

# **DO LEADERS NEED EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE?: A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND LEADERSHIP OF CHANGE**

Malcolm Higgs

## **ABSTRACT**

Over the last few years there has been a significant and sustained growth in interest in the area of leadership (Chaudry 2000; Bagshaw & Bagshaw 1999; Goffee & Jones 2000). This paper reviews the development in thinking and research in relation to leadership. The limitations of progress in our understanding of the phenomenon are discussed (e.g., Kets De Vries 1993). Building from this review, the potential for a view of leadership relating to its role in the context of change (e.g., Conner 1999; Kotter 1998) and its relationship to Emotional Intelligence (e.g., Higgs & Dulewicz 1999) is explored. The relationship between the Competencies associated with change leadership and Emotional Intelligence is examined by means of a quantitative study involving a sample of 70 managers. Change Leadership Competencies are operationalised using an instrument reported by Higgs and Rowland (2000). Emotional Intelligence is operationalised using the EIQ developed by Dulewicz and Higgs (1999). The study reported in this paper demonstrates strong correlations between six of the seven elements of Emotional Intelligence (as defined by Higgs & Dulewicz 1999) and all five factors in the Change Leadership Competency (CLC) model (Higgs & Rowland 2000). In addition, the overall EI score correlates significantly with the overall CLC score. The author concludes that Emotional Intelligence potentially plays a significant part in the effectiveness of leadership in a change context and identifies areas for further research.

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Why there is a growing interest in leadership?**

Over the last few years there has been a significant and sustained growth in interest in the area of leadership in organisations (e.g., Chaudry 2000; Bagshaw & Bagshaw 1999; Goffee & Jones 2000). Indeed, the rate and range of publications in the academic and practitioner journals attest to this growth. For example, in 1999 alone it was estimated that over 2000 new books on the topic of leadership were published (Goffee & Jones 2000). In terms of research publications the growth has been equally stunning in the last decade (Alimo-Metcalfe 1995). In reviewing this trend, the question arises as to why is this growth in interest so notable? What is driving the growth in interest?

Reviewing the management and organisational literature indicates that there are a number of key drivers of interest. These are:

- i) 'The Talent Wars'. Evidence is emerging that organisations perceive the key to sustainable competitive advantage as being intricately involved with the

---

Malcolm Higgs ([malcolmh@henleymc.ac.uk](mailto:malcolmh@henleymc.ac.uk)) is Professor of Management and Dean of Henley Management College in the United Kingdom

---

ability to attract and retain a critical mass of talent in a world in which there is a shortage of the required talent (Williams 2000).

- ii) There has been a notable shift in the factors which drive investor decisions. During the 1960s to the early 1990s investor behaviour was dominated by 'hard' earnings data. However, since 1990 other 'intangible' factors have influenced this behaviour. In terms of these 'intangibles' investor views on the leadership of the organisation play a significant role (Ulrich 1997).
- iii) In order to compete in a rapidly changing environment, the ability to lead and manage change is a critical success factor. Yet some 70 percent of change initiatives fail (e.g., Kotter 1996; Hammer & Champy 1993).

### **Understanding leadership**

Whilst the interest in leadership is growing in its perceived importance to business, the interest in exploring its nature, and attempting to identify what makes for effective leadership, is by no means new. Indeed the topic, as an area of both academic and business interest, has a 20<sup>th</sup> century history which dates back to at least the 1930s. In spite of this sustained interest, and associated research, there appears to be little emerging which enables us to define the nature of effective leadership and related requirements of effective leaders in a meaningful way (Kets De Vries 1994). Furthermore, the linkages between academic research and practical experience appear to cause difficulty (e.g., Kets De Vries 1995; Kouzes & Posner 1999). Researchers, who also work as consultants in the business world, highlight the problem of building generic models to describe the nature of characteristics of effective leadership, by pointing to the difficulty of finding a consistent way of exploring the realities of accounting for a huge variety of leadership styles, which lead to effective business performance (e.g., Kets de Vries 1994; Goffee & Jones 2000; Collins 2001; Cacioppe 1997).

### **An Historical Perspective**

The difficulty of defining the nature of leadership, and i) the relationship of this research to the needs and concerns of organisations; and ii) the challenge of identifying what leads to effective leadership; may be elucidated by considering the development of the topic from an historic perspective. There is little doubt that mankind has been intrigued by the nature of leaders and leadership since the times of Plato. However, as Goffee and Jones (2000) point out, the belief in rationality, which dominated our thinking since the Enlightenment, was challenged by the work of Max Weber and Sigmund Freud. This led to the start of a reappraisal of our thinking about leadership and attempts to define and understand the phenomenon. This development of leadership thinking may be grouped into five categories. These categories, and their historical development, are summarised in Table 1.

