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SUMMARY
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Psychological constructs may have significant influence on police leadership. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between, Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness within a policing context. Leadership within the policing environment in particular the South African context has raised contentious issues over the past decade. This research adopted a quantitative study and the sample was made up of 107 police personnel in commanding positions. The measuring instruments used were the Assessing Emotions Scale, Self-Efficacy Scale and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The results of this research study confirm a positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness. The insights gained from the findings may be used to guide selection of future leaders within the policing environment and may also be used to establish future developmental programmes and research initiatives.
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CHAPTER 1: SCIENTIFIC ORIENTATION OF THE RESEARCH

1.1 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

Competent management is one source of sustainable competitive advantage in contemporary, rapidly-changing organisations (Gilley, McMillan & Gilley, 2009). Leadership, or its absence, is recognised as a key force shaping outputs and outcomes in most formal or informal organisations (Schafer, 2008).

The Police Services is complex in its organisational structure and also faces complex leadership challenges. According to Clarke (2005) leaders in a complex organisation, have to meet the challenges of a society that is diverse, pragmatic and questioning of authoritative stances. Traditional leadership approaches seem to be inadequate in addressing leadership challenges in complex organisations (Yukl, 2002). Lichtenstein, Uhl-Bien, Marion, Seers, Orton and Schreiber (2006) concur and motivate that traditional views of leadership are increasingly less useful, given the complexities of the modern world.

The task of police leaders includes the implementation of policy to guide crime prevention activities; creating a societal consensus on crime prevention; developing and implementing national programmes to address the causes of crime; mobilising community resources and engaging communities in all crime prevention activities (Artz & Oliveira cited in Adam, 2010).

Within the South African Police in particular the Station Commanders are tasked with many duties as set out in Standing Order 28. “It will, to a great extent, depend on the zeal, activity and intelligence of the Station Commander whether Police duties are carried out smoothly and whether those serving under his command are functioning effectively, whether individually or as members of a team, he and his subordinates shall not spare themselves when, in serving the public or the interests of the State, it requires their time and their energies” (Standing Order 28).

The multidimensional increase in complexities from organisational structures to societal demands may render leaders ineffective if they are unable to adjust to these complexities. The question can be asked if this ability to adjust or not, to the complexities innate and for the purposes of this research regarding a leader’s effectiveness can be associated with the psychological constructs of Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy. Leadership does involve both the rational and emotional sides of human experience (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy 2006). Riggio, Murphy and Pirozzolo (2002) propose multiple forms of intelligence possessed by effective leaders, allowing them to respond successfully to a range of situations.
The researcher is interested in extending the available knowledge on Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes to effective leadership from a social cognitive perspective and simultaneously highlighting the growing trends in terms of Leadership Effectiveness in the 21st century within complex organisations.

1.2 PROBLEM FORMULATION
Policing organisations are complex. Leaders that work in these organisations face complexities from the organisational structure, complexities in terms of their jobs and complexities in how they as leaders provide safety and security to the community.

These leaders have to adapt to face the complexities in order to be effective leaders. The ability to adapt may come from their knowledge, skills and abilities. However, this research is concerned with exploring how leaders’ psychological constructs such as Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy can enhance effective leadership considering the complexities they face.

1.2.1 Research Question
As a result of the above-mentioned problem, the following research question was developed: Do Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes play a role in Leadership Effectiveness?

1.3 AIMS
The general aim of this research is to gain an understanding of the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes and the extent (if any) to which influence Leadership Effectiveness.

The specific aims related to the literature review are:
- To conceptualise Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy;
- To conceptualise Leadership Effectiveness; and
- To theoretically integrate the literature concerning Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness.

The specific aims related to the empirical study are:
- To determine if there is a statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership within a Police Organisation;
- To determine if there is a statistically positive relationship between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership within a Police Organisation;
To determine if there is a statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy within a Police Organisation; and

Lastly to formulate recommendations stemming from the findings in terms of the field of industrial and organisational psychology, future research and for the organisation represented in this study

1.4 THE PARADIGM PERSPECTIVE

Paradigms refer to the intellectual climate or variety of meta-theoretical values or beliefs and assumptions underlying the theories and models that form the definitive context of research (Mouton & Marais, 1994).


The Social Cognitive Theory recognises the importance of behaviourism’s contingent environmental consequences, but also includes cognitive processes of self-regulation. The social part acknowledges the social origins of much human thought and action which individuals learn by being part of society, whereas the cognitive portion recognises the influential contribution of thought processes to human motivation, attitude and action (Luthans, 2008).

Bandura (1986) explains that the Social Cognitive Theory has five basic human capabilities each of which has bidirectional reciprocal influences. Bandura (1986) individuals possess various capabilities that underlie their functioning in the context of the interaction between person, situation and behaviour and these distinguish them from animals.

According to Meyer, Moore and Viljoen (2002), the five basic human capabilities are:

- Symbolising: which is fundamental to all other capabilities and enables human beings to conserve and manipulate experiences in the form of cognitions.
- Forethought: implies that people do not simply react only to the immediate situation and are also not simply programmed by their past. They can devise plans and goals for the future and act in accordance with these.
- Observational: the individual’s ability to learn from the experiences of others broadens his/her learning capabilities immensely.
- Self-regulatory: refers to people’s ability to live by their own standards and therefore to be relatively independent of other people’s approval and control.

- Self-reflective: is the uniquely human ability to have a self-image, to be able to reflect on oneself, and to evaluate oneself. The central component of this capability is people’s self-efficacy perceptions, in other words their beliefs about their capabilities to function effectively in a given situation. This capability is of particular importance in terms of an individual’s self-efficacy and the impact it has on their Leadership Effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbolising</th>
<th>Forethought</th>
<th>Observational</th>
<th>Self-Regulatory</th>
<th>Sel-Reflective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees process visual experiences into cognitive models that then serve as guides for future actions</td>
<td>Employees plan their action, anticipate the consequences and determine the level of desired performance</td>
<td>Employees learn by observing the performance of referent and credible others and the consequences they receive for their action</td>
<td>Employees self-control their actions by setting internal standards and by evaluating the discrepancy between the standard and the performance in order to improve it</td>
<td>Employees reflect back on their actions and perceptually determine how strongly they believe they can successfully accomplish the task in the future given the context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.1: The Human Capabilities: Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory (Meyer, Moore & Viljoen, 2002)

To explain Self-Efficacy in terms of the Social Cognitive Theory, it refers to psychological functioning in terms of environmental events; internal personal factors in the form of cognitive affective and biological variables; and behavioural pattern (Luthans, 2008). These factors interact with one and other and influence each other bi-directionally. As illustrated in to Figure 1.1, there is a self-theory that is self-regulation and self-reflection. Luthans (2008) states: it is the capability of self-reflection that people reflect back on their action/experience with a specific event/task to cognitively process how strongly they believe they can successfully accomplish this even/task in the future and this serves as the theoretical basis for Self-Efficacy.

A leadership approach is proposed based on Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory that posits leadership Self-Efficacy as a key cognitive variable regulating leader functioning in a dynamic environment (McCormick, 2001). Thinking of leadership as a particular kind of human functioning, Bandura’s Social Cognitive Model implies, that to fully understand the leadership process three categories of leadership variables must be considered, that is
leader cognitions, leader behaviour and leadership environment. In the context of this research study, leader cognitions refer to Self-Efficacy and Emotional Intelligence, leader behaviour is effective leadership and the leadership environment refers to the organisation and the community that these leaders interact with. The Social Cognitive Theory proposition on leadership goes as follows: “Variations in leader cognition, leader behaviours and the leadership environment are necessary and sufficient to account for variation on the leader effectiveness” (McCormick, 2001, p. 24).

Figure 1.2: APPLYING THE SOCIAL COGNITIVE THEORY TO LEADERSHIP (McCormick, 2001)

The successful application of the social cognitive approach to leadership depends upon the leader’s ability to bring awareness to the overt or covert antecedent cues and contingent consequences that regulate the leader’s and subordinates’ performance behaviour (Luthans, 2008).

Emotional Intelligence has gained much popularity as an absolute necessity for effective leadership (Hayward, 2005). Thus the researcher will use the Ability Model by Mayer and Salovey (1997) to conceptualise the emotional-intelligence framework. This model defines Emotional Intelligence as a set of abilities that involves perceiving and reasoning abstractly with information that emerges from feelings (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003).
1.5 LITERATURE REVIEW

A police organisation has its own structural and cultural milieu that informs facets within it in particular leadership. The absence of quality leaders in policing is, in part, due to a common failure to develop officers to become more effective leaders (Schafer, 2008). Rapid change requires an organisation 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 (Weinberger, 2004). In the case of the South African Police Services (SAPS), leaders are responsible for effectively managing good order, control and discipline of all members under their command and providing safety to the community. The rapid changes that leaders within the SAPS face are systemic. Lewis, Goodman and Fandt (1998) assert that managers of the future will have to be prepared to cope with change if they are to be effective. As proposed in Riggio et al. (2002) organisation effectiveness depends on Leadership Effectiveness.

Leadership Effectiveness stems from the concept of leadership, which, over several decades has accumulated many different definitions. According to Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994) leadership involves persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the responsibilities and welfare of the group. Leadership is the process of communication (verbal and non-verbal) that involves coaching, motivating/inspiring, directing/guiding and supporting/counselling others (Howard, 2005). Heifetz and Linsky (2004), highlights leadership as being the ability to influence and mobilise individuals identified with specific skills to discuss and complete specific tasks in order to achieve results. This definition highlights the human component in leadership. Dorbrzanska (2005), further mentions the human element as being key in such relations, since leadership is seen as the ability to express and channel human autonomy.

Leadership Effectiveness according to Chester Barnard (cited in Hollander, 1978, p. 112), is the accomplishment of the recognised objectives of cooperative action, which depends initially on influence, but beyond that there are questions of value, such as how things are done to achieve the objective. Leadership Effectiveness differs in terms of understanding in that a particular context will require a particular kind of leader effectiveness in a particular situation. One major distinction between definitions of Leadership Effectiveness is the type of consequences or outcome selected to be the effectiveness criterion (Yukl, 1981). Though effective leadership is a desired commodity within policing, limited scholarly attention has been given to studying the leadership process and the barriers to developing more efficacious leadership practices (Schafer, 2008).
Good leadership is more than just calculation and planning, or following a checklist, and even though rational analysis can enhance good leadership, good leadership also involves touching the feelings of others and emotions play an important role in leadership too (Hughes et al., 2006). Leadership is intrinsically an emotional process, whereby leaders recognise followers’ emotional states, attempt to evoke emotions in followers, and then seek to manage followers’ emotional states accordingly (Humphrey, 2002).

The concept of Emotional Intelligence has received much attention in the last decade. Given the increased recognition of the importance of emotions in leadership literature the question has arisen whether the concept of Emotional Intelligence, measured as a set of abilities, might provide insight into the difference between outstanding and below par levels of leadership performance (Herbest & Maree, 2008). According to Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2000), Emotional Intelligence includes the ability to perceive, appraise and express emotions accurately and adaptively; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; the ability to access and generate feelings where they facilitate cognitive activities and adaptive action; and the ability to regulate emotions in oneself and others. Daniel Goleman (1998), defines Emotional Intelligence as the capacity for recognising one’s own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves and for managing emotions well in ourselves and our relationships. The ability to identify emotions allows leaders to be aware of their own feelings and emotions. This ability also allows the leader to accurately identify emotions of the group and of individual followers to express emotion accurately and to differentiate between honest and phoney emotional expressions (Riggio et al., 2002). George (2000), suggests that Emotional Intelligence plays an important role in Leadership Effectiveness and can promote effectiveness at all levels in organisations.

Leadership is a process of social interaction where leaders’ ability to influence the behaviour of their followers can strongly influence performance outcomes (Humphrey, 2002). According to Paglis and Green (2002), Self-Efficacy is an estimate of one's ability to orchestrate performance through successfully executing the behaviours that are required to produce desired outcomes. Self-Efficacy is defined “as the beliefs in ones capability to organise and execute the course of action required to produce certain attainments” (Bandura, cited in Villanueva & Sanchez, 2007, p. 350). Bandura (1986) (cited in Villanueva & Sanchez, 2007) states that Self-Efficacy is the chief construct that links ability with performance. The higher the Self-Efficacy a person feels, the more confidence he or she will feel about successfully completing a task (Villanueva & Sanchez, 2007). Riggio et al. (2002) states that high Self-Efficacy has been shown to lead to increased performances in a wide range of situations.
The role that personal attributes play in predicting leadership success will become more prominent as leadership situations become more complex and varied (Herbest & Maree, 2008). Leadership represents a crucial determinant of police organisational efficacy (Adam, 2010). Moving towards domains of leadership, however, requires that police organisations develop definitions of what effective leadership means within their own communities and policing contexts (Schafer, 2008).
1.6 RESEARCH DESIGN

Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter (2006), define a research design to be a strategic framework for action that serves as a bridge between the research question and the execution or implementation of the research.

Figure 1.3: A Graphic and Schematic Representation of the Research Design
1.6.1 Research Approach

This particular research will involve empirical testing of a hypothesis, hence the research will be quantitative in nature. A hypothesis is a formal statement postulating a relationship between variables (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). A null hypothesis stipulates that there is no difference or relationship between variables.

Based on the aforementioned discussion, it is hypothesised that:

1) Null Hypothesis: There is no statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership

Alternate hypothesis: There is a statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership

2) Null Hypothesis: There is no statistically positive relationship between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership.

Alternate hypothesis: There is a statistically positive relationship between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership.

3) Null Hypothesis: There is no statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy

Alternate hypothesis: There is a statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy

Thus, the variables that will be measured in this research study are Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness.

The research design will be based on a survey study, which involves using questionnaires to gather data within a representative sample of a population. According to Cozby (2004) survey research employs questionnaires and interviews to ask people to provide information about themselves, their attitudes and beliefs, demographics and other facts and past or intended future behaviours. In this research study, the survey design will be used to assess the relationship between Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy as attributes of effective leadership.

The quantitative data analysis technique that will be employed to analyse the data collected will be the Spearman Rho’s Correlation Coefficient.
1.6.2 Research Method
The following is the research method that will pave the way to completing this research. It will include a literature review that will be conducted focusing on theories related to leadership, Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy. The research design as depicted in Figure 1.3 will be executed. Lastly, conclusions will be drawn and stated along-side research limitations and future recommendations.

1.6.2.1 Research Participants
A population is considered to be any group of people, events or things that are of interest to researchers and that they wish to investigate (Sekaran, cited in Hayward, 2005). The particular research population that the researcher will be interested in, is an Essential Services Department within the Kwa-Zulu Natal (KZN) region.

A sample is the selection of research participants from the entire population and involves decisions about people, settings, events, behaviours and/or social processes that are observed (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). The sample that the research intends to target is all those employee in commanding positions within the Essential Services Department.

Non-probability sampling refers to any kind of sampling where the selection of elements is not determined by the statistical principle of randomness (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). The type of sampling method the researcher will use is convenience-sampling, which is a sample that is chosen according to availability to the researcher (Leedy, cited in Hayward, 2005).

The estimated sample size that the researcher will target is n =185.

1.6.2.2 Measuring Instruments
The following variables will be measured in this research:
- Emotional Intelligence;
- Self-Efficacy; and
- Leadership Effectiveness.

From the outset it is suggested that the independent variables are Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy and the dependent variable is Leadership Effectiveness. For the purpose of this research the data will be collected by administering paper-based questionnaires to the sample. The questionnaires will also be administered in English and take approximately 45 minutes to complete.
The instruments that were used to collect the data are discussed below.

a) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire also known as the MLQ, assesses a full range of leadership behaviours. The MLQ has proven to be a strong predictor of leader performance across a broad range for organisations (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The MLQ has 45 items and uses a five-point Likert scale to measure leadership behaviours. It also has 12 subscales that measure leadership behaviour namely: Idealised Influence (attributes); Idealised Influence (behaviour); Inspirational Motivation; Intellectual Stimulation; Individualised Consideration; Constructive Transaction; Management by Exception (active); Management by Exception (passive); Laissez-Faire; Extra Effort; Effectiveness; and Satisfaction. According to Hanke 1998 (cited in Coetzee & Schaap, 2005) the alpha reliability coefficients for the MLQ scales vary between 0.71 and 0.93. Similar reliabilities were reported by Ackermann, Schepers, Lessing and Dannhauser, 2000 (cited in Coetzee & Schaap, 2005) on the MLQ in the South African context and ranged from 0.74 to 0.94.

b) Assessing Emotions Scale (AES)
The AES is a 33-item self-report inventory which uses a five-point Likert scale to measure individuals’ Emotional Intelligence traits and consists of four subscales: perception of emotion (10 items); managing own emotions (9 items); managing others’ emotions (8 items); and utilisation of emotions (6 items) (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010). In terms of reliability (internal consistency) the Cronbach alpha coefficients range between 0.55 (moderate) to 0.78 (high). Test-retest reliability tests indicate a coefficient score of 0.78 for total scale scores (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010). Validity studies confirm both the convergent and divergent validity of the AES (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010). Since the AES has not been standardised for South African populations, scale reliability tests were conducted for the sample group. In the study by Coetzee and Beukes (2010), the internal consistency coefficients obtained for each sub-scale were only moderate: perception of emotion (0.65); managing own emotions (0.56); managing others’ emotions (0.58); and utilisation of emotions (0.54).

c) Self-Efficacy Scale
Self-Efficacy was measured by using the Self-Efficacy Scale (SES) (Sherer & Maddux, 1982). The SES consists of 27 items. The reverse items of this scale were items: 1; 2; 9; 10; 11; 12; 22; 25; and 26. The statements deal with attitudes and feelings that people might have of themselves and their performance in a variety of tasks. Each item is answered on a seven-point Likert-type scale varying between one (1) (strongly agree) and seven (7)
(strongly disagree), while four (4) indicates a midpoint. Low scores indicate a high level of Self-Efficacy (Marais, 1997). Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients (internal consistency reliabilities) vary between 0.71 and 0.86. The overall Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the scale (as obtained for the sample of the current study) was 0.79. Research in South Africa confirms the construct and criterion validity of the scale (Marais, 1997; Oosthuizen, 1998).

