COPY RIGHT

IJIEMR Transactions, online available on 26th Dec 2022. Link

:http://www.ijiemr.org/downloads.php?vol=Volume-11&issue=Issue 12

10.48047/IJIEMR/V11/ISSUE 12/126

TITLE: A STUDY TO EXPLAIN A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCES AND LEADERSHIP

Paper Authors NEERAJ KUMAR SINGH, DR.ANSHUMAN SHARMA

USE THIS BARCODE TO ACCESS YOUR ONLINE PAPER

To Secure Your Paper As Per UGC Guidelines We Are Providing A Electronic Bar Code

A STUDY TO EXPLAIN A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCES AND LEADERSHIP

CANDIDATE NAME= NEERAJ KUMAR SINGH
Designation- research scholar monad university Hapur U.P
GUIDE NAME = DR.ANSHUMAN SHARMA
Designation- PROFESSOR monad university Hapur U.P

ABSTRACT

This research paper explores the conceptual framework of emotional intelligence and its relationship with leadership effectiveness. Emotional intelligence (EI) refers to the ability to recognize, understand, and manage one's own emotions as well as understand and influence the emotions of others. Leadership, on the other hand, involves the ability to inspire and guide individuals and teams towards achieving common goals. The paper critically examines the theoretical foundations and empirical evidence linking emotional intelligence and leadership, highlighting the key dimensions and components of emotional intelligence that are relevant for effective leadership. Through a comprehensive analysis of existing literature and case studies, the paper aims to shed light on the significance of emotional intelligence in leadership and its impact on organizational outcomes. Furthermore, it explores the implications of emotional intelligence for leadership development and offers recommendations for leveraging emotional intelligence to enhance leadership effectiveness in various organizational contexts.

Keywords: - Emotional Intelligence, Leadership, Behaviour, Goals, Emotions.

I. INTRODUCTION

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION AND EVOLUTION OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Evidenced by historical records of philosophical arguments among early Roman and Greek philosophers, it is clear that for two millennia, emotion was not considered part of the intellectual realm since it was seen too unpredictable to be a component of rational cognition. Emotions were given a bad rap in academic discourse until the 1950s. People believed that their emotions controlled them. The person was responsible for managing his or her feelings lest he or she be manipulated by them. Emotions were eventually seen as a strength of the human condition, aiding in decision making, productivity, and inspiration. It was also recognized that emotions are multifaceted and include the full person, head, heart, and soul. Emotions were found to have evolved in humans "to provide new types of motivation and new action tendencies as well as a greater variety of behaviors to cope with the environment and life's demands," as stated in a review of the literature.

In 1920, Thorndike identified psychological concepts that the military might employ to better manage its people. Thorndike observed that people had more than one kind of intelligence, which may shift depending on their circumstances. People are not equally brilliant in all areas, thus he proposed testing for three types of

intelligence to determine a person's total IQ: abstract, mechanical, and social. According to Thorndike, intelligence is the capacity to comprehend and control abstract concepts, mechanical devices, and social interactions. The capacity to "understand and manage men and women, boys and girls—to act wisely in human relations," according to him, is the essence of social intelligence. The notion of social intelligence put forward by Thorndike [38] serves as the foundation upon which the EI construct rests.

Sixty years after Thorndike, H. Gardner [39] used the concept of social intelligence to investigate the human mind in terms of specific cognitive skills, rather than IQ as a whole. Gardner's hypothesis of multiple intelligences includes interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences that are analogous to social intelligence. The term "intelligence" is used in Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences to refer to "a biopsychological potential to process information that can be activated in a cultural setting to solve problems or create products that are of value in a culture" [40].

II.   EI MODELS

The literature is not entirely in agreement on how to define, create, and assess emotional intelligence [53] [25] [54] [55] [56] [57]. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso's [58] ability model; Bar-On's [59] [42] emotional-social intelligence (ESI) model; Petrides and Furnham's [50] [60] [61] [8] emotional and social competencies model centered on a theory of performance in the workplace; and the trait-EI model.

According to Bar-On, EI consists of "noncognitive skills or competencies that enable an individual to understand, control, and adapt to environmental stressors." Mayer et al.'s concept of EI focused on people's capacity to recognize, name, accept, analyze, and control their own and others' emotional states. According to Goleman, emotional intelligence is one's capacity to encourage oneself and others via an awareness of one's own and other people's emotions. According to Petrides and Furnham, trait EI is "a constellation of emotion-related self-perceptions and dispositions (e.g., emotion perception, emotion management, empathy, impulsivity)" [50].