**Table 1: Historical Development of Thinking on Leadership**

Period	Predominant 'School'	Predominant Constructs	Key References
1920s	Trait Theory	Leadership can be understood by identifying the distinguishing characteristics of great leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weber (1947)</li> </ul>
1950s	Style Theory	Leadership effectiveness may be explained and developed by identifying appropriate styles and behaviours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tannenbaum &amp; Schmidt (1958)</li> </ul>
1960s	Contingency Theory	Leadership occurs in a context. Leadership style must be exercised depending on each situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fiedler (1967)</li> <li>• Hersey &amp; Blanchard (1969)</li> </ul>
1970s	Charismatic Theory	Leadership is concerned with the charismatic behaviours of leaders and their ability to transform organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• House (1976)</li> <li>• Burns (1978)</li> <li>• Conger &amp; Kanungo (1988)</li> <li>• Bryman (1992)</li> </ul>
1980s	New Leadership/Neo-Charismatic School	Leadership and management are different. Leaders require a transformational focus which encompasses a range of characteristics and behaviours in addition to charisma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bass (1985)</li> <li>• Avolio &amp; Bass (1995; 1997)</li> <li>• Conger &amp; Kanungo (1988)</li> <li>• Shamir (1992)</li> <li>• Bennis (1985)</li> <li>• Alimo-Mecalf (1995)</li> </ul>
Late 1990s	Emerging Approaches a) Strategic Leadership b) Change Leadership	<p>a) Leadership may be understood by examination of strategic decision-making by executives</p> <p>b) Leadership is inexorably linked to the management of change. Leader behaviours may be understood in the context of the work of delivering change</p>	<p>a) Finhelstein &amp; Hambrick (1996)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hambrick &amp; Brandon (1998)</li> </ul> <p>b) Kotter (1994)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higgs &amp; Rowland (2000)</li> <li>• Conner (1999)</li> </ul>

---

The summary provided in Table 1 suggests that one 'school' takes over from another as understanding develops. In reality this is not the case. For example, the 'trait' approach continues today, albeit in a refined manner. Goffee and Jones (2000) acknowledge that their approach to identifying the core aspects of leadership is rooted in trait theory thinking. However, they have replaced personality elements with examination and categorisations of leader behaviours, and thus change the initial paradigm.

In broad terms the 'New Leadership School' (i.e. neo-charismatic/transformational approach) gained dominance in management thinking in the 1990s. In particular the transformational/transactional model promoted by Bass (1985) was seen as relevant to the challenges of organisations in a highly volatile and rapidly changing business environment. However, this model tended to build a leader/manager divide, which led to much debate around the difference between leaders and managers. This difference has been seen by many as being associated with initiation and the implementation of change or transformation within an organisation (e.g., Kotter 1990; Carnall 1999; Higgs & Rowland 2000). Indeed some (e.g., Kotter 1990; 1994; Zaleanik 1992; Higgs & Rowland 2000) argue that leadership can only usefully be considered within a context of change or transformation.

However, much of this debate omits consideration of the business context. The combination of the transformational/transactional debate with context requires linkage to the strategic leadership thinking (e.g., Finkelstein & Hambrick 1996). The central idea in strategic leadership is that executives make choices on the basis of their own personalised interpretations of problems, options and outcomes (Finkelstein & Hambrick 1996). The focus of strategic leadership exposes the assumption that companies and the strategies they pursue are purely economic (Hambrick & Brandon 1988). This perspective recognises that complex, strategic decisions are the result of behavioural factors as well as techno-economic optimising considerations (Hambrick & Brandon 1988). This emerging 'school', or approach to thinking about leadership, remains focused on the top leaders and their behaviours. However, many (e.g., Kotter 1990; 1996; Alimo-Metcalfe 1995) see leadership as a more widely distributed set of behaviours.

The frustration of many practitioners and researchers (e.g., Kets De Vries 1993; 1995; Kotter 1990; Zaleanik 1992) has stimulated a number of studies which focus on looking at 'What Leaders Do'. In many ways this shift in focus mirrors the earlier frustrations with the theoretical models of management; a frustration which was resolved, to an extent, by the seminal work of Mintzberg (1975), who presented a more practical way of looking at management based on studies of the work of management. This shift in the focus of studies of leadership has led to the emergence of a number of 'models' of leadership based on observed behaviour and practices of leaders. A number of these models share a finding that the differentiators leading to effective leadership are relatively few. For example, Goffee and Jones (2000) identify four critical behaviour categories, Kouzes and Posner (1998) identify five categories and Collins (2001) identifies two critical categories. However, whilst many of these, and other studies, use different terminology there appears a degree of commonality in the core constructs. Indeed a number of these overlap with the constructs embodied in much of the transformational literature. Table 2 summarises the core constructs which appear to be emerging from the research into 'What Leaders Do'.

