Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Dissertations

Graduate Research

2016

The Relationship Between Leaders' Emotional Intelligence and Employees' Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Job-Related Affective Well-Being at Andrews University

Robert L. Overstreet

Andrews University, overstrr@andrews.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Overstreet, Robert L., "The Relationship Between Leaders' Emotional Intelligence and Employees' Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Job-Related Affective Well-Being at Andrews University" (2016). *Dissertations*. 1620.

<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/1620>

<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/dissertations/1620>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERS' EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE
AND EMPLOYEES' ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR
AND JOB-RELATED AFFECTIVE WELL-BEING AT
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

by

Robert Overstreet

Chair: Jay Brand

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

School of Education

Title: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERS' EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND EMPLOYEES' ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND JOB-RELATED AFFECTIVE WELL-BEING AT ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

Name of researcher: Robert L. Overstreet

Name and degree of faculty chair: Jay Brand, Ph.D.

Date completed: November 2016

Problem

Research has been conducted linking high levels of Emotional Intelligence (EI) in leaders with organizational success. However, the link between leaders' EI levels and workplace climate (as evidenced by employees' Job-related Affective Well-being [JAW] and Organizational Citizenship Behavior [OCB] levels) has not been adequately understood. This study sought to improve the understanding of how employee affective well-being and citizenship behaviors are related to leaders' EI, with additional consideration given to how the gender of those leaders may affect that relationship.

Method

A quantitative correlational research method has been chosen as an appropriate method for the research study in which a relationship or link is sought between Andrews University (AU) leaders' EI as indicated by the results of the *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)* and their team-members' JAW, as measured by the *Job Affective Well-being Scale's (JAWS)* and OCB, as measured by the *Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C)*, with leader gender as a moderating factor. In addition to descriptive analyses, two canonical correlation analyses were conducted, one in which leader gender was not included as an independent variable and one in which leader gender was included.

Results

Scores on the *MSCEIT* indicate that AU leaders in general are relatively weak at recognizing how they feel and how those around them feel, as neither the composite, nor the male or female groups, scored in the competent range on any of the EI branches; however, in no areas did they score as needing improvement, indicating that leaders in the sample have a functional EI that is similar to that of the normative population.

On the *JAWS*, the team members' total mean score is 2.79 ($SD= 0.29$). AU team members' negative emotion scores (2.20) are lower than those reported by Rode (2.44), while AU team members' positive emotion scores (3.33) are considerably higher (2.63).

The total mean score for *OCB-C* is 2.83 ($SD=0.36$) while the total mean score for the *JAWS* is 2.79 ($SD= 0.29$). The highest average of the *OCB-C* test was in the Organizational Citizenship Behavior—Acts Benefiting Organization (OCB-o) with a mean score of male and female ($n=80$) of 2.95 ($SD=0.70$), which is lower than the levels

found in two other studies that have also used the *OCB-C*. Both male ($n=31$, $M=2.87$, $SD=0.66$). Subsequent analysis using Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) showed that OCB-o and Organizational Citizenship Behavior—Acts Benefiting Person (OCB-p) are very highly correlated and measure basically the same thing in this population.

Two canonical correlation analyses were conducted to answer the third and fourth research questions. The third question asked: What is the nature of the relationship between AU leaders' EI levels as measured by the *MSCEIT* test of EI and their team members' JAW, as measured by the *JAWS* two subscales: positive and negative emotional experiences, and their team members' OCB, as measured by the OCB subscales: OCB-o and OCB-p? The CCA performed to answer this question yielded unexpected results that indicate that lower levels of Perceiving, Using, and Understanding emotions in AU leaders produce higher levels of positive emotions towards work and lower levels of negative emotions towards work. A second CCA was completed to answer: What role does the gender of the AU leaders play in the relationship between AU leaders' EI and their team members' levels of JAW and OCB? Results indicate that employees who have lower levels of positive emotions and higher levels of negative emotions are associated with female leaders with lower levels of EI.

Conclusion

EI at AU can be linked to some aspects of organizational climate. This study's findings in the first canonical correlation did not yield expected results, but the second CCA, which included gender, indicates that employees who have lower levels of positive emotions and higher levels of negative emotions are associated with leaders with lower levels of EI and being female.

These results align closely with the Higher Education Work Climate (HEWC) Model developed to explain the relationship between the variables in this study.

Andrews University

School of Education

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERS' EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND
EMPLOYEES' ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND JOB-
RELATED AFFECTIVE WELL-BEING AT ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Robert L. Overstreet

November 2016

© Copyright by Robert L. Overstreet 2016
All Rights Reserved

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERS' EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND
EMPLOYEES' ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AND JOB-
RELATED AFFECTIVE WELL-BEING AT ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Robert L. Overstreet

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Chair: Jay Brand

Dean, School of Education
Robson Marhino

Member: David Caruso

Member: Jimmy Kijai

External:

Date approved

DEDICATION

To my best friend, life partner, wife, Tammy Overstreet. Thank you for the tremendous support you have shown me throughout this process and your unswerving determination for me to finish. I could not have done it without you! I love you!

To Laura and Rebecca, thank you for your patience with me as I have completed this journey. I wanted to make you proud because I love you so much.

To God, be all the glory!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of Problem.....	6
Purpose of the Study	8
Conceptual Framework.....	9
Research Questions	11
Significance of the Study	12
Definition of Terms.....	13
Limitations and Delimitations.....	15
Summary	17
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	19
Emotional Intelligence: An Overview	19
Defining Emotional Intelligence.....	19
History of Emotional Intelligence.....	22
Current Theoretical Models and Perspectives	24
The Emotional Intelligence Personality-based Model	25
The Emotional Intelligence Competency-based Model	26
The Emotional Intelligence Ability-based Model.....	27
Measuring Emotional Intelligence	28
The Effect of Emotional Intelligence on Leadership	29
EI and Gender	36
Controversies Regarding EI.....	39
Organizational Climate	41
Job-related Affective Well-being.....	44

Job-related Affective Well-being and Leadership	49
Measuring Job-related Affective Well-being.....	50
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	52
Measuring OCB	56
Organizational Climate and JAWS and OCB.....	57
Final Key Analysis.....	59
 3. METHODOLOGY	 62
General Introduction	62
The Research Questions.....	62
Research Design.....	63
Population and Sample	64
Definition of Variables	65
Instrumentation	66
Instrument 1: Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence	
Test (MSCEIT)	66
MSCEIT General Description.....	67
MSCEIT Structure, Scoring, and Interpretation	67
MSCEIT Reliability and Validity.	74
Instrument 2: Organizational Citizenship Behavior	
Checklist (OCB-C).....	75
OCB-C General Description.	75
OCB-C Structure, Scoring, and Interpretation.....	76
OCB-C Reliability and Validity.....	76
Instrument 3: Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS)	77
JAWS General Description.....	77
JAWS Structure, Scoring, and Interpretation	77
JAWS Reliability and Validity	78
Procedure.	78
Ethical Considerations.	80
Data Gathering.....	80
Gathering Leaders' EI Data	80
Gathering Organizational Climate Data Using the	
JAWS and OCB	80
Data Analysis	81
Summary	82
 4. RESULTS.	 83
Introduction.....	83
Description of the Sample.....	83
Results by Research Question.....	87
AU Leaders' EI Levels	87
Team Member JAW and OCB.....	90
CCA 1 Function 1	99
CCA 1 Function 2	101

CCA 2	102
CCA 2 Function 1	105
CCA 2 Function 2	106
Summary of Major Findings.....	107
 5. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 110
Introduction.....	110
Purpose of the Study	111
Summary of Literature Review	111
Summary of the Methodology	115
Research Questions	115
Research Design.....	116
Summary of the Major Findings	117
Discussion of Major Findings	124
Conclusion	136
Recommendations.....	136
For Practice	136
For Future Research.....	137
 Appendices.....	 138
A. Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C).....	139
B. Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS).....	140
C. Survey Introductory Materials	141
D. Email to AU Leaders	142
E. Email to AU Team Members.....	143
F. Email to AU Team Members.....	144
G. Informed Consent Agreement: AU Leaders	145
H. Informed Consent Agreement: AU Team Members.....	147
 REFERENCE LIST	 149
 VITA.....	 166

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test.....	69
2.	MSCEIT EIQ and Qualitative Ranges	69
3.	Reliability of MSCEIT and Its Subareas and Branches.....	75
4.	Demographics AU Leaders.....	85
5.	Demographics of AU Team Leaders	86
6.	AU Leaders' MSCEIT Results	88
7.	AU Leaders' EI and Gender	89
8.	AU Team Members' OCB and JAWS.....	91
9.	AU Team Members' OCB, JAWS, and Gender	92
10.	OCB-p Item Statistics	93
11.	OCB-o Item Statistics	94
12.	JAWS Item Statistics (Positive and Negative).....	95
13.	EI With JAWS (Positive and Negative), OCB-o, and OCB-p Inter-correlations.....	97
14.	EI With JAWS (Positive and Negative), OCB-o, and OCB-p CCA	99
15.	EI by Gender With JAWS (Positive and Negative), OCB-o, and OCB-p Inter-correlations	102
16.	EI by Gender With JAWS (Positive and Negative), OCB-o, and OCB-p.....	104
17.	AU Team Members' OCB and JAWS by Gender of Leader.....	130

18.	AU Team Members' OCB & JAWS by Leader Type	131
19.	AU Team Members' OCB & JAWS by Leader Type by Gender	133
20.	AU Leaders' Total EI by Job Type.....	134

LIST OF FIGURES

1.	Higher Education Work Climate (HEWC) Model.....	10
2.	Perceiving Emotions Question Type on the MSCEIT	71
3.	Using Emotions Question Type on the MSCEIT	72
4.	Understanding Emotions Question Type on the MSCEIT	72
5.	Managing Emotions Question Type on the MSCEIT	73

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AU	Andrews University
CCA	Canonical Correlation Analysis
EI	Emotional Intelligence
EQ	Emotional Quotient
EQ-I	Emotional Quotient Inventory
ESI	Emotional Social Intelligence
ECI 2.0	Emotional Competence Inventory 2.0
ECR	Emotional Capital Report
EIQ	Emotional Intelligent Quotient
EEIQ	Experiencing Emotions Intelligent Quotient
HEWC	Higher Education Work Climate
HPHA	High Pleasure High Arousal
HPLA	High Pleasure High Arousal
IQ	Intelligent Quotient
IRB	International Review Board
JAW	Job Affective Well-Being
JAWS	Job Affective Well-Being Scale
LPHA	Low Pleasure High Arousal
LPLA	Low Pleasure Low Arousal

<i>MSCEIT</i>	<i>Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test</i>
OCB	Organizational Citizenship Behavior
<i>OCB-C</i>	<i>Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist</i>
OCB-o	Organizational Citizenship Behavior—Acts Benefiting Organization
OCB-p	Organizational Citizenship Behavior—Acts Benefiting Person
PWB	Personal Well-Being
SEIQ	Strategic Emotion Intelligent Quotient
SWB	Subjective Well-Being
TMMS	Trait Meta-Mood Scale

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank first and foremost my eternal friend, Jesus Christ. Without his guidance, this journey would not have been possible. Secondly, I would like to thank my best friend and wife, Tammy Overstreet. She has truly been the rock of my life and I will be forever grateful for her never-ending belief that I could get this completed. Also, my two daughters, Laura and Rebecca. These two young ladies have brought a new meaning to my life and have certainly made great sacrifices for me to accomplish this task. Also, this journey would not have been possible without the support and guidance of my committee members. Thank you, Dr. Jay Brand, for your commitment to excellence, your global perspective, and your eye for detail. Thank you, Dr. Jimmy Kijai, for guiding every step of my research process, making this work seem doable while feeding my interest in future research. Thank you, Dr. David Caruso, for opening my eyes to a life-long passion (The topic of emotions) and helping me to stay enthusiastic about my topic and energized about the work I had to do to see this to the end. You all made me feel like a professional researcher.

I also wish to thank all the Andrews University leaders and the Andrews University team members for their willingness to complete the *MSCEIT* and *JAWS/OCB-C* survey.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Scholars and lay people alike believe that leaders have a tremendous effect on the success or failure of their organization's mission (Abdul & Ehiobuche, 2011; Akerjordet & Severninson, 2010; Barbuto & Burbach, 2006; Bird & Sultmann, 2010; Bradberry & Greaves, 2005; Butler & Chinowsky, 2006; Delmatoff & Lazarus, 2014; Feather, 2009; Kreitz, 2009; Parker, 2008; Ramchunder & Martins, 2014; Sewell, 2009). Of particular interest to many researchers is the search for a link between leadership/leader characteristics and organizational success (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987; Yukl, 2002).

Although numerous traits and behaviors of leaders and elements of leadership have been studied and reported in this regard, one aspect in particular has constituted a recent focus: emotional intelligence (EI), which is the capacity that an individual has for learning about, understanding, and attending to his or her own emotions and those of others (Mayer, 1999; Mayer & Caruso, 2008; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004a). As a result of this initial success, EI in the workplace has engendered much attention over the past decade (Tofighi, Tirgari, Fooladvandi, Rasouli, & Jalali, 2015). Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts (2004) urge: "over three decades of psychological assessment research has vindicated the importance of taking social and emotional traits into consideration when attempting to predict occupational effectiveness" (p. 388). This increased scrutiny hassled

to discoveries that leaders' EI may account for facets of job-related performance and to organizations' fiscal and operational success that cannot be fully accounted for by other concepts (Jafri, Dem, & Choden, 2016; Mayer, 2001; Peterson et al., 2003; Watkin, 2002). Researchers increasingly view EI as an important workplace construct in the study of leadership as well as of organizational success (Jordan & Troth, 2011).

Although leaders' can impact their organizations in powerful ways, employees do so as well. The success of organizations, whether large or small, depends upon both leaders and employee (team members). The complex interplay between leaders' decision-making skills, ability to communicate and inspire others to embrace their vision of the organization's mission, and relationship-building abilities affects employees' work behaviors and feelings towards their jobs, which, in turn, affects the successful accomplishment of organizational mission (Dasborough, 2006; Farooqui, 2012; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002).

Leaders with high EI are adept at recognizing feelings in themselves and others, which enables them to manage their emotions as well as to perceive and respond well to the emotions of others (Goleman, 1998; Mayer et al., 2004a, 2004b). Among other advantages, when leaders have high EI, they are able to use this ability to guide their thoughts and actions and to build relationships with others (Hernon & Rossiter, 2006). Dulewicz and Higgs' (2003) research on leaders' EI found: "the higher one rises within an organization, the more important EI becomes" (p. 199). Mayer et al. (2004b; 2012) state that intelligent, rational decision-making can be facilitated by emotions, which can result in more appropriate behavior. Further, these researchers stress that if leaders can manage their emotions, they increase the chances that their decisions will be more easily

embraced by those that follow, because a leader's attitudes and behaviors can positively or negatively influence employees. The ability to manage emotions will greatly enhance the ability to build positive relationships, manage conflict, and thus provide improved outcomes for the organization (Yuan, Hus, Shieh, & Li, 2012).

Some leaders mistakenly believe that emotions have no place in the workplace and should be ignored or hidden. However, ignoring the fact that leaders and employees are emotional beings is detrimental to the development of a complete account of how the human element affects organizational success. A recognition that leaders with high EI do not suppress emotions but rather manage them and an understanding that the ability to do this well has an impact on employees is crucial.

Leaders with high EI use their personal emotional management skills in ways that positively impact their organizations and employees particularly through the ways they let their emotional management affect their decision-making. According to Caruso and Salovey (2004), "This is the challenge of emotion management—neither to suppress feelings nor to vent them but to reflect on them, integrate them with our thinking, and use them as a source of information and an inspiration for intelligent decision making" (p. 73). Leaders must make numerous decisions, and those decisions necessarily impact employees. When employees can embrace their leaders' decisions, which were processed at both the cognitive and emotional levels, they are more likely to have a positive emotional reaction to their jobs and thus higher levels of JAW. These positive feelings could affect the employees' willingness to go above and beyond the required parameters of their jobs, as evidenced through such things as their conscientiousness, altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach.,

1990). Why are such behaviors, known in the literature as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB), important to organizations? Although the impact of these behaviors on organizational success may be difficult to directly evaluate, many would agree that employees with higher levels of them would likely have a positive impact on their organization's success while those with lower levels would likely not have the same positive influence and may in some cases have a negative impact (Farooqui, 2012; Johnson, 2011; Lo & Ramayah, 2009; Maamari & Messara, 2012; Truxillo, Erdogan, Bauer, & Hammer, 2009; Van Lent, 2013; Vandewaa & Turnipseed, 2012; Yuan et al., 2012).

