

## **A study of the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Development in an Organization**

**Tan Wee Wah (S-ED0083)**

**ABSTRACT.** The study was conducted for fifty-eight managers and executives of a local multinational with the purpose of studying the relationship between their Emotional Intelligence (EI) and their Personality traits with their performance. It was hypothesized that higher performer manager have higher level of EI. Similarly, it was argued that higher performer managers exhibit specific Personality traits. The relationship between the Emotional Competencies and Personality Traits were also studied in an attempt to establish the “linkage” between the EI and the preferred behavior of the individuals. The participants were selected from the group of managers that participated in the Emotional Intelligence workshop. As part of the EI workshop, the participants were asked to conduct a self-assessment on their Emotional Competencies Inventory (ECI) and Personality Profile based on Leonard Personality Inventory (LPI). To examine the difference in the ECI levels and LPI profile of higher and average performers, the one-way ANOVA was used. The results showed that higher performer managers exhibit higher ECI from the average performer managers. The study also revealed that the higher performers tend to be “less” analytical in their personality traits. It is interesting to note that, eventhough not statistically significant; the higher performer managers tend to exhibit higher Relational and Decisive behavior in their personality traits. The study also revealed that certain functional group such as the Operation functional group exhibits higher ECI level in the Contentment in Life. Within different functional groups, it was also found that, there is a significance difference in the LPI profile especially in the Relational and Decisive personality traits. This reflects the theoretical arguments that different functional roles do influence a specific set of behaviors from the people within the functional group. As such it is not surprising to that managers from the operations exhibit higher score in these behavior. The correlation approach was used to examine the relationship between the ECI and LPI dimensions. It is interesting to note there is a negative correlation between the ECI dimensions with the Neutral and Analytical personality while the Openness, Relational and Decisive personality traits have positive correlation with the ECI dimensions.

Tan Wee Wah (S-ED0083)

## **Introduction**

Recently there has been an increasing widespread of interest in the importance of emotional intelligence (EI) in the work place (Goleman, 1995) and this has led to the view that the *key challenge for organizations in the coming decade will be the harnessing of hearts and minds, emotions and intellectual/knowledge, to deliver superior service and business performance* (Thomson, 1998). The competitive advantage of an organization is its ability to build and capitalize on their “emotional capital” and leverage it intellectual capital. Hence it is not surprising that EI is considered as an important factor in a successful leader (Goleman, 1998) and it was argued that an individual who demonstrate “high” EI is able to use their emotions in managing themselves and working with others to be effective at work (Boyatzis, Goleman and Rhee, 1999). Given the importance, most of the leadership development program has incorporated the EI or EQ (Emotional Intelligence Quotient) interventions that are designed to (a) educate the managers and leaders about the relevance of emotional intelligence in the workplace, (b) assess their relative strengths and weakness such as their Emotional Competencies Inventory (ECI) and Personality profile, and (c) provide a framework and support to develop and enhance their ability to interact with others with greater emotional intelligence (Boyatzis and Burckle, 1999). Recently a local Multi-National Corporation (MNC), have initiated a series of two-day EI workshops for their managers as part of their leadership development program that was designed to create the awareness among the managers about the relevance of EI in the workplace. In the process, the managers were given a self-assessment in term of their ECI and personality profile. Since this is the initial phase EI intervention within this organization, the study will attempt to establish the baseline levels of the ECI and examine the preliminary statistical results of the ECI among the participants to establish if there are any specific trends or patterns. It is also imperative that the study examines if there are any specific difference in the ECI between the high performers from the average performers. Finally, the study will also examine the link between the ECI and personality traits of the participants.

## **Theoretical Background and Hypothesis**

The concept of Emotional Intelligence (EI) or sometime refereed to as EQ, started from the discipline of psychology in the early 1920’s and 1930’s, when Thorndike was exploring the arena of “social intelligence” and viewed it as a single concept (Goleman, 1995). However, the more recent psychologists realized its complexity and found the need to operationalized it in term of multiple capabilities (Bar-on, 1992; Goleman, 1998; Saarni,

1988). For instance, Gardner (1983) conceptualized it in terms of intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence. Salovey and Mayer (1990) adopted the term “emotional intelligence” and identified four main dimensions to describe it: knowing and handling one’s own and others’ emotions. Since then, the concept and description of EI have expanded into a framework for describing human dispositions, as a set of emotional competencies that distinguish how people manage feelings, interact and communicate in performing their work effectively in achieving outstanding performance.