1.6.2.3 Research Procedure
An Essential Services Department will be approached to conduct the research, and permission will be requested to conduct the research within this department. The researcher intends to administer the questionnaires to each cluster which was comprises of a minimum of four and a maximum of 13 commanders per cluster.

1.6.2.4 Informed Consent
Attaining consent is one of the primary ethical considerations in research. Informed consent should be obtained from all participants in the research study. These participants should be made aware that involvement in the study is voluntary. The researcher first wrote a motivation letter to the SAPS National office seeking consent to conduct the research with their organisation. See Appendix A for the motivation letter. Thereafter before administrating the questionnaire, the researcher sought consent from the participants in the research study. See Appendix B for the questionnaire given to the participants.

The informed consent form outlined the following:
- The nature of the study;
- Biographical information;
- Estimated time needed to complete the questionnaire;
- Assurance to participants of anonymity of their identity;
- Assurance to participants that their right to privacy would be respected at all times;
- Assurance that the results would be kept confidential and would only be used for the purpose of the research study and not for the benefit of the SAPS;
- Contact details of the researcher should the participants have any queries; and
- Inform participants that data would be stored in a safe place and kept for 5 years before being destroyed.

1.6.2.5 Statistical Analysis
The statistical analysis included descriptive statistics and correction analysis. Terre Blanche et al. (2006) indicate that a correlation coefficient is an accurate method of representing the relationship between variables. The descriptive statistics were used to indicate mean
standard deviation and frequencies range variance. The correlation analysis was used to indicate whether or not there is a statistically significant relationship between the variables.

1.7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical clearance was obtained from the Ethics Committee at the Department of Industrial and Organisational Psychology at UNISA. A letter of permission was sent to the SAPS to obtain consent to conduct research in their organisation.

In order to ensure the ethical requirement of informed consent, all participants signed an informed consent form. The participants were told that participation was voluntary and should they wish to withdraw from the study at any point in time they were free to do so.

Basic ethics in research entails following the code of ethics in social science research, obtaining informed consent, treating participants involved in the research process with dignity and respect and in the best interest of their well-being, maintaining confidentiality, right to privacy and voluntary participation and being culturally sensitive (Terre Blanch et al., 2006).
1.8 CHAPTER LAYOUT
The following was the layout of the chapters within this research dissertation:
Chapter 1: Scientific Orientation of the Research;
Chapter 2: Literature Review;
Chapter 3: Research Article; and
Chapter 4: Conclusions, Limitations and Recommendations.

1.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY
In conclusion, the intention of conducting this research was to create awareness of how
 certain psychological constructs may influence Leadership Effectiveness (if research is
 proven true). In order for leaders to remain effective within complex organisations certain
 psychological constructs need to be enhanced. Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy
 were the two psychological constructs that were researched to determine their influence on
effective leadership.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

An examination of literature in the fields of Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership will be explored in this chapter. Thus the aim of this chapter is to investigate scientific research in order to conceptualise these constructs.

2.1 EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Emotional Intelligence has become a buzz-word and part of informed people’s vocabulary over the past several years (Badenhorst & Smith, 2007). Emotional Intelligence describes the extent to which individuals are able to tap into their feelings and emotions as a source of energy to guide their thinking and actions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

2.1.1 Introduction to Emotional Intelligence

Emotions have an impact on everything that people do, on the one hand, emotions can lead to an increased morale amongst employees, but on the other, they can also prove to be destructive (Hayward, 2005). Concomitant with the growing attention to emotions in organisations over the last decade, interest in Emotional Intelligence has been increasing (Ashkanasy & Dasborough, 2003). The relevance and importance of Emotional Intelligence in organisational setting, while somewhat controversial, is well-documented in the literature (De Miranda, 2011). As set out in Badenhorst and Smith (2007), confusion about the concept of Emotional Intelligence can be highlighted by the following statements:

- Is Emotional Intelligence in essence, being able to manage ourselves and our relationships with others so that we truly live our interaction?
- Does Emotional Intelligence refer to the array of personal-management and social skills that allows one to succeed in the workplace and in life in general?
- Is emotional aptitude a meta-ability, determining how well we can use whatever other skills we have, including raw intellect?
- Is Emotional Intelligence more simply involved in the capacity to perceive emotions, assimilate emotion-related feelings, understand the information of those emotions, and manage them?

This apparent diversity in the conceptualisation of Emotional Intelligence leads to confusion with regard to the territory of Emotional Intelligence, as well as to Emotional Intelligence practitioners making claims that cannot be substantiated by addressing Emotional Intelligence alone (Badenhorst & Smith, 2007).
The discussion of Emotional Intelligence set out below first describes its nature. Thereafter three models of Emotional Intelligence that have generated the most interest are outlined. This is followed by a discussion of how Emotional Intelligence is measured, after which the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Effectiveness is explored.

2.1.2 The Nature of Emotional Intelligence

The term “Emotional Intelligence” was formally presented in 1990 with the publication of Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) article Emotional Intelligence in the journal *Imagination, Cognition and Personality* (Villanueva & Sanchez, 2007).

Intelligence, such as Emotional Intelligence, needs to encompass three criteria in order to be regarded as true intelligence (Mayer et al., 1999; Mayer et al., 2000; Mayer et al., 2004). These criteria are as follows:

1. Conceptual, meaning this intelligence can be described as a set of abilities.
2. Correlational meaning that the measures correlate with other measures which reflect similar skills and abilities.
3. Developmental meaning that it develops with age and experience but only up to some point.

Initially Salovey and Mayer (1990), defined Emotional Intelligence as a subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions.

However upon subsequent revision, Mayer and Salovey (1997) added that an emotionally intelligent person is capable of recognising emotional information and of performing abstract reasoning using this emotional information. Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2000) added that Emotional Intelligence includes the ability to perceive, appraise and express emotion accurately and adaptively; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; the ability to access and generate feelings where they facilitate cognitive activities and adaptive action; and the ability to regulate emotions in oneself and others.

Daniel Goleman was exposed to the work of Salovey and Mayer in the 1990s. Goleman (1997) provides a useful definition of the concept, and believes that Emotional Intelligence is about:

- Knowing what you are feeling and being able to handle those feelings without having them swamp you;
• Being able to motivate yourself to get the job done, being creative and performing at your peak; and
• Sensing what others are feeling, and handling relationships effectively.

Goleman (1998), defines Emotional Intelligence as the capacity for recognising one’s own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships (Goleman, 1998).

Weisinger (1998), refers to Emotional Intelligence as the intelligent use of emotions, which allows one to use them to guide behaviour and thinking in ways that will enhance results. Bar-On defines a non-cognitive model of Emotional Intelligence as “an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures” (Bar-On, 1997, p. 14). Davies, Stankov, and Roberts (1998), propose that Emotional Intelligence should not he considered a unique human ability until there was an appropriate instrument for the construct's measurement.

Cooper and Sawaf (1997), formulated a model of Emotional Intelligence that relates specific skills and tendencies to what they called the Four Cornerstone model in which they defined Emotional Intelligence as the ability to sense, understand, and effectively apply the power and acumen of emotions as a source of human energy, information, connection, and influence. This model moves Emotional Intelligence out of the realm of psychological analysis and philosophical theories, into the realm of direct knowing, exploration and application (Klem & Schlechter, 2008).

Broadening of the definition of Emotional Intelligence might be a result of the lack of a single, accepted definition of the concept, or in Caruso’s terms, the lack of a common language (Badenhorst & Smith, 2007). The lack of consensus on a single definition may also be connected to the other major criticisms of the concept, namely:

• Emotional Intelligence overlaps with aspects of established personality theories and traits;
• Measures of the construct are weak or problematic;
• The degree to which Emotional Intelligence is malleable, in contrast to the relative fixity of IQ, is contested by critics; and
• Claims made about the importance of Emotional Intelligence which cannot be substantiated.
The current state of Emotional Intelligence is somewhat paradoxical; although it is a wildly popular tool in organisations, organisational science has yet to answer many theoretical, measurement, and validity questions surrounding the construct (Joseph & Newman, 2010).

2.1.3 Models of Emotional Intelligence
In the Emotional Intelligence field numerous theories, models and views exist (Badenhorst & Smith, 2007). There are several definitions of Emotional Intelligence, each aiming to conceptualise it according to a particular school of thought. While several alternative models of this construct exist, the three that have generated the most interest in terms of research and application are Salovey and Mayer (1999), Goleman (1997) and Bar-On (1997) (Herbst & Maree, 2008). Although these models do not necessarily contradict one another, they represent different perspectives (Klem & Schlechter, 2008).

2.1.3.1 The Ability Model
The ability model of Emotional Intelligence is the most theoretically well-clarified, having been developed over a series of articles in the 1990s (Mayer & Salovey, 1993; 1997; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). This model defines Emotional Intelligence as a set of abilities that involves perceiving and reasoning abstractly with information that emerges from feelings (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003). Mayer and Salovey’s (1997), model presents Emotional Intelligence as having four branches ranging from the most basic psychological processes (i.e. identifying and using emotions) to higher level mechanisms (i.e. understanding and managing emotions). A depiction of this four-branch model is illustrated in figure 2.1, which outlines the four branches and the corresponding stages in emotion processing associated with each branch.
The four different abilities (branches) within this model include a) perceiving emotion, b) using emotion to facilitate thought, c) understanding emotion, and d) managing emotions (Caruso, Mayer & Salovey, 2002). These branches can be defined as follows:

- The first branch, emotional perception, is the ability to be self-aware of emotions and to express emotions and emotional needs accurately to others. Emotional perception also includes the ability to distinguish between honest and dishonest expressions of emotion.
- The second branch, emotional assimilation, is the ability to distinguish among the different emotions being felt and to identify those that are influencing thought processes.
- The third branch, emotional understanding, is the ability to understand complex emotions such as feeling two emotions at once, and the ability to recognise transitions from one to the other.
- The fourth branch, emotional management is the ability to connect or disconnect from an emotion depending on its usefulness in a given situation (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

This framework conceptualises Emotional Intelligence in the traditional sense of consisting of a conceptually related set of mental abilities to do with emotions and the processing of emotional information (Palmer et al., 2001). The ability-based Emotional Intelligence model
emphasises that Emotional Intelligence should be viewed as a type of intelligence that is relatively independent of personality traits (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

The Ability Model of Emotional Intelligence behaves psychometrically just as intelligence should and it demonstrates solid convergent and discriminant validity to support its claims regarding the nature of intelligence (Daus & Ashkansay, 2005). Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (1999), present evidence and argue convincingly that Emotional Intelligence meets the standards set for allowing it to be called intelligence. These criteria are that a test of intelligence should have more-or-less correct answers (which the MSCEIT – the ability measure of Emotional Intelligence - does), that the patterns of correlations are similar to those of known intelligences and that it should correlate only modestly with other intelligences and that it should develop with age (Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 1999).

2.1.3.2 The Mixed Model

The Mixed Model defines Emotional Intelligence as an ability with social behaviours, traits and competencies (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003). Goleman (1995, p. 34) “popularised Emotional Intelligence, and made new and extraordinary claims about its importance, including that it is as powerful and at times more powerful than IQ”. However, independent reviews of Goleman’s (1995, 1998) popular writings have shown that his claims are unsubstantiated (Mayer et al., 2000). According to Joseph and Newman (2010), mixed model definitions of Emotional Intelligence are the source of many Emotional Intelligence criticisms because:

(a) they appear to define Emotional Intelligence by exclusion as any desirable characteristic not represented by cognitive ability; and
(b) they are too redundant with personality traits to justify a distinct construct.


- Self-awareness is the cornerstone of Emotional Intelligence, and he defines it as knowing one’s internal states, preferences, resources, and intuitions (Goleman, 1995).
- Emotional management or self-regulation is the second of Goleman’s core competencies, and enables the individual to manage his own internal states, impulses and controls (Goleman, 1995).
• Self-regulation also involves self-monitoring, which allows the individual to adjust his behaviour according to external, situational factors. The element of self-regulation includes aspects such as trustworthiness, self-control, conscientiousness, adaptability and innovation (Goleman, 1995).

• The third core competency that Goleman (1995) includes in his theory of Emotional Intelligence is that of self-motivation. Self-motivation involves the control of emotional tendencies that facilitate reaching one’s goals (Goleman, 1995).

• The fourth core competency that Goleman (1995) outlines in his work on Emotional Intelligence is that of social awareness or empathy, which is an awareness of other people’s feelings. This concept of social awareness has been labelled by several authors as being a crucial component of Emotional Intelligence (Goleman, 1995).

• Lastly, social skills are the fifth competency that Goleman (1995) outlines with regard to Emotional Intelligence. This skill involves adeptness at handling interpersonal relationships. Goleman (1995; 1998) believes that social skills involve influencing tactics, effective communication, conflict management skills, leadership abilities, change management skills, instrumental relationship management, collaboration and co-operation abilities and effective team membership capabilities.

Goleman (2001b), suggests that there is a difference between Emotional Intelligence and emotional competence. Goleman’s competence model has undergone a number of revisions since it was first developed:

• The first model of Emotional Intelligence (1998b) contained 25 competencies grouped into five clusters (Goleman, 1998b), these being self-awareness, self-regulation, self-motivation, social awareness and social skills.

• The model (Goleman, 2001b) was revised and changes were made on the basis of statistical analysis conducted by Boyatzis, Goleman and Rhee (2000) and the five clusters were integrated into the following four dimensions which still form the basis of the model:
  1. Self-awareness (knowing oneself, knowing how emotions affect the self and others);
  2. Self-management;
  3. Social awareness; and
  4. Relationship management.
The Mixed Model by Goleman is a competency-based approach to Emotional Intelligence in the workplace. This model was proposed in terms of performance, abilities, personality and their effects in the workplace (Goleman, 2001). This model was created and adapted to predict effectiveness and personal outcomes in the workplace and in the organisational fields (Goleman, 1998). The model becomes useful in viewing the intrinsic and extrinsic nature of Emotional Intelligence as individuals do not operate in isolation. It further considers other factors that can influence employee’s Emotional Intelligence within organisations. It is essential to understand Goleman’s idea of learned competence, because emotional competencies by themselves represent the level to which a person dominates specific abilities or skills based on his/her Emotional Intelligence level and these skills make this person more effective in his/her work (Goleman, 2001). However, Goleman’s Mixed Model approach lacks empirical support and evidence.

2.1.3.3 The Bar-On Model
The Bar-On Model of Emotional Intelligence relates to the potential for performance and success (Bar-On, 2002). Bar-On’s non-cognitive model defines Emotional Intelligence “as an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies and skills that influence the individual’s ability to be successful in coping with environmental demands and pressures” (Bar-On, 1997, p. 14). This model is a multi-factorial array of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that influence one’s ability to recognise, understand and manage emotions, to relate with others, to adapt to change and solve problems of a personal and interpersonal nature, and to efficiently cope with daily demands, challenges and pressures (Bar-On, 2006). In this model, Bar-On outlines five components of Emotional Intelligence, these being intrapersonal, interpersonal, adaptability, stress management and general mood. Within these components are sub-components. Bar-On (1997), uses 15 conceptual constructs in the operationalisation of this model, and these all pertain to five specific dimensions of emotional and social intelligence. These dimensions are:

- **Intrapersonal Emotional Intelligence** – representing abilities; capabilities; competencies; and skills pertaining to the inner self;
- **Interpersonal Emotional Intelligence** – representing interpersonal skills and functioning;
- **Adaptability Emotional Intelligence** – representing how successfully the individual is able to cope with environmental demands by effectively sizing up and dealing with problematic situations;
- **Stress management Emotional Intelligence** – concerning the ability to manage and cope effectively with stress; and
• **General mood Emotional Intelligence** – pertaining to the ability to enjoy life and to maintain a positive disposition.

### Table 2.1 The major constructs in the Bar-On (1997) Model (Barnard & Herbst, 2005, p. 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrapersonal</strong></td>
<td>The interpersonal area concerns a person’s ability to know and manage himself. Success in this area indicates that a person is able to express his feelings adequately, live and work independently, and has the necessary confidence to express his ideas and beliefs comfortably.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td>This area refers to what is known as “people skills”. People who function well in this area tend to be responsible and dependable; they understand, interact with and relate well to others in a variety of situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptability</strong></td>
<td>The adaptability area of Emotional Intelligence reveals how successfully the respondent is able to cope with environmental demands and to deal with problematic situations as they arise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stress management</strong></td>
<td>This area of Emotional Intelligence involves a person's ability to withstand stress without giving in, falling apart or losing control. Success in this area indicates a person who is usually calm, hardly ever impulsive and someone who copes well under pressure. These skills are vital in the workplace, especially when one is continuously faced with deadlines and a variety of demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General mood</strong></td>
<td>General mood refers to a person's outlook on life, the ability to enjoy himself and others and an overall feeling of contentment and satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcomponents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-regard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional self-awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress tolerance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulse control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Bar-On places this model under the banner of Emotional Intelligence, it is a somewhat broader construct to which he more generically refers as “emotional and social intelligence” (Bar-On, 2000). The development of Bar-On’s (2007b), model of emotional and social intelligence followed six steps over a period of 17 years:

- Step 1: identifying and grouping relevant competencies that impact on human effectiveness;
- Step 2: defining the competencies and skills clusters;
- Step 3: constructing an experimental assessment tool, which initially consisted of over a thousand items;
- Step 4: cutting down the items to 15 scales and 133 items in the EQ-i;
- Step 5: creating norms for the EQ-i on 3 831 adults in the USA; and
- Step 6: conducting further validation studies on EQ-i worldwide.