In addition to improving the quality and acceptance of decisions, high EI levels permit leaders to better support and relate to employees, which allows those workers to perform at higher levels (Collins, 2013; Goleman, 2004). Well-supported employees not only have a more positive emotional reaction to their jobs, but they also contribute to a positive climate within the workplace through their willingness to engage in behaviors not required by their jobs; employees volunteer these discretionary accomplishments irrespective of reward or punishment. Employees exhibiting this type of behavior contributes to the social and psychological environment of the workplace above and beyond their job requirements (Farooqui, 2012; Organ & Konovsky, 1988). Therefore, the positive emotional reactions towards their jobs (JAW) and the levels of behaviors that contribute positively to the workplace environment that go above and beyond job requirements (OCB) of employees whose leaders have high EI should both be higher than for employees who have leaders with lower EI (Adnan, Chaudhry, & Malik, 2012; Carmelli, 2003). Furthermore, the combination of employee satisfaction and greater OCB

should lead to higher levels of organizational success (Peterson et al., 2003; Shapiro, 2009).

In some occupations, a leader's EI may be even more impactful than others. Hochschild (1983) coined the phrase *emotional labor*, which means the work required when employees must display certain emotions towards customers and others at their place of employment. According to Newman and Smith (2014), in fields that require high emotional labor, such as nursing, law enforcement, and education, leaders and employees benefit from having a high EI. Even when leaders are less on the front lines than employees in dealing with customer service and caring assignments, EI levels of leaders are critical because leaders with high EI create a sense in their employees of being valued (Glasser, 1998). When employees feel valued by their leader, their feelings about their jobs are more positive, improving their loyalty to the organization and their job satisfaction (Barbuto & Burbach, 2006; Gholami et al., 2015; Sand, Cangemi, & Ingram, 2011), feelings which they reciprocate in their dealings with those they serve (Wang, 2009). Further, according to LeBaron (2003), 65% of performance problems at work happen because of some type of conflict: personal conflicts, internal politics, different work styles, and stress. Leaders who exhibit strong EI abilities are better at recognizing early stages of such conflict and can properly and proactively mediate to prevent disruptions to organizational outcomes. Additionally, employees may emulate this style of emotional management and thus be better able to make good decisions, build positive relationships, manage conflict, and thus provide improved outcomes for the organization (Yuan et al., 2012).

Much of the research on the link between leaders' EI and organizational success

as viewed through employees' emotional feelings toward their work and their willingness to go above and beyond their job requirements has been done in non-educational settings. In the construction industry (Barling, Slater, & Kelloway, 2000) and in the nursing industry (Eason, 2009; Feather, 2009), the link between leaders' EI and organizational success, employees' levels of well-being and organizational citizenship has been clearly established. More research needs to be done within educational contexts on this link. According to Greenockle (2010), it has become important for academic leaders to understand the role EI plays in leadership effectiveness. In educational settings, a leader's work is often to inspire a shared vision and to elicit high levels of teamwork to accomplish that vision—tasks which cannot be accomplished through a top-down approach. Leaders must understand how their own EI can influence employees and affect organizational outcomes (Gardner & Stough 2002).

Statement of the Problem

Some scholars have speculated that emotionally intelligent leaders account for more successful organizations, greater job satisfaction for employees, and more loyal staff than leaders lacking in EI (Bradberry & Greaves, 2005; Hernon & Rossiter, 2006). Over the past decade, researchers have revealed that in the business world, a positive association exists between effective organizations and leaders' EI (Caruso, & Salovey 2004; Van Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2004). Leaders who exhibit high levels of EI tend to perform at a higher level than their colleagues with low EI (Bradberry & Greaves, 2005).

The link between leaders' EI and success of organizations has been studied previously (Abdul & Ehiobuche, 2011; Barbuto & Burbach, 2006; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Benjamin, Gulliya, & Crispo, 2012; Collins, 2013; Cote, Lopes, Salovey, & Miners,

2010; Delmatoff & Lazarus, 2014; Furnham & Petrides, 2003; Gardner & Stough, 2002; Miller, 1999; Shapiro, 2009). The link between organizational climate and organizational success has also been the subject of previous research (Acikgoz, Gunsell, Bayyurt, & Kuzey, 2014; Fineman, 1975; Lin, 2006; Popa, 2011). The link between organizational climate and employees' JAW and OCB has also been demonstrated (Farooqui, 2012; Ghanbari & Eskandari, 2013; Maamari & Messara, 2012). However, research examining the relationship between the EI of university leaders and workplace climate as viewed through the lens of employees' JAW and OCB is lacking.

The common understanding regarding the emotions of employees in the 20th century has been that happy workers are equivalent to productive workers (Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986). A wide-ranging study by Lyubomirsky, King, and Diener (2005) found that a person's tendency to experience encouraging emotions and moods is associated with positive work performance actions, better supervisory evaluations, higher income, and increased ability to negotiate benefits within the organization. The term OCB suggests positive contributions made to the social and psychological environment of the workplace through one's behavior beyond that required by one's job description (Farooqui, 2012), which may be especially important in an educational setting. Business, school, and university leaders as well as their employees must be able to understand the interests and views of students, staff, parents, and other constituents within the school system and respond to those in an emotionally intelligent manner. Further, leaders should be cognizant of employees' levels of JAW and their OCB and the importance of both to schools, businesses or universities. Anderson (2008) states that a strong correlation exists between low levels of JAW and poor performance of employees. Mayer, Salovey, and

Caruso (2004b) suggest that in situations where “the maintenance of positive personal commitments is important to success” (p. 209), EI enhances job performance.

According to Johnson and Stevens (2006), schools in which leaders or team members perceive a positive climate with a high degree of relational involvement and an innovative atmosphere have better student achievement, a worthy goal in any educational setting. Thus, it is reasonable to connect school climate as measured through employees’ JAW and OCB with students’ performance levels, further illuminating the need to examine this relationship in a higher education setting, since student performance is a crucial outcome for colleges and universities.

Additionally, research has been conducted linking high levels of EI in leaders with organizational success. However, the link between leaders’ EI levels and workplace climate (as evidenced by employees’ JAW and OCB levels) has not been researched adequately. This study seeks to add to the understanding of how leaders’ EI levels are linked to employees’ JAW and OCB, with additional consideration given to how the gender of those leaders may affect that relationship.

Purpose of the Study

This study was conducted to investigate how the EI of leaders affects organizational climate in regards to employees’ emotions about their work and their helping behaviors at work with additional consideration given to how the gender of leaders may influence this relationship. To measure leaders’ EI, the *Mayer Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)* was administered to AU leaders. Each leader’s employees’ JAW was measured using the *Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS)*, an instrument developed by Van Katwyk, Fox, Spector, and Kelloway (2000) as

well as their OCB using the *Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C)* (Lee & Allen, 2002).

The current study presents four independent variables, the EI branch scores of each AU leader, which were measured by the *MSCEIT*, and four dependent variables: the JAW levels of positive and negative emotions of employees who work for each leader, which were measured by the *JAWS*; and the two subscales of OCB of employees who work for each leader, as measured by the *OCB-C*: Organizational Citizenship Behaviors—Acts Benefitting Person (OCB-p) and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors—Acts Benefitting Organization (OCB-o). One moderating factor was also considered: gender of leaders.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual context used to explain the relationships between the variables in this study is the Higher Education Work Climate Model (HEWC) that I developed (see Figure 1). This framework includes the four-branch ability model of EI (Mayer et al., 2004b), which considers EI as an ability that can be developed. This model includes four branches of EI: Perceiving Emotions, Using Emotions to Facilitate Thought, Understanding Emotions, and Managing Emotions. The HEWC provides a meaningful framework for considering the relationship between the variables in this study: leaders' EI levels to employees' JAW and OCB levels.

This model of EI enhances the work of Gardener (1983) who urged that intelligence can come in multiple forms, and that of Mayer and Mitchell (1998) and Mayer and Salovey (2004), who theorized that one category of intelligences are those that operate on personal, social, practical, and emotional data (as cited in Mayer et al., 2004b).

Figure 1. Higher Education Work Climate (HEWC) Model.

Theory regarding the general construct of intelligence, according to Fancher (1985), has its roots in the work of Binet, Thorndike, and Wechsler who sought to define and measure intelligence as a psychometric property (as cited in Mayer et al., 2004b; Wechsler, 1997). Further back in the past, Darwin's evolutionary theory provides the foundation for this field by relating emotions to categories of relationships and the manner in which mammals came to appraise those relationships in terms of survival of the fittest (as cited in Mayer et al., 2004b).

Bandura's (1986) social learning theory further supports this conceptual framework. Humans observe and imitate others and can learn by observing the positive and negative outcomes of behaviors of others. Leaders with high EI can serve as positive role models for employees, further enhancing workplace climate by modeling the appropriate management of emotions and perceiving of emotions in others and

responding appropriately (Yuan et al., 2012).

Because leaders' EI has been linked to enhanced organizational climate (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005; Mayer et al., 2004b; Newman & Smith, 2014), which can be linked to employees' JAW and OCB (Gholami et al., 2015), analysis of the relationship among these three variables is important. Additionally, because the level of importance of EI on relationships between employers and employees has been linked to gender (Farooqui, 2012; Gholami et al., 2015), the study of this construct as a potential moderating factor is also important. Therefore, if these considerations have merit, and the above assumptions, taken together, theoretically match and undergird this study's purpose, then it follows that if a leader has high levels of EI, his or her employees should have higher levels of affective well-being and OCB. Leaders with lower levels of EI will have employees with lower levels of JAWS positive and negative emotions and OCB-o and OCB-p. Additionally, in spite of some literature suggesting a possible role for gender in these predictions, I did not expect this relationship to be affected by gender.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer several related research questions: What is the level of EI among selected leaders at AU? What is the level of JAW and OCB of the members of selected leaders at AU? What is the nature of the relationship between AU leaders' EI levels as measured by the *MSCEIT* test of EI and their team members' JAW, as measured by the *JAWS*' two subscales: positive and negative emotional experiences, and their team members' OCB, as measured by the *OCB-C* subscales: OCB-o and OCB-p? What role does the gender of the AU leaders play in the relationship between AU leaders' EI and their team members' levels of JAW and OCB?

Significance of the Study

Within any organization or business, employees must feel valued and appreciated by their leaders to perform at their highest levels for a sustained length of time. If leaders are proficient at making their employees feel valued and respected, those employees' feelings about their jobs are more positive, improving their loyalty to the organization and job satisfaction (Barbuto & Burbach, 2006; Sand et al., 2011). Well-supported employees not only have higher levels of JAW, but they also have higher levels of OCB, contributing to the social and psychological environment of the workplace above and beyond their job requirements (Farooqui, 2012; Organ & Konovsky, 1988). This study sets forth the proposition: JAW and OCB of employees whose leaders have high EI should be higher than employees who have leaders with lower EI (Adnan et al., 2012; Bradberry & Greaves, 2005).

This relationship is important to explore, as, in theory, high levels JAW and OCB in employees should lead to higher levels of organizational success (Feather, 2009; Shapiro, 2009). Likewise, this study advances the body of EI research by more closely examining the moderating factor of gender. This study's design contributes to practice and theory by building upon recent studies showing that high levels of EI in leaders are connected to organizational success through the closer examination of leaders' EI levels and the relationship of those levels to employees' well-being and behavior (Farooqui, 2012; Gholami et al., 2015). These associations suggest that leaders' high levels of EI could be linked to higher levels of JAW and OCB. This study is also significant because it will have potential positive benefits for AU leaders, team members, and students by facilitating AU leaders' improved understanding of their EI levels, and by helping those

leaders understand the effect of their own EI levels on their employees' JAW and OCB while competently and accurately contributing to the scientific body of knowledge relevant to the variables being investigated. Others in administrative positions both inside and outside the field of education can also learn from the study's results.

Definition of Terms

Emotional Intelligence. Emotional intelligence is the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Empathy. The ability to understand and to possibly share the feelings of another.

Emotional Quotient. An approach to evaluating general EI (Bar-On, 1997).

Leadership. Leadership is a person's capacity or ability to lead a group or other people using direction and guidance. Leadership refers to a person's skills to guide and inspire groups as well as individuals (Varca, 2004).

Job-related Affective Well-being. JAW is a person's emotional reaction to his or her job.

Job-related Affective Well-being Scale. The JAWS (Van Katwyk et al., 2000) is a 30-item scale describing emotional reactions of respondents to their job. It is based on a two-dimensional circumplex model in which emotions are represented on a continuous circle. The space of the circumplex is defined by two bipolar dimensions of pleasure and arousal. The pleasure-displeasure dimension represents emotional valence, whereas the arousal dimension, ranging from sleep to high arousal, represents activating potential of

emotions. Each affective state can be identified by its position in this space (Van Katwyk et al., 2000).

Job Satisfaction. How the job is perceived and to what degree it enhances or fulfills the needs, expectations, or desires of job holders (Sardana & Vrat, 1984).

MSCEIT. According to Mayer (1997), the *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)* is

an ability-based test designed to measure the four branches of the EI model of Mayer and Salovey. *MSCEIT* was developed from an intelligence-testing tradition formed by the emerging scientific understanding of emotions and their function and from the first published ability measure specifically intended to assess emotional intelligence, namely *Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS)*. (p. 199)

Negative Emotions. Negative emotions are those that occupy the displeasure side of the two-dimensional model of JAW and include those in the areas of distress and depression (Van Katwyk et al., 2000).

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. OCB are defined as:

individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization. By discretionary, we mean that the behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description, that is, the clearly specifiable terms of the person's employment contract with the organization; the behavior is rather a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable. (Organ & Konovsky, 1988, p. 4)

Organizational climate. Is defined as "a multi-dimensional phenomenon descriptive of the nature of an individual's experience within in an organization" (DeCotils & Koys, 1980, p. 171).

Organizational culture. Has roots in anthropology and sociology and focuses on values, beliefs, and traditions; while organizational climate has roots in psychology and focuses on current situations in an organization, links between groups within the

organization, and work performance (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2011; Verbeke, Volgering, & Hessels, 1998).

Positive Emotions. Positive emotions are those that occupy the pleasure side of the two-dimensional model of affective well-being and include those in the areas of excitement and contentment (Van Katwyk et al., 2000).

OCB-o. Acts directed towards the organization.

OCB-p. Acts directed towards persons in the organization such as coworkers that help with work-related issues (Fox & Spector, 2011).

Andrews University Leader. Signifies an individual who works for AU who has a minimum of 3 employees report to for job performances.

Andrews University Team Member. Is defined by an individual who is employed by AU whose leader is eligible to participate in this study.

Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations can affect the predictive validity and generalizability of research. This study presented several limitations. One limitation of this study includes the fact that while the goal was to test all leaders at AU, this is a limited sample size as only 30 of the leaders chose to participate, and of those 30, only 25 had 3 or more team members participate. If a larger sample size could have been used, the study perhaps would have had higher levels of generalizability. While the sample from this study is reasonable, future research may be needed using a larger sample size.

As the length of the *MSCEIT* test may have been viewed by some leaders at AU as requiring too much time to complete thus limiting participation, consideration perhaps should have been given to requiring participants to complete only part of the test rather

than all of it. A selectively abbreviated test would permit assessment of the EI levels of participants in a shorter amount of time; however, I chose to administer the full *MSCEIT* in order to have more complete results and to be able to obtain results from the branch scores. Therefore, sample size may be limited due to resistance from leaders to taking the test due to time constraints.

