformational leadership as management of emotion: A conceptual review. *The First Conference on Emotions and Organizational Life*. San Diego, CA.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, New York: Free Press.
- Barach, J., & Eckhardt, D. (1996). *Leadership and the job of the executive*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M.M. Chemmers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 49-88). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (2000). *MLQ: Multifactor leadership questionnaire*, (2nd ed.). *Technical report*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

- Buford, B. A. (2001). *Management effectiveness, personality, leadership, and emotional intelligence: A study of the validity evidence of the emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i)*. [Diss], Iowa City, IA: The University of Iowa. UMI: 303482.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to Great: Why some companies make the leap..and others don't*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.
- Collins, V.L. (2001). *Emotional intelligence and leadership success*. [Diss], Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska. UMI: 3034371.
- Drodge, E. N., & Murphy, S. A. (2002, December). Interrogating Emotions in Police Leadership. *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(4), 420-438.
- Druskat, V.U., & Wolff, S.B. (2001). Building the emotional intelligence of groups. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(3), 80-90.
- Friedman, H., & Riggio, R., & Casella. (1988). Nonverbal skill, personal charisma, and initial attraction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 203-211.
- George, J. M. (2000, August). Emotions and Leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53(8), 1027- 1054.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Goleman, D. (1998), *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. E., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Hamlin, R. (2003, March). Towards a generic theory of managerial and leadership effectiveness: A meta-level analysis from organisations within the U.K. Public sector. In S. Lynham & T. Egan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Academy of Human Resource Development* (pp. 944-951). Academy of Human Resource Development, Minneapolis, MN: Academy of Human Resource Development.
- Holton, E.F., & Lynham, S. (2000). Performance-driven leadership development. In E.F. Holton & S.S. Naquin (Eds.), *Advances in Developing Human Resources: Developing High-Performance Leadership Competency*, (pp. 1-17). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1998). Leadership in Organizations: Looking ahead to the 21st century. *Canadian Psychology*, 39(1-2), 71-82.
- Kuchinke, K.P. (2000). The role of feedback in management development training. In K.P. Kuchinke (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Academy of Human Resource Development* (pp. 707-714). Baton Rouge, LA: Academy of Human Resource Development.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT): Users Manual*. Toronto, ON: Multi Health Systems, Inc.
- Sosik, J.J. & Megerian, L.E (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance: The role of self-other agreement on transformation leadership perceptions. *Group and Organization Management*, 24(3), 367-390.
- Tichy, N., & Devanna, M. (1990). *The transformational leader*, (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Ulrich, D., Zenger, J., & Smallwood, N. (1999). *Results- based leadership: How leaders build business and improve the bottom line*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Vaill, P.B. (1996). *Learning as a way of being: Strategies for survival in a world of permanent white water*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Vitello-Cicciu, J. (2001). *Leadership practices and emotional intelligence of nursing leaders*. [Diss] The Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara, CA. UMI: 3032096.
- Wasielewski, P. (1985). The emotional basis of charisma. *Symbolic Interaction*, 8, 207-222.
- Weinberger, L. A. (2002b). Emotional intelligence: Its connection to HRD theory and practice. *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(2), 215-243.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*, (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G., & VanFleet, D.D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In M.D. Dunnette & I.M. Hough (Eds), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol 3. pp. 14-197). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists.
- Zehner, R., & Holton III, E. (2003, March). Development and validation of an instrument for early assessment of management potential. In S. Lynham & T. Egan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Academy of Human Resource Development* (pp. 936-943). Academy of Human Resource Development. Minneapolis, MN: Academy of Human Resource Development.