Bar-On developed the EQ-i (Emotional Quotient Inventory). The EQ-i is a self report tool which consists of 133 items and uses a five-point response scale to measure five meta-factors.
The biggest problem when working with emotional quotient (EQ), is that self-report measures (the easiest ways to gauge) are also the weakest ways to take these measurements (Badenhorst & Smith, 2007). According to Daus and Ashkanasy (2003), the broad definitions of Emotional Intelligence by Bar-On do not appear to be markedly different from traditional personality models or competency models.

The development of the Bar-On Model has been rigorous, and the outcome of this process has produced a valid concept and measure of emotional and social intelligence (Bar-On, 2006). The value of this model is that it is consistent and stable over time and across cultures, but it is also capable of describing the construct it was designed to describe (emotional-social intelligence) (Bar-On, 2006). The importance and usefulness of the Bar-On model has also been demonstrated by examining its ability to predict various aspects of human behaviour and performance (Bar-On, 2006).

Goleman’s (1995) and Bar-On’s (1997), definitions of Emotional Intelligence are much more inclusive than the ability-based definition of Mayer and his colleagues. These alternative definitions encompass various personal traits, straying from the traditional view of intelligence (Mayer et al., 1999). According to Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2008), trait models includes little or no justification for why certain traits are included and others not; or why, for that matter, certain emotional abilities are included and others not, except for an occasional mention that the attributes have been chosen because they are most likely to predict success. Mayer et al. (2008) goes on to say that such approaches are disappointing from a theoretical and construct validity standpoint, and they are scientifically challenging, in that, with so many independent qualities, it is hard to identify a global theme to these lists of attributes. The lack of consensus regarding the definition of Emotional Intelligence has led to the development of different measures assessing Emotional Intelligence (Livingstone & Day, 2005).
2.1.4 Measuring Emotional Intelligence

Measurements of Emotional Intelligence tend to be associated with the major Emotional Intelligence models and items, and this in turn has allowed us to confuse Emotional Intelligence models or theories with a specific measurement approach (Caruso, 2004, p. 3). Each approach to measuring Emotional Intelligence can influence the validity of the construct, for example, in intelligence research, performance scales are standard because they are based on the capacity to solve mental tasks (Brackett & Mayer, 2003).

Two published measures, the MSCEIT by Mayer and Salovey and the EQ-i by Bar-on are marketed as assessing Emotional Intelligence, but they are based on different models and use different measurement methods. Construct validity evidence for both the EQ-i and MSCEIT is lacking, therefore, using these measures as criteria for each other is not sufficient to provide evidence of construct validity (Livingstone & Day, 2005).

Self-report scales of intelligence (e.g. EQ-i), on the other hand, are based on people’s endorsements of descriptive statements about themselves, and if a person’s self-concept is accurate, then self-report data gleaned in this way serve as an accurate measure (Brackett & Mayer, 2003).

Correlations between ability and self-report measures of intelligence, for instance, are generally low ($r = 0.00$ to $0.35$), therefore, with respect to Emotional Intelligence, it is likely that ability and self-report models will yield different representations of the same person (Brackett & Mayer, 2003).

The Assessing Emotions Scale, in some literature called the Emotional Intelligence Scale, the Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test, or the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale, is based on Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) original model of Emotional Intelligence. The Assessing Emotions Scale has been used in many studies of Emotional Intelligence and has been much written about, as indicated by over 200 publications listed in the PsycINFO database as citing the Schutte et al. (1998) article that first described the scale.

In the development sample of 346 participants, Schutte et al. (1998) found the internal consistency of the Assessing Emotions Scale, as measured by Cronbach’s alpha, to be 0.90. Numerous other studies have also reported the internal consistency of the 33 item scale. Schutte et al. (1998) reported a two-week test-retest reliability of 0.78 for total scale scores for the Assessing Emotions Scale.
Several studies have obtained scores which exhibit convergent validity on the Assessing Emotions Scale and other measures of emotional functioning. The results of these studies provide some evidence regarding the validity of the Assessing Emotions Scale. Brackett and Mayer (2003) found that scores on the Assessing Emotions Scale were correlated with scores on the EQ-i, another self-report measure of Emotional Intelligence that is based on a broader definition of Emotional Intelligence and with the MSCEIT (a performance test of Emotional Intelligence).

The relationship between the Assessing Emotions Scale scores and the EQ-i was substantial, at $r = 0.43$, while the relationship between Assessing Emotions Scale scores and the MSCEIT, although statistically significant, was not strong at $r = 0.18$.

Insight regarding the psychometric properties of the Assessing Emotions Scale will be used in this study to assess Emotional Intelligence.

2.1.5 Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Effectiveness

In reviewing Emotional Intelligence research, Higgs and Dulewics (1999) indicated that there is a developing view that Emotional Intelligence may be strongly related to leadership. Exactly how, and to what extent Emotional Intelligence accounts for effective leadership is currently unknown (Palmer et al., 2001).

However, scholars have also focused on relating Emotional Intelligence to leadership (George, 2000) or showing how components of Emotional Intelligence such as empathy are important traits that contribute to leadership (Kellett et al., 2002; Wolff et al., 2002).

The ability to manage emotions in oneself will in turn affect the ability to lead others (Bar-On, 1996). Goleman (1998) believes that emotions, when properly managed, can drive trust, loyalty and commitment, and, in turn drive many of the greatest productivity gains, innovations and accomplishments of individuals, teams and organisations. As emotions guide reasoning, Emotional Intelligence in a leader is seen as a fundamental ingredient for success (Hayward, 2005). It has been proposed that in leadership, dealing effectively with emotions may contribute to how one handles the needs of individuals, how one effectively motivates employees and how one makes them “feel” at work (Goleman, 1998).

Goleman’s work addressed the theoretical framework within which a leader must be emotionally intelligent to be effective (Goleman, 2002). Effective leaders with high Emotional Intelligence could help other people they lead to raise their own level of Emotional Intelligence, potentially resulting in a more effective organisational overall and a better
organisational climate (Momeni, 2009). George (2000) suggests that Emotional Intelligence plays an important role in Leadership Effectiveness in generating employee performance and consequently organisational performance, and proposes that the ability to understand and manage moods and emotions in oneself and in others theoretically contributes to the effectiveness of leaders.

Emotional Intelligence has been linked to several areas of Leadership Effectiveness. Theoretically, the area of Emotional Intelligence appears to have great validity as presented in studies by Barling, Slater and Kelloway (2000) and Palmer, Walls, Burgess and Stough (2001), which provide empirical justification for the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership.

A study by Coetzee and Schaap, (2005) indicates a significant correlation between the Emotional Intelligence scores and the Effective and Ineffective Leadership scores ($r = 0.342$; $p < 0.01$) of the sample group. Effective Leadership was significantly positively related ($t = 2.359$; $p < 0.05$) to Emotional Intelligence and Ineffective Leadership was significantly negatively related ($t = -2.645$; $p < 0.01$) to Emotional Intelligence. Thus Coetzee and Schaap, (2005) conclude that a significant relationship does exist between Emotional Intelligence and what can be considered effective and ineffective leadership.

Palmer et al., (2001) administered a self-report Emotional Intelligence measure to 43 managers in order to evaluate the link between Emotional Intelligence and leadership style. They found significant correlations with several components of the transformational leadership model. Especially, the inspirational motivation and individualised consideration components of transformational leadership correlated with the ability to monitor emotions and the ability to manage emotions (De Miranda, 2011). Inspirational motivation was moderately correlated with both the emotional monitoring ($r = 0.42$, $p < 0.01$) and emotional management ($r = 0.37$, $p < 0.05$) scales. Similarly, individual consideration also correlated with emotional monitoring and management ($r = 0.55$, $p < 0.01$, $r = 0.35$, $p < 0.05$) (Palmer et al., 2001).

Similarly, Barling et al. (2000) conducted an exploratory study on the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and transformational leadership. Their results suggest that Emotional Intelligence is associated with three aspects of transformational leadership, namely, idealised influence, inspirational motivation and individualised consideration. The leaders who report exhibiting these behaviours were assumed to be more effective in the workplace.
(De Miranda, 2011). In recent years the notion of Emotional Intelligence has been seen as critically important to effective leadership (Bipath, 2007)

2.1.6 Criticism of Emotional Intelligence

The current state of Emotional Intelligence is somewhat paradoxical and although it is a wildly popular tool in organisations, organisational science has yet to answer many theoretical, measurement, and validity questions surrounding the construct (Joseph & Newman, 2010).

Landy’s (2003), criticism addresses three broad areas:

1. There is a lack of scientific scrutiny of measures of Emotional Intelligence. According to Landy (2003), Emotional Intelligence is not viable as a scientific construct, and organisational researchers ought to stop wasting their time in researching the construct. However Ashkanasy and Daus (2003) argue, on the contrary, that Emotional Intelligence research is grounded in recent scientific advances in the study of emotion, specifically regarding the role that emotion plays in organisational behaviour.

2. The construct is rooted in the (discredited) concept of “social intelligence”. According to Ashkanasy and Daus (2003), the question is, however, whether Emotional Intelligence research is appropriately characterised as a form of social intelligence. Goleman (1995, 2000) would probably agree with this proposition, whereas Mayer et al. (2000) have gone to some lengths to distinguish Emotional Intelligence from concepts of social intelligence in which they argue that Emotional Intelligence is essentially about emotion.

3. Research in Emotional Intelligence is characterised by weak designs that have yet to demonstrate incremental validity over traditional models of personality and social/organisational behaviour, and it is therefore premature to apply the results. However Ashkanasy and Daus (2003), argue that current research in these respects is proceeding vigorously.
2.2 SELF-EFFICACY

Self-Efficacy can be considered to be a belief in one's abilities and capabilities to drive successes and actions when faced with various tasks.

2.2.1 Introduction to Self-Efficacy

Self-Efficacy is a term that emerged in the field of behaviour modification, and was formulated and developed by Albert Bandura of the Department of Psychology at Stanford University, California (Ganyane, 2005). Self-Efficacy is defined “as beliefs in one’s capabilities to mobilise the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands” (Wood and Bandura, 1989, p. 408). However the definition of Bandura (1997) states that “it is the beliefs in ones capabilities to organise and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3).

Gardener and Pierce (1998) postulate that Self-Efficacy gradually emerges through the experiences that the individual accumulates. In contrast to these ideas, some researchers have argued that Self-Efficacy might simply be a reflection of past performance, rather than a generative motivational belief impacting future performance (Heggestad & Kanfer, in press; Mitchell, 1997).

The construct of Self-Efficacy represents one core aspect of Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1994). According to Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986, 1997), Self-Efficacy beliefs vary on three dimensions:

(a) Level or magnitude (particular level of task difficulty);
(b) Strength (certainty of successfully performing a particular level of task difficulty); and
(c) Generality (the extent to which magnitude and strength beliefs generalise across tasks and situations).

The formal definition of Self-Efficacy that is usually used by Bandura is, however, a somewhat broader and more workable definition for positive organisational behaviours and is provided by Stajkovic and Luthans (2008). This definition states that Self-Efficacy refers to an individual's conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilise the motivation, cognitive resources and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context.

More recently, researchers have become interested in the more trait-like generality dimension of Self-Efficacy, which has been termed general Self-Efficacy (GSE) (Eden, 1988, Gardner & Pierce, 1998; Judge, Erez & Bono, 1998; Judge, Locke & Durham, 1997). Gardner and Pierce (1998) and Judge, Locke, Durham and Kluger (1998) state that Self-
Efficacy can be viewed from both a specific and general angel. Specific Self-Efficacy follows Bandura’s conceptualisation of Self-Efficacy (Luthans, 2008). Earlier in this chapter a definition of Self-Efficacy was provided by Bandura, however, the restrictive words “given situational demands” have given Self-Efficacy a narrow focus, and most researchers have limited their research to the magnitude and strength dimensions, conceptualising and studying Self-Efficacy as a task-specific or state-like construct (SSE) (Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Lee & Bobko, 1994). With reference to task-specific Self-Efficacy, it is highly variable depending on the specific task and is cognitively processed by the individual before any effort is expended (Luthans, 2008).

Self-Efficacy can be viewed as a general, stable cognition or trait that individuals hold with them that reflects the expectation that they possess the ability to perform a task successfully in a variety of situations (Eden & Zuk, 1995). General Self-Efficacy is defined as “one’s belief in one’s overall competence to effect requisite performances across a wide variety of achievement situations” (Eden, 1988) or “as individuals perception of their ability to perform across a variety of different situations” (Judge, et al., 1998, p. 170).

The higher the Self-Efficacy a person feels, the more confidence he or she will feel about successfully performing a task in a certain domain (Villanueva & Sanchez, 2007). Efficacy beliefs influence how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave, however Self-Efficacy beliefs produce these diverse effects through major processes which include cognitive, motivational, affective and selection processes (Bandura, 1994). Thus it is important to acknowledge that Self-Efficacy can impede or enhance a person at various processes (cognitive, motivational, affective and selection).

2.2.1.1 Cognitive Processes
The effects of Self-Efficacy beliefs on cognitive processes take a variety of forms. Much human behaviour, being purposive, is regulated by forethought embodying valued goals. Personal goal-setting is influenced by self-appraisal of capabilities and the stronger the perceived Self-Efficacy, the higher the goal challenges people set for themselves and the firmer their commitment to them (Bandura, 1994).

2.2.1.2 Motivational Processes
Most human motivation is cognitively generated and self-beliefs of efficacy play a key role in the self-regulation of motivation (Bandura, 1994). According to Bandura (1994), Self-Efficacy beliefs contribute to motivation in several ways, by determining:

• The goals people set for themselves;
• How much effort they expend;
• How long they persevere in the face of difficulties; and
• Their resilience to failure.

When faced with obstacles and failures people who harbour self-doubts about their capabilities slacken their efforts or give up quickly whereas those who have a strong belief in their capabilities exert greater effort when they fail to master the challenge (Bandura, 1994).

2.2.1.3 Affective Processes

People's beliefs in their coping capabilities affect how much stress and depression they experience in threatening or difficult situations, as well as their level of motivation (Bandura, 1994). As suggested by Bandura, (1994), perceived coping Self-Efficacy regulates avoidance behaviour as well as anxiety arousal, and the stronger the sense of Self-Efficacy the bolder people are in taking on taxing and threatening activities.

2.2.1.4 Selection Processes

People are partly the product of their environment, therefore, beliefs of personal efficacy can shape the course that lives take by influencing the types of activities and environments people choose (Bandura, 1994). People avoid activities and situations they believe exceed their coping capabilities but they readily undertake challenging activities and select situations they judge themselves capable of handling (Bandura, 1994).
2.2.2 Sources of Self-Efficacy

According to Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory, Self-Efficacy beliefs help determine the choices people make, the effort they put forth, the persistence and perseverance they display in the face of difficulties, and the degree of anxiety or serenity they experience as they engage the myriad tasks that comprise their life.
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Bandura (1986) identifies four ways in which Self-Efficacy is learned and Self-Efficacy expectations are acquired, these being, mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion and physiological states. It is in these ways that people’s beliefs about their efficacy can be developed.

2.2.2.1 Mastery Experiences/ Performance Attainments

This is potentially the most powerful for forming efficacy beliefs because it is direct information about success (Luthans, 2008). Performance attainments refer to doing something competently (Antonovsky, 1991). Experienced mastery in a domain often has enduring effects on one’s Self-Efficacy in that when people believe that their efforts have been successful, their confidence to accomplish similar or related tasks is raised and when their efforts fail to produce the effect desired, confidence to succeed in similar endeavours is diminished (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Mastery experiences prove particularly powerful when individuals overcome obstacles or succeed on challenging tasks (Bandura, 1997).

A resilient sense of efficacy requires experience in overcoming obstacles through perseverant effort whilst some setbacks and difficulties in human pursuits serve a useful purpose in teaching that success usually requires sustained effort (Bandura, 1994). After people become convinced they have what it takes to succeed, they persevere in the face of adversity and quickly rebound from setbacks (Bandura, 1994).
2.2.2.2 Vicarious Experiences

Vicarious experiences refer to the performance of those with whom individuals associate in their daily lives. These associates have relative status which forms the guidelines for most individuals, most of the time, for what they believe they can do (Antonovsky, 1991). On the other hand Bandura (1997), states that observing modelling behaviours of others, the learner is able to reflect on past experiences with such behaviour and make a meaning for its relevance in a new situation. Observers benefit from seeing their role models overcome difficulties by determined coping efforts (Mtsweni, 2007). The increase in one’s own Self-Efficacy is inspired by observing the success in task performance of those people we consider ordinary, people we interact with and people we perceive to have similar competencies to ourselves (Ganyane, 2005).

2.2.2.3 Social Persuasion

Social persuasion refers to people’s beliefs in their efficacy that are strengthened by respected, competent others persuading them that they can be successful (Luthans, 2008). Social persuasions may be limited in their ability to create enduring increases in Self-Efficacy, however it may actually be easier to undermine an individual’s Self-Efficacy through social persuasions than to enhance it (Bandura, 1997).