Another potential limitation to this study was possible resistance by some team members to taking the *OCB-C* and the *JAWS* assessments due to worry over the linking of data to them specifically and being viewed in a poor light due to low levels of OCB. Leaders may have had the same resistance over fear of being linked to low EI. This limitation was addressed by strict adherence to confidentiality and the use of codes for leaders and team members rather than names. I diligently communicated to both employees and leaders the confidentiality measures.

Another limitation of this study was that the leaders may have chosen not to participate because they did not wish to learn information about themselves that they would rather not know. This study required leaders to engage in a thoughtful examination of themselves, which can be difficult for some. This task may have limited the sample size. Further, this study relied on voluntary participation, so the results may be biased between those who agreed to participate and those who did not, especially considering that one measure includes OCB. Team members who have higher levels of OCB and leaders who have higher EI may have been more inclined to add to research by participating in the study, limiting reliability if there are, in fact, systematic differences between people who agree to participate and people who do not.

Additionally, parts of the measure used for leaders' EI as well as measures for

team members' JAW and OCB are self-report assessments, which may have limited the validity of results. Also, respondents may have answered questions with a social desirability bias, giving answers that they believed made them be viewed in a better light. Further, answers may have been skewed by the feelings of each individual at the time of the assessment. If an individual was having a difficult day, his or her answers may have been different than if he or she was having a better day.

There were several delimitations of this study. First, the study consisted of an intact group of leaders and their team members at a small, Midwestern, private, denominationally-affiliated university, which precludes the generalization of results to a broader population. Another delimitation is that the study was limited to team members who have worked within their current job setting for six months or more. Those who have worked less time may not have had time to have adequately settled into their role within their departments to be able to accurately understand the organizational climate of their department. Further, these new team members were likely highly taxed with learning their responsibilities and fulfilling their roles within their departments to have time or energy to consider engaging in OCB and thus were not included. Concurrent validity could have been better established with triangulation methods that combined data from self-report assessments with more objective measures; however, for this study, I chose to include only self-report measures.

Summary

Although it is true that leaders within organizations have a tremendous effect on the success or failure of their organization's mission (Bradberry & Greaves, 2005), many leaders may be unaware of the importance of their EI and intimidated by the concept of

EI. When leaders understand what EI entails, namely, the capacity an individual has for learning about, understanding, and attending to emotions in oneself or others (Feather, 2009; Mayer, 1999), this knowledge could lead to improved leadership capacity, employee job satisfaction and work behaviors, and ultimately, organizational success. This study is an important step in examining crucial connections in these areas.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Emotional Intelligence: An Overview

Leaders are critical to the success of organizations, and thus, leadership as a field is a topic of interest in many circles. An abundance of material is available regarding leadership, and many specific variables have been examined in this area including the intersection of leaders and emotion. Researchers have studied this juncture within the context of EI. This review of literature will examine leaders' capacity of the heart, which will be delineated as EI (Wharam, 2009). The review will explore definitions of EI, provide a history of EI, examine findings related to EI in the workplace, and explore current theoretical models of EI, including the Bar-On Model, the Emotional Intelligence Ability-based Model, and the Goleman's Model of Emotional Intelligence. The review will also examine the effect of EI on leadership, relate controversies regarding EI, and present perspectives on EI.

Defining Emotional Intelligence

Articles, books, and other materials related to the topic of EI reveal that the phrase connotes many definitions, due in part to the complexities involved in understanding each word in the phrase: intelligence and emotional. Intelligence is commonly understood to be the capacity or aptitude an individual possesses for understanding and learning. Intelligences have been distinguished as cool or hot. Cool intelligences being those that

deal “with information relatively impersonal in relation to the individual” (Mayer, Panter, & Caruso, 2012, p. 125) and include verbal-comprehension intelligence and quantitative intelligence. Hot intelligences are those that “concern the degree to which a person can reason about hot information: information that is especially personally relevant, and consequently, can trigger a person’s mental pleasure and pain” (p. 125). The study of intelligence originated in the cool intelligences and has moved more recently to include the hot intelligences. Many types of intelligence have been labelled, such as the intelligence associated with academics, technology intelligence, social intelligence, and EI (Purcell & Wilcox, 2007). Intelligence can also be viewed through the lenses introduced by Gardner (1983), which include: logical-mathematical, linguistic, musical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, or intrapersonal intelligence. Not surprisingly, EI, a hot intelligence, is a type of intelligence that involves emotions.

The other element of EI, emotion, can be traced back to the 19th century when Charles Darwin researched emotions as part of an effort to support his theory of evolution (Darwin, 1872/2007). Simply defined, emotion is feeling, or the element of affect that is present in an individual’s subconscious, an instinctive or intuitive state of mind. As the field of psychology developed, interest in studying emotion mushroomed, leading to the identification of six emotions that are recognized around the world in every culture: anger, sadness, grief, fear, joy, and happiness (White, 2005). Mehrabian (1972) did research on how emotions are communicated through non-verbal messages. LeDoux’s (1996) research provided additional compelling evidence that emotions are essential to human existence. Emotions are also a crucial element in success for leaders due to their connection to decision-making, which is a large element of being a leader. Also,

according to the research of Donaldson-Feilder and Bond (2004), “Emotions cause rational and irrational thought, are interconnected, and are necessary for personal and professional decision-making” (p. 55). Caruso, Salovey, and Mayer (2004b) also explain: “emotions have the functional purpose of signaling relationships and changes in relationships, real or imagined, principally between people and their environments (including other people)” (p. 250). Each day, leaders make many decisions, some of great import. As these decisions are linked to emotions, this factor alone necessitates the consideration of emotion by leaders.

Combining the words intelligence and emotion creates a phrase that describes a person’s ability to know and understand their feelings. EI can thus be understood to be the capacity an individual has for learning about and understanding emotions both in oneself and in others. Goleman (1998) defined individual EI as “the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships” (p. 317). EI is generally defined as “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” (Salovey & Mayer, 1989, p. 189). In response to the problematic over-generalization of the term, Mayer and Caruso (2008) defined EI as “an intelligence that explains important variance in an individual’s problem-solving and social relationships” (p. 512). Those with high EI are skilled at building relationships, are adept at monitoring and controlling their own emotions and at perceiving and responding well to the emotions of others. Some of EI’s leading researchers caution that research literature should be the guide when

defining EI rather than “journalistic renderings of scientific concepts” (Mayer & Caruso, 2008, p. 514).

EI enables individuals to recognize emotions, to take advantage of the acquired information, to understand those emotions, to empathize toward the emotion acquired, and also to be able to control and monitor the emotions. Individuals with high emotional intelligence can also harmonize emotions, managing, reflecting on, and opening up their emotions more effectively which enables them to have better healthy life (Mayer et al., 2000) and has effects on interpersonal relations (Schutte et al., 2001).

History of Emotional Intelligence

Many facets of the study of EI can be traced back to Darwin’s previously mentioned research on emotions as part of an effort to support his theory of evolution. As history has unfolded, many different researchers have done in-depth studies and research on the analysis of EI. Researchers first studied the construct of intelligence from a cognitive viewpoint, generating conflicting views on how to define intelligence and how to measure it. Thus, throughout the years, the definitions of intelligence and EI has been repeatedly been revised by many researchers such as Galton, Binet, Goddard, Spearman, and Cattell (as cited in Fletcher & Hattie, 2011). EI came to be emphasized more recently than cognitive intelligence; yet a fair share of controversy already exists regarding how to define and measure EI, as some within the field see this new construct as questionable.

Most scholars and researchers would agree that the development of high levels of interest in the topic of EI can be traced back to Gardner (1983) when he maintained that success in life is founded on more than traditional types of intelligence. Gardner (1983) claimed that life success is based on at least two types of intelligences: interpersonal

intelligence and intrapersonal intelligence. Interpersonal intelligence, the capacity to “understand the intentions, motivations, and desires of other people and, consequently, to work effectively with others” (Gardner, 1999, p. 43); and intrapersonal intelligence, the capacity to “understand oneself, to have an effective working model of oneself—including one’s own desires, fears, and capacities—and to use such information effectively in regulating one’s own life” (p. 43).

Intelligence can be viewed through the lenses introduced by Gardner (1983), which include: logical-mathematical, linguistic, musical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal or intrapersonal intelligence. From early on, some in the field of psychology believed that any definition of intelligence must include consideration of more than cognitive aspects. Payne (1985) first used the term EI, and Goleman (1995), in his seminal work on the topic, popularized the term. Goleman substantiated that EI is directly linked to effectiveness in leadership, stimulating great interest in the construct of EI. Since that time, many authors/researchers have contributed to the body of literature on this topic (Abdul & Ehiobuche, 2011; Barbuto & Burbach, 2006; Caruso & Salovey, 2004; Donaldson-Feilder & Bond, 2004; Furnham & Petrides, 2003; Goleman, 2004; Hernon & Rossiter, 2006; Kluemper, 2008; Miller, 1999). Through their pioneering study of EI, these researchers have established the credibility of the construct today. Emotional intelligence, which is also known as Emotional Quotient (EQ), has been compared with Intelligence Quotient (IQ). From their research in this area, Legree, Mullins, and Psotka (2016) conclude that when EI is measured with an appropriate instrument such as the *MSCEIT*, the construct should clearly be included “within the pantheon of well-

established broad intelligences, such as memory retrieval and quantitative intelligence” (as cited in Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, in press).

Current Theoretical Models and Perspectives

Within the field of EI, several theoretical models exist. Following the publication of Goleman’s book (1995), some authors and speakers became heavily involved in promoting the concept of EI without having the appropriate research protocols to properly guide their commercial endeavors (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997; Elías, Tobías, & Friedlander, 1999). These opportunistic entrepreneurs turned EI experts did much to sully the work of scientific research into EI. Another group of researchers have sought to restore credibility to the construct by developing models based on the review of literature describing valid empirical studies to validate them (Bar-On, 1997; Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000; Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Among plentiful current theories of EI, the three that have produced the most interest are those of Bar-On (2000), Mayer and Salovey (1997), and Goleman (1998). All three theories seek to develop an understanding of how individuals recognize, understand, apply, and manage emotions in order to predict and improve individual effectiveness (Goleman, 2003). These three theoretical approaches have guided present lines of research in the study of EI, and all three methodologies investigate the emotional components of individuals who are emotionally intelligent. These three theoretical approaches include: Bar-On’s Emotional-Social Intelligence (ESI) model (1997; Bar-On, 2006) developed by Bar-On, the emotional competencies model, which focused on the workplace that was developed by Goleman (1998; 2001; see also Boyatzis, 2006), and

the EI ability-based model developed by Mayer and Salovey (1997; Brackett & Salovey, 2006).

The Emotional Intelligence Personality-based Model

A popular scholarly perspective is explained by Reuven Bar-On (2005) who in the 1980s developed a measure to assess EI in the area of well-being, using the term emotional quotient. He defined EI as an array of emotional, personal, and social abilities that influence how well an individual can effectively cope with daily demands and pressures.

Bar-On (2005) identified five areas of emotional and social intelligence: (a) Intrapersonal—Self-awareness and Self-Expression, (b) Interpersonal—Social Awareness and Interpersonal Relationship, (c) Stress Management—Emotional Management and Regulation, (d) Adaptability—Change Management, and (e) General Mood—Self motivation. From Bar-On's perspective, emotional-social intelligence is "a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate with them, and cope with daily demands" (Bar-On, 2006, p. 13). Bar-On's intent was to create a model that would include factors and components of social and emotional functioning that allow individuals to develop psychological well-being (Bar-On, 2000, 2004, 2006).

Bar-On's (2006) model divides emotional and social intelligence into five areas, which are subdivided into sub-categories of intrapersonal skills, which include: intrapersonal skills (the ability of being aware of and understanding emotions, feelings, and ideas in oneself); interpersonal skills (the ability of being aware of and understanding emotions, feelings, and ideas in others); adaptability refers to the ability of being open to

change in one's feelings depending on situations); stress management (the ability to cope with stress and control emotions); and general mood (the ability of feeling and expressing positive emotions, and being optimistic) (Bar-On, 2006). Most scholars and researchers would agree that Bar-On's (1997; 2000) theoretical approach to EI is broader and more comprehensive than Mayer and Salovey's model (1997); however, this broad approach that includes emotional and social competencies has led many critics to contend that Bar-On's model cannot be supported empirically. Additionally, due to the nature of self-report measures, this model lacks psychometric support (Feather, 2009).

The Emotional Intelligence Competency-based Model

The term EI was brought to light by Goleman (1995) who stated in his *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ* that EI comprises five essential elements: 1) knowing one's emotions; 2) managing emotions; 3) motivating oneself; 4) recognizing emotions in others; and 5) handling relationships (Boyatzis et al., 2000; Goleman, 1998, 2001). In 1998, Goleman's second book on EI was published, suggesting a theory of performance in organizations based on a model of EI that has become known as a model of competencies focused on the workplace. The model is based on several competencies such as: 1) self-awareness, which is comprised of emotional self-awareness, accurate self-assessment, and self-confidence; 2) social awareness, which includes empathy, service orientation, and organizational awareness; 3) self-management, which consists of self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, achievement drive, and initiative; and finally, 4) relationship management, which includes several subcategories such as developing others, influence, communication, conflict management, leadership, change catalyst, building bonds and teamwork, and collaboration. According to Goleman,

each one of these four dimensions are the basis to develop other learned abilities or competencies necessary in the organizational field.

According to Goleman (2001), emotional aptitude is a learned competence based on EI that results in outstanding performance at work. This notion of EI as a learned competence is important to understand Goleman's pitch whereas EI is defined by Mayer and Salovey as our potential to dominate specific emotional abilities. Thus, Goleman's belief is that emotional competencies alone represent the level in which a person dominates specific abilities or skills based on how high their level of EI is (Goleman, 2001). Here, he sharply digresses from Mayer and Salovey who contend that EI is an important element related to success in life, but that other factors such as cognitive abilities are also important.

The Emotional Intelligence Ability-based Model

When reviewing the literature on EI, one finds that Mayer and Salovey's mental ability model (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) is the theoretical approach that has been most studied and written about in peer-reviewed journals (Matthews et al., 2002; Geher, 2004). Peter Salovey and John Mayer (1990) expounded on and clarified the concept of individual EI by stating that it can be characterized by three branches that work together: (a) appraisal and expression of emotion, (b) regulation of emotion, and (c) utilization of emotion.

The great interest in this model from the scientific community is based on the fact that it has a strong theoretical base. Another reason for its success and acceptance lies in its innovative means of measurement compared to other EI approaches. Last, the EI ability based model is based on a systematic evaluation and study, allowing it to be

supported by empirical data (Fernandez-Berrocal & Extremera, 2006). Some critics of the concept of EI are beginning to see more validity in the construct since they consider Mayer and Salovey's model a genuine approach to the study of intelligence that could contribute to the emotional individual differences field (Matthews et al., 2002). Within the ability-based-model concept, the most accepted proposal is the one that considers EI as a mental ability, specifically, the "ability to perceive, accurately appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth" (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 10).

The EI ability model comprises and has a hierarchy of four abilities: perception (most basic level), assimilation, understanding, and regulation (highest and most complex level) of emotions. Mayer and Salovey (1997) contend that since EI is based on the development of competencies that proceed along the four levels of their hierarchy, it can be measured in a similar manner to the assessment methodology used to measure more traditional emotions and must be considered as an integral element of intelligence. The ability-based model is the one that will be used in this for this research.

Measuring Emotional Intelligence

The first instrument developed to be used commercially to measure EI was the *Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i)*, a self-reported measure developed by Bar-On (2006). Goleman's *Emotional Competence Inventory 2.0 (ECI 2.0)* includes a self-report measure as well as an external measure completed by an employer, which lends more credence to results. Several other researchers initially developed self-reported measures for the assessment of the EI (*Trait Meta-Mood Scale, [TMMS]*; Salovey, Mayer,

Goldman, Turvey, & Palfai, 1995). Several of these models are not proven empirically and often lack a strong theoretical foundation (Feather, 2009).