- **Bar-On's Model**

Noncognitive components and abilities that investigate how people respond to environmental stresses are a part of Bar-On's [41] [59] mixed model construct of EI. Intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, flexibility, stress management, and emotional stability are the five pillars of Bar-On's mixed model [41] [59] [44]. The following elements were included in Bar-On's model [42]:

- Self-respect, self-awareness, assertiveness, independence, and self-actualization make up the intrapersonal component (internal intelligence).

- Empathy, social responsibility, and interpersonal interactions make up the interpersonal component (external intelligence).

- Capacity for adjusting to new situations and overcoming obstacles.

- Developing a higher tolerance for stress and better managing impulses.

- Mood in general: joy and hope [44]

Using these factors, Bar-On [41] [59] investigated how one's actions affect one's sense of success, pleasure, and general well-being. BarOn's methodology emphasizes the importance of people knowing themselves and being able to communicate effectively with their coworkers under pressure.

- **Mayer-Salovey-Caruso's Model**

The ability model of EI, created by Salovey and Mayer [2], is widely used. Instead of a "general sense of self and appraisal of others," Salovey and Mayer defined EI as the "recognition and use of one's own and other's emotional states to solve problems and regulate behavior." "The ability to monitor one's own feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions," [2] they write, "is a subset of social intelligence."

Mayer et al. [43] argued that EI required a certain level of innate talent or intellect. The model emphasizes one's capacity for social interaction and finds stronger correlations with cognitive talents than with personality qualities [43] [25] [44]. Perception, facilitation, comprehension, and management are the four main emotional components of the approach.

III. INSTRUMENTS TO MEASURE EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Multiple emotional intelligence scales are in common use and have been described in the research. Ten tools for gauging emotional intelligence have been compiled by the collaboration for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations [68]. The 10 tools in this set are:

1. EQ-i, or the Emotional Quotient Inventory,
2. The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso (MSCEIT) Scale of Emotional Intelligence
3. The Inventory of Social and Emotional Competence (ESCI)
4. The Genos Emotional Intelligence Scale (Genos EI) is the fourth.
5. 5. The Inventory of Group Emotional Competence (GEC)
6. The Schutte Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test (SSEIT) is the sixth.
7. The TEIQue Measure of Trait Emotional Intelligence 7
8. Emotional IQ test: Wong's WEIS score 8.
9. Assessment of Emotional Intelligence in the Workplace (WEIP)
10. The College Version of the Emotional and Social Competence Inventory

Eight of these ten are specifically designed to gauge an individual's EQ. Group or team emotional intelligence may be assessed using tools like the Group Emotional Competence (GEC) Inventory and the Work Group Emotional Intelligence Profile (WEIP). There are both self-report and multi-rater versions of instruments measuring emotional intelligence, such as the Emotional Quotient Inventory, the Emotional and Social Competence Inventory, and the Genos Emotional Intelligence Inventory (Genos EI). College and university students' emotional

intelligence is measured by the Emotional & Social Competence Inventory - University Edition.

- **The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i)**

In order to examine a theory of emotional and social functioning, Bar-On developed the EQ-i. In order to evaluate the Bar-On theory of emotional and social intelligence, this test was created. The EQ-i is a self-report instrument developed to assess many dimensions of emotional intelligence. The EQ-i has 133 questions and can be completed in about 40 minutes. Each question has a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (which means "very seldom or not true of me") to 5 (which means "very often true of me or true of me"). All participants must be at least 17 years old. It provides not only an overall EQ score but also scores on each of the 15 subscales and five composite scales [59, 42].

- **The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)**

Ability-based MSCEIT was created using Mayer and Salovey's EI concept. The 141-item MSCEIT is a self-report assessment. Between 30 and 45 minutes are needed to finish the instrument. Its purpose is to quantify the model's four components. The 15 possible scores from MSCEIT are as follows: overall EI score, two Area scores, four Branch scores, and eight Task scores. These 15 scores are supplemented by an additional 3 instrument-generated scores [70] [71].

- **Emotional & Social Competence Inventory (ESCI)**

The Emotional and Social Competence Inventory (ESCI) was created by Professor Richard Boyatzis and Dr. Daniel Goleman of the Hay group in the United States and is a "360°" assessment. ESCI was created to measure the skills that set apart top performers from the rest of the pack. The ESCI assesses how people really behave, both in their own eyes and in the eyes of others [64].