2.2.2.4 Physiological States

Lastly, Self-Efficacy beliefs are informed by emotional and physiological states such as anxiety, stress, fatigue, and mood. Bandura (1997) suggests that people tend to function optimally when their physiological arousal is neither too high nor too low, that is, physiological arousal may be related curvilinearly to Self-Efficacy. When a person increases their physical and emotional well-being, thus reducing negative emotional states it strengthens Self-Efficacy. Perceptions of Self-Efficacy will affect emotional reactions as well as behaviour and the coping success, resulting in the new situation being likely to be a predictive of high Self-Efficacy (Bandura, 1982).

2.2.3 Leadership Self-Efficacy

As Self-Efficacy is specific in nature, leadership Self-Efficacy is also conceptualised in various ways depending on the theorist approach to the construct. Leadership Self-Efficacy is proposed as central to cognitive variables. In one definition leadership Self-Efficacy is referred to as one’s self-perceived capabilities to perform the cognitive and behavioural functions necessary to regulate group process in relation to goal achievement (McCormick, 2001). This means that leadership Self-Efficacy refers to the person’s belief in his/her capability to lead a group successfully. Paglis and Green (2002) define leadership Self-
Efficacy as a person’s belief that he or she can exercise leadership successfully and set a direction for teamwork and build relations with followers to gain their commitment to changing the goal. Put in another way, it refers to beliefs in one’s general skill to lead (Murphy, 2002).
2.3 LEADERSHIP

2.3.1 Introduction

Leadership is a fascinating social phenomenon that occurs in all groups of people regardless of geography, culture or nationality (Howell & Costley, 2006). This phenomenon can be complex and equally diverse in nature. The difference between leaders and non-leaders remains a source of disagreement and controversy in the leadership domain (Herbest & Maree, 2005). This chapter will explore the nature and definition of leadership and highlight the different leadership theories over time. The discussion will then turn to leadership roles in the twenty first century world of work. Lastly, Leadership Effectiveness as a concept stemming from leadership and the impact it has within this field of study, will be examined.

2.3.2 Nature and Definition

Leadership literature is characterised by an endless proliferation of terms and definitions to deal with the construct, coupled with many extraneous connotations that create ambiguity of meaning and an array of imprecise descriptions (Yukl, 1998). The meaning and interpretation attached to leadership may vary in several different ways.

According to Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994) leadership involves persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the responsibilities and welfare of the group. Leadership is a critical element and influence in an organisational environment or performance system, due to the four significant domains that leadership could affect, namely, the strategic/organisational goals and objectives, the work processes, interdependent social subsystems and the individuals in the organisation (Cumming & Worley, 2001). Heifetz and Linsky (2004), highlight leadership as being the ability to influence and mobilise individuals identified with specific skills to discuss and complete specific tasks in order to achieve results. This definition highlights the human component of leadership.

Howell and Costley (2006) conceptualise leadership as a process used by an individual to influence group members towards the achievement of group goals in which the group members view the influence as legitimate. They consider four core characteristics that stem from this definition of leadership. Figure 2.3 illustrates the core characteristics of leadership.
Figure 2.3: The core characteristics of leadership (Howell & Costley, 2006)

It is important to note that no leader can exist without followers, and secondly that the followers follow out of their own volition and lastly that follower behaviour is aimed towards the attainment of some organisational goal (Aamodt, 2004).

From early classical writers to modern researchers, the distinction between management and leadership has often been based on viewing management as doing things right and leadership as doing the right things (Howell & Costley, 2006). Management is more concerned with promoting stability and enabling the organisation to run smoothly while the role of leadership is to inspire, promote and oversee initiatives to do with long-term change (French, Rayner, Rees & Rumbles, 2008).

According to Bennis (1989) to survive in the twenty-first century, a new generation of leaders will be needed, and they will have to be leaders not mangers. Bennis (1989) further adds that leaders conquer the context, that is, the volatile, turbulent, ambiguous surroundings that sometimes seem to conspire against us and will surely suffocate us if we let them, while mangers surrender to this context.

Table 2.2: Characteristic of Managers versus Leaders (Bennis, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Characteristics</th>
<th>Leader Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administers</td>
<td>Innovates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A copy</td>
<td>An original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains</td>
<td>Develops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on systems</td>
<td>Focuses on people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relies on Control</td>
<td>Inspires trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-range view</td>
<td>Long-range perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks how and when</td>
<td>Asks what and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye on bottom line</td>
<td>Eye on the horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitates</td>
<td>Originates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accepts the status quo  Challenges the status quo
Classic good soldier  Own person
Does things right  Does the right thing

Although there are many specific definitions of leadership that could be cited, besides influence, leadership has been defined in terms of group processes, personality, compliance, particular behaviours, persuasion, power, goal achievement, interaction, role differentiation, initiation of structure and combinations of two or more of these (Bernard & Bass, 1990).

2.3.3 Theories of Leadership

Investigating the significant shift in leadership over time can be evoked by looking at the shift in leadership theories over time. Leadership theories can be divided into eras, the oldest theory dating back to the pre-1900s and called great man theory, followed by trait theories, behavioural theories, contingency theories and the emergence of modern leadership theories.

2.3.3.1 Great Man Theories

The great man theories were based on the belief that leaders are exceptional people, born with innate qualities and destined to lead (Mortimer, 2009). Although there was no good research to support this belief, early attempts to understand why some individuals were effective leaders focused on their personal characteristics often called traits (Howell & Costley, 2006). This lead to the next school of leadership theories during the period of 1904 to 1950 called trait theories.

2.3.3.2 Trait Theories

Trait theories assumed that effective leaders have specific inherent characteristics that make them effective, such as intelligence, aggressiveness or alertness (Howell & Costley, 2006). Studies were not successful enough to provide a general trait theory, however they did lay the ground work for considering certain traits, in combination with other leadership aspects (such as behaviours) that form the basis for some current theories (French et al., 2009). In recent years the trait approach to Leadership Effectiveness has become more prevalent. Leadership trait theory suggests that successful leaders rely on a set of psychological traits (Ilies, Scott, & Judge, 2006), however, more than 300 studies have failed to produce a definitive list of agreed-on traits common to all effective leaders (Bass, 1990). By the 1950s focus had turned away from leader traits and attention was given to examining leader behaviours.
2.3.3.3 Behavioural Theories

Researchers moved away from assessing individuals in terms of traits, and focused on assessing how leaders' behaviour contributes to the success or failure of leadership (Draft, 1999). Behaviourist theories concentrate on what leaders actually do rather than on their qualities, and different patterns of behaviour are observed and categorised as styles of leadership (Mortimer, 2009). The trait and behavioural theories are categorised as the traditional leadership theories. The trait and behavioural approaches assume that effectiveness of individuals in their leadership roles depends on their traits, or specific behaviours that have a major impact on leadership outputs (French et al., 2008). The restrictions of these behavioural theories are their omission of situational factors on the level of leader effectiveness (Hayward, 2005). One concern is whether one particular method of leading is appropriate for all situations, regardless of the development stage of the organisation, the business environment in which it operates, or the type of people employed by the organisation (Senior, 1997).

2.3.3.4 Contingency Leadership Theories

The emergence of contingency leadership theories during the 1970s came about by adding situational factors to leadership. Contingency leadership theories describe the leader’s situation as a key aspect of Leadership Effectiveness (Howell & Costley, 2006). Theorists like Fred Fiedler, Paul Hersey, Kenneth Blanchard, Robert House, Yukl, Vroom, Yetton and Jago have contributed largely to contingency leadership theories. Below is a tabulation of the various contingency theories.

Table 2.3: Summary of the five major contingency theories of leadership (Howell & Costley, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingency Theories</th>
<th>Leadership Behaviours or Predispositions</th>
<th>Situational Characteristics</th>
<th>Followers Psychological Reactions</th>
<th>Follower and Group Behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiedler’s Contingency Theory</td>
<td>Task-oriented Relationship-oriented</td>
<td>Leader-member relations Task structure Leader’s position power</td>
<td></td>
<td>High group performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership Theory</td>
<td>Task/directive Relationship-oriented/supportive</td>
<td>Follower/ Development/ Task Relevant Maturity</td>
<td>Satisfaction Commitment</td>
<td>High follower performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House’s Path Goal Theory</td>
<td>Directive, supportive, participative achievement-oriented, Work Facilitation, Interaction Facilitation, Group-oriented, Representative Charismatic, Shared</td>
<td>Task structure or ambiguity, Frustrating, stressful or dissatisfying tasks, Challenging tasks, Low follower authoritarianism or High need for</td>
<td>Satisfaction, Motivation, Acceptance of the leader, Job clarity, High effort</td>
<td>High Follower performance, Low levels of grievances and turnover, High group performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leader contingency approaches argue that leadership, in combination with various variables, has a major impact on outcomes (French et al., 2008). Fiedler’s Contingency theory and Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership theory were proposed more than twenty-five years ago and have remained largely unchanged and research evidence indicates that these models are too simple to provide adequate guidance for effective leadership in today’s complex organisations (Howell & Costley, 2006).

The overall proposition of the Goal Path theory, that the effects of leadership behaviour are contingent on situational factors is generally supported, however some specific predictions of the Goal Path theory have not been supported due to faulty testing methods (Howell & Costley, 2006). According to Luthans (2008), the Goal Path theory needs more research and it warrants continued attention.

According to French et al. (2008) the Multiple Linkage theory fails to specify when certain situational factors affect intervening variables or group performance or how the situational factors influence the impacts of specific leadership behaviour. This lack of specific predictions makes it very difficult to test the model, and very few tests have been conducted (Yukl, 1998). The Normative Decision Making theory of participation has been and shows much promise as a tool to help managers involve their followers in decision making (Howell & Costley, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Independence</th>
<th>Job knowledge, High effort, Organisation of the work, Adequate resources, Cooperation and group cohesion, Role Clarity, Coordination with other groups</th>
<th>High group performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yukl’s Multiple Linkage Theory</td>
<td>Supporting, networking, managing conflict, team building, motivating, Rewarding and recognising, problem solving, Planning and organising, Consulting and delegating, Monitoring, clarifying, informing</td>
<td>Organisation’s reward system, Follower tasks, Policies and procedures, Technology of the workplace, Organisational crises or major change, Follower characteristics, Economic conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vroom, Vetton and Jago’s Normative Decision Making Theory</td>
<td>Five decision making styles: Decide, consult individually, consult group, facilitate, delegate</td>
<td>Decision significance, Importance of commitment, Leader’s expertise, Likelihood of commitment, Group support for objectives, Group expertise, Team competence</td>
<td>High decision acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High decision quality, Decision timelines, Cost of decision making, Opportunities for learning and development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bass (1990), suggests that traditional theories have not been rigidly tested in practice and are too specific in defining leadership, either in terms of traits, behaviours or situations.

2.3.3.5 Modern Leadership Theories
Changes in the world, in the organisation, or in global markets are no different to the changes brought about within leadership theories. There has been a significant shift from the traditional approaches to leadership to a more modern approach. Modern or emerging perspectives of leadership are based on attribution theories in the form of Charismatic leadership theories, Transformational and Transactional leadership theories and viewing leadership from a Social Cognitive Approach.

Charismatic leaders are usually those who by force of their personal characteristics are capable of having a profound and extraordinary effect on followers (French et al., 2008).

Transactional leaders are able to entice subordinates to perform and thereby achieve desired outcomes by promising them rewards and benefits for the accomplishment of tasks (Bass, 1990). Transactional leadership includes contingent reward behaviour, passive management-by-exception, and active management-by-exception (a form of monitoring) (Yukl, 1999). According to Bass (1990) the transactional leader’s relationship with subordinates has three phases:

- Firstly, he recognises what subordinates want to get from their work and ensures that they get what they want, given that their performance is satisfactory.
- Secondly, rewards and promises of rewards are exchanged for employee’s effort.
- Lastly, the leader responds to his employees’ immediate self interests if they can be met through completing the work.

On the other hand transformational leadership is based more on leaders shifting the values, beliefs and needs of their followers (Luthans, 2008). Transformational leadership includes individualised consideration, intellectual stimulation, idealised influence (charisma), and inspirational motivation (Yukl, 1999). Many leadership theories today indicate that leadership styles are transforming at a rapid pace to keep up with globalisation and flattening organisational hierarchies (Miranda, 2011). In most organisational contexts, transformational as compared to transactional leadership is considered a more effective leadership style and is consistently found to promote greater organisational performance (Lowe & Kroeck, 1996). Of the two leadership styles, the transformational leadership approach has repeatedly shown the benefit of using a communal approach to leadership (Rosette & Tost, 2010; Lowe et al., 1996; Eagly, 2005). It is predicted that there will be a stronger relationship between
Emotional Intelligence and transformational leadership than between Emotional Intelligence and transactional leadership (Miranda, 2011).

One of the new emerging trends in leadership is an approach that is proposed to be based on Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory that posits leadership self-efficacy as a key cognitive variable regulating leader functioning in a dynamic environment (McCormick, 2001). Thinking of leadership as a particular kind of human functioning, Bandura’s Social Cognitive Model implies, that to fully understand the leadership process three categories of leadership variables must be considered, these being leader cognitions, leader behaviour and leadership environment.

This model provides for continuous, reciprocal interactions between the leader, the environment and the behaviour itself (Luthans, 2008). The Social Cognitive Theory proposition on leadership is as follows: Variations in leader cognition, leader behaviours and the leadership environment are necessary and sufficient to account for variation on the leader effectiveness (McCormick, 2001). As suggested by Luthans (2008), in the application of the Social Cognitive Approach to leadership, the followers are actively involved in the process, and together with the leader they concentrate on their own and one another’s behaviours, the environmental contingencies and their cognitions. Luthans (2008), further puts forth the following examples:

- The leader identifies the environmental variables that control his or her behaviour.
- The leader works with the associate to discover the personalised set of environmental contingencies that regulate the associate’s behaviour.
- The leader and the associate jointly attempt to discover ways in which they can manage their individual behaviour to produce more mutually reinforcing and organisationally productive outcomes.
- The leader enhances the efficacy of associates through setting up successful experiences, modelling, positive feedback and persuasion and psychological and physiological arousal that can lead to performance improvement.
2.3.4 Leadership Roles

The current trends in the global market dictate the kinds of roles that leaders assume in the respective context. There has been a significant shift from the traditional roles leaders assumed to roles that have been aligned with the current state of the world. Such roles force leadership to display a higher level of maturity in dealing creatively with increasing complexity, uncertainty, diversity and a number of paradoxes (Gauthier, 2005). Leadership roles should be of primary importance in organisational settings, because these roles lend their occupants legitimate authority and are usually regulated by relatively clear rules about appropriate behaviour (Eagly, Schmidt & Van Engen, 2003). Roles describe the various contexts in which clusters of competencies are applied at various levels, and competencies describe behaviourally specific skills and abilities that impact effectiveness in those leadership contexts – and both competencies and roles are important to effectively capture aspects of leadership behaviour (Appelbaum & Pease, 2003). The following table 2.4 describes the leadership roles that a leader may assume, the description thereof and the tasks that are usually associated with the leadership role in complex organisations.

Table 2.4: Leadership Roles for Leaders in Complex Organisations (Guathier, 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navigator</td>
<td>Clearly and quickly works through the complexity of key issues, problems and</td>
<td>• Identifies root causes quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities to affect actions (e.g. leverage opportunities and resolve issues)</td>
<td>• Displays a keen sense of priority, relevance and significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrates information from a variety of sources and detects trends, associations and cause-effect relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Creates relevant options for addressing problems and opportunities, and achieves desired outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Translates complex situations into simple, meaningful explanations that others can grasp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides others with a relevant context for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Overcomes personal and organisational biases in looking at data and avoids ‘not the way we do it here’ thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategist</td>
<td>Develops a long-range course of action or set of goals to align with the</td>
<td>• Continuously looks beyond the current year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organisation’s vision</td>
<td>• Perceives what drives the business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Uses financial data for a successful business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Grasps big-picture, enterprise-wide issues across boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognises risks and pursues actions that have acceptable levels of risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>Identifies and exploits opportunities for new products, services and markets</td>
<td>• Takes calculated risks to capitalise on emerging trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Looks beyond the boundaries of the organisation for new growth opportunities (partnerships, new technologies, applications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Turns threats (from competitors, government policies, and new technologies) into organisational opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.4: Leadership Roles for Leaders in Complex Organisations (Guathier, 2005) continued

| Mobiliser | Proactively builds and aligns stakeholders, capabilities, and resources for getting things done quickly and achieving complex objectives | • Anticipates and diffuses roadblocks to desired goals  
• Leverages and integrates the capabilities of resources across all levels of the organisation to accomplish complex, multiple-level objectives  
• Uses necessary and appropriate lobbying techniques to gain support for actions from decision-makers  
• Utilises creative networking approaches to identify contacts who can help in attaining goals  
• Develops alternative/contingency plans  
• Empowers others relative to achieving the strategy |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Talent Advocate | Attracts, develops, and retains talent to ensure that people with the right skills and motivations to meet organisational needs are in the right place at the right time | • Relentlessly identifies and secures high-potential talent  
• Identifies the best people (internal and external), gets to know them, and stays in touch with them  
• Links development assignments to current and future needs of the organisation  
• Increases readiness of high-potential talent by providing developmental opportunities  
• Minimises barriers to achievement and maximises the individual’s likelihood for success  
• Builds and facilitates a culture that embraces development  
• Promotes employee retention by analysing and understanding its drivers |
| Captivator | Builds passion and commitment toward a common goal | • Conveys a simple, vivid picture of the organisation’s vision and goals  
• Moves people from compliance to commitment  
• Instils others with a strong sense of belonging  
• Generates energy and enthusiasm through personal passion conviction  
• Keeps the message alive and ongoing |
| Global Thinker | Integrates information from all sources to develop a well-informed, diverse team | • Considers the implications of issues, decisions and opportunities beyond the boundaries of own country and culture  
• Understands the different perspectives and approaches in order to effectively handle cross-cultural challenges and individual differences  
• Identifies opportunities for global leverage |
| Enterprise Guardian | Integrates information from all sources to develop a well-informed, diverse team | • Refuses to trade long-term for short-term  
• Possesses the courage to make difficult decisions in times of success  
• Objectively upholds the interests of the organisation  
• Takes responsibility for unpopular decisions and their aftermath |
| Change Driver | Creates an environment that embraces change | • Sees the possibility for change  
• Recognises the need for change before it becomes critical  
• Sells ideals for change  
• Funds and supports the implementation of change |
2.3.5 Leadership Behaviour

During the 1950s and 1960s, researchers sought an ideal pattern of leadership behaviour that would produce satisfaction and high performance amongst followers regardless of the leadership situation or type of followers (Howell & Costley, 2006).