**Table 2: Core Constructs**

Author	Articulate Vision	Self Awareness	Resilience	Empower Followers	Sensing	Encouraging
Goffee & Jones (2000)		✓	✓		✓	✓
Collins (2001)	✓	✓	✓			
Kouzes & Posner (1998)	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Kotter (1990)	✓		✓	✓		✓
Levinson (1996)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Bass (1985)	✓			✓		✓
Conger & Kanungo (1988)	✓		✓	✓		✓
Alimo-Metcalfe (1995)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tichy & Devamna (1986)	✓			✓		✓
Conner (1999)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

### Leadership and Change

In practice (as outlined above) one of the main focuses of the current interest in leadership relates to the linkage between leadership and the ability of an organisation to manage and deliver significant organisational change (Kotter 1998; Carnall 1999; Higgs & Rowland 2000). Many argue that up to 70 percent of change initiatives fail to deliver expected benefits (e.g. Kotter 1996, 1998; Hammer & Champy 1993; Higgs & Rowland 2000). The explanations for this failure, and the nature of leadership behaviour required to deliver success, are often positioned in relation to successful transformational behaviours (e.g., Kotter, 1996; 1994). However, in spite of identifying generic delivery failures, the above authors tend to avoid specifics in terms of alternative leadership behaviour patterns. Perhaps the issue in addressing proposed routes forward lies with a belief in the role of individual leaders, as an enduring and pervasive set of behaviours, rather than linking leadership behaviours to specific activities in the work involved in making change happen (Higgs & Rowland 2000). In a study of change leaders in a large multi-national Higgs and Rowland (2000; 2001) identified a distinct set of leadership competencies which were associated with the work involved in implementing change successfully. These were:

- i) **Creating the case for change.** Effectively engaging others in recognising the business need for change;

- ii) **Creating structural change.** Ensuring that the change is based on depth of understanding of the issues and supported with a consistent set of tools and processes;
- iii) **Engaging others** in the whole change process and building commitment;
- iv) **Implementing and sustaining changes.** Developing effective plans and ensuring good monitoring and review practices are developed; and
- v) **Facilitating and developing capability.** Ensuring that people are challenged to find their own answers and that they are supported in doing this.

There is general support for the need to look at leadership in a change context (e.g., Ulrich 1997, Antonacopoulou & Fitegerald 1996). However, different views are taken on the nature of change and the leader's role. For example, Kotter (1996) emphasises the leader's role, while Senge et. al. (1999) take a more systemic view. Others (e.g., Carnall 1997) highlight the need for planned programmes.

Whilst the research on leadership and change is still an emerging area (Conner 1999; Chaudry 2000), there is some evidence that a competence-based framework, combined with planned development, can impact on both business results and the building of leadership capability (Higgs & Rowland 2001).

### **Emotional Intelligence (EI) & Leadership**

There is little doubt that the concept of Emotional Intelligence has become a 'hot topic' in the area of organisational behaviour (Higgs & Dulewicz 1999). Whilst attracting a large amount of academic, practitioner and media attention it is evident that the topic is an emerging one with resulting confusion, misunderstanding and differences of opinion on the topic (Higgs & Dulewicz 1999; Dulewicz & Higgs 2000; Woodruffe 2001). Indeed there is, as yet, no agreed definition of the concept (Woodruffe 2001). As Dulewicz, Higgs & Slaski (2001) comment the definitions of EI may be seen as falling into those based on interpretation of the construct as an ability (Salovey & Mayer 1990); a set of competencies (e.g. Goleman 1996) and a personal capabilities approach (e.g., Higgs & Dulewicz 1999; Bar-On 2000). The personal capabilities approach is more easily operationalised whilst retaining psychometric rigour. A definition, using this approach is offered by Higgs & Dulewicz (1999) in which they suggest that Emotional Intelligence is:

'Achieving one's goals through the ability to manage one's own feelings and emotions, to be sensitive to, and influence other key people, and to balance one's motives and drives with conscientious and ethical behaviour' p. 20.

In an extensive review of the literature on Emotional Intelligence Dulewicz and Higgs (2000) identified the core common elements in the overall construct which were subsequently demonstrated in empirical studies (Dulewicz & Higgs 2000). These are:

1. **Self-Awareness.** The awareness of your own feelings and the ability to recognise and manage these.
2. **Emotional Resilience.** The ability to perform well and consistently in a range of situations and when under pressure.