IV. BACKGROUND OF LEADERSHIP

Leadership is described as a social engagement in which the leader's capacity to influence the conduct of their followers has a significant impact on the result of the interaction (in this case, performance). When it comes to leadership, it's crucial to remember that feelings matter [83]. According to Kouzes and Posner, [84] leadership is defined as a set of behaviors that anybody in a leadership position can learn and master. An early description of transformative leadership was provided by Burns [85]. "Leadership is defined as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations of both leaders and followers," he said. Furthermore, leaders' insights into and responses to the values and motives of themselves and their followers are the essence of leadership.

Similar to Burn's definition of leadership, Bass gave a more all-encompassing one in 1990. "Leadership is interaction between two or more members of a group, and it often involves structuring or restructuring the situation and the perceptions and

expectations of the members," as put out by Bass. Leaders are those who bring about change for the better, whose actions have a greater impact on the lives of others around them than their own. One member of a group exercises leadership when he or she influences the enthusiasm or skills of the group as a whole.

V. LEADERSHIP THEORIES

According to the chemists, the first scientific research on leadership might be broken down into three distinct eras. Beginning in 1910 and continuing through World War I, trait theory investigations were then conducted from World War II through the late 1960s from a behavioral standpoint. Finally, the late 1960s marked the beginning of the contingency theory, which, among other things, emphasized contingency-oriented leadership theories in addition to more recent developments in the field. To trace the roots of transformative leadership, it is useful to analyze these early eras of leadership research [86].

Trait Theory

The core tenet of trait theory is the identification of unique and superior features that make for good leaders. The "Great Man" theories of leadership, developed in the early days of the study of leadership, centered on the question of "who" the leader "was" by isolating the most important characteristics of effective leaders [87]. High levels of activity, the capacity to get along with people, and a willingness to change were all factored in. Early on, researchers in the field of leadership felt that leaders had a mysterious and unique combination of qualities that marked them apart from other people. After concluding that leadership cannot be identified by a set of features alone, Stogdill projected that both individual and contextual factors will need to be included into future theories of leadership [87].

Behavioural Theory

Studies of leadership styles based on behavioral theories mostly centered on either a task-oriented or a people-oriented approach. Research at Ohio State University in the 1960s and, subsequently, at the University of Michigan inspired this. These earlier studies focused on (a) the leadership behaviors necessary for effective leadership or patterns of communication termed consideration [88] and (b) the importance of a leader's interpersonal relationship with their followers as well as their concerns for accomplishing tasks toward goals or initiating structure. As a result, several behavioral theories classify a leader's consistent approach to action as being either task- or people-oriented.

Contingency Theory

Despite the fact that behavioral theories in leadership described leadership success, research switched to theories that may explain why leadership behavioral styles were not always beneficial in all circumstances. When compared to organizational outcomes like employee happiness and output, the identified patterns of leader behavior were inconsistent [86]. Contingency leadership theories emerged to explain the right leadership style depending on the leader, the follower, and the context [89] when personality and behavioral studies

failed to uncover a leadership style that worked best in all scenarios.

Theoretical Foundation of Leadership Styles

The situational leadership model developed by Hersey and Blanchard explains how different scenarios call for different types of leadership. According to Hersey and Blanchard, a leader's style is determined by how his or her subordinates interpret his or her actions, which led to the categorization of leadership actions as either task- or relationship-focused. The leader's job behavior comprises providing specific instructions for the work at hand, such as what has to be done, when, where, and how. The leader's relationship conduct includes tuning in to the group's conversations and providing a safe space for open dialogue [90].

CONCLUSION

REFERENCES

1. Higgs, M., "A study of the relationship between emotional intelligence and performance in UK call centres." Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 442-454, 2014
2. Rahim, M. A., & Psenicka, C., "Relationship between emotional intelligence and effectiveness of leader role: A dyadic study in four countries", The International Journal of Organizational Analysis, Vol. 13, no.4, pp. 327-342, 2015.
3. Rosete, D. and Ciarrochi, J., "Emotional intelligence and its relationship to workplace performance outcomes of leadership effectiveness", Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, Vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 388-399, 2015.
4. Kerr, R., Garvin, J., Heaton, N., & Boyle, E., "Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness", Leadership & Organization Development Journal, Vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 265-279, 2016.
5. Butler, C.J. & Chinowsky, P.S., "Emotional Intelligence and leadership behavior in construction executives", Journal of Management in Engineering, Vol.22, no.3, pp. 119-125, 2016.
6. Sunindigo, R., Hadikusumo, B., and Ogunlana, S., "Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Styles in Construction Project Management." J. Manage. Eng., Vol. 23, no. 4, 166-170, 201
7. 7