According to Howell and Costley (2006), the following are core behaviour patterns of leaders:

- **Supportive Leadership Behaviour**
  This behaviour pattern refers to the leader’s role in showing concern for the comfort and well being of followers; demonstrating a considerate, kind and understanding attitude in dealing with followers; being friendly and informative, and encouraging open, two-way communication and follower development.

- **Directive Leadership Behaviour**
  This pattern refers to the leader’s behaviour in assigning followers to specific tasks, explaining the methods to be used in completing the tasks, clarifying expectations regarding quantity of follower performance, setting goals for followers, planning and coordinating followers work, and specifying rules and procedures to be followed.

- **Participative Leadership Behaviour**
  When leaders use this approach, they involve followers in decision making processes. Participative leadership behaviours may include holding one-on-one meetings with individuals or groups of followers to gather input for decisions; it may involve a group of decision making efforts initiated by the leader; or it may involve assigning a particular problem to a follower to resolve.

- **Leader Rewards and Punishment Behaviour**
  With this leadership behaviour, when followers provide services to the organisation, the leader rewards them with tangible and intangible benefits.

- **Charismatic Leadership Behaviour**
  This pattern of behaviour involves the leader communicating a vision of the future that has ideological significance to followers, arousing follower needs that are relevant to goal accomplishment, serving as a role model, expressing high expectations and confidence in followers’ capabilities and projecting a high degree of self-confidence.
Although there are other ways to describe and classify leader behaviours, these five have been extensively researched and have been found useful in describing specific behaviours that improve leader effectiveness (Howell & Costley, 2006). The following table illustrates each of the five leader behaviours, the enhancers of the leader behaviour and neutralisers of supportiveness. Then the table also looks at the psychological reactions of the followers within each leader behaviour and the followers' behavioural outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Behaviour</th>
<th>Leader Supportiveness</th>
<th>Leadership Directiveness</th>
<th>Leader Participativeness</th>
<th>Leader Reward Punishment Behaviours</th>
<th>Charismatic Leadership Behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned, trusting and respectful of followers, Considerate, understanding attitude, Friendly, encouraging and communicative, Fostering follower development</td>
<td>Guiding and structuring followers activities, Defining roles and communication patterns, Clarifying expectations and work methods, Planning, scheduling and assigning responsibilities, Monitoring and following up on assignments, Motivating and conveying expertise</td>
<td>Drawing out and listening to followers, Holding meeting to share decision problems and gather input, Giving serious consideration to followers input, Reaching consensus with followers and leaders as equals, Delegating decisions to capable followers</td>
<td>Provide pleasant job assignments, Provide compliments and recognitions, Provide recommendatio n for awards and promotions, Provide salary or wage increase, Provide reprimands and criticisms, Provide unpleasant job assignments , Provide low performance evaluation and demotions, Reduce privileges and extra work</td>
<td>Advocates moral mission and vision, Uses inspirational rhetoric, Builds own image in followers eyes, Role model behaviours for followers with high expectations and confidence, Takes risks to achieve mission, Uses frame alignment to guide follower behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Factors Increasing Leader Effectiveness</td>
<td>Enhancers</td>
<td>High task structures (performance), High stress on followers, Large group, Bureaucratic structure, Expert leader,</td>
<td>Task importance, Task requires followers commitment, Environmental uncertainty, Leaders conflict management skills, Group</td>
<td>Tangible rewards are distributed fairly, promptly and contingently, Leader controls important rewards that</td>
<td>Crisis or extreme uncertainty, Follower distress, anxiety, isolation, helplessness, Organisational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5: Leadership Behaviour Patterns (Adapted from Howell & Costley, 2006)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational Factors Increasing Leader Effectiveness</th>
<th>Neutralisers</th>
<th>High task structure (satisfaction), Cohesive group with low performance norms, High follower experience, High follower ability, High follower need for independence</th>
<th>Highly structured task, High task complexity with professional followers, Large group size, Short time deadlines, Passive followers, Authoritarian followers, Followers willing to accept autocratic leadership</th>
<th>Spatial distance between leader and followers, Followers job autonomy, Intrinsic satisfaction task, Indifference towards organisational rewards, Existence of cohesive work groups with anti-leader norms, High degree of organisational formalisation</th>
<th>None found thus far</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors that Substitute</td>
<td>Importance placed on organisational rewards, Intrinsic satisfaction tasks, Task feedback</td>
<td>Autonomous work groups, Team operations, Organisational formalisation, Task Feedback, Predictable work flow, Large number of years with leaders</td>
<td>Many formal rules and procedures</td>
<td>High degree of follower professionalism, Years of schooling and work experience by followers, Intrinsic satisfaction task, Indifference towards organisational rewards, Formal group organisation</td>
<td>High leader rank expertise, Older experienced followers, Formal plans, goals and procedures that support leader missions, Consensus decision making or self-management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above illustrates five leadership behaviours, these being, Leader Supportiveness, Leader Directiveness, Leader Participativeness, Leader Rewards and Punishment and Charismatic Leader behaviours and defines the behaviours inherent to each. Each of these leader behaviours enhances or neutralises certain situational factors and in doing so may increase Leadership Effectiveness. The table further illustrates how the followers or groups may react psychologically to the behaviours displayed by each of the five leader behaviours. Lastly this table indicates the followers' behavioural outcome that may be dependent on the type of leader behaviour displayed. Overall this table classifies five leader behaviours which have been extensively researched and what is useful to acknowledge is how these leader behaviours address certain situational factors, improve Leadership Effectiveness and influence followers' behavioural outcomes according to the type of leader behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follower or Group Psychological Reactions</th>
<th>Role clarity, Satisfaction with supervisor and job, Intrinsic satisfaction with work, Lower job stress and burnout and Group cohesion.</th>
<th>Satisfaction of needs for competence, self control independence and personal growth, Satisfaction with supervisors work and organisation, Motivation and commitment to decisions</th>
<th>Emotional involvement and attachment to leader, High esteem, trust acceptance and loyalty to the leader, High self esteem, self assurance and experienced meaningfulness of work, Satisfaction with the leaders, work and organisation, Organisational commitment, Low stress levels, Possible hatred of the leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follower Behavioural Outcomes</td>
<td>Lower turnover, tardiness, absenteeism and grievance rates, Increased individual and group performance</td>
<td>Increased performance and productivity, high quality decisions, professional development of followers, Possible resistance by some followers, Decision requires extra times</td>
<td>High follower performance, High group or departmental performance, Low job burnout, Possible attacks on the leader, Possible physical or financial destruction of followers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above illustrates five leadership behaviour patterns (Adapted from Howell & Costley, 2006) continued
2.3.6 Leadership Effectiveness

Leadership Effectiveness according to Chester Barnard (cited in Hollander, 1978, p. 112), “is the accomplishment of the recognised objectives of cooperative action, which depends initially on influence, but beyond that there are questions of value, such as how things are done to achieve the objective”. Leadership Effectiveness differs in terms of understanding, in that a particular context will require a particular kind of leader effectiveness in a given situation. Riggio et al. (2002) proposed that effective leaders posses multiple forms of intelligence, which allows them to respond successfully to various situations.

It has been suggested that effective leaders differ from less effective leaders on a number of attributes and these differences contribute significantly to their effectiveness as leaders (Herbst & Maree, 2008). Goleman (1998) adds that during the last decade interpersonal skills have become integral to effective leadership. Goleman (1998) proposes that leadership which deals with emotions may contribute to how one handles the needs of individuals, how one effectively motivates employees, and how one makes them “feel” at work. Effective leaders know how to tailor their leadership to different situations, conditions, or people (Kasier, Hogan, & Craig, 2008).

Kasier et al. (2008) make several implications based on the assumption that leadership is a collection of efforts made to solve a problem. These implications are that:

- Effective leadership is the ability of a leader to influence people to contribute willingly;
- Effective leadership is the reminder of goals and how they differ by organisation; and
- Effective leadership is when a leader can guide and direct a group of people to the achievement of the organisational goal or the accomplishment of the mission.

Ideally leadership should be evaluated on its effectiveness, as the leader’s effectiveness relates to the performance outcomes of the workforce. When evaluating the effectiveness of a leader one should be cognisant of the differences between leadership, management and the perception of leadership. According to Chester Barnard (cited in Hollander, 1978, p. 112), “leadership effectiveness is the accomplishment of the recognised objectives of cooperative action, which depends initially on influence, but beyond that there are questions of value, such as how things are done to achieve the objective”. Leadership Effectiveness differs in terms of understanding, in that a particular context will require a particular kind of leader effectiveness applied to a particular situation. Riggio et al. (2002) propose that effective leaders posses multiple forms of intelligence, which allow them to respond successfully to various situations.
2.4 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has been shaped by an overview of Emotional Intelligence followed by the various conceptualisations of Emotional Intelligence. The three models that have generated the most interest in terms of research and application, namely, those of Bar-On (1997), Goleman (1997) and Salovey and Mayer (1999) have been explored. The ability-based Emotional Intelligence model emphasises that Emotional Intelligence should be viewed as a type of intelligence that is relatively independent of personality traits (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The theoretical framework of this study is based on Salovey and Mayer’s (1999) conceptualisation of Emotional Intelligence which defines it as a set of abilities that involves perceiving and reasoning abstractly with information that emerges from feelings. To articulate the framework the Ability Model by Mayer and Salovey (1997) conceptualises the Emotional Intelligence model as having four branches ranging from the most basic psychological processes (i.e. identifying and using emotions) to higher level mechanisms (i.e. understanding and managing emotions).

Self-Efficacy as stated in Bandura (1986) is the chief construct that links ability with performance. The higher the Self-Efficacy a person feels, the more confidence he or she will feel about successfully completing a task (Villanueva & Sanchez, 2007). Riggio et al. (2002) state that high Self-Efficacy has been shown to lead to increased performance in a wide range of situations. Sources of Self-Efficacy were discussed, and these Self-Efficacy beliefs help determine the choices people make, the effort they put forth, the persistence and perseverance they display in the face of difficulties, and the degree of anxiety or serenity they experience as they engage the myriad tasks that comprise their life (Bandura, 1986).

Leadership is a large field of study, consisting of many different kinds of knowledge, skills and characteristics. According to Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994) leadership involves persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the responsibilities and welfare of the group. Theories of Leadership from the Great Man Theory, over time, to the modern theories were presented. The Social Cognitive approach to leadership will be used in this study. The successful application of the social cognitive approach to leadership depends upon the leader’s ability to bring awareness to the overt or covert antecedent cues and contingent consequences that regulate the leader’s and subordinates’ performance behaviour (Luthans, 2008). Leadership roles and leader behaviours were explored to highlight the impact they have on leaders in an ever-changing world as well as in diverse and complex organisations.
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ABSTRACT

ORIENTATION: The impact of psychological constructs on police leadership by using scientific research that may add value when appointing people in leader positions or developing people into leader roles within the police environment.

RESEARCH PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between three constructs, Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness within a policing context.

MOTIVATION FOR THIS STUDY: Leadership within the policing environment in particular the South Africa context, has raised contentious issues over the past decade. In the police sector there are difficulties in linking leadership with organisational outcomes, since common police leadership measures are affected by multiple confounding factors. Thus this study explores the psychological constructs of Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy on Leadership Effectiveness of the police.

RESEARCH DESIGN, APPROACH AND METHOD: This research adopted a quantitative study to assess the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes of Leadership Effectiveness. 107 police personnel in commanding positions made up the sample. The measuring instruments used were the Assessing Emotions Scale, Self-Efficacy Scale and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

MAIN FINDINGS: The results confirm a positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness. The correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
PRACTICAL MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS: Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy should be considered as attributes during the selection of leaders within police organisations or used for developmental purposes to enhance these attributes within police leaders.

CONTRIBUTION/VALUE-ADDED: The insights gained from the finding may be used to guide selection of future leaders within the policing environment and could also be used to establish future developmental programmes and research initiatives.

KEY WORDS: Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy, Leadership Effectiveness, Police, South Africa
INTRODUCTION

Key focus of the study

Since its transition to democracy, South Africa has gained a reputation as a dangerous country, having one of the highest rates of crime in the world (Mattes, 2006). South Africa faces diverse challenges in the policing environment. Competent management is one source of sustainable competitive advantage in contemporary, rapidly-changing organisations (Gilley, McMillan, & Gilley, 2009). Leadership, or its absence, is recognised as a key force shaping outputs and outcomes in most formal or informal organisations (Schafer, 2008).

The Police Services is complex in its organisational structure and also faces complex leadership challenges. The statement made by Clark (2005), “that leaders in a complex organisation, have to meet the challenges of a society that is diverse, pragmatic and questioning of authoritative stances” is related to police organisations in South Africa.

The task of the police leaders includes the implementation of policy to guide crime prevention activities; creating a societal consensus on crime prevention; developing and implementing national programmes to address the causes of crime; mobilising community resources; and engaging communities in all crime-prevention activities (Artz & Oliveira cited in Adam, 2010). The multidimensional increase in complexities from organisational structures to societal demands may render leaders ineffective if they are unable to adjust to these complexities. The question can be asked whether this ability to adjust to the complexities is innate and for the purpose of this research whether a leader’s effectiveness is associated with the psychological constructs of Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy. According to Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (2006) leadership involves both the rational and emotional sides of human experience. Riggio, Murphy and Pirozzolo (2002) propose multiple forms of intelligence possessed by effective leaders, which allow them to respond successfully to a range of situations.

Background to the study

Police organisations have their own structural and cultural milieu that informs facets within these organisations in particular leadership. The absence of quality leaders in policing is, in part, due to a common failure to develop officers to become more effective leaders (Schafer, 2008, p. 239). Rapid change requires an organisation 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 (Weinberger, 2004). In the case of the SAPS the leaders are responsible for effectively managing good order, control and discipline.
of all members under their command and providing safety to the community. The rapid changes that leaders within the SAPS face are systemic. Lewis, Goodman and Fandt (1998) assert that managers of the future will have to be prepared to cope with change if they are to be effective. The Police Service, as with other organisations today, is experiencing diverse challenges in its internal and external operational environment that could have an impact on leadership in the organisation. As proposed in Riggio et al. (2002) organisation effectiveness depends on Leadership Effectiveness. However, according to a study by Campbell and Kodz (2011) the difficulties of linking leadership with organisational outcomes are particularly pronounced for the police, since common police performance measures are affected by multiple confounding factors.

Leadership Effectiveness stems from the concept of leadership, which, over several decades has accumulated many different definitions. According to Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994) leadership involves persuading other people to set aside, for a period of time, their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the responsibilities and welfare of the group. Leadership is the process of communication (verbal and non-verbal) that involves coaching, motivating/inspiring, directing/guiding and supporting/counselling others (Howard, 2005). Heifetz and Linsky (2004), highlight leadership as being the ability to influence and mobilise individuals identified with specific skills to discuss and complete specific tasks in order to achieve results. This definition highlights the human component in leadership. Dorbrzanska (2005), further mentions the human element as being key in such relations, since leadership is seen as the ability to express and channel human autonomy.

Leadership Effectiveness according to Chester Barnard (cited in Hollander, 1978, p. 112), “is the accomplishment of the recognised objectives of cooperative action, which depends initially on influence, but beyond that there are questions of value, such as how things are done to achieve the objective”. Leadership Effectiveness differs in terms of understanding in that a particular context will require a particular kind of leader’s effectiveness applied to a particular situation. One major distinction between definitions of Leadership Effectiveness is the type of consequences or outcome selected to be the effectiveness criterion (Yukl, 1981). Though effective leadership is a desired commodity, within policing limited scholarly attention has been given to studying the leadership process and the barriers to developing more efficacious leadership practices (Schafer, 2008).

Good leadership is more than just calculation and planning, or following a checklist, and even though rational analysis can enhance good leadership, good leadership also involves touching the feelings of others, and emotions play an important role in leadership too.
(Hughes et al., 2006). Leadership is intrinsically an emotional process, whereby leaders recognise followers’ emotional states, attempt to evoke emotions in followers, and then seek to manage followers’ emotional states accordingly (Humphrey, 2002).