Considering the importance of EI, it is imperative that we are able to develop our emotional competencies and increase our EI. Hence the question of “nature” versus “nurture” of our EI level. It was argued that to a certain degree, our EI is “genetically” embedded within us and it is reflected through our personality traits. The good news is that we can nurture and develop our emotional competence. As pointed out by Goleman (1998), emotional competence is a learned capability based on EI that results in outstanding performance at work. Hence, our EI can be observed when we demonstrate our emotional competencies that constitute self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and social skills at appropriate times and ways in sufficient frequency to be effective in the situation (Boyatzis, Goleman and Rhee, 1999). EI can be developed and it continues to develop with life experience. Understanding and raising EI is essential for the development of an individual’s success and leadership potential (Yong, 2002).

Building on the above arguments, it is not surprising that many consultants are developing EI workshops and seminars that are designed to help people become more emotionally competent and socially skilled. Similarly, many organizations have incorporated the EI interventions in their leadership development program. Do these programs work? Can the EI interventions develop the leaders’ EI? Some questioned the effectiveness of the EI training program, while there are some skeptics who believe that nothing can be done to improve emotional competencies after the age of fifteen. Contrary to these views, some studies and researches in these areas showed some “promising” findings. For instance, Sala (2002) conducted a study on the effectiveness of a MEI (Mastering Emotional Intelligence) training program, and found that there were significant improvements in the EI of the participants that went through the program. Johnson Consumer & Personal Care Group implemented the EQ intervention as part of their leadership development on a global basis and the initial study done by Brienza (2002) on this organization has shown that the highest performing managers have significantly more “emotional competence” than other managers. She also found some differences in the emotional competencies levels among

gender, different regions and functional groups. With this framework in mind, I would like to propose the following hypotheses for empirical verification: -

*H1: Higher performer managers exhibit higher ECI level;*

*H2: There are differences in the ECI level for the different gender, business units functional and department heads' grouping;*

*H3: There is a different in the Personality profile between the higher performer and average performer managers;*

*H4: There are difference in the Personality profile for the different gender, business units, functional and department heads' grouping;*

*H5: There is relationship between the dimension of the ECI and the Personality profile.*

## Method

### Sample and Procedure

The sample for the study consists of 58 managers and executives that have participated in the two-days EI workshop. The demographic compositions of the sample are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1**

**Demographic compositions of the sample (n=58)**

RPA category*	No %		Functional group	No %		Department Head		
	No	%		No	%	Head	No	%
ME	29	50.0	Engineering (ENG)	17	29.3	A	2	3.5
Non-ME	29	50.0	Finance (FIN)	2	3.5	B	4	6.9
<b>Gender</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	Human Resource (HR)	4	6.9	C	3	5.2
Female	9	15.5	Operations (OPS)	12	20.7	D	14	24.1
Male	49	84.5	Quality Assurance (QA)	4	6.9	E	18	31.0
<b>Business Unit**</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	Research and Development (RND)	19	32.8	F	4	6.9
GTDG	20	34.5				G	13	22.4
SCOG	38	65.5						

Note. \*RPA=Relative Performance Assessment category; ME=Most Effective represents those high performer managers and Non-ME= Non-Most Effective represents the average performer managers grouping

\*\*Business Unit consists of two main groups i.e. GTDG=Global Technology and Development Group and SCOG=Supply Chain and Operations Group

The sample was categorized into five major compositions for the purpose of the study. The RPA (Relative Performance Assessment), Gender and Business Units, each consisted of only two categories, Most Effective (ME) and Non-ME (Non-Most Effective) based on the participants rated performance, female and male, and two major business

units in the organization. RPA (Relative Performance Assessment) category represents the grouping of the participants according to their performance rating provided by their supervisors and the managers. Those rated as high performers will be grouped into the ME (Most Effective) category while those average performers will be grouped as Non-ME category. The organization consist of two main business units i.e. GTDG (Global Technology and Development Group) that has the design and development responsibility while the SCOG (Supply Chain and Operations Group) is responsible for the manufacturing and distribution function. There are six major functional groups in the organization, namely Engineering, Finance, Human Resource, Operations, Quality Assurance and Research and Development groups. There are seven main department heads that are direct reports to the Managing Directors and to ensure confidentiality they were coded "A" to "G".

As part of the EI workshop requirement, the participants were asked to answer a set of self-assessment on their personality profile prior to attending the workshop. The personality profile assessment is done electronically and each participants were notified through the e-mail and were requested to log on to a dedicate WEB sites to answer the set of questionnaires related to their personality preferences. The individual result of the personality profile and report of the assessment were send to the participants before they attend the workshop. The ECI assessment is done manually and each of the participants were asked to answer the ECI questionnaires on the second day of the EI workshop.