3. **Motivation.** The drive and energy which you have to achieve results, balance short and long-term goals and pursue your goals in the face of challenge and rejection.
4. **Interpersonal Sensitivity.** The ability to be aware of the needs and feelings of others and to use this awareness effectively in interacting with them and arriving at decisions impacting on them.
5. **Influence.** The ability to persuade others to change their viewpoint on a problem, issue or decision.
6. **Intuitiveness.** The ability to use insight and interaction to arrive at and implement decisions when faced with ambiguous or incomplete information.
7. **Conscientiousness and Integrity.** The ability to display commitment to a course of action in the face of challenge, to act consistently and in line with understood ethical requirements.

In a range of research studies Dulewicz and Higgs (1999; 1999b; 2000) have demonstrated that Emotional Intelligence is strongly correlated with individual advancement and success in an organisational setting and with individual performance.

In reviewing the Emotional Intelligence research Higgs & Dulewicz (1999) indicated that there was a developing view that Emotional Intelligence may be strongly related to leadership. A number of assertions to this effect have been made by both researchers in the field of Emotional Intelligence and leading authors on the topic of leadership (e.g. Goleman 1998; 2000; Bennis 1985).

In looking more broadly at leadership and, in particular, the future nature of leadership, a number of authors and researchers have identified the growing significance of Emotional Intelligence (e.g., Cacioppe 1997; Sosik & Magerian 1999; Chaudry 2000). In part, this shift in focus from the rational to emotional aspects of leadership represents the continuation of a trend encountered more broadly in thinking on organisational behaviour and leadership (e.g., Fineman 1997; Goffee & Jones 2000). Indeed, although not explicitly surfaced, much of the literature on transformational leadership implies that leaders require Emotional Intelligence.

In reviewing the more recent literature on leadership and that on Emotional Intelligence there is, on a content analysis basis, a case to be made for the linkage between the two. This is illustrated in Table 3 which provides a 'map' of some of the key leadership models and their potential relationship to the elements of Emotional Intelligence as defined by Higgs and Dulewicz (1999).

**Table 3: Relationships between Leadership ‘Models’ and Emotional Intelligence**

Elements of Emotional Intelligence (from Higgs & Dulewicz 2000)	Leadership Models and Frameworks					
	Bass (1985) Transitional/ Transformational	Alimo-Metcalfe (1995) Leadership Constructs	Goffee & Jones (2000) Four Factors	Kouzes & Posner (1998)	Kotter (1990) - What Leaders Do	Bennis (1985)
Self Awareness		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self – Awareness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reveal differences</li> <li>Selectively show weaknesses</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop Self-Knowledge</li> <li>Develop Feedback Sources</li> </ul>
Emotional Resilience			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tough empathy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Challenges processes</li> <li>Enable others</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Balance change &amp; transition</li> <li>Learn from adversity</li> </ul>
Motivation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Charismatic Leadership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achieving, determined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tough empathy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Challenge Processes</li> <li>Model the way</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Motivating and inspiring</li> <li>Setting directions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Role model</li> </ul>
Interpersonal Sensitivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual Consideration</li> <li>Charismatic Leadership</li> <li>Intellectual Stimulation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration for the Individual</li> <li>Sensitive Change Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tough empathy</li> <li>Selectively show weaknesses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Challenge processes</li> <li>Inspire shared vision</li> <li>Enable others</li> <li>Model the way</li> <li>Encourage the heart</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aligning people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open style</li> </ul>
Influence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Charismatic leadership</li> <li>Individual consideration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Networking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reveal differences</li> <li>Tough empathy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inspire shared vision</li> <li>Enable others</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aligning people</li> <li>Motivating and inspiring</li> <li>Setting direction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open style</li> </ul>
Intuitiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intellectual Stimulation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decisive, achieving</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intuition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inspire shared vision</li> <li>Encourage the heart</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity to concentrate</li> <li>Curious about innovation</li> </ul>
Conscientiousness & Integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual consideration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrity and openness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tough empathy</li> <li>Reveal differences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Model the way</li> <li>Encourage the heart</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aligning people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Role model</li> </ul>

---

**SUMMARY**

From the foregoing review it is evident that leadership is a topic which is increasingly important to organisations. However, as many authors have pointed out, the concept of leadership is extremely hard to define and operationalise (e.g., Kets De Vries 1993; 1995; Levinson 1996). The challenge is captured effectively in the following observation:

‘Leadership is like beauty, it is hard to define but you know it when you see it’ (Levinson 1996, p. 158).