A more recent push in the assessment of EI has been the design and development of ability measures or performance-based measures. This goal was completed through the collaboration of several researchers who developed an instrument with acceptable validity and reliability, the *MSCEIT* (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004b; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2001). The *MSCEIT* is an instrument that allows individuals to demonstrate their own emotional performance aptitudes by examining faces, pictures, and abstract designs. The *MSCEIT* also examines test takers' ability to understand emotions in several thinking and decision-making processes, the ability to understand simple and complex emotions, and the ability to manage and regulate their own and others' emotions.

The Effect of Emotional Intelligence on Leadership

A consideration of its component skills leads many researchers to consider EI to be a critical factor in the success or failure of leaders and of their organizations (Goleman, 1998; Salovey, 2005). Leaders must use as many effective avenues as possible as they seek to lead successfully, and as they are humans and lead humans, leaders must consider the emotional aspects of being human. How well leaders understand and manage their own emotions and those of employees depends on their EI. When leaders understand their own emotions and are skilled at reading and understanding others' emotions, they are able to predict the emotional responses and/or behavior of their colleagues in a manner that helps them better lead their organizations towards success (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). Leaders with high EI capitalize on emotions to strengthen

their organizations (Hernon & Rossiter, 2006).

EI is, therefore, a critical factor in effective leadership. According to Goleman (2004), “EI might predict up to 90% of the variance in leadership effectiveness by uncovering strong positive effects of leadership commitment and effectiveness that support strong influences on leadership effectiveness” (p. 98). Emotionally intelligent leaders are positive and encouraging in relationships (Glasser, 1998). Creating in others a sense of being valued is also an excellent indicator that a leader has high EI. These leaders are keenly sensitive and perceptive; they recognize that life is heavily influenced by emotions. A natural outcome of this recognition of the impact of emotions is to treat employees differently than leaders who are less sensitive to this impact. In light of this, one is not surprised that EI has been cited as an important predictor of workplace outcomes, including job satisfaction and organizational climate (Carmeli, Yitzhak-Halevy, & Weisberg, 2009; Law, Wong, Huang, & Li, 2008).

For that reason, EI considerably affects the performance of a leader (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001). A leader who has a high level of EI will have a greater positive effect on an organization than a leader with a low level of EI (Cherniss, 2003). In many organizations, the study and development of EI is now being viewed not only as a valid component of organizational success, but also as an essential part of an organization’s managing process (Feather, 2009). Feather concludes: “A vital portion of the development of leaders in achieving success is to develop and enhance their level of emotional intelligence. This enables the leader to get others to do their jobs more effectively and increases job satisfaction” (p. 381). Feather concludes that “the

knowledge of emotions can only help in providing a better understanding of workplace performance” (Feather, 2009, p. 379).

With the current emphasis on team-building and adapting to change, EI becomes more crucial (Goleman, 1998). Leaders who expect to guide their organizations through change processes and restructuring will be much more successful if they have high levels of EI, as studies have indicated that successful leaders have the ability to work through emotions (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002), and attending to emotions is a key aspect of change initiatives. “Leaders need to be aware of their own feelings and emotions to enable them to accurately identify the emotions of the group and of individual followers, to express emotions accurately, and to differentiate between honest and phony emotional expressions” (Feather, 2009, p. 379).

Whether a formal change initiative is ongoing or not, EI can be linked to success due to its connection to motivation. Segal (1997) made the point that the word “emotion comes from the Latin *moiere*, which means *to move*. It is not a coincidence the words *emotion*, *motion* and *motivation*” (p. 34) are all spelled with the same root. Motivation, the drive to accomplish something, is driven by emotion, a fact that a wise leader will not ignore. In businesses and other organizations where accomplishments are essential to success, leaders must be able to harness workers’ motivation in order to accomplish the goals and objectives of their organizations (Chovwen, 2012; Kluemper, 2008). Since motivation is closely linked to emotion, highly effective leaders conceivably must have high EI in order to properly understand their employees’ emotions and motivations.

In a study relating EI to job performance, a survey was conducted for on-the-job performance of workers in various local governments in Osun State (Adebayo, Olayide,

& Saheed, 2012). Using a survey research design with random sampling, the researchers selected 256 respondents from 3 local governments, which included Ejigbo, Irepodun and Atakunmosa East. Four instruments were used for the study: *Wong and Law EI Scale*, *Work Performance Rating Scale*, *Leadership Assessment Scale*, and the *Scale on Demographic Variables*.

This study indicated that the positive influence of EI to job performance is significant, leading the researchers to conclude that EI holds a noteworthy influence on job performance since it gives workers the opportunity to relate effectively with fellow workers and customers. Further, this study seems to indicate that emotionally intelligent leadership styles play a large role in the job performance of workers of local governments. The researchers recommend that EI training should be incorporated as part of professional development for local government officials. This study identified four specific dimensions of EI that should be the focus of these types of training for leaders: self-emotions appraisal, use of emotion, others' emotions appraisal, and regulation of emotion.

As the importance of EI in the workplace becomes more well-known, some researchers have begun to look at the impact of EI on success in jobs where emotions are naturally more of a focus. A study conducted by Newman and Smith (2014) inspected the association of EI with success in jobs requiring emotional labor. This international sample included 6,874 participants who answered questions that allowed an investigation into the “relationship of a mixed model of EI, as measured by the *Emotional Capital Report (ECR)*, to emotional labor identified in recent literature as performed by workers in three types of service occupations, customer service, social, and control and caring”

(p. 41). Hochschild (1983) has described *ECR* as the ability to recognize and regulate emotion at work.

In Newman and Smith's (2014) study, more than three thousand occupations were classified as having a high emotional labor such as, marketing, consultants, travel agents, and those employed in the field of human resources. After completing an occupational questionnaire, all participants completed an *ECR*. Results of this survey indicate that participants doing roles involving high emotional labor scored significantly higher on all *ECR* scales than those in roles that involved low emotional labor. Newman and Smith's results led them to contend that in roles where emotional labor is high, having higher EI provides a noteworthy benefit, as possessing high EI is likely to be helpful to people in customer service positions, or caring assignments. These jobs require individuals to effectively manage their own emotional responses and the responses of other people in order to be successful, which necessitates the possession of high levels of EI.

Conversely, of the study's 6,874 participants, 2,637 occupations were classified as requiring low emotional labor. Examples of low emotional labor occupations included law enforcement officer, military personnel, engineer, accountant, clerical work, government administrator, computer and IT technician, clerical work, and financial services professional (Newman & Smith, 2014). Their study led them to believe that having lower levels of EI in these occupations would not be as problematic as in jobs where emotional labor demands are greater.

Having high EI is an excellent trait for leaders; however, as Stogdill (1948) urged: "a person does not become a leader by having specific traits; a leader must act" (p.54). EI remains an important factor for leaders, as EI facilitates the act of leading because EI

permits leaders to make good decisions. Caruso and Salovey (2004) emphasized, “If we can manage our emotions; that is, blend emotion and thought, we increase the chances that our decisions will be more effective and our lives more adaptive” (p. 54). The challenge for leaders is to learn to not suppress feelings nor to vent them but to reflect on them, integrate them with their thinking, and use them as a source of information and as inspiration for intelligent decision-making. The leader who can do this has high EI and will use that trait to act more effectively, as “intelligent, rational leadership decision-making can be facilitated by emotions, resulting in more appropriate behavior” (Caruso & Salovey, 2004, p. 44).

One such appropriate behavior is creating loyalty and enhancing job satisfaction of employees. Retention of valuable employees is a critical factor in the success of any organization. A recent study by Sand et al. (2011) found: “the number-one reason people quit their jobs is *lack of appreciation—an emotional reason*” (p. 132). The leader of an organization must attempt to ensure that employees feel valued. Employees usually do not quit their jobs; they quit their bosses. “Everyone has a need to feel significant, to be valued as a person, and to have his/her work appreciated—or at least their effort” (Maslow, 1976, p. 79). Leaders with high EI are more adept at making employees feel valued and have less job-related fear and anxiety, a factor in retaining them as employees (Feather, 2009; Nelson & Low, 2005).

EI also benefits leaders by helping them minimize conflicts within the organization. “Sixty-five percent (65%) of performance problems at work happen because of some type of conflict; i.e., personal conflicts, internal politics, different workstyles, and stress” (LeBaron, 2003, p. 99). Emotionally intelligent leaders are able to

recognize the early stages of their own rising emotions and those of others, which can allow them to divert impending conflicts. Salovey and Mayer (1989) reported emotionally competent individuals are better able to problem solve, which would lead one to believe that leaders with high EI could be better at solving problems such as interpersonal conflicts among employees (Zeidner et al., 2004). This factor illustrates the importance of EI in leaders and others.

Is the EI of leaders truly a significant consideration for organizations? According to Goleman (1998, 2004), using EI in the workplace helps to ensure success, especially for individuals in management and leadership roles. Abdul and Ehiobuche (2011) performed a case study ($n=35$) that confirms that high levels of EI are associated with higher levels of managerial competence.

Collins (2013) also urges that EI is critical to leadership (p. 5). Generally speaking, one of the biggest challenges organizations face is the proper training of effective leaders and managers (Cavolla, 2008; Miller, 1999). One strategy organizations could use to improve leadership capacity is to consider EI when hiring new leaders (Benjamin et al., 2012). Bass and Riggio (2006) contend that people who exude appealing personalities are more prone to be successful managers and leaders. This personality type is perhaps perceived as appealing due to their own high EI, or their ability to read the emotions of other people and to manage and understand their own emotions (Furnham & Petrides, 2003).

EI and its connection to success in organizations is not only at the administrative level (Hopkins, 2004). Employees' EI level can also have an important effect (Vandewaa & Turnipseed, 2012). Shapiro (2009) contends emotionally intelligent people are happier,

are more committed to their organization, and achieve more promotions, and this applies to employees and leaders. Opengart (2005) strongly supported the idea of enhancing the EI of employees, especially in occupations that require a high level of EI such as human service and customer service sectors. Opengart (2005) was in agreement with Jewell (2007b) who maintained employing emotionally intelligent employees in jobs that necessitate high levels of emotional work such as teaching, sales, and healthcare was critical to their success. One of Opengart's (2005) conclusions was that only highly emotionally intelligent individuals were able to perform at a high level in emotionally demanding occupations. This concept was also consistent with Law et al. (2004) who stated that EI levels was related to job performance.

While other studies have been conducted and should continue to be conducted on employees' EI and its effect on job performance and organizational success, the current study examines the link between leaders' EI and employees' feelings about their work and their citizenship behaviors in the workplace. Much justification can be found in the literature to support such as study. Barbuto and Burbach (2006) found that high EI is an antecedent of highly successful transformational leaders. Cote et al. (2010) found that EI is more highly correlated with leadership emergence than cognitive intelligence, personality traits, and gender. Abdussamad, Akib, and Jasruddin (2015) found links between transformational leadership and organizational climate. These findings indicate that the EI of leaders is an important factor in the success of organizations.

EI and Gender

In the field of leadership research, the effects of gender on leadership has been studied. Few studies, however, have examined how a leader's gender interacts with EI

and instead often cover differences in male and female levels of intelligence rather than how EI and gender relate to other variables such as leadership. For example, Petrides and Furnham (2000) studied gender differences in male and female (measured and self-estimated) trait EI, finding that males are better able to assess their EI than females. As this study does examine the intersection of EI, leadership, and organizational climate, an examination of existing literature is necessary, though some extrapolation has been necessary due to the paucity of literature that includes all of the aforementioned variables.

Gallant (2014) conducted a study to examine the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions in higher education settings using a qualitative research method. This study found that women leaders in higher education tend to be defined by soft skills such as communication, ability to nurture, and skill in relationships. The author urges that this can be problematic for women in leadership because their character is judged rather than their skills. Female leaders are viewed more harshly than male leaders for being aggressive and must perform well on both job skills and soft skills in order to be viewed positively as leaders while male leaders only need to perform well on job skills to be rated as effective leaders. This finding contradicts Hatcher's (2003) article, which claimed that "the traditional masculine/feminine hierarchy of logic/emotion" (p. 392) has been redrawn by new expectations that leaders be passionate in their work, to capitalize on emotion as a means of connecting with employees, controlling their emotions in a way that leads to higher levels of organizational success. Johnson (2013) also found that male leaders are held to a different standard than females, who must communicate that they are

both tough and compassionate, but can be judged as weak if too much compassion is perceived.

Bark, Escartin, and Van Dick (2014) conducted a meta-analysis of literature published since 2000 in Spain, the United States, or any European country that examines changes in gender roles, underrepresentation of women in top management, and gender differences in leadership through the lens of organizational success. This study found evidence that female leaders face tension due to the incongruence between colleagues and employees' expectations of female leaders based on their traditional gender role and the traditional role of leader.

These findings correspond with those of Eagly and Karau (2002) who found that female leaders were subjected to two kinds of workplace prejudice. First, they were seen as not being well suited to leadership roles, and second, they were evaluated less favorably than male leaders if they complied with leader-role expectations. Further, female leaders are expected to be simultaneously "tough" and "nice", but are evaluated poorly if they are perceived as being too "tough" or too "nice."

Hopkins (2004) studied managers ($n=105$) at a financial institution and found that "gender has a powerful influence on the images and profiles of successful leadership and there are distinctly divergent paths to success for male and female leaders" (p. iii). This study findings illustrates the consequence of the intersection of gender roles with leadership behaviors through the lens of emotional competency. Male leaders are rewarded when they follow gender-expected behaviors and experience less success when they show democratic leadership style, which is perceived as incongruent with their gender role. Female leaders are only viewed as successful when they behave both in

gender congruent and incongruent ways, depending on whether the behaviors are interpreted as appropriate for leadership through a male-dominated lens of leadership.

Zenger and Folkman (2012) found that women in leadership face a double bind due to the traditional view of the ideal leader that many hold: a leader must be decisive, assertive, and independent, which is almost identical to the view of how an ideal man should be, according to their study. However, female leaders are expected to be unselfish, care-taking, and nice. When women excel in the ideal leader role, they are viewed as less likeable than male leaders. If women in leadership are self-confident and assertive, they are viewed as arrogant and abrasive, yet if they use a more traditional feminine approach, they are liked but not respected as leaders.

Controversies Regarding EI

Despite the enthusiasm some have shown for the importance of EI both in the workplace and in other settings, others remain unconvinced, believing the idea is unproven and unscientific, pointing to studies with inconclusive findings. Many critics of EI believe it is a flawed construct because the personality and ability models were coupled together without a consideration of the unavoidable differences in these constructs (Landy, 2005). Landy also contends that researchers in this area have struggled to come to consensus on or to communicate the meaning of EI. However, proponents of EI, Ashkanasy and Daus (2005), argued against Landy's assertions by pointing out that essentially all developing philosophies and theories undergo deliberation and debate as the construct and hypothesis are developed and formalized, a point also made by Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2004b) who point out that the construct of intelligence is also fraught with controversy regarding its definition and measurement.

Another challenge involving the study of EI came about when Daniel Goleman (2006) linked EI to social intelligence, which was conceptually broader and more advanced than EI itself. Goleman (2006) viewed social intelligence as the key component for successful relationships and even good health. In addition, Goleman claimed that social intelligence was a logical fit within the EI arena. Goleman also claimed he was not offering unsupported assertions, but rather, was calling for a scientific re-examination of social intelligence and provided an analytical model from which to proceed. Critics such as Salovey and Mayer (1990) as well as Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) challenged Goleman's philosophical view. Some in the field of education are opposed to the measuring of EI. Kaschub (2002) believes that test results only partially represent this type of intelligence, that cultural bias can affect the validity of results, and that the utilization of this information can be problematic, as has been the case in the measurement of IQ. Nonetheless, critics are often forced to concede that the theory of EI can contribute to improved organizational outcomes if results are used cautiously (Kaschub, 2002).

Muhammad (2006) cautions that while many organizations are integrating the concept of EI as a consideration in organizational hiring and other decision-making processes based on study results that indicate that EI is a great predictor of successful work and overall happiness, little is known about the definition of EI and what it actually predicts. Muhammad's (2006) argument, however, only lends credibility to detractors of the personality model since, in contrast, a good amount of progress has been made with the ability model of EI including the development of an empirical definition as well as the development of valid and reliable instruments designed to measure the construct,

which have been refined (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Law et al., 2004; Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005).