### ***Measures***

Two main assessment instruments were used in the EI workshop and the summary data obtained for these assessment instruments were used for the statistical analysis in this study. As mentioned earlier, one of the instrument measures the EI of the participants and the other provide an assessment on the personality profile of the participants.

***Emotional Competencies Inventory (ECI).*** The ECI dimensions used in the assessment for the EI workshop was developed based on the basic components of EI such as those suggested by Goleman (1998). The basic EI components are: - a) Self-Awareness which includes Emotional Awareness, Accurate self-assessment and self-confidence; b) Self-Regulation which includes Self-control, Trustworthiness, Conscientiousness, Adaptability and Innovation; c) The Motivation Cluster which included Achievement Drive, Commitment, Initiative and Optimism; d) Empathy which included Understanding Others, Developing Others, Service Orientation, Leveraging Diversity and Political Awareness; and

e) Social Skills which included Influence, Communication, Conflict Management, Leadership, Change Catalyst, Building Bonds, Collaborations and cooperation and Team capabilities. Specifically, Professor Leonard Yong (2002) that facilitated the EI workshop for the organization have “selected” seven Emotional Competencies Inventory (ECI) dimensions, to assess the participants emotional competencies. According to Yong (2002), the high EI individual demonstrates abilities to pursue goals with vision, perseverance and energy. He further argued that research has indicated that certain Emotional competencies contribute significantly to predict success at work. Based on this, he has selected the seven ECI dimensions for the assessment and they are: - Intra-Personal Skills, Inter-Personal Skills, Assertiveness, Contentment in life, Resilience, Self-Esteem and Self-Actualization. It consists of 28 items with 4 items “dedicated” to each of the mentioned dimensions.

**LEONARD Personality Inventory (LPI).** The personality profile is based on the LEONARD Personality Inventory (LPI), which was developed by Professor Leonard Yong (1999). The LPI profile was developed based on the five factors personality factors devised by Goldberg’s Big Five Markers, Hogan’s Personality Inventory and Costa & McCrae’s NEO-Personality Inventory. The LPI is based on ten years of research by Yong (1999) into the personality traits of Malaysians and is modeled after the combination of both four Greek temperaments and the Big Five Model. Specifically, the LPI attempts to “locate” the emotional orientations based on the individual’s preferred behavioral dimensions, namely, **Openness**, **Neutral**, **Analytical**, **Relational** and **Decisive**. The brief description of the main “attributes” of the preferred behaviors are as follows: - a) Openness include the individual that are creative, easily bored and tend to be curious; b) Neutral include the individual that are a good listener, like to live in harmony and get hurt easily by others; c) Analytical include the individual that are quite and reserved, like to be precise and prefer to be a loner; d) Relational include the individual that are full of life and excitement, inspire others and tend to talk too much and e) Decisive includes the individual that are decisive, like to win and are too aggressive. Based on this five LPI dimensions, Yong (1999) have twenty-two possible LPI profile based on the possible combination of the five dimensions. In term of the validity and reliability of the LPI instruments, Yong (1999) indicated that the research results from the administrations of the LPI in Malaysia have indicated the validity and reliability of the Personality inventory for the purpose of identifying the preferred behavioral styles of the respondents.

### **Statistical Analysis**

The data was analyzed to compare the ECI and LPI level of groups defined by RPA (for ME and Non-ME category), Gender, Business Units, Functional and different Department Heads grouping. The mean score or rating of the ECI and LPI level obtained from the participants' self-assessment was compared using One-way ANOVA. To "test" the relationship between the seven dimensions of ECI and the five LPI dimensions, I adopted the inter-correlation analysis. For the analyses, the individual variables between the ECI and LPI dimensions were tested on a "pair-wise sample" basis for their correlation and the Pearson correlation and its significance were used to indicate the strength and significance of their relationship.

The focus of the study is on the leaderships in the organization, as such expected number participants involved in the sample (n=58) is relatively small from the statistical "perspective". Based on this, I would like to point out that some of the statistical findings were considered meaningful if they showed (a) moderate to high effect of sizes, and (b) if differences were statistically significant based on the results of paired-sample t-tests. The typical level of significance used in the statistical testing will take the value of  $p < .05$ . However, because of the sample size,  $p$  values of  $p < .1$  will be used for some statistical testing.

## **Results**

### **Overall Statistics**

In general, the overall level of the different dimensions of the ECI are shown in Table 2 indicating the typical descriptive statistics such as the mean, standard deviation, median, minimum, maximum, quartiles 1 and 3 as well as the standard error of mean for the ECI measures.