The history of leadership studies is somewhat chequered and, in many ways, difficult to categorise. The transformational model has come close to identifying the boundaries of leadership thinking in today’s organisations. However, making sense of this model has led to a stream of work which attempts to examine what leaders actually do (Kotter 1990; Collins 2001; Goffe & Jones 2000). Whilst some commonalities emerge from this work it has still not led to an agreed and proven behavioural model. This, perhaps, is unsurprising given the range, complexity and diversity of organisations and markets (Kets De Vries 1995). The problem faced by researchers in this area may be summarised aptly by the following observation:

‘Leadership in action is characterised as much by its complications and subtleties as by its dramatic success or failure stories’ (Kotter 1990, p. 58).

The nature of organisations today, and the consequent demands on leadership, suggest that leadership needs to be understood in a change context (Kotter 1990; Higgs & Rowland 2000). Indeed, some argue that the emergence of interest in leadership is totally associated with the need to manage and implement change effectively (Kotter 1990).

The recent emergence of interest in the concept of Emotional Intelligence and its relevance to organisations (Higgs & Dulewicz 1999) has now moved into the leadership arena (Goleman 1998; Higgs & Dulewicz 1999). This stream of work, combined with developments in leadership research, and increasing interest in the role of Self-Awareness (e.g. Fletcher 1997), is suggesting that a potential relationship exists between Emotional Intelligence and Change Leadership. However, many authors identify the need for further research to explore these potential relationships (e.g., Kotter 1990; Channer & Hope 2001; Higgs & Dulewicz 1999; Bagshaw & Bagshaw 1999; Susik & Margeriam 1999).

**Research Questions & Hypotheses**

From the above brief review of the literature on leadership, change and Emotional Intelligence, a number of areas for research are evident. The core question which seems to arise is:

Is there a relationship between Emotional Intelligence and the competencies required to lead change?

In answering this question it is helpful to consider the model of change leadership competencies, developed by Higgs & Rowland (2000) which is rooted in research into both change management and leadership and which they argue reflects a combination of theoretical rigour and practical relevance. From the overall review it is feasible to hypothesise a number of relationships between this model and the Higgs & Dulewicz (1999) model of the elements of Emotional Intelligence which is suggested above also provides a rigorous and relevant approach to operationalising the construct. The nature of the hypothesised relationships between these two models is summarised in Table 4.

**Table 4: Hypothesised Relationships between Change Leadership Competencies (Higgs & Rowland 2000) and Emotional Intelligence (Higgs & Dulewicz 1999)**

Emotional Intelligence Elements	Change Leadership Competency Groups					
	Creating the Case	Structural Change	Engagement & Commitment	Implementing Change	Facilitating & Developing Capabilities	Overall Competencies
Self Awareness	+	+	+	+	+	+
Emotional Resilience		+		+	+	+
Motivation	+	+	-	+	-	+
Interpersonal Sensitivity	+		+	+	+	+
Influence	+	+	+	+	+	+
Intuitiveness	+		+	-	+	+
Conscientiousness & Integrity	+		+	+	+	+
Overall EI	+	+	+	+	+	+

Key + = positive relationship

- = negative relationship

In reviewing these proposed relationships, there is an over-arching hypothesis that there will be a clear and positive relationship between an individual's Emotional Intelligence and their overall Change Leadership Competencies.

## Methodology

It was decided to explore the research question and hypothesised relationships, outlined above, using a quantitative approach. The operationalisation of Emotional Intelligence was carried out by using the self-assessment Managerial version of the EIQ (Dulewicz & Higgs 1999b). This instrument was chosen due to its position in relation to the range of views on the nature of Emotional Intelligence (see above). The instrument has been demonstrated to have both construct and predictive validity and an acceptable reliability (Dulewicz & Higgs 1999b).

The Change Leadership Competency framework was operationalised using the questionnaire reported by Higgs and Rowland (2001) which had acceptable reported reliabilities in relation to each scale (Higgs & Rowland 2001). This instrument was selected as, within the literature, there appeared to be an absence of a clear and reliable alternative to operationalising change leadership (Higgs & Rowland 2000).

## Results

The results of the study are reported below.

The study sample comprised some 70 participants from a range of private sector organisations who had completed the Change Leadership Competency questionnaire (CLCQ) and the self-assessment Managerial EIQ. Details of the sample are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5 — Sample Description for CLC: EIQ Analysis**

Sample Size	70
Mean Age	35.3 years
Standard Deviation	3.8 years
Male	61.2%
Female	38.8%

The scores for the two questionnaires were correlated, using a Pearson Product Moment correlation, in terms of overall scores and individual scale scores. The correlation results are shown in Table 6.