Muhammad (2006) also inspected claims that EI can be used to predict job satisfaction. The purpose of Muhammad's (2006) study was to conclude whether or not a relationship existed between an individual's EI quotient and his or her level of job satisfaction. The 125-item *Bar-On EQ-i* and the 72-item *Job Descriptive Index*, which included the Job-In-General Scale, were administered to a group of 200 participants. Data analyses showed that an individual's EI quotient was not a significant predictor of the level of job satisfaction. In contrast, it was hypothesized in the current research that a relationship indeed exists between EI (ability model) and job satisfaction. However, other authors (Newman & Smith, 2014) have found significant links between EI and job success in jobs that require high emotional labor.

An important consideration when researching controversies involving EI is to be careful not to lump all findings together. Within the field of EI, two different ideologies exist—the personality model and the ability model. Almost all research involving the construct has been based on one foundation or the other. I will use the ability model of EI for the current research due to the empirical evidence that has established it as a narrow construct distinct from personality allowing for more accurate assessment, which aligns best with the chosen conceptualization of EI and the assessment instrument chosen (Law et al., 2004).

Organizational Climate

Organizational climate has been linked to EI and to the elements of this study, which will be used as measures of EI: OCB and JAW. Organizational climate is defined

as “a multi-dimensional phenomenon descriptive of the nature of an individual’s experience within in an organization” (DeCotils & Koys, 1980, p. 171) in terms of the organization’s history, the struggles of the organization, the people it attracts to work there, its processes, its actual physical layout, the most common types of communication used, and the manner in which authority is used within the organization (Denison, 1996; Dinu, 2013; Katz & Kahn, 1978, p. 50). DeCotils and Koys (1980) further define the construct as:

An experientially-based, complex and enduring perceptual phenomenon which is widely shared by the members of given organizational unit. Its primary function is to cue and shape individual behavior towards the modes of behavior dictated by organizational demands. p. 171

Schneider, Chung, and Yusko (1993) note that climate is “conceptualized as a summary or aggregate perception, a gestalt, comprising the practices and procedures experienced by the people in a situation” (p. 297). Over the course of the past 80 years, various researchers have lobbied to have specific dimensions included in the construct of organizational culture (James & Jones, 1974). Generally, some of the essential factors are “structure, motivation, interpersonal relations, flexibility, support, communication, information, working conditions, rules and regulations, objectives, management and leadership” (Novac & Bratanov, 2014, p. 155). The most commonly accepted measure today includes 17 dimensions and contains more than 150 questions (Patterson, Warr, & West, 2004).

Kurt Lewin (Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939), the originator of the term, is considered by most the founding father of organizational climate. The first studies on organizational climate, aiming to study the climate of an organization through the lens of a psychological approach, were carried out during the 1930s. Organizational climate

should be distinguished from organizational culture, although they are similar concepts whose meanings overlap in that both reflect the overall atmosphere within an organization. The two concepts diverge due to the basis of their fields. Organizational culture has roots in anthropology and sociology and focuses on values, beliefs, and traditions; while organizational climate has roots in psychology and focuses on current situations in an organization, links between groups within the organization, and work performance (Roxana & Nicula, 2012; Schneider, Ehrhart et al., 2011; Verbeke et al., 1998). Since this research focuses on strategic behavior, the focus is organizational climate.

The study of organizational climate has been expanded by research, which examined the effect that a particular kind of leadership has in relation to climate within organizations. According to Reichers & Schneider (1990), different types of leadership styles resulted in varying types of social atmospheres in organizations, supporting the idea that an organization's climate is affected by the style of its leaders. The connection between an organization's climate and the style of its leadership seems intuitive to many (Novac & Bratanov, 2014) as it does to me. While the construct is broad, encompassing many dimensions, as will be shown later in the literature review, it can be viewed through the lenses of JAW and OCB, which are two of the variables included in this study as representations of organizational climate.

Clearly, the research indicates that organizational climate is an important construct for study. "A positive climate within an organization can stimulate and inspire employees within that organization, decreasing the costs of turnover and reducing employees' resistance to change" (Momeni, 2009, p. 36) while improving employees'

quality of work, creativity levels, and willingness to accept risks. Employers who lead effectively can easily identify the positive effect of a successful organization with a strong climate (McGregor, 2005). Positive organizational climate encourages employees and motivates them to have a high level of performance (Hemmelgarn, Glisson, & James, 2006; Momeni, 2009; Neagu & Nicula, 2012).

Given this evidence, managers must evaluate and strengthen a positive work environment (Carlos-Alegre, 2005). Holloway (2012) and Momeni (2009) conclude that the domains of leadership and organizational climate have much overlap and are entwined. Momeni (2009) found that employees' attitudes, morale, behaviors, and emotions are strongly influenced by their leader's behavior, with all dimensions of EI having a positive correlation with all dimensions of organizational climate. Specifically, self-awareness and self-management of emotions have a strong correlation to levels of organizational climate. Organizational climate is clearly affected by leadership behaviors and is crucial to employees' feelings of well-being within the workplace and their behaviors within the workplace (Barent, 2005).

Job-related Affective Well-being

One aspect of organizational climate is how employees feel about their jobs. Feelings within the workplace have become a focus of research in recent years, beginning more than eight decades ago with Lewin's research (as cited in Gershwin, 1994). How an organization's employees feel about their jobs affects the organization on large and small scales. A term used to talk about feelings within the workplace is JAW. To understand this phrase, one must explore the meanings of each word within the phrase.

The term *affect*, broadly defined as feeling or emotion, is often understood in the

world of leadership through the lens of the two dominant categories of feelings that people experience. The first, which is designated as feeling state, is understood as spontaneous, short-term emotions felt immediately after an event or stimulus. The feeling state has two groupings of affect: emotions and moods. Emotions are largely caused by a particular event but is often short-lived (Frijda, 1986; Lazarus, 1991); whereas, moods are not necessarily caused by a particular event or reason (Frijda, 1986; Tellegen, 1985). The other dominant aspect of affect is feeling traits which are more long-term or established ways to feel and behave (Watson & Clark, 1984). Feeling traits has only one category of feeling—dispositional affect. This trait simply refers to a person's ability to experience positive and negative moods and emotions (Watson & Clark, 1984).

According to Hochschild (1983), the term, well-being, has been classified into two measurements: subjective well-being (SWB) and psychological well-being (PWB). SWB concentrates on people's evaluation of their lives. PWB emphasizes the process of living a life to one's fullest potential. SWB, which is not simply happiness, can be explained and defined by how an individual experiences the worth of his or her life, including both emotional responses and cognitive judgments (Diener, 1994). According to Diener (whom many proclaim to be Dr. Happiness due to his wide research in this area), there are two mechanisms of SWB. The first is Affect Balance, and the other is Life Satisfaction. The balance between positive affect, which includes feelings of pleasure, and negative affect, which includes feelings of pain, can be combined to create Affect Balance. Life Satisfaction is a measure of how an individual feels that his or her life has matched up to his or her goals and hopes. A person's scores on the two measures are summed to produce a total SWB score. In essence, Diener (1994) states that SWB can

be understood as a person's assessment of the way he or she lives life. "SWB is a broad category of phenomena that includes people's emotional responses, domain satisfactions, and global judgments of life satisfaction" (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999, p. 277).

According to (Diener et al., 1999) the term, PWB, refers to how people evaluate their lives. Samman (2007) clarifies that SWB refers to satisfaction and happiness and include hedonic measures with "the criteria of maximizing pleasure and avoiding pain" (p. 8), while PWB refers to a multi-faceted flourishing. PWB is important to leadership and organizations, as individuals with high levels of PWB tend to perform at higher levels in their occupations. This measure is important also because it combines process and outcome, which is partially due to the foundational definition of this construct, which includes Ryff and Singer's description "the idea of striving toward excellence based on one's own unique potential" (as cited in Samman, 2007, p. 8). Given this definition, the implications for the workplace are clear.

According to Diener (1994), these assessments of one's life may be in the form of cognitions or in the form of affect. The cognitive measure is an information-based, self-assessment of an individual's complete life. The supposition behind this test is that most individuals are guided by emotions and feelings, which most people view as either good or bad (Diener, 1994). A pioneer in the field of measuring PWB, Ryff (Seifert, 2005), created scales to quantify this construct. The long form of the Ryff inventory has 84 questions that asks individuals to respond to statements from various areas of PWB including autonomy, personal growth, self-acceptance, purpose in life, positive relationships with others, and mastery of one's environment (Seifert, 2005). Shorter forms of this instrument exist but have unacceptable levels of reliability.

JAW, a variable of interest in this study, is linked to PWB and has been defined as “an individual’s feelings about themselves in relation to their job” (Morrissy, Borman, & Mergler, 2013). Earlier researchers have found that as an individual’s well-being or sense of comfort increases at work, his or her job performance improves (Waterman, 1993). Conversely, if an individual has a low level of sense of well-being at work, his or her work focus will be reduced, thereby reducing job performance (Hochschild, 1983). Borman and Motowidlo (1997) defined job performance as work-related behaviors that can be measured by the individual’s level of contribution toward meeting organizational goals.

Employee comfort, happiness and well-being are increasingly seen as playing an important role in a healthy, dynamic workplace. Literature abounds that relates health and well-being to improved job performance (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000), productivity (Lowe, 2003), job satisfaction (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000), and ability to cope with stress (Leiter, 1991; Stumpf, Brief, & Hartman, 1987). Despite the importance of the construct, the definition of well-being or health remains unclear. The World Health Organization according to C. Winslow (1948) recognizes a healthy individual as one who has complete physical, mental, and social well-being. Beneath this definition, well-being is not exclusively defined through the absence of disease or infirmity. Nevertheless, since World War II, the psychological focus of well-being has been on healing, “repairing” or “fixing” damaged human functioning (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

Despite the prevailing deficit model of well-being, investigation in the area of subjective well-being has revealed that most people tend to report their lives positively (Diener & Diener, 1995). However, the field of psychology focuses on more negative

experiences. Luthans (2002) conducted a search of the psychological literature and found that 375,000 articles highlighted negative well-being; whereas, only 1000 articles emphasized positive concepts and capabilities of people. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) contend that this difference should not exist given that the field of psychology is not aligned only on pathology, weakness and damage, but it is also focused on “identifying and nurturing [people’s] strongest qualities, what they own and are best at, and helping them find niches in which they can best live out these strengths” (p. 6).

Consistent with this positive focus, Warr (1987, 1990) conjectured that mental health encompasses five factors or mechanisms: (1) affective well-being, (2) competence, (3) autonomy, (4) aspiration, and (5) integrated functioning. Each distinct factor can be viewed as a measure of mental health. However, Warr (1987, 1990) proposed that affective well-being is the principal cause of how well an individual feels, and most measures of well-being focus on this dimension. Though affective well-being has been measured beside a single band, practical findings by Russell (1979) show that affective well-being is structured along two dimensions, pleasure and arousal, a view that was also suggested by Warr (1987). Russell (1979) defined affective well-being or affective space by two orthogonal dimensions: pleasure-displeasure and arousal-sleep. These dimensions are a continuum upon which feelings can be placed. Makikangas, Feldt, and Kinnunen (2007) report that Warr’s scale is best conceptualized as the four dimensions: job-related anxiety, comfort, depression, and enthusiasm, which align closely with Van Katwyk et al. (2000) who identified the four dimensions as excitement, contentment, distress, and depression. Their research indicates that the scale is highly stable across a three-year period.

Job-related Affective Well-being and Leadership

The leading theory about the emotions of employees in the 20th century was that happy workers are equivalent to productive workers (Staw et al., 1986). A comprehensive study by (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005) indicated that a person's propensity to experience encouraging emotions and moods is associated with work performance actions, an increased supervisory evaluations, higher income, and ability to negotiate benefits within the organization. Other studies have confirmed this idea (Argyle, 1989).

Given that improved employee affect improves organizational outcomes, many believe that discovering methods that improve job-affective well-being is imperative to successful leadership. Leaders might take note that Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, and Schaufeli (2001) found that the presence of job resources can improve well-being in employees. Job resources can be described as: organizational support such as salary, career opportunities, human resources, and job security. A second type of organizational support is the employees' perception of having growth opportunities like performance feedback, autonomy and learning, and development. Third, job resources include job rotation and advancement factors, such as career advancement in the form of promotion, more accountability, achievement of career and personal goals, and growth. (Demerouti et al., 2001).

Additional factors affect feelings of well-being in the workplace, as well. Makikangas, Hyvonen, Leskinen, Kinnunen, and Feldt (2011) conducted a longitudinal study spanning a 10-year period, which included three measurement points to investigate the JAW of managers in Finland ($n=402$). The study's main aim was to look at how JAW develops over the course of a decade using a person-centered approach. Since this

measurement period coincided with an economic recession, the study investigated the relationship between career disruptions and perceived job insecurity with JAW trajectories. The researchers found that the timing of career disruptions had a significant effect on JAW, and that job insecurity is related to decreased feelings of JAW.

Other researchers urge that leaders should be cognizant of employees who have low levels of JAW. According to Anderson (2008), a strong correlation exists between depression and JAW, and employees with high levels of depression have lower levels of JAW. This finding is unremarkable as depression is considered to be a condition of extreme negative affect. Individuals or employees who have depressive conditions are more likely to have negative feelings about his or her job, the lives they live, and also their ability to help make things change for the better. Regardless of the cause of low levels of JAW, leaders will do well to consider employees' levels in order to understand which employees may benefit from interventions targeting their depression and thus their JAW. Even if employees are not struggling with depression, if employees have high levels of negative emotions and/or low levels of positive emotions, their job performance will be compromised. Leaders should care about their workers' affect in addition to their job performance and its effect on organizational climate and thus organizational success. Informed leaders can make informed choices, making the assessment of employees' JAW a possible high priority. Measuring JAW can be done quickly and accurately using the *JAWS*.

Measuring Job-related Affective Well-being

Developed by Van Katwyk et al. (2000), the *JAWS* is a 30-item scale describing emotional reactions of employees to their jobs within their profession. The *JAWS* is

founded on a two-dimensional model with emotions represented on a continuous loop with two bipolar dimensions of pleasure and arousal. The pleasure-displeasure dimension represents emotional valence, whereas the arousal dimension, ranging from sleep to high arousal, represents activating potential of emotions.

The *JAWS* includes a wide variety of emotional experiences, both negative and positive, which have been placed into four categories (subscales) that are listed along two dimensions: pleasurable and arousal (intensity). A 30-item scale measuring affective well-being using a 5-point Likert scale, the *JAWS*, asks respondents to consider their last 30 days at work and to respond to statements about their reactions to work. The scale begins with 1, “never”, and proceeds to 5, “extremely often” (Van Katwyk et al., 2000). The *JAWS* seeks to identify patterns in affective state. This instrument allows researchers to assess participants’ responses in several ways. The *JAWS*, according to Van Lent (2013) can be assessed as:

a total scale ($\alpha=0.94$), across positive and negative emotions ($\alpha=0.92$ and $\alpha=0.89$ respectively) or across its four subscales: High Pleasurable-High Arousal (Excitement, HPHA, $\alpha=0.88$), High Pleasurable-Low Arousal (Contentment, HPLA, $\alpha=0.72$), Low Pleasurable-High Arousal (Distress, LPHA, $\alpha=0.73$) and finally Low Pleasurable-Low Arousal (Depression, LPLA, $\alpha=0.69$). Note, this falls below the critical value of $\alpha=0.70$, in contrast with previous research where it usually falls around $\alpha=0.80$ (Van Katwyk et al., 2000). Low Pleasurable items are related to negative emotions, for example “My job made me feel angry” (LPHA) and, “My job made me feel discouraged” (LPLA), whereas High Pleasurable items are related to positive emotions, “My job made me feel excited” (HPHA) and “My job made me feel relaxed” (HPLA). (p. 11)

According to Morrissey et al. (2013), adding scores of the 15 positive affect items gives a positive emotion score, and adding scores of the 15 negative affect items gives a negative emotion score. The scale reliability has been reported as 0.95 by Van Katwyk et al. (2000) and Morrissey et al. (2013). This instrument is thus an acceptable choice for measuring the way team members feel about their jobs.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Job affective well-being, which examines employees' feelings about their jobs, is one indicator of organizational climate. Another measure, the *OCB-C* can provide a different kind of information about organizational climate by examining the behaviors of employees rather than their feelings. In the 1980s, Organ and his colleagues (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) created the term "organizational citizenship behavior" (OCB). This concept was based on Barnard's (1938) concept of the "willingness to cooperate" and Daniel Katz's (1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978) distinction between dependable role performances and "innovative and spontaneous behaviors," Organ (1988) defined organizational citizenship behaviors as:

Individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization. In using the term discretionary it is implied that behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or the job description, that is, the clearly specifiable terms of the person's employment contract with the organization; the behavior is rather a matter of personal choice, such that its omission is not generally understood as punishable. (p. 513)

Another definition of OCB emphasizes contributions made to the social and psychological environment of the workplace through one's behavior beyond that which is required (Farooqui, 2012). This type of behavior is done without an expectation of reward and is altruistic in nature. People with high levels of OCB help beyond what is expected without hope of or desire for reward.