Table 2 Overall Descriptive Statistics for Emotional Competencies Inventory (ECI)

Dimensions	N	Mean	SD	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Q1	Q3	SE Mean
Intra-Personal Skills	58	15.97	2.29	16.00	10.00	20.00	14.00	18.00	0.30
Inter-Personal Skills	58	15.59	2.46	15.50	10.00	20.00	14.00	17.25	0.32
Assertiveness	58	13.43	3.06	13.00	6.00	20.00	11.75	15.25	0.40
Contentment in Life	58	16.95	2.51	18.00	10.00	20.00	15.00	19.00	0.33
Resilience	58	16.47	2.74	16.00	9.00	20.00	15.00	19.00	0.36
Self-Esteem	58	16.35	2.64	16.00	10.00	20.00	14.75	19.00	0.35
Self-Actualization	58	16.81	2.33	17.00	12.00	20.00	15.00	19.00	0.31

The ECI statistics shown in Table 2 indicated, that the assertiveness dimension for the overall organization is the lowest value (M=13.43,SD=3.06). Those ECI dimensions that are high and exceed the average level of sixteen are: - Contentment in life (M=16.95, SD=2.51), Resilience (M=16.47, SD=2.74), Self-Esteem (M=16.35, SD=2.64) and Self-Actualization (M=16.81, SD=2.33). The two ECI dimensions that fall between the two extreme i.e. less than sixteen and more than fourteen are:-Intra-personal (M=15.97,SD=2.29) and Inter-personal (M=15.59, SD=2.46) skills.

Table 3 contains the descriptive statistics for the LPI score. From the Table 3, we can see that the Relational profile have the lowest score (M=71.76,SD=9.75), while the highest score for the top three LPI profile that scored above seventy-seven are: - Neutral (M=77.36, SD=8.95), Openness (M=77.31, SD=8.95) and Decisive (M=77.16, SD=8.54). The Analytical profile (M=74.98, SD=9.34) falls between the two extreme i.e. between seventy-seven and seventy-one.

Table 3 Overall Descriptive Statistics for Leonard Personality Inventory (LPI)

LPI Variable	N	M	SD	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Q1	Q3	SE Mean
Openness	58	77.31	8.95	78	58	100	70	84	1.18
Neutral	58	77.362	7.546	77.5	60	94	71	83	0.991
Analytical	58	74.98	9.34	76	54	99	70.5	80	1.23
Relational	58	71.76	9.75	72	49	90	66	78	1.28
Decisive	58	77.16	8.54	78	55	94	71.75	83	1.12

### ***ECI and Demographics Compositions***

The study revealed that there are significance difference between the ME and Non-ME categories in term of some of the ECI dimensions. However, there is no significance in the gender and business units' categories. Table 4 provides the summary of the test results.

Table 4 ECI by Demographic profile: RPA, Gender and Business Units

ECI Dimensions	RPA				Gender				Business Units			
	ME(n=29)		Non-ME(n=29)		Female(n=9)		Male(n=49)		GTDG(n=20)		SCOG(n=38)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Intra-Personal Skills	16.24	1.96	15.69	2.59	15.444	2.506	16.061	2.268	16	2.077	15.947	2.427
Inter-Personal Skills	15.97	2.34	15.21	2.56	15.333	1.936	15.633	2.555	15.75	2.9	15.5	2.227
Assertiveness	13.35	3.27	13.52	2.90	13.78	3.87	13.367	2.935	14.05	2.929	13.105	3.117
Contentment in Life	<b>17.552 *</b>	2.01	<b>16.345 *</b>	2.83	16.222	2.489	17.082	2.515	17.35	2.3	16.737	2.617
Resilience	<b>17.034*</b>	2.43	<b>15.897*</b>	2.96	16.11	3.26	16.531	2.67	16.75	2.731	16.316	2.772
Self-Esteem	<b>16.966 *</b>	2.58	<b>15.724 *</b>	2.59	17	1.936	16.224	2.748	16.55	2.395	16.237	2.784
Self-Actualization	<b>17.31*</b>	2.27	<b>16.31*</b>	2.32	16.778	2.906	16.816	2.242	16.9	2.713	16.763	2.136

\* p<.10 \*\*p<.05\*\*\*p<.01

On the whole, we can see that the ME category that consists of higher performing managers, have higher means for the entire seven ECI dimensions when compared to the non-ME category. From the statistical perspective and at the significance level of  $p < .10$ , the study found that the higher performer managers exhibit higher ECI in the following dimensions i.e. Contentment in Life, Resilience, Self-Esteem and Self-Actualization. The finding supports the hypothesis (H1) that higher performer managers do exhibit higher ECI level. The findings also support theorist's suggestions that the social, emotional and relational competency set is a distinguishing factor in leadership performance.