**Table 6: Results of Analysis of EIQ versus Change Leadership Competencies (CLCQ)****Emotional Intelligence**

Change Leadership Competencies (CLC)	Emotional Intelligence							
	EI Total	Self-Aware	Emotional Resilience	Motivation	Interpersonal Sensitivity	Influence	Intuitiveness	Conscientiousness
Creating the Case	<b>0.333</b> (0.025)	<b>0.388</b> (0.008)	0.249 (0.100)	<b>0.340</b> (0.022)	<b>0.298</b> (0.047)	<b>0.332</b> (0.026)	-0.113 (0.461)	<b>0.306</b> (0.041)
Structural Change	0.269 (0.074)	<b>0.461</b> (0.001)	0.189 (0.214)	<b>0.290</b> (0.054)	<b>0.362</b> (0.015)	0.225 (0.138)	-0.131 (0.391)	0.208 (0.170)
Engagement	0.287 (0.056)	<b>0.326</b> (0.029)	0.176 (0.246)	0.268 (0.075)	<b>0.346</b> (0.020)	<b>0.368</b> (0.013)	-0.144 (0.344)	<b>0.317</b> (0.034)
Implementation	<b>0.418</b> (0.004)	<b>0.445</b> (0.002)	<b>0.311</b> (0.038)	<b>0.391</b> (0.008)	<b>0.381</b> (0.010)	<b>0.371</b> (0.012)	-0.043 (0.780)	0.279 (0.063)
Facilitation	<b>0.333</b> (0.025)	<b>0.483</b> (0.001)	<b>0.325</b> (0.029)	<b>0.308</b> (0.040)	<b>0.384</b> (0.009)	0.241 (0.111)	-0.162 (0.287)	0.286 (0.056)
Overall Change Competency	<b>0.377</b> (0.011)	<b>0.486</b> (0.001)	0.284 (0.059)	<b>0.367</b> (0.013)	<b>0.411</b> (0.005)	<b>0.354</b> (0.017)	-0.134 (0.381)	<b>0.317</b> (0.034)

Key ( ) = significance level  
**Bold** = statistically significant

From Table 6 it is evident that clear relationships exist between EI and Change Leadership Competencies (as measured by the CLCQ). Of the seven EI elements there are positive and significant relationships with all except Intuitiveness. At the overall level there are clear relationships between EI and Change Leadership (as measured by the total CLCQ). Of the potential 48 relationships some 29 are statistically significant (60.4%). This is well in excess

of the minimum of five percent which suggests change relationships (Hair et. al. 1995) and indicates a strong overall level of inter-relationship between the two constructs.

## **Discussion**

A significant number of relationships between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Change Leadership Competencies hypothesised from the review of the literature outlined above are supported by the results of this study. However, it is somewhat surprising that there is no significant relationship between the EI element of Intuitiveness and the elements of Change Leadership (CLC). It was expected that this element would be positively related to Creating the Case and Facilitating and Developing Capabilities as well as the overall EI rating. The literature underpinning this element of the CLC (e.g., Conner 1999) indicated a degree of ambiguity tolerance and related self-belief in decision-making which are essential components of the EI factor of Intuitiveness. These unexpected lack of relationships would appear to warrant further research.

On reflection the relationships between the EI factor of Emotional Resilience and the CLC factor of Creating the Case, which did not emerge from this study, may be explained by the initial high impact of creating the case for change which is subsequently overtaken by other elements of the work of change (Conner 1999; Senge et. al. 1999; Kotter 1996).

The encountered positive relationship between the EI element of Motivation and the CLC element Facilitating and Developing capability is initially somewhat surprising (given the hypothesised negative relationships). However, on further reflection and analysis of the constituent parts of 'Facilitating' it is evident that although the motivation of the facilitator can get in the way of the facilitation process (Higgs & Rowland 2001; Conner 1999), it may well be that high levels of the EI element of Self- Awareness can enable the individual to manage the impact of their own motivation in the process of facilitating change. Furthermore, the high commitment to a long-term goal combined with such a balance may lead to more effective Change Leadership (e.g. Kotter 1996). For similar reasons, the unexpected relationships between the EI factor of Influence and the CLC factors of Structural Change and Facilitation may possibly be understood.

The lack of the relationships between the EI factor of Conscientiousness and Integrity and the CLC factors of Structural Change, Implementation and Facilitation is somewhat surprising. This EI factor includes a strong component of 'modelling the way' which appears, from the literature, to be core to change leadership (e.g., Kotter 1996; Kouzes & Posner 1998; Higgs & Rowland 2000). This is an area which again would appear to warrant further investigation.