Given the increased recognition of the importance of emotions in leadership literature the question has arose as to whether the concept of Emotional Intelligence, measured as a set of abilities might provide insight into the difference between outstanding and below par levels of leadership performance (Herbst & Maree, 2008). According to Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2000), Emotional Intelligence includes the ability to perceive, appraise and express emotions accurately and adaptively; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; the ability to access and generate feelings where they facilitate cognitive activities and adaptive action; and the ability to regulate emotions in oneself and others. Daniel Goleman (1998), defines Emotional Intelligence as the capacity for recognising one’s own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves and for managing emotions well in ourselves and our relationships. The ability to identify emotions allows leaders to be aware of their own feelings and emotions. This ability also allows the leader to accurately identify emotions of the group and of the individual followers to express emotion accurately and to differentiate between honest and phoney emotional expressions (Riggio et al., 2002). George (2000), suggests that Emotional Intelligence plays an important role in Leadership Effectiveness and can promote effectiveness at all levels in organisations.

Leadership is a process of social interaction where the leader’s ability to influence the behaviour of followers can strongly influence performance outcomes (Humphrey, 2002). According to Paglis and Green (2002), Self-Efficacy is an estimate of one’s ability to orchestrate performance through successfully executing the behaviours that are required to produce desired outcomes. Eden (1992), argues that leadership is the mechanism through which managers raise performance expectations and enhance Self-Efficacy which, in turn, increases performance. Self-Efficacy is defined “as the beliefs in one’s capabilities to organise and execute the course of action required to produce certain attainments” (Bandura, cited in Villanueva & Sanchez, 2007, p. 350). Bandura (1986) (cited in Villanueva & Sanchez, 2007) states that self--efficacy is the chief construct that links ability with performance. The higher the Self-Efficacy a person feels, the more confident he or she will feel about successfully completing a task (Villanueva & Sanchez, 2007). Riggio et al., (2002), states that high Self-Efficacy has been shown to lead to increased performance in a wide range of situations.
The role that personal attributes play in predicting leadership success will become more prominent as leadership situations become more complex and varied (Herbest & Maree, 2008). Leadership represents a crucial determinant of police organisational efficacy (Adam, 2010). Moving towards domains of leadership, however, requires that police organisations develop definitions of what effective leadership means within their own communities and policing contexts (Schafer, 2008).

**Trends from research literature**

In reviewing Emotional Intelligence research, Higgs and Dulewics (1999) indicate that there is a developing view that Emotional Intelligence may be strongly related to leadership. Exactly how, and to what extent Emotional Intelligence accounts for effective leadership is currently unknown (Palmer *et al*., 2001). However, scholars have also focused on relating Emotional Intelligence to leadership (George, 2000) or showing how components of Emotional Intelligence such as empathy are important traits that contribute to leadership (Kellett *et al*., 2002; Wolff *et al*., 2002).

A study by Coetzee and Schaap (2005) indicates a significant correlation between the Emotional Intelligence scores and the Effective and Ineffective Leadership scores ($r = 0.342; p < 0.01$) of the sample group. Effective Leadership was significantly positively related ($t = 2.359; p < 0.05$) to Emotional Intelligence and Ineffective Leadership was significantly negatively related ($t = -2.645; p < 0.01$) to Emotional Intelligence. Thus Coetzee and Schaap, (2005) conclude that a significant relationship does exist between Emotional Intelligence and what can be considered effective and ineffective leadership. This research study is similar to the one presented by Coetzee and Schaap (2005) in that one of the hypotheses looks at the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Effectiveness.

Palmer *et al*., (2001), administered a self-report Emotional Intelligence measure to 43 managers in order to evaluate the link between Emotional Intelligence and leadership style. They found significant correlations with several components of the transformational leadership model. In particular, the inspirational motivation and individualised consideration components of transformational leadership correlated with the ability to monitor emotions and the ability to manage emotions (De Miranda, 2011). Inspirational motivation was moderately correlated with both the emotional monitoring ($r = 0.42$, $p < 0.01$) and emotional management ($r = 0.37$, $p < 0.05$) scales. Similarly, individual consideration also correlated with
the emotional monitoring and management ($r = 0.55$, $p< 0.01$, $r =0.35$, $p< 0.05$) (Palmer et al., 2001).

Similarly, Barling et al., (2000), conducted an exploratory study on the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and transformational leadership. Their results suggest that Emotional Intelligence is associated with three aspects of transformational leadership, namely, idealised influence, inspirational motivation and individualised consideration. The leaders who report exhibiting these behaviours were assumed to be more effective in the workplace (De Miranda, 2011). In recent years the notion of Emotional Intelligence has been seen as critically important to effective leadership (Bipath, 2007).

Theoretically, the area of Emotional Intelligence appears to have great validity as presented in studies by Barling, Slater and Kelloway (2000), Palmer, Walls, Burgess and Stough (2001) and Coetzee and Schaap (2005) which provide empirical justification for the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership.

Research on Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness is very limited in this field. However there is research on different kinds of Self-Efficacy such as leader Self-Efficacy and task Self-Efficacy. More recently, researchers have become interested in the more trait-like generality dimension of Self-Efficacy, which has been termed general Self-Efficacy (GSE) (Eden, 1988; Gardner & Pierce, 1998; Judge, Erez, & Bono, 1998; Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997).

It is evident after conducting extensive literature research that more research should be done in the South African context. Furthermore research into the relationship between Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness and Emotional Intelligence should be conducted in order to increase knowledge within the field.

**Research Objectives**

The purpose of this research is to determine the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes and the extent (if any) to which they influences Leadership Effectiveness.

Based on the aforementioned discussion, it is hypothesised that:

1) Null Hypothesis: There is no statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership.
Alternate hypothesis: There is a statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership.

2) Null Hypothesis: There is no statistically positive relationship between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership.

Alternate hypothesis: There is a statistically positive relationship between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership.

3) Null Hypothesis: There is no statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and self–efficacy.

Alternate hypothesis: There is a statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and self–efficacy.

Thus, the variables that will be measured in this research study are Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness.

**The potential value-add of the study**

The findings from this research may provide useful insights into the psychological constructs, these being Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy which may (or may not) influence Leadership Effectiveness within the police. The insights gained from these findings may be used to guide selection processes for future leaders within the policing environment and could also be used to establish future developmental programmes and research initiatives.

**What will follow**

In the next section the research design used in this study will be elaborated and the research approach and method described. A statistical analysis of the results will then be presented and the findings discussed. A synopsis of the most significant information will form the conclusion, the limitations of this research will be highlighted and finally recommendations will be made for future initiatives.
RESEARCH DESIGN

Research approach
A quantitative study was used to achieve the research objectives, which involved using questionnaires to gather data within a representative sample of a population. The sample the research targeted were those employees in commanding positions within an Essential Services Department. The type of sampling method used was the convenience-sampling method, which is a sample that is chosen according to availability to the researcher (Leedy cited in Hayward, 2005). Spearman’s Rho was used to determine the relationships between Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness.

Research method

Research Participants
In total, one hundred and seven employees from an Essential Services Department responded to this research. Table 3.1 provides an overview of the biographical information of the respondents that participated.

Table 3.1: Biographical and Demographical Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (n=107)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (n=105)</td>
<td>Age 18 to 29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 30 to 39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 40 to 49</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 50 to 59</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (n=102)</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you work weekends? (n=102)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home language (n=104)</td>
<td>African languages</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English or Afrikaans</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of employment (n=104)</td>
<td>Junior management</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sample is 78.5% male and 21.5% female. In relation to the age variable 105 of the 107 participants responded to the question. 1% of the response fell in the age category 18-29 and 4.7% in the age 30-39 category. The largest age category indicated, was between 40-49 with 63.8%, followed by 30.5% within the age group of 50-59. The variable on material status showed a response of 102 out of 107 participants of which 8.8% are divorced, 82.4% are
married and 7.8% are single. For the variable 'Do you work weekends? 102 out of 107 participants responded. 43 of the 102 respondents replied ‘Yes’, which represents 42.2% of respondents. 59 out of 102 responded ‘No’ which represents 57.8% of respondents. The home language variable was responded to by 104 out of the 107 participants of this sample which further indicates that 49% spoke an African Language (these are any of the eight official African languages in South Africa) and 51% spoke English or Afrikaans. For the last variable Level of Employment 104 out of 107 participants responded. 50 of the 104 are in Junior Management, this represents 48.1% of the respondents, 31 of the 104 are in Middle Management which represents 29.8% of the respondents and 23 of the 104 are in Senior Management which represents 22.1% of respondents. It should be noted that even though 107 participants participated in this research, not all the participants responded to each question asked. This can be seen in table 3.1 under the variable heading were the sample (n) varies between 102 and 107 in terms of responses to those questions.

**Measuring Instruments**

*Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)*

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire also known as the MLQ assesses a full range of leadership behaviours. The MLQ has proven to be a strong predictor of leader performance across a broad range for organisations (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The MLQ has 45 items and uses a five-point Likert scale to measure leadership behaviours. It also has 12 subscales that measure leadership behaviour namely: Idealised Influence (attributes); Idealised Influence (behaviour); Inspirational Motivation; Intellectual Stimulation; Individualised Consideration; Constructive Transaction; Management by Exception (active); Management by Exception (passive); Laissez-Faire; Extra Effort; Effectiveness and Satisfaction.

According to Hanke (1998) (cited in Coetzee & Schaap, 2005) the alpha reliability coefficients for the MLQ scales vary between 0.71 and 0.93. Similar reliabilities were reported by Ackermann, Scheepers, Lessing and Dannhauser (2000) (cited in Coetzee & Schaap, 2005) on the MLQ in the South African context and ranged from 0.74 to 0.94.

*Assessing Emotions Scale (AES)*

The AES is a 33-item self-report inventory which uses a five-point Likert scale to measure individuals’ Emotional Intelligence traits and consists of four subscales: perception of emotion (10 items); managing own emotions (9 items); managing others’ emotions (8 items); and utilisation of emotions (6 items) (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010). In terms of reliability (internal consistency) the Cronbach alpha coefficients are 0.55 (moderate) to 0.78 (high). Test-retest reliability tests indicate a coefficient score of 0.78 for total scale scores (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010). Validity studies confirm both the convergent and divergent validity of the
AES (Coetzee & Beukes, 2010). Since the AES has not been standardised for South African populations, scale reliability tests were conducted for the sample group. In the study by Coetzee and Beukes (2010), the internal consistency coefficients obtained for each subscale were only moderate: perception of emotion (0.65); managing own emotions (0.56); managing others’ emotions (0.58); and utilisation of emotions (0.54).

**Self-Efficacy Scale**
Self-Efficacy was measured by using the Self-Efficacy Scale (SES) (Sherer & Maddux, 1982). The SES consists of 27 items. The reverse items of this scale were items: 1; 2; 9; 10; 11; 12; 22; 25; and; 26. The statements deal with attitudes and feelings that people might have of themselves and their performance in a variety of tasks. Each item is answered on a seven-point Likert-type scale varying between one (1) (strongly agree) and seven (7) (strongly disagree), while four (4) indicates a midpoint. Low scores indicate a high level of Self-Efficacy (Marais, 1997). Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients (internal consistency reliabilities) vary between 0.71 and 0.86. The overall Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the scale (as obtained for the sample of the current study) was 0.79. Research in South Africa confirms the construct and criterion validity of the scale (Marais, 1997; Oosthuizen, 1998).

**Research Procedure**
The questionnaire booklet designed for this study consisted of the three measuring instruments, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Assessing Emotions Scale and the Self-Efficacy Scale. The questionnaire booklets were accompanied by a cover letter and the permission letter to conduct research. Permission was obtained from the National Office of the Essential Service Department. Confidentiality was guaranteed for the participants. Data was collected in two ways; some data was collected where the questionnaire booklets were administrated to groups of participants. These sessions lasted between 30-45 minutes. Whilst other data was collected where certain participants preferred to take the questionnaire booklet and return it to the Cluster Office once completed. Data was collected over a period of 8 months. Two hundred and fifty questionnaires were distributed however only 107 of those questionnaires were completed. Once the questionnaires were collected, the researcher coded the questionnaires and the scores were captured onto a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and imported into SPSS to be statistically analysed. It should be noted that reverse codes for the Assessing Emotions Scale were items 5, 28, and 33 and for the Self-Efficacy Scale they were items 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, 22, 25 and 26. When an item is reverse coded, the response to an item was reversed. The Self-Efficacy Scale was originally rated from strongly agree to strongly disagree. This was rescaled from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The reason for the rescale is to allow for the interpretation of the correlation.
coefficient. The scores were computed based on the full scale of each construct, summed across each item and then the score was converted to a percentage.

Statistical Analysis
Statistical analysis of the data was carried out using the SPSS statistical package version 19. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were calculated and are reported on in the results section below. The descriptive statistics are intended to present a snapshot of the data while the Spearman’s Rho was used to evaluate the relationships between Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness.

RESULTS
This section consists of two parts. The first part presents the descriptive statistics for each of the three constructs used in the study and the second part reports on the associated inferential statistics.

Descriptive Statistics
Descriptive and Reliability Analysis
Table 3.2 below presents the summary statistics for each construct. The Emotional Intelligence construct has a mean of 81.359, a median of 82.424 and a standard deviation of 8.970. Cronbach’s alpha, which is a measure of the reliability of a scale, is 0.868 which, according to Field (2009), is indicative of a reliable scale.

Table 3.2: Summary of Descriptive Statistics for each construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Emotional Intelligence</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Leadership (MLQ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>81.359</td>
<td>74.806</td>
<td>65.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>82.424</td>
<td>75.132</td>
<td>68.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>8.970</td>
<td>10.702</td>
<td>11.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, the Self-Efficacy construct has a mean of 74.806, median of 75.132 and standard deviation of 10.702. Cronbach’s alpha for the Self-Efficacy scale is at an acceptable level of reliability of 0.833. The leadership (MLQ) has a mean of 65.971, median
of 68.333, standard deviation of 11.346 and a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.880. Based on the alpha values, the Self-Efficacy and MLQ scales can be considered reliable. As indicated in table 3.2, participants scored, on average, highest on the Emotional Intelligence construct and the median of 82.424 means that 50% of the sample scored above 82.424. Also, the standard deviation of 8.970 suggests less variability in participants’ scores for this construct when compared to the standard deviation of the other two constructs.

**Reliability Statistics for Subscales of the Assessing Emotions Scale and MLQ**

The Assessing Emotions Scale indicated $\alpha = 0.868$ on the full scale and subscale between $\alpha = 0.679$ and $\alpha = 0.748$, which is lower than the full scale alpha reliability. The Assessing Emotions Scales has four subscales: Perception of Emotions; Managing own Emotions; Managing others’ Emotions; and Utilising Emotions. The Assessing Emotions subscales are reliable based on Cronbach’s alpha. The Cronbach’s alpha were as follows: Perception of Emotions $\alpha = 0.734$; Managing own Emotions $\alpha = 0.727$; Managing others’ Emotions $\alpha = 0.679$; and Utilising Emotions $\alpha = 0.748$. The Assessing Emotions Scale indicated $\alpha = 0.868$ on the full scale and subscale between $\alpha = 0.679$ and $\alpha = 0.748$ which was also lower than the full-scale alpha reliability.

**Table 3.3: Reliability Statistics for the Emotional Intelligence subscales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Guttman Split half coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Emotions (PE)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing own Emotions (MOWNE)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing others’ Emotions (MOE)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilising Emotions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The alpha reliabilities of the MLQ were at an acceptable level on the full scale, $\alpha = 0.880$ and slightly lower in the subscales ranging from reliability alphas between $\alpha = 0.461$ and $\alpha = 0.793$. The MLQ has twelve subscales. Table 3.4 reflects the reliability statistics for the MLQ subscales.
### Table 3.4 Reliability Statistics for the MLQ subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Guttman Split half coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealised Influence (attributes)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealised Influence (behaviour)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*.538</td>
<td>*.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualised Consideration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive Transaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception (active)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*.565</td>
<td>*.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception (passive)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*.486</td>
<td>*.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*.550</td>
<td>*.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Effort</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*.461</td>
<td>*.469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-reliable subscale

The following subscales are reliable according to Cronbach’s alpha: Idealised Influence (Attributes) $\alpha = 0.793$; Idealised Influence (Behaviour) $\alpha = 0.744$; Inspirational Motivation $\alpha = 0.692$; Individual Consideration $\alpha = 0.604$; Constructive Transaction $\alpha = 0.705$; Effort $\alpha = 0.628$; and Effectiveness $\alpha = 0.702$. However, there are other subscales that indicate non-reliability, these being, Intellectual Simulation $\alpha = 0.538$, Management by Exception (Active) $\alpha = 0.565$, Management by Exception (Passive) $\alpha = 0.486$, Laissez-Faire $\alpha = 0.550$ and Satisfaction $\alpha = 0.461$.

The Cronbach Alpha has a range from 0-1, where 0 is no internal consistency and 1 is maximum internal consistency (Terre Blanch et al., 2006). Although it depends on what is being measured, according to Terre Blanch et al. (2006), a rule of thumb of 0.75 is set as an acceptable level for the Cronbach Alpha. The low alpha coefficient of the subscales limits the possibility of generalising the findings. The alpha reliabilities of the MLQ was at an acceptable level on the full scale, $\alpha = 0.880$ and slightly lower in the subscales ranging from reliability alphas between $\alpha = 0.461$ and $\alpha = 0.793$. The Self-Efficacy scale indicated an alpha reliability at $\alpha = 0.833$ as indicated in table 3.2. There were no subscales on the Self-Efficacy scale.

**Inferential Statistics Related to Constructs and Subscales**

The Shapiro-Wilks test of normality revealed that there were significant deviations from normality in the data with respect to the Leadership and Self-Efficacy constructs. This is summarised in the table below.
Due to the deviation from normality, a non-parametric correlation analysis was used to test the following three hypotheses:

1) Null Hypothesis: There is no statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership.