From the gender and business units' perspectives, the study does not reveal any significant difference. Hence it does not support part of the hypothesis (H2) that there are difference in the ECI level for the different gender and business units.

The statistical results of the testing for the ECI level by the functional and department head's grouping are shown in Table 5 and 6 respectively.

Table 5 ECI by Functional grouping

ECI Dimensions	Functional Grouping											
	Engineering (n=17)		Finance (n=2)		HR (n=4)		Operations (n=12)		QA (n=4)		RND (n=19)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Intra-Personal Skills	16.529	2.095	16	1.41	14.5	1.732	16.167	2.823	14.25	2.75	16	2.134
Inter-Personal Skills	15.882	2.261	14.5	0.707	14.5	2.52	15.667	2.535	15.25	1.258	15.684	2.964
Assertiveness	13.824	2.811	12.5	0.707	13.5	4.04	12.75	3.82	12	2.71	13.895	2.923
<b>Contentment in Life</b>	<b>17.06 ***</b>	<b>2.135</b>	<b>15 **</b>	<b>5.66</b>	<b>13.75 **</b>	<b>2.22</b>	<b>18.08 **</b>	<b>1.621</b>	<b>14.25 **</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>17.58 **</b>	<b>2.12</b>
Resilience	17.176	2.243	15.5	2.12	15.25	3.77	16.25	2.734	14.75	4.03	16.684	2.79
Self-Esteem	16.588	2.347	17	1.41	15.5	4.04	17	2.763	13.25	2.5	16.474	2.435
Self-Actualization	17.059	1.919	15.5	4.95	15	1.826	17.417	1.832	15.75	2.06	16.947	2.778

\*  $p < .10$  \*\* $p < .05$  \*\*\* $p < .01$

Table 6 ECI by Department Head grouping

ECI Dimensions	Department Head													
	Mgr D (n=14)		Mgr A (n=2)		Mgr B (n=4)		Mgr G (n=13)		Mgr C (n=3)		Mgr E (n=18)		Mgr F (n=4)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Intra-Personal Skills	16.36	2.06	16.00	1.41	14.50	1.73	16.39	2.93	15.33	2.08	16.06	2.18	14.75	2.63
Inter-Personal Skills	15.86	2.38	14.50	0.71	14.50	2.52	16.08	2.36	15.33	1.53	15.72	3.05	14.25	0.96
Assertiveness	13.07	2.30	12.50	0.71	13.50	4.04	13.08	3.97	13.33	0.58	14.06	2.92	13.50	4.80
<b>Contentment in Life</b>	<b>17.286 **</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>15**</b>	<b>5.66</b>	<b>13.75**</b>	<b>2.22</b>	<b>17.85**</b>	<b>2.19</b>	<b>14.33**</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>17.56**</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>16.25**</b>	<b>2.06</b>
Resilience	17.07	2.27	15.50	2.12	15.25	3.77	16.39	2.84	14.67	4.93	16.78	2.84	16.25	1.50
Self-Esteem	16.21	2.16	17.00	1.41	15.50	4.04	17.39	2.57	13.00	3.00	16.56	2.48	15.50	3.11
Self-Actualization	16.93	1.69	15.50	4.95	15.00	1.83	17.39	2.14	15.67	2.52	16.94	2.86	17.25	1.26

\*  $p < .10$  \*\* $p < .05$  \*\*\* $p < .01$

From the above analysis, the results shown in Table 5 and 6 showed some consistent findings with respect to the fact that the common difference among the different functional groups and department head's grouping is the "contentment in life" dimension of the ECI. The most group that scored "high" in the contentment in life" dimension i.e. scoring above seventeen are those from Operations (M=18.08, SD=1.621), Research and Development (M=17.58, SD=2.11) and Engineering (M=17.06, SD=2.13). On the other hand, the group that scored "low" this dimension are those from Human Resources (M=13.75, SD=2.22), QA (M=14.25, SD=3.1) and Finance (M=15, SD=5.66). On the whole, this finding, partially support hypothesis (H2) that there is some difference in the ECI dimensions among the functional and department heads' groupings.

### ***LPI (Personality Profile) and Demographics Compositions***

Table 7 revealed that there are some significance difference between the ME and non-ME category in the LPI especially in the Analytical profile. This does suggest that the higher performer managers or ME (M=73.03, SD=8.94) are less likely to be analytical than the non-ME (M=76.93, SD=7.86). This finding does partially support the hypothesis (H3) that there is a different in the personality profile between the higher performer and the average performer managers. Eventhough not statistically significant, the ME category, exhibit higher level in the Relational and Decisive LPI profile. In term of gender, the analysis indicates there is a difference between the female (M=81.67,SD=6.78) and male (M=76.63, SD=8.62) group in the "decisive" profile. This does suggest that the female group tend to be more 'decisive' than the male group. The findings does partially support hypothesis (H4) that there are some different in the LPI profile in the gender grouping. There is no significance difference in the LPI profile in the different business units' grouping.