The lack of the relationship, at the overall level, between the EI factor of Emotional Resilience and the total CLC score is surprising, given the emphasis by many writers in change leadership (e.g., Conner 1999) on the importance of resilience and the general emphasis on this factor in the leadership literature (e.g., Kets De Vries 1993; 1995). However, the encountered relationships with Change Implementation and Change Facilitation represent the key points at which resistance is encountered (Higgs & Rowland 2000; 2001). The broader literature identifies overcoming barriers to change in the key point in which resilience is encountered (e.g., Kouzes & Posner 1999; Kets De Vries 1995) and thus hypothesising on overall relationships may have been too large a generalisation to have made from the literature.

## CONCLUSIONS

The core research question, which this study was designed to address, was the relationship between Leadership and Emotional Intelligence. The results suggest that such a relationship does indeed exist in the context of Change Leadership. However, the relatively small sample size and limitation to Change Leadership suggests that care is needed in generalising from this research study. Furthermore the use of a self-assessment measure of EI raises issues in relation to the robustness of such a measure (Dulewicz & Higgs 2000). Therefore, further research using a 360 degree assessment of EI (Dulewicz & Higgs 2000) would be important. In addition, further research with larger samples, and in a broader range of sectors, gender mixes and age ranges, would prove to be valuable. In addition further research using alternative leadership models and frameworks would appear to be warranted.

## REFERENCES

- Alimo-Metcalf, B. 1995, 'An investigation of female and male constructs of leadership', *Women in Management Review*, MCB, Bradford.
- Ashforth, B.E. & Humphrey, R. H. 1995, 'Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal', *Human Relations*, 48(2): pp. 97-99.
- Bagshaw, M. & Bagshaw, C. 1999, 'Leadership in the twenty-first century', *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 31 (6) pp. 236–240.
- Bass, M.B. 1990, *Bass and Stodghill Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Applications*, Free Press, New York.
- Bass, B. M. 1985, *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*, Free Press, New York.
- Bass, B. M. 1997, 'Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organisational and national boundaries?', *American Psychologist* 52, pp. 130-139.
- Beer, M. 1980, *Organisational change and development: A systems view*, Goodyear, Santa Monica, CA:
- Bennis, W. 1989, *On Becoming a Leader*, Hutchinson, London.
- Bryman, A. 1992, *Charisma and Leadership in Organisations*, Sage, Santa Monica CA.
- Buchanan, D. & Boddy D. 1992, *The Expertise of the Change Agent*, Prentice Hall, Hemel Hempstead.
- Burns, J. M. 1978, *Leaders' Work*, Harper & Row, New York.
-

- 
- Cacioppe, R. 1997, Leadership Moment by Moment!, *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, 18 (7), pp. 335–346.
- Carnall, C. 1999, *Managing Change in Organisations*, Prentice Hall, London.
- Channer, P. & Hope, T. 2001, *Emotional Impact: Passionate Leaders and Corporate Transformation*, Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- Chaudry, S. 2000, *Management 21C*, Pearson Education, London.
- Collins, J. 2001, 'Level 5 Leadership: The triumph of humility and fierce resolve', *Harvard Business Review*, Jan–Feb, pp. 67–76.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. 1988, 'The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice', *Academy of Management Review*, 13, pp. 471–482.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (eds.) 1988, *Charismatic leadership: the elusive factor in organisational effectiveness*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Conner, D. 1999, *Leading at the Edge of Chaos*, John Wiley, New York.
- Dulewicz, S.V.D. & Higgs, M.J. 2000, 'Emotional Intelligence: a review an evaluation study', *Journal of Managerial Psychology*; 15 (4), pp. 341–368.
- Dulewicz, S.V.D. & Higgs, M.J. 1999, 'Can Emotional Intelligence be measured and developed?', *Leadership and Organisation Development*; 20 (5), pp. 242–252.
- Dulewicz, S.V.D. & Higgs, M.J. 1999b, *EIQ User Manual*, NFER-Nelson, Windsor.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R. & Lowe, A. 1991, *Management Research: An Introduction*, Sage, London.
- Fiedler, F. 1967, *Theory of leadership Effectiveness*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Finkelstein, S. & Hambrick, D. 1996, *Strategic Leadership — Top Executives and Their Influence on Organisations*, West Publishing Company, St. Paul, Min.
- Fineman, S. 1997, 'Emotion and Management Learning', *Management Learning*, 28 (1), pp. 13–25.
- Fletcher, C. 1997, 'Self-Awareness — a neglected attribute in selection and assessment?', *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 5 (3), pp. 183–187.
- Goffee, R. & Jones, G. 2000, 'Why should Anyone be Led by You?', *Harvard Business Review*, Sept–Oct, pp. 63–70.
-