Alternate hypothesis: There is a statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership.

2) Null Hypothesis: There is no statistically positive relationship between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership.

Alternate hypothesis: There is a statistically positive relationship between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership.

3) Null Hypothesis: There is no statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and self-efficacy.

Alternate hypothesis: There is a statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and self-efficacy.

The next step of the data analysis looked at the correlations between the three constructs, Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy, and Leadership. The correlations in the range 0.3 to 0.5 can be regarded as moderate, while the correlations in the range 0.1 to 0.3 are modest (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Table 3.5 reflects the correlation coefficients of this study. As indicated within this table, Emotional Intelligence was moderately correlated with Leadership (Spearman’s rho = 0.492, p-value < 0.01) and Self-Efficacy (Spearman’s rho = 0.363, p-value < 0.01); Leadership and Self-Efficacy are moderately correlated (Spearman’s rho = 0.342, p-value < 0.01). Thus all three of the null hypotheses above were rejected in favour of the corresponding alternate hypothesis.
Table 3.6: Non-parametric Correlations using Spearman’s rho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Emotional Intelligence</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>Correlation: 1.000</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.363**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>Coefficient:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Correlation: .492**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.342**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>Coefficient:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Correlation: .363**</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>Coefficient:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The variables listed in table 3.7 below represent participants’ scores on the subscales of the Emotional Intelligence and leadership constructs. Participants’ scores were calculated by summing across items making up the subscales. This table includes the variables representing participants’ scores on the Self-Efficacy, leadership and Emotional Intelligence constructs.

Table 3.7: Shapiro-Wilk’s test of normality for Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotions subscale 1</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions subscale 2</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions subscale 3</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions subscale 4</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership subscale 1</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership subscale 2</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership subscale 3</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership subscale 4</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership subscale 5</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership subscale 6</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership subscale 7</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership subscale 8</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership subscale 9</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.7 tests whether or not each variable is normally distributed. The Shapiro-Wilk’s test shows that all variables, except Emotions subscale 1 and Emotional Intelligence whose p-values are greater than 0.05, are not normally distributed (p-value <0.05). This implies that a non-parametric correlation coefficient must be used; thus Spearman’s rho is used in the correlation analysis table listed below.

Table 3.8 provides a detailed analysis of this research by focusing on the correlations between subscales of the instruments used in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Subscales</th>
<th>Assessing Emotions Subscales</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Emotional Intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of Emotions</td>
<td>Managing Own Emotions</td>
<td>Managing Others' Emotions</td>
<td>Utilising Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealised Influence (Attributes) α = 0.793</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealised Influence (Behaviour) α = 0.744</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation α = 0.692</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation α = 0.538</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8: Correlations between the Self-Efficacy Scale and the Subscales of Assessing Emotions Scale and Subscales of the MLQ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualised</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>0.330&quot;</td>
<td>0.425&quot;</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.282&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>0.374&quot;</td>
<td>0.432&quot;</td>
<td>0.281&quot;</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Active)</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>0.292&quot;</td>
<td>0.447&quot;</td>
<td>0.277&quot;</td>
<td>0.215&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Active)</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.391&quot;</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.203&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>0.436&quot;</td>
<td>0.331&quot;</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

For the purpose of analysing table 3.8 it should be noted that the leadership subscales can be further group into Transformational Leadership (which includes Idealised Influence Active
and Passive, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individual Consideration), Transactional Leadership (which includes Constructive Transaction, Management by Exception Passive and Active) and Laissez-Faire. There are also three outcomes on the MLQ, these being, Extra Effort, Effectiveness and Satisfaction. Although leadership styles were not used in this research study, it helps to make certain deductions about the relationship from the subscales. Eagly, Schmidt, and Van Engen (2003) report that effective successful leaders use transformational leadership behaviours more often than transactional or laissez-faire leadership. Literature suggests the most effective and successful leaders use transformational leadership most of the time followed by some transactional leadership with a minimal use of laissez-faire leadership.

The leadership subscale: Intellectual Stimulation has the highest correlation to the Perceptions of Emotional subscale ($r = 0.399, p < 0.01$); this is a moderate correlation. The rest of the leadership subscales, except Management by Exception (Passive) and Satisfaction, indicated a significant and moderate relationship to Perceptions of Emotion (refer to table 3.7). However the Laissez-Faire and Management by Exception (Passive) subscales had a negative correlation to the Perceptions of Emotion subscale. Correlation coefficients between 0.1 and 0.3 in absolute value are regarded as modest; the correlations between 0.3 and 0.5 in absolute value are regarded as moderate (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).

Inspirational Motivation was moderately correlated to Managing Own Emotions ($r = 0.468, p < 0.01$). The Management by Exception (Passive) and Laissez-Faire subscales were negatively correlated to the Managing Own Emotions subscale ($p > 0.05$). All other leadership subscales were significantly correlated with Managing Own Emotions.

Inspirational Motivation was correlated to Managing Others Emotions ($r = 0.458, p < 0.01$) and the Management by Expectation (Passive) and Laissez-Faire subscales were negatively correlated to the Managing Others Emotions subscale ($p > 0.05$).

The Manage by Exception (Active) leadership subscale has a significant correlation to the Utilising Emotions subscale ($r = 0.323, p < 0.01$). However, the rest of the Leadership subscales were modestly correlated to Utilising Emotions. Thus the researcher deduces that Utilising Emotions which is the ability to identify emotions and also indicates the ability to accurately perceive, appraise and express emotions (Weisinger, 1998) has minimal impact on leadership including Leadership Effectiveness.

A trend in table 3.8 reveals that Self-Efficacy and the assessing emotions subscales have a negative to poor correlation with Management by Exception (Passive) and Laissez-Faire.
Thus it can be deduced that as Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy increase, Laissez-Faire and Management by Exception will decrease. Laissez-Faire and Management by Exception (Passive) are considered ineffective leadership styles, further concluding that should Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy increase then Leadership Effectiveness will increase.

Self-Efficacy had a significant correlation with the Effectiveness subscale ($r = 0.484$, $p < 0.01$). This result supports hypothesis two of this research study which states that there is a statistically positive relationship between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership. This is further supported with Self-Efficacy being moderately correlated with the leadership subscales Idealised Influence Active and Passive, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individual Consideration which are considered effective leadership behaviours.

*Self-Efficacy* is also moderately correlated to *Perception of Emotions* ($r = 0.436$ $p< 0.01$) and *Managing own Emotions* ($r = 0.331$ $p< 0.01$) whilst being modestly correlated to *Managing own Emotions* ($r = 0.165$ $p< 0.01$) and *Utilising Emotions* ($r = 0.172$ $p< 0.01$). In managing own emotions the respondent is expected to indicate how effective each action would be to cope with emotions in a situation in which he/she is involved (Mayer and Salovey, 1997), whilst Bandura, 1997, states that Self-Efficacy is the belief in ones capabilities to organise and execute the course of action required to produce given attainments. The common thread between *Managing Own Emotions* and *Self-Efficacy* is the awareness of being able to control one’s capabilities to effectively deal with a given situation or in this case emotions. This correlation result supports hypothesis three of this research study which states that there is a statistically positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy.

Table 3.8 provides an array of statistical data of the instruments that were used in this research study. Although table 3.6 rejects three of the null hypotheses and favours the corresponding alternate hypothesis table 3.8 provides a detailed understanding of the relationship between subscales which may not have been portrayed in table 3.6.
DISCUSSION

As mentioned earlier, the aim of this research study is to gain a better understanding of the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes and the extent (if any) they influence Leadership Effectiveness. The overall results of the study supports the proposition that Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes do influence Leadership Effectiveness.

In this study it was assumed that Emotional Intelligence is correlated to effective leadership. This hypothesis was confirmed by the statistical analysis which indicated that Emotional Intelligence is positively correlated to effective leadership. According to George (2000), Emotional Intelligence plays an important role in Leadership Effectiveness and can promote effectiveness at all levels in organisations. Effective leaders with high Emotional Intelligence could help other people they lead to raise their own level of Emotional Intelligence, potentially resulting in a more effective organisation overall and a better organisational climate (Momeni, 2009). As indicated in the results, the Managing Own Emotions subscale was significantly correlated to the effectiveness outcome from the leadership subscale. This supports the assumption that effective leadership may have its roots in managing emotions (Caruso et al., 2002).

A study by Coetzee and Schaap, (2005), indicates a significant correlation between the Emotional Intelligence scores and the Effective and Ineffective Leadership scores ($r = 0.342$; $p < 0.01$) of the sample group. Effective Leadership was significantly positively related ($t = 2.359$; $p < 0.05$) to Emotional Intelligence and Ineffective Leadership was significantly negatively related ($t = -2.645$; $p < 0.01$) to Emotional Intelligence. Furthermore, three of the four of the Emotional Intelligence subscales had a negative correlation with the Laissez-Faire and Management by Exception (Passive) Leadership subscale and the fourth poorly correlated. Laissez-Faire behaviour is marked by a general failure to take responsibility for managing (Eagly, Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003) and considered least effective, followed by Management by Exception in terms of Leadership Effectiveness (Coetzee & Schaap, 2005).

This research study was also interested in establishing whether or not a relationship exists between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership. The findings suggest that there is a significant relationship between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership. However there were negative correlations between Self-Efficacy and certain leadership subscales. A step further into statistical findings, Self-Efficacy was positively correlated to the Effectiveness Leadership subscale at a significant level and this is important for the purpose of this research. On the basis of the theory of Self-Efficacy (Bandura,1997), it is expected that
leaders with greater Self-Efficacy are more effective leaders, because they are inclined to expend greater efforts to fulfil their leadership roles and to persevere longer when faced with difficulties (Ng, Ang & Chan, 2008). The result from this research study supports the assumption made by Ng, Ang and Chan, (2008). Self-Efficacy was negatively correlated to Laissez-Faire and Management by Exception (Passive). According to Felfe and Schyns (2002), Management by Exception (Passive), as well as Laissez-Faire, which are both contained in the MLQ, are both forms of ineffective leadership. Thus it can be deduced that that as Self-Efficacy increases Leadership Effectiveness decreases. It should be noted that there are limited studies of Leadership Effectiveness and Self-Efficacy but rather studies in the academic fraternity explore Leadership Effectiveness and leadership self efficacy. Self-Efficacy and leader Self-Efficacy have the same foundational value but are defined as different constructs. Bandura (1997) defines Self-Efficacy as “the beliefs in ones capabilities to organise and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). However the definition of leadership Self-Efficacy is referred to as one’s self-perceived capabilities to perform the cognitive and behavioural functions necessary to regulate group process in relation to goal achievement (McCormick, 2001).

Another aim of this study was to determine whether or not a relationship exist between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy. The results indicate that a significant relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy does exist. Self-Efficacy was moderately correlated to the subscale Perception of Emotions. This supports the research done by Schutte et al. (2009), which indicates that Self-Efficacy for emotional functioning is the perception or belief that one can achieve desired outcomes in the emotional realm.

**Limitations to the Study**

The limitation to this study is related to the nature of the sample. The sample size was small n=107. The sample can also be considered to be gender and age biased, that is, there were more males than females in the sample and the age category indicated most of the sample participants ranged between 39-49 years. Another limitation refers to the reliability coefficient for the subscales of the MLQ which were significantly lower than the full scale reliability. Factor analysis could not validate the subscales used in the correlation analysis, which is also a limitation to the study. Lastly it should be noted that the results will be specific to the policing context and cannot be generalised to other populations.
Recommendations

Recommendations will be made as set out below.

The field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology

In view of the findings from this research study the following recommendations are made for the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology:

- The Social Cognitive Theory to Leadership
  The application of the Social Cognitive Theory to describe leadership has both theoretical and practical implications in the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology. The Social Cognitive Theory is a conceptual framework of human functioning that is well-supported by a large body of empirical research (McCormick, 2001). Thus it forms a reliable paradigm perspective in which to explore leadership. The practical implication is that the Social Cognitive Model of leadership has relevance in leadership training. However, there is a lack of research to substantiate the value of the Social Cognitive Theory to leadership. Thus it is recommended that research be done to increase the empirical and practical nature of applying the Social Cognitive Theory to leadership.

- Self-Efficacy
  Literature provides empirical findings on the various conceptualisations of Self-Efficacy such as leadership Self-Efficacy, task Self-Efficacy, general Self-Efficacy and its influence in different domains. However due to the various conceptualisations of Self-Efficacy, there seems to be a lack of research on Self-Efficacy as a concept and leadership. It is recommended that a meta-analytic study of Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness be done to increase the knowledge and understanding of Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness as well as identify gaps in terms of the literature, empirical research and practical implications.

- The Assessing Emotions Scale
  The Assessing Emotions Scale is a self-report inventory which measures individuals’ Emotional Intelligence traits. However this scale has not been standardised to South African norms. Thus it will be useful to develop South African norms for the Assessing Emotions Scale and increase the self report inventories with South African norms available to South African researchers.
Future Research
In view of the findings from this research study the following recommendations are made for future research:

- Future studies that are aimed at improving on this research study should include a larger sample size and a sample population that represents police commanders from different parts of South Africa.

- Another approach to this study may look at research in terms of biographical dynamics such as race, gender and age and the influence thereof.

- Additional research may investigate a comparative study of this research between police commanders in the different provinces within South Africa. This will make interesting research as South Africa is a diverse country and each province has its own political and socio-economic influences which impact on policing.

- Other research may investigate leadership styles and the impact they have on Leadership Effectiveness. Further investigation may report the current police leadership style and which leadership style will generate effective leaders considering the nature of the work.

Recommendations for the Organisation
In view of the findings from this research study the following recommendations are made for the organisation:

- Due to the complexity and nature of work within police organisations, leaders face different challenges than those in other environments. For this reason, a way to equip these leaders is through developmental programmes for current leaders. Thus they become more resourceful in performing their leader duties.

- Furthermore potential leaders are to be initiated into these developmental programmes to better prepare them for leadership within the police and foster effective leadership. Thus it will be useful for the police organisation to create a talent management strategy focusing on identification and succession planning of potential leaders.

- A revision of the current recruitment and selection policy to address the implementation of selection instruments that screen for psychological constructs like
Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy which impacts on leadership of policing organisations.

- It has been identified in this study that the number of females in commanding positions is significantly lower than males. Traditionally police commanders are predominately male and this still appears to be the case. Thus the organisation should revise its strategy for addressing transformational change, by representing more females in commanding positions. This strategy should also address how to prepare these women for commanding roles and the change management needed to create an acceptance of women in these roles.

**Conclusion**

The objective of this research study was to determine the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes of Leadership Effectiveness. A policing organisation was chosen as the context in which to address the objective of this study. In this research study Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness were discussed in terms of literature.

The general methodology consisted of the use of three instruments. The Assessing Emotions Scale was use to collect information about Emotional Intelligence, the Self-Efficacy Scale was used to collect information on efficacy and information on the third construct Leadership Effectiveness was collected using the MLQ. The data was analysed using the Spearman’s rho correlation coefficient.

The three hypotheses in this study were confirmed by the statistical analysis, that is there is a significant correlation between Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership. There is a significant correlation between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership and lastly there is a significant correlation between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy. It should be noted that due to a deviation in normality a non-parametric correlation analysis was used to test the above-mentioned hypotheses.

In conclusion, the intention of conducting this research was to create awareness of how certain psychological constructs as attributes may influence Leadership Effectiveness. According to Herbest and Maree (2008), the role that attributes play in predicting leadership success will become more prominent as leadership situations become more complex and varied leadership represents a crucial determinant of police organisational efficacy (Adam,
Moving towards domains of leadership, however, requires that police organisations develop definitions of what effective leadership means within their own communities and policing contexts (Schafer, 2008). In this study it is clear that there are positive correlations between the constructs Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness. Therefore, Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes do play a role in Leadership Effectiveness.
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CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter concludes this research study and includes limitations of and recommendations for this research.

4.1 CONCLUSIONS

This research study focused on determining the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes to Leadership Effectiveness. The research will be concluded in terms of the research aims as stated in section 1.3, chapter 1 and set out below.

- The General Aim

The general aim of this research was to gain a better understanding of the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes and the extent (if any) to which they influence Leadership Effectiveness. Understanding this aim was achieved in chapters 2 and 3. Chapter 2 helped provide literature and empirical research that has been done in the field whilst chapter 3 provided the statistical analysis of the data collected which gave a representation of the statistical relationship of Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy and the degree to which they correlate to Leadership Effectiveness. The analysis also highlighted poor and negative correlations between certain subscales. Hence through this analysis, the researcher was able to gain a better understanding of the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes and the extent to which they influence Leadership Effectiveness.

- The Specific Literature Aims

The specific literature aims were to conceptualise the constructs (Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness) which formed part of this research study and to theoretically integrate the literature between these constructs. This aim was achieved by means of a literature review in chapter 2.

For the purpose of this study Emotional Intelligence was defined in terms of Mayer and Salovey, (1997) as including the ability to perceive, appraise and express emotion accurately and adaptively; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; the ability to access and generate feelings where they facilitate cognitive activities and adaptive action; and the ability to regulate emotions in oneself and others. Chapter 2 further described models of Emotional Intelligence that have generated the most interest in terms of research and application, these being the Ability Model by Salovey and Mayer (1999), Mixed Model by Goleman (1995) and the Bar-On Model by Bar On (2002). This research study used the
Ability Model by Salovey and Mayer (1999) to conceptualise Emotional Intelligence. The Emotional Intelligence literature review concluded with the integration of literature between Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Effectiveness and the criticisms of this construct.