Table 7 LPI by Demographic profile: RPA, Gender and Business Units

LPI Dimensions	RPA				Gender				Business Units			
	ME (n=29)		Non-ME (n=29)		Female (n=9)		Male (n=49)		GTDG (n=20)		SCOG (n=38)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Openness	77.24	8.85	77.38	9.21	80	8.87	76.82	8.97	75.7	9.5	78.16	8.66
Neutral	76.9	8.82	77.83	6.14	79.22	5.43	77.02	7.87	77.7	6.79	77.18	8
<b>Analytical</b>	<b>73.03*</b>	<b>10.39</b>	<b>76.93*</b>	7.86	79	7.95	74.24	9.46	75.55	6.49	74.68	10.61
Relational	73.17	8.94	70.34	10.46	73.22	6.02	71.49	10.31	69.95	9.37	72.71	9.93
<b>Decisive</b>	78.59	7.88	75.72	9.06	<b>81.67*</b>	<b>6.78</b>	<b>76.33*</b>	8.62	75.2	8.35	78.18	8.56

\* p<.10 \*\*p<.05\*\*\*p<.01

The statistical results of the testing for the LPI level by the functional and department head's grouping are shown in Table 8 and 9 respectively.

Table 8 LPI by Functional grouping

LPI Dimensions	Functional Grouping											
	Engineering (n=17)		Finance (n=2)		HR (n=4)		Operations (n=12)		QA (n=4)		RND (n=19)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Openness	75.82	10.6	79	4.24	74.25	6.6	81	6	83.25	5.12	75.53	9.73
Neutral	76.88	8.48	77.5	0.707	76.25	5.12	79.42	9.39	72.75	2.75	77.68	6.98
Analytical	73.82	9.78	74.5	4.95	75.5	4.65	74.25	14.79	77.5	6.4	75.89	6.48
<b>Relational</b>	<b>69.12**</b>	<b>10.77</b>	<b>66.5**</b>	<b>6.36</b>	<b>69.5**</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>80**</b>	<b>7.92</b>	<b>70.75**</b>	<b>5.19</b>	<b>70.16**</b>	<b>9.58</b>
<b>Decisive</b>	<b>73.88*</b>	<b>10.25</b>	<b>81*</b>	<b>1.41</b>	<b>75.75*</b>	<b>6.34</b>	<b>83.17*</b>	<b>5.29</b>	<b>80*</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>75.58*</b>	<b>8.4</b>
	* p<.10		**p<.05		***p<.01							

Table 9 LPI by Department Heads grouping

LPI Variable	Department Head													
	Mgr D(n=14)		Mgr A (n=2)		Mgr B(n=4)		Mgr G(n=13)		Mgr C(n=3)		Mgr E(n=18)		Mgr F (n=4)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Openness	74.71	9.13	79	4.24	74.25	6.6	80.46	8.95	81.67	4.93	75.89	9.88	81.5	8.96
Neutral	78.07	8.93	77.5	0.707	76.25	5.12	79.46	8.3	73.33	3.06	77.17	6.79	73	10.07
Analytical	74.57	10.59	74.5	4.95	75.5	4.65	74.46	13.92	79.33	6.43	75.44	6.35	72.5	9
Relational	69.5	11.18	66.5	6.36	69.5	3.42	78.46	9.86	72	5.57	70.72	9.53	67.25	6.13
<b>Decisive</b>	<b>73.14*</b>	<b>10.87</b>	<b>81*</b>	<b>1.41</b>	<b>75.75*</b>	<b>6.34</b>	<b>82.31*</b>	<b>6.12</b>	<b>81.33*</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>76.72*</b>	<b>6.96</b>	<b>72.75*</b>	<b>12.42</b>
	* p<.10		**p<.05		***p<.01									

There are a few “interesting” findings that we can observe from Table 8 and 9 above. The study revealed that there are significance difference in the Relational and Decisive LPI profiles for the functional groupings and in the case of the department heads grouping the only significant difference is the Decisive LPI profile. From the functional grouping aspects we found that the functional group that exhibit “higher” relational LPI profile are operations group (M=80,SD=7.92) while those within the seventy score range are from the QA (M=70.75,SD=5.19) and RND (M=70.16,SD=9.85). The rest of the functional group scored less than seventy are from the HR (M=69.5,SD=3.42), Engineering (M=69.12,SD=10.77) and Finance (M=66.5, SD=6.36). In term of the “Decisive” LPI the analysis showed that functional group that are “more decisive” i.e. those that scored above eighty are the functional group from Operations (M=83.17, SD=5.29), Finance (M=81,SD=1.41) and QA (M=80, SD=3.65). The rest of the functional groups that fall below the seventy-six levels are those group from HR (M=75.75, SD=6.34), RND (M=75.58,