Many different forms of citizenship behavior have been identified. To define the construct, one must consider the conceptual definitions of OCB, which fall along common themes or dimensions and include: "(1) Helping Behavior, (2) Sportsmanship, (3) Organizational Loyalty, (4) Organizational Compliance, (5) Individual Initiative, (6) Civic Virtue, and (7) Self Development" (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, & Bachrach,

2000, p. 516). According to Podsakoff et al., helping behavior includes actions done when one voluntarily helps others or serves them or prevents problems, while sportsmanship encompasses the willingness to put up with the things at work that are inconvenient without complaining. These authors explain that organizational compliance describes the willingness to comply with work rules and procedures because one has accepted them and internalized them and is willing to comply when not monitored, that individual initiative is illustrated when an employee voluntarily does extra duties above minimum requirements, and that civic virtue can be described as a commitment to the organization.

Helping behavior is a critical ingredient of citizenship behavior. According to Organ (1988), helping behavior theoretically involves helping others willingly with work-related problems. This type of behavior encompasses (Organ & Konovsky, 1988) altruism, peacemaking, and cheerleading. Another element of helping behavior includes assisting with continued work-related problems. This part of the definition consists of assisting individuals in circumventing problems that may occur with coworkers.

With respect to the sportsmanship type of OCB, Organ (1988) claimed that those displaying sportsmanship behavior aim to accept the non-ideal condition within the organization without complaining. When a high level of this dimension is present, the working atmosphere among employees will remain more positive thus helping to create a conducive working environment. Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) discovered that quality sportsmanship improves the morale of the work group thus leading to a low attrition rate of employees. The downside to sportsmanship, in some researchers' opinion, is that it demonstrates what some deem a non-helping behavior because it allows negative

conditions to exist that do not contribute to heightened effectiveness of the organization. Lo and Ramayah (2009) are researchers who urge that sportsmanship is not a dominant dimension of OCB.

Organizational loyalty, another commonly listed OCB, in its simplest form, means protecting the organization's well-being from within from the outsiders (Graham, 1989, 1991). Even in the case where the company is at fault, organizational loyalty is demonstrated by individuals who show loyalty to the organizations, protecting it from outsiders. Spreading goodwill and defending the company for which one works is the essence of organizational loyalty (George & Brief, 1992; George & Jones, 1997).

The organizational compliance aspect of OCB has been called generalized compliance by Smith et al. (1983) and organizational obedience by Graham (1991). Organizational compliance is aspect of OCB in which an employee's loyalty is exemplified by loyalty to and acceptance of the organization's policies, rules, and guidelines by that employee even when he or she is not being forced to do so. Organizational compliance is looks like willing obedience to policy and agreement to policy.

Another aspect of OCB is individual initiative. Individual initiative is the behavior demonstrated by an employee who goes above and beyond the call of duty, doing more than his or her job demands. Individual initiative is a task-related behavior that is exemplified by an employee that goes far beyond what is written in his or her job description (Organ & Konovsky, 1988). Some examples of individual initiative include actions that include intentional acts of creativity and innovation, volunteering, assuming responsibilities, and encouraging others to demonstrate these some types of behaviors.

Civic virtue is the conduct that aims to demonstrate respectable working approaches such as the acceptance of change and working with the policies within the company by participating in its governance. Graham (1991) states that civic virtue represents a macro-level interest in, or commitment to, the organization as a whole. Civic virtue within the realm of organizational citizenship behavior places the company's interest ahead of one's own personal interest.

Finally, the development of self is a critical element of OCB. The research of Katz (1964), as well as that of George and Brief (1992), explains that an effort to develop oneself includes the improvement of obtaining knowledge, skills, and abilities. According to George and Brief, this might include: "seeking out and taking advantage of advanced training courses, keeping abreast of the latest developments in one's field and area, or even learning a new set of skills so as to expand the range of one's contributions to an organization" (p. 155).

In a study of workers from a wide variety of fields who were also students at a university ($n=203$), Miles, Spector, Borman, and Fox (2002) found the overall score in OCB to be 3.46 ($SD=0.70$). This sample of workers were of an average age of 25 and were diverse (66% white, 18% African-American, and 12% Hispanic). Researchers in this study used the Citizenship Performance Scale (Coleman & Borman, 2000).

Spector and Che (2014) examined several instruments used to measure OCB in an attempt to determine which predictors remain valid for OCB. They found that many predictors should be reexamined based on a meta-analysis of literature, but that the *OCB-C* remains a valid means of predicting OCB. In a sample ($n=146$) of workers from a

variety of fields, who worked at least 20 hours per week while in college, who were 75% female, the OCB level was 3.34 ($SD=0.80$).

Wang (2009) studied factors that promote and moderate citizenship in service settings, studying 1,387 contact employees and 666 supervisors. The behaviors of employees who have contact with customers can be crucial to organizational success in such settings. Wang's findings indicate that employees who feel positively about their relationships with their employers will reciprocate by having higher levels of OCB when in contact with customers. A logical conclusion to some is that leaders with higher EI will be more successful at developing such positive feelings in employees, which increases those employees' OCB.

Measuring OCB

Organizational citizenship behavior can be assessed using the *OCB-C*. This instrument has 12 items and uses a 5-point Likert scale. The reliability of this instrument is high (0.86-0.93) (DiPaola, Tarter, & Hoy, 2005). In their study involving 113 managers in 10 firms in Malaysia, Lo and Ramayah (2009) assessed the *OCB-C* measurement in regard to validity and reliability. "Exploratory factor analysis with an orthogonal rotation of varimax was used to evaluate the construct validity of the instrument" (p. 50). This analysis was followed by a principal component analysis. Construct validity was found to be high. The four extracted factors all met the required levels for acceptable internal consistency. Based on these and a variety of other tests, this instrument was found to be acceptable to use in assessing OCB.

Organizational Climate, JAWS, and OCB

While JAW and OCB are not in themselves measures of organizational climate,

these two constructs can lend a window into the much more complex construct of organizational climate by looking through these two lenses at an organization's climate (Ramandi, Karimi, & Rajaei, 2015).

The construct of job affective well-being has strong connections to the climate within an organization (Van Katwyk et al., 2000). The *JAWS* measure is based on a two-dimensional circumplex model in which emotions are represented on a continuous circle, and leaders within organizations are often urged that they should be cognizant of employee's affective well-being as it has a great effect on the success of organizations they serve due to its effects on climate (Anderson, 2008). According to Anderson, a strong correlation exists between JAW and a positive or negative atmosphere within an organization, which is closely linked to organizational climate levels.

The concept of OCB and how it relates to organizational climate is also an important element of this study. The general definition of OCB falls along common themes or dimensions, which include: "(1) Helping Behavior, (2) Sportsmanship, (3) Organizational Loyalty, (4) Organizational Compliance, (5) Individual Initiative, (6) Civic Virtue, and (7) Self Development" (Podsakoff et al., 2000, p. 516).

An organization will more likely be successful if employees are willing to go above their usual job description to complete duties, conditions that are more likely if the employees believe the organization's environment or climate to be conducive to them personally and supportive of them as individuals and as employees (Margarita, Reyes, & Zapata, 2014). In their study of over 500 employees, Randhawa and Kaur (2015) found a strong positive correlation between OCB and organizational climate, with 67.6% of variance in OCB explained by the dimensions of organizational climate (p. 65). These

authors urge that leaders should seek to improve organizational climate as a means of increasing employees' OCB, which will positively impact the success of the organization (Bergeron, 2007; Tang et al., 2008).

Why measure organizational climate with the *JAWS* and *OCB-C* rather than through some other means? Organizational climate measures are numerous, including the:

Organizational Climate Questionnaire (Litwin & Stringer, 1966), *Agency Climate Questionnaire* (Schneider & Bartlett, 1968, 1970), *Executive Climate Questionnaire* (Tagiuri, 1968), *Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire* (Halpin, 1966; Margulies, 1965), *Organizational Climate Index* (Stern, 1970), *Survey of Organizations* (Bowers & Taylor, 1972), *Organizational Climate Questionnaire* (Lawler, Hall, & Oldhman, 1974), *Perceived Organizational Climate* (Dieterly & Schneider, 1974), *Perceived Work Environment* (Newman, 1975, 1977), *Psychological Climate Questionnaire* (Jones & James, 1974), *Organizational Climate Measure* (Patterson et al., 2005), and the *Survey of Organizational Characteristics* (Thumin & Thumin, 2011). (as cited in Pena-Suarez, Muniz, Campillo-Alvarez, Fonseca-Pedrero, & Garcia-Cueto, 2012, p. 138)

The construct of organizational climate may be defined as global or multi-dimensional, leading to wide disparity in measurement instruments, some of which attempt to measure as many as 17 dimensions with over 150 questions. This researcher has chosen to view organizational climate through the lenses of OCB and JAW.

Employees who feel positive and have high levels of well-being in regard to their jobs and who go above and beyond the requirements of their jobs are also likely to have good attitudes towards their jobs (Williams & Anderson, 1991). According to Thumin and Thumin (2011), "any good, solid measure of climate is inevitably also a good, solid measure of employee attitude" (p. 104).

Regarding the other dependent variable used in this study, OCB, and its connection to organizational climate, Randhawa and Kaur (2015) conducted a study in

the workplace and found “a strong positive correlation between organizational climate and OCB” (p. 65). Gholami et al. (2015) also found a significant positive relationship between OCB and organizational climate. Castro and Martins (2010) found that organizational climate can be defined as “the shared perceptions, feelings, and attitudes that organizational members have about the fundamental elements of the organization . . . and influences individuals’ behavior positively or negatively” (p. 6). While organizational climate is complex and multidimensional, viewing the construct through the lenses of JAW and OCB is a sound approach.

Final Key Analysis

Given the abundance of material available regarding the topic, many variables have been examined in the study of leadership; one of the key areas of study in the field is EI. Articles, books, and other materials related to the topic of EI reveal that the phrase connotes many definitions, due in part to the complexities involved in understanding each word in the phrase, EI: intelligence and emotional. Intelligence is commonly understood to be the capacity or aptitude an individual possesses for learning. Intelligence can be viewed through the lenses introduced by Gardner (1983), which include: logical-mathematical, linguistic, musical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal or intrapersonal intelligence as well as those associated with academics, technology intelligence, social intelligence, and EI (Purcell & Wilcox, 2007).

Based on the findings of many researchers, EI plays a noteworthy role in leadership and organizational success concepts (Jafri et al., 2016; Jordan & Troth, 2011; Mayer, 2001; Peterson et al., 2003; Watkin, 2002). Understanding EI and being aware of one’s own strengths and weaknesses in this area is crucial for leaders who want to

maximize their effectiveness. Studies have shown that scores in each category of EI can predict job performance and satisfaction for leaders' employees (Shahhosseini, Silong, Ismaill, & Uli, 2012). When an organization evaluates the EI of its employees, particularly those in leadership roles, it gains a strong blueprint for improving performance, improving the workplace climate, and driving productivity. The costs for ignoring EI in an organization can be devastating to the bottom-line success as well as to people, due to lower productivity, less effective contact along organizational front lines, and increased attrition of valuable employees. Organizations should strive to reap the benefits of helping leaders and employees becoming more emotionally intelligent: improving performance of employees and executives, building strong teams, and driving productivity. Wharam (2009) urges: "EI measures the capacity of the heart while IQ measures that of the brain" (p. 29). Brains have long been acknowledged as having great effect on success, but an informed leader will recognize the importance of heart as well. A leader's EI is impactful and important for consideration.

Team members and their perceptions of organizational climate are also crucial elements of organizational success. Each of the previously described aspects of OCB as well as those of JAW can positively contribute to the work environment and to the success of the organization. Research into connections between these behaviors and leaders' EI seems judicious given that a leader's actions affects how employees think, feel, and behave. A leader with high levels of EI could improve organizational climate by helping employees feel more positive with higher levels of JAW and be more likely to exhibit high levels of OCB. As stated previously, happy, helpful employees help an organization succeed.

The purpose of this literature review was to answer several questions. First, how does the current study relate to and expand research within the field of leadership, specifically in the areas of EI and the effect of leader EI on organizational climate. This review of literature began with a description of EI, an explanation of how it is defined, its history, its theoretical basis, methods of measuring it, its relationship with gender, and controversies relating to it. Organizational climate and its link to JAW and OCB were also explored. Job affective well-being was defined, its relationship to leadership was explored, and its assessment was discussed. Organizational citizenship behavior were detailed, with an analysis of how those behaviors relate to leadership, as well as a discussion of how they are measured. The review of available literature examined findings from previous studies that can shed light on the following questions: First, does a relationship exist between leaders' EI and his or her team members' work behaviors and feelings about their jobs, and, second, do gender differences exist in the relationship between leaders' ability to recognize and manage their emotions and their team members' work behaviors and feelings towards their jobs? This study's focus is, thus, timely and reasonable.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

General Introduction

This study was conducted to investigate how the EI of leaders affects organizational climate in regard to employees' emotions about their work and their helping behaviors at work with additional consideration given to how the gender of leaders may influence this relationship. Topics discussed in Chapter 3 include the research method, design appropriateness, reasons for the selection of a quantitative research method instead of a qualitative method, an explanation of why the design accomplished the study goals, and why the design was the optimum choice for the specific research. Chapter 3 also reflects the research participants' informed consent, confidentiality, and the geographic location of where the study was conducted. Chapter 3 provides a rationale for the quantitative methods that were used regarding their appropriateness to the study and why they are preferable to other methods. Other areas discussed in chapter 3 identify the in-depth data analysis to be performed, an examination of the reliability as well as the internal and external validity of instruments to be used.

The Research Questions

In order to accomplish the purpose of this study, the following research questions will be explored:

1. What is the level of EI among selected leaders at AU?

2. What is the level of JAW and OCB of the members of selected leaders at AU?
3. What is the nature of the relationship between AU leaders' EI levels as measured by the *MSCEIT* test of EI and their team members' JAW, as measured by the *JAWS*' two subscales: positive and negative emotional experiences, and their team members' OCB, as measured by the *OCB-C* subscales: OCB-o and OCB-p?
4. What role does the gender of the Andrews University leaders play in the relationship between AU leaders' EI and their team members' levels of JAW and OCB?

Research Design

A quantitative correlational research method has been chosen as an appropriate method for the research study in which a relationship or link is sought between AU leaders' EI as indicated by the results of the *MSCEIT* (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999) and their team-members' JAW, as measured by the *JAWS* and OCB, as measured by the *OCB-C*.