Self-Efficacy was defined as “the beliefs in ones capabilities to organise and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). For the purpose of this study Self-Efficacy was conceptualised in terms of the Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986, 1997), which states that Self-Efficacy beliefs vary on three dimensions:

(a) Level or magnitude (particular level of task difficulty);
(b) Strength (certainty of successfully performing a particular level of task difficulty);
(c) Generality (the extent to which magnitude and strength beliefs generalise across tasks and situations).

The literature review of Self-Efficacy further proceeded to explore the sources of Self-Efficacy and concluded with the integration of literature between Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness.

The last construct of this research study is Leadership Effectiveness. Leadership is a broad construct thus the literature reviewed in this study included the core leadership characteristics, leadership roles and leadership behaviours. Leadership theories from the Great Man Theories, trait theories, behavioural theories, contingency leadership theories and modern leadership theories were discussed to highlight the developments in the field of leadership. The Social Cognitive Theory was used to conceptualise leadership. The literature reviewed concluded with the definitions of Leadership Effectiveness for the purpose of this study.

- The Specific Aims related to the Empirical Study

The objective of this research study was to determine the relationship between Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy as attributes of Leadership Effectiveness. A policing organisation was chosen as the context in which to address the objective of this study.

The specific aims that were related to the empirical study were answered in chapter 3 of this dissertation.

In general the methodology consisted of the use of three instruments. The Assessing Emotions Scale was used to collect information about Emotional Intelligence, the Self-
Efficacy Scale was used to collect information on efficacy and data on the third construct, Leadership Effectiveness was collected using the MLQ. The data was analysed using Spearman’s rho correlation coefficient.

The three hypotheses in this study were confirmed by the statistical analysis that is, there is a significant correlation between Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership. There is a significant correlation between Self-Efficacy and effective leadership and lastly there is a significant correlation between Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy. It should be noted that due to a deviation in normality a non-parametric correlation analysis was used to test the above-mentioned hypotheses. Therefore it can be concluded that Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes do play a role in Leadership Effectiveness.

The last aim was to formulate recommendations in terms of the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, future research and for the organisation represented in this study, which were achieved chapter 3 and section 4.3 in chapter 4.

In conclusion, the intention of conducting this research was to create awareness of how certain psychological constructs as attributes may influence Leadership Effectiveness. According to Herbest and Maree (2008), the role that attributes play in predicting leadership success will become more prominent as leadership situations become more complex and varied leadership represents a crucial determinant of police organisational efficacy (Adam, 2010). Moving towards domains of leadership, however, requires that police organisations develop definitions of what effective leadership means within their own communities and policing contexts (Schafer, 2008). In this study it is clear that there are positive correlations between the constructs Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness. Therefore, Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes do play a role in Leadership Effectiveness.

4.2 LIMITATIONS

The limitation to this study is related to the nature of the sample. The sample size was small n=107. The sample can also be considered to be gender and age biased, that is there were more males than females in the sample and the age category indicated that most of the sample participants ranged between 39-49 years. Another limitation refers to the reliability coefficient for the subscales of the MLQ which were significantly lower than the full scale reliability. Factor analysis could not validate the subscales used in the correlation analysis, which is also a limitation of this study. Lastly it should be noted that the results will be specific to the policing context and cannot be generalised to other populations.
4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations were made as set out below.

The field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology:

In view of the findings from this research study the following recommendations are made for the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology:

- The Social Cognitive Theory of Leadership

The application of the Social Cognitive Theory to describe leadership has both theoretical and practical implications in the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology. The Social Cognitive Theory is a conceptual framework of human functioning that is well supported by a large body of empirical research (McCormick, 2001). Thus it forms a reliable paradigm perspective in which to explore leadership. The practical implication is that the Social Cognitive Model of leadership has relevance in leadership training. However there is a lack of research to substantiate the value of the Social Cognitive Theory to leadership. Thus it is recommended that research be done to increase the empirical and practical nature of applying the Social Cognitive Theory to leadership.

- Self-Efficacy

Literature provides empirical findings on the various conceptualisations of Self-Efficacy such as leadership Self-Efficacy, task Self-Efficacy, general Self-Efficacy and its influence in different domains. However due to the various conceptualisations of Self-Efficacy, there seems to be a lack of research concerning Self-Efficacy as a concept and leadership. It is recommended that a meta-analytic study of Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness be done to increase the knowledge and understanding of Self-Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness as well as to identify gaps in terms of the literature, empirical research and practical implication.

- The Assessing Emotions Scale

The Assessing Emotions Scale is a self-report inventory which measures individual’s Emotional Intelligence traits. However this scale has not been standardised to South African norms. Thus it would be useful to develop South African norms for the Assessing Emotions Scale, thus increasing the self-report inventories with South African norms available to South African researchers.
Future Research
In view of the findings from this research study the following recommendations are made for future research:

- Future studies that are aimed at improving on this research study should include a larger sample size and a sample population that represents police commanders from different parts of South Africa.

- Another approach to this study could look at research in terms of biographical dynamics such as race, gender and age and the influence thereof.

- Additional research might investigate a comparative study of this research between police commanders in the different provinces of South Africa. This will make interesting research as South Africa is a diverse country and each province has its own political and socio-economic influences which impact on policing.

- Further research may investigate leadership styles and the impact they have on Leadership Effectiveness. Further investigation could report the police current leadership style and which leadership style will generate effective leaders considering the nature of police work.

Recommendations for the Organisation
In view of the findings from this research study the following recommendations are made for the organisation:

- Due to the complexity and nature of work within police organisations, leaders face different challenges to those in other environments. For this reason, a way to equip these leaders is through developmental programmes for current leaders. In this way they become more resourceful in performing their leadership duties.

- Furthermore potential leaders are to be initiated into these developmental programmes to better prepare them for leadership within the police and foster effective leadership. Thus it will be useful for the police organisation to create a talent management strategy focusing on identification and succession planning of potential leaders.

- A revision of the current recruitment and selection policies to address the implementation of selection instruments that screen for psychological constructs like
Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy would impacts on leadership of policing organisations.

- This study indicated that that the number of females in commanding positions is significantly lower than males. Traditionally police commanders are predominately male and this still appears to be the case. Thus the organisation should revise its strategy for addressing transformational change, by representing more females in commanding positions. This strategy should also address how to prepare these women for commanding roles and the change management needed to create an acceptance of women in these roles.

4.4 CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter a detailed conclusion about this research study was presented. The limitations that constrain the research were highlighted and recommendations for further research were made.
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Motivation to conduct Research within the South African Police Service

Dear Sir / Madam

My name is Yvette Ramchunder. I am currently an intern psychometrist at Employee Health and Wellness - PHQ. I have been an intern at the South African Police Service for the past two years, under the supervision of Lt.Col. R Botha. As a master’s student at UNISA, student number 4444-016-2, I am embarking on conducting research as part of my Masters Programme. My research focuses on Emotional Intelligence and self-efficacy as attributes in leadership effectiveness. Herewith I would like to request whether your organization would be willing to allow me access to conduct my research. The SAPS is known for its focus on leadership. Thus, this organization would be my ideal choice to conduct my research.

My research targets Station Commanders in KZN who have had/ has experience in leadership. Participation is voluntary. For my study, I will require the 183 station commanders within KZN to offer their time to assist me in my research. Three questionnaires will be administered and will last approximately 45 minutes per station commander. The questionnaire maybe administered in a group/ cluster of station commanders for logistical purposes.

I hold a Bachelor of Social Science Degree from the University of Kwa-Zulu Natal and an Honours Degree from UNISA. I am also a Registered Psychometrist with the HPCSA. The research will be undertaken for a Masters Degree at UNISA. For reference, the research supervisor can be contacted, Professor Nico Martins on 012-429-8379 or 083-266-6372.

Looking forward to your response.

Yvette Ramchunder
0825249460
yvette.ramchunder@gmail.com
This booklet consists of 3 different questionnaires.

Completion of this questionnaires should last approximately 45 minutes

Questionnaire 1- Assessing Emotions Scale

Questionnaire 2- Self Efficacy Scale

Questionnaire 3- Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Dear Sir / Madam

My name is Yvette Ramchunder. I am currently an intern psychometrist at Employee Health and Wellness - PHQ. I have been an intern at the South African Police Service for the past two years, under the supervision of Lt.Col. R Botha. As a master’s student at UNISA, student number 4444-016-2, I am embarking on conducting research as part of my Masters Programme. My research focuses on Emotional Intelligence and self-efficacy as attributes in leadership effectiveness. The SAPS is known for its focus on leadership. Thus, this organization would be my ideal choice to conduct my research.

My research targets Station Commanders in KZN who have had/ has experience in leadership. Participation is voluntary. For my study, I will require the 183 station commanders within KZN to offer their time to assist me in my research. Three questionnaires will be administered and will last approximately 45 minutes per station commander. The questionnaire maybe administered in a group/ cluster of station commanders for logistical purposes.

I hold a Bachelor of Social Science Degree from the University of Kwa-Zulu Natal and an Honours Degree from UNISA. I am also a Registered Psychometrist with the HPCSA. The research will be undertaken for a Masters Degree at UNISA. For reference, the research supervisor can be contacted, Professor Nico Martins on 012-429-8379 or 083-266-6372.

Looking forward to your response.

Yvette Ramchunder
0825249460
yvette.ramchunder@gmail
RESEARCH REQUEST: THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND SELF EFFICACY AS ATTRIBUTES IN LEADERSHIP SKILLS; MASTERS DEGREE: UNISA; RESEARCHER: YVYETTE RAMCHUNDER

1. Attached, please find Head Office minute 3/34/2 dated 2011-11-18 from the office of Major General Moorcroft regarding the above-mentioned matter.

2. Permission to conduct the said research has been granted in terms of SAPS Research Policy (NI 1/2006).

3. Approval from the office of the Provincial Commissioner is hereby granted to conduct the research as stipulated in Head Office minute 3/34/2 dated 2011-11-18.
4. For any queries, please contact Colonel A.D. van der Linde at the following numbers:
Office: 031 325 4841
Mobile: 082 496 1142

5. Thank you.

MAJ-GEN P E. RADEBE
DEP. PROV.COM:
OPERATIONS OFFICER

........................MAJOR GENERAL
DEPUTY PROVINCIAL COMMISSIONER: OPERATIONS OFFICER: KZN
P.E. RADEBE
Dear Sir/ Madam

Thank you for taking time to participate in this research study. Completion of the consent form and questionnaires will last approximately 45 minutes.

This consent form informs you the participant of the nature of this study, it will require you to fill in standard biographical information, its informs you if your rights as a participant in a research study and lastly you are required to sign a declaration giving informed consent to participate in this research study.

**Nature of study**

The researcher is interested in broadening the scope of knowledge in Emotional Intelligence and self-efficacy as attributes to effective leadership from a social cognitive perspective and simultaneously highlighting the growing trends in terms or leadership effectiveness in the 21st century within complex organisations. Thus, this research study is interest in establishing psychological constructs such as Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy as attributes in effective leadership.

**Biographical Details**

The following biographical details will be used for statistical purposes only. Please complete the below fully by placing a tick in the appropriate box eg. 

1. Gender
   - Male
   - Female

2. Age
   - 18-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60+

3. Marital Status
   - Married
   - Single
   - Divorced
   - Widowed

4. Level of employment

5. Home Language

6. Do you work weekends on a regular basis?
I ......................................................................................(Participants Name) are fully aware of the following:

- This study is voluntary and as such yields no financial gain for the participants.
- All written material will be kept safe and will only be used for purpose of the research. After which they will be destroyed. The data will be disposed of after 5 years, as this is the required time after which research can be incinerated.
- The researcher assures complete confidentiality and anonymity to participants of the study.
- You will not be disadvantaged should you wish to not participate.

SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT ..................................................  DATE ............................................

DECLARATION

I.........................................................................................................................(full names of participant) hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I consent to participating in the research project.

I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time, should I so desire.

SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT ..................................................  DATE ............................................
Questionnaire 1

Assessing Emotions

**Directions:** Each of the following items asks you about your emotions or reactions associated with emotions. After deciding whether a statement is generally true for you, use the 5-point scale to respond to the statement. **Please circle** the “1” if you strongly disagree that this is like you, the “2” if you somewhat disagree that this is like you, “3” if you neither agree nor disagree that this is like you, the “4” if you somewhat agree that this is like you, and the “5” if you strongly agree that this is like you. There are no right or wrong answers. Please give the response that best describes you.

1 = strongly disagree  
2 = somewhat disagree  
3 = neither agree nor disagree  
4 = somewhat agree  
5 = strongly agree

1. I know when to speak about my personal problems to others.  
2. When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them.  
3. I expect that I will do well on most things I try.  
4. Other people find it easy to confide in me.  
5. I find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages of other people.
6. Some of the major events of my life have led me to re-evaluate what is important and not important.  

7. When my mood changes, I see new possibilities.  

8. Emotions are one of the things that make my life worth living.  

9. I am aware of my emotions as I experience them.  

10. I expect good things to happen.  

11. I like to share my emotions with others.  

12. When I experience a positive emotion, I know how to make it last.  

13. I arrange events others enjoy.  

14. I seek out activities that make me happy.  

15. I am aware of the non-verbal messages I send to others.  

16. I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others.
17. When I am in a positive mood, solving problems is easy for me. 1 2 3 4 5

18. By looking at their facial expressions, I recognize the emotions people are experiencing. 1 2 3 4 5

19. I know why my emotions change. 1 2 3 4 5

20. When I am in a positive mood, I am able to come up with new ideas. 1 2 3 4 5

21. I have control over my emotions. 1 2 3 4 5

22. I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them. 1 2 3 4 5

23. I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on. 1 2 3 4 5

24. I compliment others when they have done something well. 1 2 3 4 5

25. I am aware of the non-verbal messages other people send. 1 2 3 4 5

26. When another person tells me about an important event in his or her life, I almost feel as though I experienced this
event myself. 1 2 3 4 5

27. When I feel a change in emotions, I tend to come up with new ideas. 1 2 3 4 5

28. When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail. 1 2 3 4 5

29. I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them. 1 2 3 4 5

30. I help other people feel better when they are down. 1 2 3 4 5

31. I use good moods to help myself keep trying in the face of obstacles. 1 2 3 4 5

32. I can tell how people are feeling by listening to the tone of their voice. 1 2 3 4 5

33. It is difficult for me to understand why people feel the way they do. 1 2 3 4 5
SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

Directions:

The following statements concern attitudes and feelings you might have about yourself and your performance of a variety of tasks. You are asked to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of these statements by marking an X in the space at one end of the scale or the other if you completely agree or completely disagree. Place an X in the space second from the end if you somewhat agree or somewhat disagree; and place an X in the space third from the end if you only slightly agree or slightly disagree. Place your X in the middle of the scale if you neither agree nor disagree.

For each statement mark the scale beneath it to indicate how much you agree or disagree with it. Work quickly and give your first impression.
<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I find it extremely unpleasant to be afraid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I sometimes avoid difficult tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am a very determined person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Once I set my mind to a task almost nothing can stop me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I have a lot of self-confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am at my best when I am really challenged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I believe that it is shameful to give up something I start</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have more than the average amount of self-determination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sometimes things just don't seem worth the effort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I would rather not try something that I'm not good at</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I have more fears than most people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I find it difficult to take risks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Man has a lot of problems but none he won't eventually be able to solve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I can succeed in most any endeavour to which I set my mind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nothing is impossible if I really put my mind to it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I feel I am better off to rely on myself for a solution when things are looking really bad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>When put to the test I would remain true to my ideals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>If a person believes in himself, he can make it in his world</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I feel that chances are very good that I can achieve my goals in life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>In general I agree that &quot;if at first I don't succeed, I'll try again&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>When I have difficulty getting what I want, I just try harder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I excel at few things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I have often burned the midnight oil to finish a task before a deadline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I have more willpower than most people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I become frustrated when I experience physical discomfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nothing is worth subjecting myself to pain for if I can avoid it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I would endure physical discomfort to complete a task because I just don't like to give up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire 3

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Directions: This questionnaire is anonymous as your name is not required. This survey designed to describe the leadership style of an individual, as you perceive it. Forty-five descriptive statements are listed in the MLQ. Please answer every item. If an item is irrelevant or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.

For each statement mark the scale beneath it to indicate how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark a X over your chosen answer. Work quickly and give your first impression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not all</td>
<td>Once in a while</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Fairly often</td>
<td>Frequently if not always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I provide others with assistance I exchange for their efforts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I re-examine critical assumptions to questions whether they are appropriate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I talk about my most important values and beliefs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am absent when needed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I seek differing perspectives when resolving problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I talk optimistically about the future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I instill pride in others for being associated with me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I wait for things to go wrong before taking action</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I spend time teaching and coaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I show that I am a firm believer in “if it ain't broke, don't fix it.”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I go beyond self interest for the good of the group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I treat other as individuals rather than just a member of a group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I act in ways that build others’ respect for me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I keep track of all mistakes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I display a sense of power and confidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I articulate a compelling vision of the future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I avoid making decisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I get others to look at problems from many different angles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I help other to develop their strengths</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I suggestion new ways of looking at how to complete assignments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I delay responding to urgent questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I express satisfaction when others meet my expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I express confidence that goals will be achieved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I am effective in meeting others’ job related needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I use others to do more than they expected to do</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I get others to do more than they expected to do</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I am effective in representing others to higher authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I work with others in a satisfactory way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I heighten others’ desire to succeed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I am effective in meeting organisational requirements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I increase others’ willingness to try harder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I lead a group that is effective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>