SD=8.4) and Finance (M=73.88, SD= 73.88). The findings do support the rational that the functional groups such as operations, finance and QA tends to behave more “decisively” because of the nature of their functions. Similarly, the operations group is likely to be more “relational” because of their need to interact to wider “spectrum of other functional groups. It is surprising that the supporting functional groups such as HR, Finance and QA do not exhibit a higher level of relational LPI profile. The department heads’ grouping does show a significant difference in the Decisive LPI profile. The overall findings in the different LPI profile for the different functional and department heads grouping do partially support the hypothesis (H4) that there are difference in the personality profile for the different functional and department head’s grouping.

#### ***Relationship between the ECI and LPI dimensions***

To test the hypothesis (H5) that there is a relationship between the dimension of the ECI and LPI personality profile, the correlation analysis between their dimensions were analyzed and the result is shown in Table 10.

Table 10 Inter Correlations between ECI and LPI

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 Openness	1.00											
2 Neutral	0.099	1.00										
3 Analytical	0.016	<b>0.592***</b>	1.00									
4 Relational	0.533**	0.109	-0.073	1.00								
5 Decisiveness	0.505**	-0.240	0.001	<b>0.535**</b>	1.00							
6 Intra-Personal Skill	<b>0.254*</b>	0.019	-0.134	0.216	0.140	1.00						
7 Inter-Personal Skill	<b>0.267*</b>	0.184	-0.157	0.173	-0.062	<b>0.592**</b>	1.00					
8 Assertiveness	<b>0.270*</b>	<b>-0.260*</b>	<b>-0.389*</b>	0.009	0.157	<b>0.519**</b>	<b>0.446**</b>	1.00				
9 Contentment in Life	<b>0.254*</b>	0.051	-0.185	<b>0.457***</b>	0.174	<b>0.466**</b>	<b>0.292*</b>	<b>0.270*</b>	1.00			
10 Resilience	<b>0.319*</b>	0.015	<b>-0.327*</b>	0.285	0.068	<b>0.678***</b>	<b>0.625***</b>	<b>0.544***</b>	<b>0.651***</b>	1.00		
11 Self-Esteem	<b>0.384*</b>	-0.012	<b>-0.322*</b>	<b>0.300*</b>	<b>0.204*</b>	<b>0.567***</b>	<b>0.495***</b>	<b>0.467***</b>	<b>0.623***</b>	<b>0.763***</b>	1.00	
12 Self-Actualization	<b>0.335**</b>	-0.072	-0.246	<b>0.369*</b>	0.194	<b>0.363*</b>	<b>0.323*</b>	<b>0.329*</b>	<b>0.626***</b>	<b>0.605***</b>	<b>0.625***</b>	1.00

\* p<.05    \*\*p<.01    \*\*\*p<.001

The above correlation matrix revealed some very interesting findings about the linking between the ECI and LPI dimensions. The Openness LPI profile is significantly and positively correlated to all the seven ECI dimensions. The Neutral LPI profile shows that three out of the seven ECI dimensions are negative correlation and it is significantly negatively correlated with the Assertiveness ( $r=-0.26$ ) dimension of the ECI. It is also interesting to note that all the seven ECI dimensions are negatively correlated with the Analytical LPI profile, out of which three are significant i.e. Assertiveness ( $r=-0.389$ ), Resilience ( $r=-0.327$ ) and Self-esteem ( $r=-0.322$ ). It found that the Relational LPI profile is positively correlated to the entire seven ECI dimension and out of which three are significantly correlated i.e. Contentment in Life( $r=0.457$ ), Self-Esteem ( $r=0.301$ ) and Self-Actualization ( $r=0.369$ ). The final LPI profile, Decisive, correlates to six of the seven ECI

dimensions with the exception of Intra-personal skills. However, only one of the ECI dimensions that was found to be significantly and positively correlated to the Decisive LPI profiles i.e. Self-Esteem ( $r= 0.205$ ). The findings do partially support the hypothesis (H5) that there are some degree of correlation between the ECI dimensions and the LPI profile. In sum, it is interesting to find that the Neutral and Analytical LPI profile to the negatively correlated to the ECI dimension. This will imply that the Neutral and Analytical persons would tend to exhibit lower EI which tend to “link” to the argument that their some of their preferred behavior such get hurt easily by others (for Neutral Profile) and preference to be a loner (for Analytical Profile).