The correlational research method was appropriate as a research strategy for this study because the data sampling and collection design used results from the *MSCEIT*, the *JAWS*, and the *OCB-C*, all of which generated quantitative data. As this research approach attempts to describe trends and to explain statistical relationships among the variables rather than seeking to generate theory or explain phenomena, quantitative methods were appropriate. The correlational research method selected to search for relationships between the chosen variables was based on the results of the literature review, which also led to the choice of the ability-based model of EI. The quantitative method required the use of the *MSCEIT*, the *JAWS*, and the *OCB-C* to gather data. The results of the *MSCEIT*, the *JAWS*, and the *OCB-C* answered the research questions using

descriptive statistics and two canonical correlation analyses. According to Sherry and Henson (2005), the use of canonical correlational method is most appropriate when seeking to determine the relationship between two variable sets. “Because CCA examines the correlation between a synthetic criterion and synthetic predictor variable that are weighted based on the relationships between the variables within the sets” (p. 39). Using standardized weights, a canonical correlational analysis “creates two linear equates, one for the predictor variables and one for the criterion variables. These equations then yield the two synthetic variables” (Sherry & Henson, 2005, p. 39.) This method was thus deemed the most effective for answering this study’s research questions.

Population and Sample

Participants in this study were from an ethnically diverse group of leaders and team members at a private university located in a small Midwestern town. The leaders’ names were taken from the AU 2015–2016 employee directory. Leaders were chosen for participation in this study based on the number of employees for whom they were responsible. At the time of the study, the university directory included 103 total leaders who had three or more employees that reported to each of them. From August 2015 to October 2015, I sent an email to all 103 leaders inviting each one to participate in the study by taking the *MSCEIT* and to allow me to gauge the climate of their department by asking their employees to respond to two short instruments: the *JAWS* and the *OCB-C*.

The other group of participants within this study were the university team members. A team member was classified as an individual who reports directly to a university leader who has three or more employees who directly report. As each leader completed the *MSCEIT*, I compiled a running list of the team members they represented,

whom I then contacted via email (on three occasions) and asked to take the *JAWS* and the *OCB-C*.

Definition of Variables

The following list of definitions defines the terms used in this study. The data collected to answer the research questions, the dependent variables, included AU team members' OCB as measured by the *OCB-C* and a second variable, *JAW*, as measured by the *JAWS*. The independent variables in this study were the branch scores of AU leaders within the EI construct as measured by the *MSCEIT*.

Emotional Intelligence: The instrument being used to measure EI includes four subscales, which for this study, will be used to define the construct of EI.

Job-related Affective Well-being: An overall score of all items on the *JAWS* with the negative emotions reverse scored.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The overall score from the *OCB-C*, which sums all 20 items.

Andrews University Leader: This signifies an individual who works for AU where a minimum of 3 employees report to for job performances.

Andrews University Team Member: This is an individual who is employed by AU and has worked in the same department for 6 consecutive months.

Positive Emotions: Positive emotions are those that occupy the pleasure side of the two-dimensional model of affective well-being and include those in the areas of excitement and contentment. These emotions are identified on the *JAWS* by Questions 1, 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, and 30. See Appendix B to see all items. Questions include: My job makes me feel at ease; My job makes me feel cheerful; and

My job makes me feel content (Van Katwyk et al., 2000). Note that, according to Morrissey et al. (2013), adding scores of the 15 positive affect items gives a positive emotion score, and adding scores of the 15 negative affect items gives a negative emotion score.

Negative Emotions: Negative emotions are those that occupy the displeasure side of the two-dimensional model of affective well-being and include those in the areas of distress and depression. These emotions are identified by the following items on the *JAWS*: 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, and 26. See Appendix B to see all items. Questions include: My job makes me feel angry; My job makes me feel annoyed; and My job made me feel miserable (Van Katwyk et al., 2000).

OCB-o: Acts directed towards the organization (Fox & Spector, 2011).

OCB-p: Acts directed towards people in the organization such as coworkers that help with work-related issues (Fox & Spector, 2011).

Instrumentation

This study examined the research questions based on the data gathered from three instruments. The *MSCEIT* was used to measure the EI of AU leaders as this test is the one most closely associated with the EI ability-based model, which I chose. The *JAWS* was used to measure the JAW of AU employees. The 20-question *OCB-C* was used to measure the OCB of AU employees. Each instrument has been established as having acceptable levels of reliability and validity.

Instrument 1: Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)

The *MSCEIT* is an ability-based test designed to measure the four branches of the EI model of Mayer and Salovey. “The *MSCEIT* test was developed from an intelligence-

testing tradition formed by the emerging scientific understanding of emotions and their function and from the first published ability measure specifically intended to assess emotional intelligence, namely *Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS)*” (Mayer et al., 2002, pp. 253–254).

MSCEIT General Description

The *MSCEIT* survey is designed to assess a person’s EI. The *MSCEIT* is a scale-based instrument that measures how well people perform tasks and solve emotional problems, such as a person’s self-assessment of emotional skills (Mayer et al., 2002). The creation of the *MSCEIT* is from an “intelligence-testing tradition” through an “emerging understanding of emotions” and functions (p. 1). The primary feature of the *MSCEIT* is that it is a “performance-based assessment of overall emotional intelligence for individuals 17 years of age or older” (p. 1).

MSCEIT Structure, Scoring, and Interpretation

The *MSCEIT* processes two EI sub score areas, which are emotional experience and emotional reasoning and measures the four branches of EI (Lopes, Salovey, & Straus, 2002).

The complete EI score used in the *MSCEIT* survey is the emotional intelligence quotient (EIQ), which “measures overall emotional intelligence” (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 14). There are two categorical scores used in the *MSCEIT* survey in the area of: “experiential EIQ (EEIQ) and strategic EIQ (SEIQ) scores” (p. 14). Perceiving emotions EIQ and facilitating thought EIQ are the two EEIQ branch scores utilized in the *MSCEIT* survey. The experiential EIQ is a depiction of a person’s ability to accommodate his or

her emotional experience or identify an emotional experience, relate the experience to other feelings, and understand how the experience interacts with thoughts.

The two SEIQ branch scores used in the *MSCEIT* are understanding emotions and managing emotions, EIQ scores (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 14). The SEIQ “indicates the degree to which people can understand the meaning of emotions, their implications for relationships, and how to manage emotions individually and in other people” (p. 14). The last part of the EI quotients are the four EI branches of the four-branch model. Table 1 shows the structure, scales, and subscales of the *MSCEIT*, representing the task levels the *MSCEIT* survey produced.

One more aspect of scores on the *MSCEIT* should be discussed. Coping is a measurement developed by one of the *MSCEIT*’s original developers, David Caruso (2016). According to Caruso (personal communication, February 17, 2016), the Coping score is obtained by subtracting Sensation tasks from Self-Management. This score yields the measurement of a construct deemed Coping. Caruso defines Coping as the ability an individual has to manage his or her emotions minus his or her ability to feel or experience emotional sensations. Thus, if a person has low emotion self-management but this is balanced by that person’s lack of emotion, then the surface appearance of that person is wellness. Caruso compares sensation and self-management to water versus the banks of the river.

To review, first the *MSCEIT* allows researchers to identify the total emotional intelligence score (EIQ) of test takers, providing the overall index of each individual’s EI based on answers to all 141 *MSCEIT* questions. Table 2 shows the score interpretations of the *MSCEIT* by listing the EIQ range and the associated qualitative range of scoring to

Table 1

Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)

Overall Scale	Two Areas of MSCEIT	Four Branches of MSCEIT	Task Level
Total Emotional Intelligence Score (EIQ)	Experiential Emotional Intelligence (EEIQ)	Perceiving Emotions	Faces
		Using Emotions Facilitating Thought	Pictures
	Strategic Emotional Intelligence (SEIQ)	Understanding Emotions	Facilitation Sensations
		Managing Emotions	Changes Blends
			Emotional Management Social Management (Emotional Relations)

Note. From J. D. Mayer, P. Salovey, and D. R. Caruso (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) User's Manual* (p. 8). North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems. Adapted with permission of the author.

Table 2

MSCEIT EIQ and Qualitative Ranges

EIQ Range	Qualitative Range
0<70	Improve
>70 and <90	Consider Developing
>90 and <99	Competent Low average score
>100 and <109	Competent High average score
>110 and <119	Competent Skilled
>120 and <129	Skilled
>130	Expert

Note. From J. D. Mayer, P. Salovey, and D. R. Caruso (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) User's Manual* (p. 18). North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems. Adapted with permission of the author.

be used when interpreting the test scores. This interpretation is true for all subscales of the *MSCEIT*.

The *MSCEIT* has four branch scores and eight task levels. The first branch score

is Perceiving emotions (faces and pictures), representing the degree to which an individual is able to demonstrate the ability to identify an emotion within themselves and other people. The first branch score revolves around identifying faces. This part of the *MSCEIT* requests that participants determine how an individual feels based on his or her facial expression.

The Perceiving branch measures the most basic emotional intelligence skill and includes the ability to perceive emotions both in oneself, others, objects, music, art, stories, and other stimuli. In this branch test, subjects indicate how much of various emotions such as happiness, fear, sadness, or surprise is present in a provided picture. This branch is measured with questions such as the one found in Figure 2.

Two types of tasks are used in the *MSCEIT* to measure an individual's ability to perceive emotions. In the Faces Task, respondents must decide how an individual feels by looking at a picture of a facial expression. In the Pictures Task, respondents must decide the extent to which various pictures of landscapes and other images express various emotions. The authors of the *MSCEIT* urge that even though some questions may seem irrelevant or unusual, the assessment is designed to measure EI in direct and indirect ways and has been proven reliable (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2011).

The second branch score centers around pictures tasks, which is an emotional perception test, where the individual determines emotions expressed in art, music, and the participant's environment (Mayer et al., 2002). This branch score's focus is on using emotions by indicating the degree to which the participant has the ability to use specific emotions to improve intellectual thinking which measures the participant's knowledge of mood interactions with supportive reasoning and thinking (Mayer et al., 2002).

Indicate how much of each emotion is present in this picture:

Emotion	Not Much				Very
Happiness	1	2	3	4	5
Fear	1	2	3	4	5
Sadness	1	2	3	4	5
Surprise	1	2	3	4	5

Figure 2. Perceiving emotions question type on the MSCEIT.

The *MSCEIT* provides branch scores for using emotions using questions such as seen in Figure 3.

Using emotions to facilitate thought incorporates the ability to generate, use, and feel emotion as necessary to communicate feelings or to use them in other cognitive processes such as to solve problems, reason, and make decisions. Emotion can improve thought processes or disrupt them, change the way one thinks, shift perspectives, and foster creative thought (Mayer et al., 2011).

Understanding emotions is the third branch score that focus on changes and blends that tell how well participants understand emotional conditions. Within section three, understanding emotions there is a focus on a Blends Task, which assesses the participant's ability to analyze emotional blends as well as understanding emotional tasks which measures the participant's knowledge of emotional train, which transition from

<i>What mood(s) might be helpful to feel when meeting in-laws for the very first time?</i>					
Mood	Not Useful				Useful
Tension	1	2	3	4	5
Surprise	1	2	3	4	5
Joy	1	2	3	4	5

Figure 3. Using emotions question type on the *MSCEIT*.

one emotional state to another, such as anger changing into rage (Mayer et al., 2002).

Understanding Emotions allows for the ability to understand complex emotions and how those emotions change as the emotion chains transition between stages.

Understanding what leads to various emotions is also an important aspect measured in this branch that can help a person understand how emotions such as irritation increase to fury. The *MSCEIT* measures this branch with questions such as the one seen in Figure 4.

Understanding Emotions is measured with two types of tasks on the *MSCEIT*: Changes Tasks and Blends Tasks. The Changes Task measures an individual's "knowledge of experiencing possibly conflicting emotions in certain situations and understanding emotional 'chains', or how emotions transition from one to another" (Mayer et al., 2011, p. 13) while the Blends Tasks measure how well an individual is able to make a connection between certain situations and emotions.

The fourth branch score focus is on managing emotions that include recording via self-report how well one manages emotions in his or her personal life and in the lives of others. The emotion management part has two sections. The first, emotion management, measures the participant's ability to combine his or her individual emotions into the

Tom felt anxious, and became a bit stressed when he thought about all the work he needed to do. When his supervisor brought him an additional project, he felt ____.
(Select the best choice.)

- a) Overwhelmed
- b) Depressed
- c) Ashamed
- d) Self Conscious
- e) Jittery

Figure 4. Understanding emotions question type on the *MSCEIT*.

critical-thinking and decision making process, requesting the participant to evaluate alternative action effectiveness. The second part of branch four, social management, the participant's ability to assimilate his or her emotions into the decision-making process involving others. This task involves participant's ability to assess how different actions are effective to accomplish results (Mayer et al., 2002).

Managing emotions is another branch of EI measured with the *MSCEIT*. Caruso (2016), in his EI Skills Group website, explains that the Managing branch of EI is measured with questions such as those found in Figure 5.

Two types of tasks on the *MSCEIT* measure managing emotions: Emotion Management Task and Emotional Relations Task. On Emotion Management Tasks, respondents "rate the effectiveness of alternative actions in achieving a certain result" (Mayer et al., 2011, p. 249), in a situation where the person must regulate their own emotions. On Emotional Relations Tasks, respondents are asked to evaluate actions in terms of effectiveness for achieving an outcome that involves other people.

MSCEIT Reliability and Validity

The various divisions of the *MSCEIT* and types of questions it includes that tests

Debbie just came back from vacation. She was feeling peaceful and content. How well would each action preserve her mood?

Action 1: She started to make a list of things at home that she needed to do.

Very Ineffective..12345..Very Effective

Action 2: She began thinking about where and when she would go on her next vacation.

Very Ineffective..12345..Very Effective

Action 3: She decided it was best to ignore the feeling since it wouldn't last anyway.

Very Ineffective..12345..Very Effective

Figure 5. Managing emotions question type on the MSCEIT.

ability rather than simply relying on self-report is an important factor in why it was chosen as the instrument for measuring EI in this study. Additionally, the *MSCEIT* has a confirmed reliability and validity and meets the criteria of level B educational testing and of the American Psychological Association (Mayer et al., 2002). The *MSCEIT* survey model has appropriate levels of validity, as face validity “is readily apparent in the tasks the survey test employs” (p. 43). The content validity of the *MSCEIT* instrument is strengthened through the scale of items, and the four-branch model, which aligns well with the theoretical construct of EI. A factor analysis indicated that the *MSCEIT* has convincing “construct validity” (p. 43). Further, the *MSCEIT* has good levels of reliability (see Table 3). For the purposes of this study, I chose to use the four branch scores as predictor variables. The *MSCEIT* survey is an authoritative, trustworthy, and effective survey instrument.

Table 3

Reliability of MSCEIT and Its Subareas and Branches

Scale Group	Scale Scores Recommended for Interpretation	General Scoring
Overall	Total EIQ	0.93
Area Scores	A. Experiential	0.90
	B. Strategic	0.88
Branch Scores	1. Perceiving	0.91
	2. Facilitating (Using)	0.79
	3. Understanding	0.80
	4. Managing	0.83
Branch 1: Perceiving Emotions	A. Faces	0.81
	E. Pictures	0.88
Branch 2: Facilitating Thought (Using)	B. Facilitation	0.64
	F. Sensations	0.65
Branch 3: Understanding Emotions	C. Changes	0.70
	G. Blends	0.66
Branch 4: Managing Emotions	D. Emotion management	0.69
	H. Emotional relations	0.67

Note. From J. D. Mayer, P. Salovey, and D. R. Caruso (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) User's Manual* (p. 14). North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems. Adapted with permission of the author.

Instrument 2: Organizational Citizenship Behavior
Checklist (OCB-C)

OCB-C General Description

Organizational citizen behavior was measured in this study using the *OCB-C*.

Podsakoff et al. (1990) created this instrument to test five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior, which include altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue (see Appendix A). All five of these can be combined to form an overall degree of organizational citizenship behavior (Pillai, Watson, & Eisenbach, 1999).

OCB-C Structure, Scoring, and Interpretation

In this instrument, participants are asked to state the degree to which they agree with the 20 *OCB-C* questions, which are on a 5-point scale (1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often, and 5=always) on how frequently they would participate in the identified behaviors. The *OCB-C* items reflects acts directed toward the organization as well as people working within the organization, such as coworkers. Some of the *OCB-C* questions ask about unselfish acts that ask the respondent about helping coworkers with personal as opposed to workplace issues. The 20-item *OCB-C* Questionnaire was divided into two separate subscale scores: OCB-o and OCB-p. For this study, I chose to use the two subscales OCB-o and OCB-p. I chose to include the subscales OCB-o and OCB-p in order to further delineate organizational climate beyond what could be learned from the combined score.