- Goleman, D. 2000, 'Leadership that Gets Results', *Harvard Business Review*; March–April, pp. 78–91.
- Goleman, D. 1998, *Working With Emotional Intelligence*, Bloomsbury, London.
- Goleman, D. 1996, *Emotional Intelligence*, Bloomsbury, London.
- Hair, J., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.T. & Black, W.C. 1995, *Multivariate Data Analysis* (4<sup>th</sup> edition), Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Hambrick, D.C. & Brandon, G. L. 1988, 'Executive Values', in D.C. Hambrick (ed.) *Executive Effectiveness — Concepts and Methods for Studying Top Managers*, JAI Press, Greenwich, Connecticut.
- Hammer, M. & Champy, J. 1993, *Reengineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for Business Revolution*, Harper Collins, New York.
- Heifetz, R.A. & Laurie, D.L. 1997, 'The Work of Leadership', *Harvard Business Review*; Jan-Feb, pp. 71–97.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. 1969, 'Life cycle theory of leadership', *Training and Development Journal*, 23 (5), pp. 26–34.
- Higgs, M.J. & Rowland, D. 2000, 'Building change leadership capability: The quest for change competence', *Journal of Change Management*; 1,2; pp. 116-131.
- Higgs, M.J. & Rowland, D. 2001, 'Developing Change Leadership Capability: The Impact of a Development Intervention', *Henley Working Paper Series*, HWP 2001/004.
- Higgs, M.J. & Dulewicz, S.V.D. 1999, *Making Sense of Emotional Intelligence*, NFER-Nelson, Windsor.
- House, J. 1995, 'Leadership in the twenty-first century: A speculative inquiry', in A. Howard (ed.), *The changing nature of work*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 411-450.
- House, R. J. 1976, 'A theory of charismatic leadership', in J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larsons (eds.), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, IL, p.p. 189-207.
- Kets de Vries, M. 1995, *Life and Death in the Executive Fast Lane*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Kets de Vries, M. F. R. 1994, 'The leadership mystique', *Academy of Management Executive*, 8(3), 73-5.
-

- 
- Kets De Vries, M. R. 1993, *Leaders, Fools, Imposters*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Kotter, J.P. 1990, 'What Leaders Really Do', *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, pp. 37-60.
- Kotter, J.P. 1994, 'Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail', *Harvard Business Review*, May – June, pp. 11–16.
- Kouzes & Posner 1998, *Encouraging the Heart*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Levinson, H. 1996, 'The leader as analyser', *Harvard Business Review*, January/February, pp. 63–70.
- Mintzberg, H. 1975, 'The Manager's Job; Folklore and Fact', *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, pp. 1–36.
- Norusis, M. J. 1994, *SPSS Advanced Statistics 6.1*, SPSS Inc, Chicago.
- Saville, P., Holdsworth, R., Nyfield, G., Cramp, L. & Mabey, W. 1993, *Occupational Personality Questionnaire Manual*, SHL, Esher.
- Seltzer, J. & Bass, B.M. 1990, 'Transformational leadership: beyond initiation and consideration', *Journal of Management*, 16, pp. 693-703.
- Senge, R., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., Roth, G. & Smith, B. 1999, *The Dance of Change*, Nicholas Brealey, New York.
- Senge, P. 1990, *The Fifth Discipline*, Doubleday, New York.
- Shamir, B. 1992, 'Attribution of influence and charisma to the leader', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(5), 386-407.
- Sosik, J.J. & Magerian, L.E. 1999, 'Understanding leader Emotional Intelligence and performance', *Group and Organisation Management*, 24 (3), pp.67–391.
- Tannenbaum, R. & Schmidt, W.H. 1958, 'How to choose a leadership pattern', *HarvardBusiness Review*, 36, 2, March-April: pp. 95-101.
- Tichy, N. M. & Devanna, M.A. 1986, *The Transformational Leader*, John Wiley, New York.
- Ulrich, D. 1997, 'HR of the Future: Conclusions and Observations', *HR Management*, 36 (1), pp. 175–179.
- Williams, M. 2000, *The War for Talent*, IPD, London.
-

Wright, G. & Fowler, C. 1986, *Investigative and Design Statistics*, Penguin Books, Middlesex.

Zaleanik, A. 1992, 'Managers and Leaders: Are They Different?', *Harvard Business Review*, March/April, pp. 126–35.