### **Discussion**

The results of the study demonstrate that high performers i.e. those in the ME category do exhibit higher EI level and it also revealed that the higher performers tend to be “less” analytical in their personality traits. Eventhough not statistically significant (and could be due to the small sample size “effect”), the higher performer managers tend to exhibit higher Relational and Decisive behavior. These findings do concur with research done Brienza (2002) and Sala (2002) that successful leaders do have higher EI levels. It interesting that certain functional group such as the Operation functional group exhibits higher ECI level in the Contentment in Life. This could be explained by that fact that most of the ME participants are from the Operations and Engineering groups. The findings would suggest that the most of the ME are “contented” with their life. Thus to motivate them, the management would have to consider the elements related with “Self-Esteem” and Self-Actualization”. Within different functional group, there is a significance difference in the LPI profile especially in the Relational and Decisive personality traits. The findings do support the theoretical arguments that different functional roles do influence specific set of behaviors from the people. As such it is not surprising that managers from the operations exhibit higher score in these behavior because of the “nature” of their job. In term of the relationship between the ECI and LPI dimensions, it is interesting to note there is a negative correlation between the ECI dimensions with the Neutral and Analytical personality. Theoretically, the findings would imply that the EI level of a Neutral and Analytical person would tend to be lower. This finding will require further “investigation” into the specific participants in this category.

In sum, the study supports the position that emotional competence differentiates high performers and it is important to understand the “emotional” side of the managers in

order to identify and address workplace emotional intelligence issues and provides support for the participants as they work to raise their emotional intelligence competencies. With this in mind, I would like to recommend the following responses to the implementation of the EI intervention for this organization: -

- 1) The organization leadership developmental model should incorporate the EI intervention and should be launched to the other facilities within the corporation and integrate it into the 360° Catalyst (the organization assessment of the leaders' behavior) and the performance management as well as talent management process (succession planning);
- 2) Educational and developmental program for the EI interventions should be launched across the corporation and should include the element of workshop, assessment and feedback or coaching. The ECI assessment should incorporate a 360° feedback so as to ensure that the participants are provided with a more "accurate" feedback;
- 3) There should be an ongoing effort to build skill in EI throughout the organization through the EI assessment and EI skill building workshop at the individual and group level. This support system is critical for enhancing the emotional competency of the organization and its members.

In conclusion, EI intervention will play a vital role in the organization's leadership development program. Given this understanding and the fact that, EI have significant impact on the individual managers' success, it is imperative that we must ensure the appropriate support to integrate the individual managers' EI "success" into the overall organization success and create a high EI climate within the organization.

## References

- Bar-On, R. (1992). *The development of a concept and test of psychological well-being*. Unpublished manuscript. Tel Aviv: Reuven Bar-On. In Boyatzis, R.E., Goleman, D. and Rhee, K. (1999). *Clustering competence in Emotional Intelligence: Insight from the ECI*. Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations. ([www.eiconsortium.org](http://www.eiconsortium.org))
- Boyatzis, R.E. and Burckle, M. (1999). *Psychometric properties of ECI: Technical Note*. Boston: The Hay/McBer Group.
- Boyatzis, R.E., Goleman, D. and Rhee, K. (1999). Clustering competence in Emotional Intelligence: Insight from the ECI. *Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations*. ([www.eiconsortium.org](http://www.eiconsortium.org))
- Brienza, D. (2002). Emotional Competence and Leadership Excellence at Johnson and Johnson: The Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Study. *Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations*. ([www.eiconsortium.org](http://www.eiconsortium.org))
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. NY: Basic Books.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. NY: Bantam Books
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. NY: Bantam
- Thomson, K. (1998). *Emotional Capital*. Oxford: Capstone
- Saarni, C. (1988). *Emotional competence: How emotions and relationships become integrated*. In Boyatzis, R.E., Goleman, D. and Rhee, K. (1999). *Clustering competence in Emotional Intelligence: Insight from the ECI*. Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations. ([www.eiconsortium.org](http://www.eiconsortium.org))
- Sala, F. (2002). Do Programs designed to increase Emotional Intelligence at work-work? *Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations*. ([www.eiconsortium.org](http://www.eiconsortium.org))
- Salovey, P. and Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence: *Imagination, cognition, and personality*, 9, pp. 185-211.
- Yong, M.S. (1999). *The LEONARD Personality Inventory*. Petaling Jaya: Nemo Marketing.
- Yong, M.S. (2002). *EQ for Innovative Leadership*. Penang: Institute of Training and Development.