OCB-C Reliability and Validity

According to Fields (2002), the instrument developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990) demonstrates acceptable validity. The five dimensions associated positively with one another. Coefficient alphas ranged from 0.67 to 0.91 for altruism, 0.76 to 0.89 for sportsmanship, 0.69 to 0.86 for courtesy, and 0.66 to 0.90 for civic virtue. The alpha for conscientiousness was 0.79. The coefficient alpha for overall *OCB-C* was 0.94. The *OCB-C* was chosen because its reliabilities are within acceptable ranges.

Instrument 3: Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS)

JAWS General Description

Job affective well-being, the other dependent variable, was assessed using a scale

developed by Van Katwyk et al. (2000), the *JAWS* (see Appendix B). The *JAWS* was developed to show patterns of affective states and related experience to the specific context.

JAWS Structure, Scoring, and Interpretation

The *JAWS* asks participants to answer 30 questions about how often any aspect of their job has caused them to feel 30 specific emotional states, both positive and negative, over the past 30 days, using the 5-point scale (1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Quite Often, and 5=Extremely Often). Four subscales of emotions fall along the dimensions of pleasurable-ness and arousal (intensity).

The *JAWS* can be measured as a total scale ($\alpha=0.94$), across positive and negative emotions ($\alpha=0.92$ and $\alpha=0.89$ respectively) or across its four subscales: High Pleasurable-High Arousal (Excitement, HPHA, $\alpha=0.88$), High Pleasurable-Low Arousal (Contentment, HPLA, $\alpha=0.72$), Low Pleasurable-High Arousal (Distress, LPHA, $\alpha=0.73$) and finally Low Pleasurable-Low Arousal (Depression, LPLA, $\alpha=0.69$). Low Pleasurable items are related to negative emotions, for example “My work made me feel annoyed” (LPHA) and, “My work made me feel disheartened” (LPLA); whereas, High Pleasurable items are related to positive emotions, “My work made me feel happy” (HPHA) and “My work made me feel tranquil” (HPLA).

JAWS Reliability and Validity

The reliability of the overall scale has been established at 0.95, while the alpha coefficients of the four subscales are also at acceptable levels, ranging from 0.80–0.95 (Van Katwyk et al., 2000). For this study, I chose to use the positive and negative emotions scales in order to capture more detail than by simply using a composite score

but to avoid the more complexity of using four subscales.

Procedure

At the study's onset, using the directory given to all AU employees, I ascertained that 103 individuals at AU had more than three individuals who reported to them, thus classifying them as a leader, using the definition of leader decided upon by me at the outset of the study. All AU leaders with three or more team members answering directly to them were invited via email to participate in the study.

I provided a description of the study along with the Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval with the explanation that the consent form would be provided at the beginning of the survey (see Appendix C). This email had a link for each participant to click to begin the *MSCEIT* via an online version of the instrument I purchased at mhs.com. I provided each leader with a username and password that allowed them to access the *MSCEIT* once they arrived at the site provided through the link. Once a leader took the *MSCEIT*, his or her team members were invited via email to also participate in the study (see Appendix D).

I provided a description of the study for all identified AU Team members along with the IRB approval with the explanation (see Appendix E). The emailed description also included a consent link provided at the beginning of the survey. The team members' email included a link to Surveymonkey.com, which allowed respondents to take a survey that was structured in such a way that they first completed a page with demographic questions, next a page with the *JAWS* questions, and finally, a page with the *OCB-C* questions (see Appendix F).

The leaders were invited to participate on four separate occasions (September 20,

2015; October 15, 2015; November 15, 2015; and December 1, 2015), allowing more than three months for participation. Only after I confirmed that their leader had taken the *MSCEIT* were team members were invited to participate. These invitations occurred on three separate occasions (November 15, 2015; December 1, 2015; and January 1, 2016).

Each AU Leader and AU Team Member was assigned a code number that was only linked to their name in a list that was kept in a locked file. When the study was completed and all data had been analyzed, this list was destroyed. All information regarding scores was linked to code numbers rather than to specific names. No participant's name will be used in any report.

The AU Leader consent form acknowledged that in order to study the relationships between leaders' EI and team members' OCB and JAWS, the leaders' results on the *MSCEIT* would not be confidential. I also informed team members that their results would not be confidential but would be linked to their specific leader. Each team member from each department has the same code number as other members of their department and are not distinguishable from other team members within their department. Further, the identities of all leaders and team members has been and will be held in strict confidentiality. I used codes to track data and destroyed code information once data analysis was complete. Utmost care has been used to ensure that the reporting of data does not allow any leader or team member to be identified.

Ethical Considerations

The ethical measurements of this research study involved having the privilege to observe EI concerns in an educational institution, AU, and also measure the OCB of AU team members. The research has been performed with honesty, lack of prejudice,

impartiality, and high reliability towards all AU participants. The treatment of the research participants and the protection of human subjects has been completed in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act with the approval of the AU IRB. Great care has been applied to the storage of data to maintain absolute confidentiality that does not link individual employees to specific data other than in the previously stated manner.

Data Gathering

Gathering Leaders' EI Data

University leaders were identified and sent an invitation to take the *MSCEIT*. Upon completion, MHS gathered the data and provided the data into a file in Excel spreadsheet format for statistical analysis. I oversaw each respondent's *MSCEIT* test results.

Gathering Organizational Climate Data Using the JAWS and OCB

Once a leader took the *MSCEIT*, each of his team members received an email invitation to participate in the study. Data from the *JAWS* and *OCB-C* were placed in a single online survey accessed by a single link to the survey, which was included in the email invitation—a cover letter of sorts. These were emailed to all team members whose leader took the *MSCEIT* from September 2015 to December 2015. The cover letter, shown in Appendix E, explained the purpose of the study and assured each team member that providing the information was voluntary and confidential.

Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software program version 23.0 was

used to prepare descriptive statistics and to conduct a Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA). Research Question 1 asked: What is the level of EI among selected leaders at AU? This question was analyzed using descriptive statistics generating the means and standard deviations for each branch of EI for all respondents as well as for males and females specifically.

Research Question 2 asked: What is the level JAW and OCB of the members of selected leaders at AU? This question was analyzed using descriptive statistics generating the means and standard deviations for team members as a whole and delineated by gender for the subscales of *OCB-C*, *OCB-o* and *OCB-p*, as well as for the subscales of *JAWS*, positive and negative emotions.

Research Question 3 asked: What is the nature of the relationship between AU leaders' EI levels as measured by the *MSCEIT* test of EI and their team members' JAW, as measured by the *JAWS*' two subscales: positive and negative emotional experiences, and their team members' OCB, as measured by the *OCB-C* subscales: *OCB-o* and *OCB-p*?

Research Question 4 asked: What role does the gender of the AU leaders play in the relationship between AU leaders' EI and their team members' levels of JAW and OCB? Since these questions involved an investigation into a relationship between multiple predictor and criterion variables, they were analyzed using CCA. This multivariate technique allowed me to minimize Type 1 error and to honor the reality of doing research that involves humans with the possibility of multiple causes and effects. CCA is technically able and theoretically consistent with the purposes of this research. The results from these measures follow in Chapter 4.

Summary

This third chapter has delineated the research methodology to be used during this study of EI of leaders at AU. A significant number of employees and leaders at AU may lack an awareness of their own EI and may be unaware of how their EI affects organizational success through its effect on employees. The principal objective of the current study is to examine the relationship between the EI levels of leaders within AU administration and their employees' levels of JAW and OCB. A complete description of the participants, the setting, the variables, the instrumentation, the procedures, the design, and the statistical analyses performed has been included. This study will contribute to the research literature by examining the effects of leaders' EI and its effect JAW and OCB of their direct reports.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

This study was conducted to investigate how the EI of leaders affects organizational climate in regard to employees' emotions about their work and their helping behaviors at work with additional consideration given to how the gender of leaders may influence this relationship. More specifically, this quantitative study examined the role leaders' EI plays on the OCB and JAW of their employees within an organization. The purpose of Chapter 4 is to present the results of the statistical procedures used to measure the effect of leaders' EI on these dependent variables. The current study presents four independent variables, the four elements of EI [perceiving emotions, using emotions (facilitating thought), understanding emotions, and managing emotions] of each AU leader, which were measured using the *MSCEIT*, and four dependent variables: the positive emotion and negative emotion totals of JAW of employees who work for each leader, as measured by the *JAWS*; and the two categories of OCB of employees who work for each leader (OCB-o and OCB-p), as measured by the *OCB-C*. One potential moderating factor was also be considered: the gender of leaders.

Description of the Sample

Leader participants in this study ($n=32$) were from an ethnically diverse, private university located in a small Midwestern town. Leaders were chosen for participation in

this study based on the number of employees for whom they were responsible. At the time of the study, the university had 103 total leaders who had three or more employees that reported to each of them. From August 2015 to December 2015, I sent an email to all 103 leaders inviting each one to participate in the study by taking the *MSCEIT*. This allowed me to gauge the climate of their departments by asking their employees to take two short instruments, the *JAWS* and *OCB-C*. Thirty-two leaders agreed to participate. Due to the extreme nature of one leader's scores, those scores were eliminated from the results, leaving a total of 31 leaders. The results of this leader were eliminated based on the advice of one of the developers of the *MSCEIT*. This leader took the test in one-third the time that a respondent usually takes and most likely clicked answers randomly without reading the test items. Another leader began the *MSCEIT* but only completed six of the eight sections, so this leader's results were also unable to be used. This left a total of 30 leaders; 10 were female, and 20 were male. Of those 30, only 25 had at least three team members participate, so this further limited the sample size. Of those 25 leaders, six were female, and 19 were male.

As shown in Table 4, the demographic representation of leaders in this study ($n=30$) reflect a sample of 66.67% male ($n=20$) and 33.33% ($n=10$) female. The highest demographic representation of participants was from three departments. The largest ($n=19$) number of participants were from the area of teaching professors at 63.33% and the smallest demographic representation number ($n=5$) were from operations department at 16.67%. Of the 25 leaders, one-third were not originally from the United States.

The other group of participants within this study were the university team members. A team member was classified as an individual who reports directly to the

Table 4

Demographics of AU Leaders

Variables	<i>n</i>	%
AU Leaders		
Male	20	66.67
Female	10	33.33
Total	30	100.00
Department		
Teaching	19	63.33
Operation	5	16.67
Administration	6	20.00
Total	30	100.00

university leader. Based on which leaders completed the *MSCEIT*, I compiled a list of 258 team members, who were then contacted via email and asked to take the *JAWS* and *OCB-C*. Out of the pool of 258 team members, 83 completed the *OCB-C* and *JAWS* surveys through Survey Monkey. There were 47 females and 33 males along with three who did not identify their gender; thus 80 results were used.

Table 5 reflects the demographic findings pertaining to gender, department, and number of leaders experienced while serving at AU as a team member, and years working at AU. The demographic representation of females was 61.25% ($n=49$) as compared to 38.75% ($n=31$) male participants. The largest demographic representation of participants came from the area of teaching with 62.50% ($n=50$) while the lowest demographic percentage of participants came from the administration department at 20.00% ($n=16$).

Table 5 also gives the demographic information regarding the number of leaders that team members have had while serving at the university. Fifty-two team members had only one leader during their tenure, and two team members had six or more leaders,

Table 5

Demographics of AU Team Members

Variables	<i>n</i>	%
Male	31	38.75
Female	49	61.25
Total	80	100.00
Department		
Teaching	50	62.50
Operation	14	17.50
Administration	16	20.00
Total	80	100.00
# of Leaders While Serving as a Team Member at AU		
1	52	65.00
2	17	21.25
3	4	5.00
4	2	2.50
5	1	1.25
6+	2	2.50
Total	80	100.00
Years at AU		
1–5	50	62.50
6–10	14	17.50
11–15	8	10.00
16–20	3	3.75
21–25	3	3.75
25+	2	2.50
Total	80	100.00

with varying ranges of tenure in between. Table 4 indicates the distribution of normative sample size by the number of years of service of each team member at the university. The greatest number of participants ($n=50$) had served the institution 1–5 years and the lowest number of participants ($n=2$) in the category of 25 or more years of service.

Results by Research Question

This study sought to answer the following research questions: What is the level of EI among selected leaders at AU? What is the level JAW and OCB of the team members of selected leaders at AU? What is the nature of the relationship between AU leaders' EI levels as measured by the *MSCEIT* test of EI and their team members' JAW, as measured by the *JAWS*' two subscales: positive and negative emotions, and their team members' OCB, as measured by the *OCB-C* subscales: OCB-o and OCB-p? Finally, what role does the gender of the AU leaders play in the relationship between AU leaders' EI and their team members' levels of JAW and OCB?

AU Leaders' EI Levels

Research Question 1 asks: What is the level of emotional intelligence among selected leaders at Andrews University? Table 6 displays the demographic representation and descriptive statistics of *MSCEIT* scale in general scoring as the number (*n*) of participants, mean (*M*), and standard deviation (*SD*).

Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test scores are reported corresponding to those of traditional intelligence scales so that the average score on the *MSCEIT* is 100 with a standard deviation of 15. Table 6 displays the total *MSCEIT* mean scores for Perceiving (*M*=95.78, *SD*=14.36), which is considered a Low Average score, Using (*M*=98.35, *SD*=12.50), also considered Low Average score, Understanding (*M* 99.64, *SD* 12.53), also considered Low Average score, and Managing (*M*=101.11, *SD* 12.73), which is considered High Average score.

In the Perceiving branch, leaders at AU (*n*=30) are relatively weak at recognizing how they feel and how those around them feel (*M*=95.78, *SD*=14.36) (see Table 6).

Table 6

AU Leaders' MSCEIT Results

Variables	Male			Female			Total		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Total EI	20	98.10	7.54	10	104.50	5.58	30	98.73	8.38
Perceiving	20	94.35	15.33	10	98.33	12.91	30	95.78	14.36
Using	20	100.31	12.46	10	94.89	12.50	30	98.35	12.50
Understanding	20	97.56	12.05	10	103.33	13.19	30	99.64	12.53
Managing	20	101.60	13.67	10	100.25	11.57	30	101.11	12.73
Bias	20	91.26	16.05	10	94.04	16.20	30	92.09	15.87

According to the guidelines for interpreting the *MSCEIT*, this is a low average score, making Perceiving emotions a relative weakness for AU leaders, whose score indicate some difficulty with being aware of and able to interpret emotions in pictures, people, and other stimuli. These leaders may be unaware of which emotions are present or perhaps misinterpret them both in themselves and others.

Managing emotions involves the ability to be open to feelings and not to suppress them. Those who manage emotions well are able to modulate them in themselves and others in ways that contribute to personal understanding and growth. They are open to emotional information at appropriate times and closed to it at appropriate times. Those who manage emotions well use emotions to problem solve, allowing emotions to be participants in thought processes, and at optimal levels, emotions are neither minimized nor exaggerated (Mayer et al., 2011). AU leaders are considered to be High Average in managing emotions, making them slightly better ($M=101.11$, $SD=12.73$) at managing emotions than the normative population.

Understanding emotions is the branch which measures the ability “to understand emotional information, to understand how emotions combine and progress through

relationship transitions, and to appreciate such emotional meanings” (Mayer et al., 2002, p. 255). AU leaders ($n=30$) scores in the area of understanding are at the very high end of low average ($M=99.64$, $SD=12.53$). High average range begins at 100.

Female AU leaders’ scores at Using Emotions ($M=94.89$, $SD=12.50$) are considered a Low Average score (see Table 7). These results would seem to indicate that female leaders at AU are stronger at managing and understanding emotions and weaker at perceiving and using emotions. Male AU leaders’ second highest branch score is in the area of using emotions ($M=100.31$, $SD=12.46$), which is a high average score. AU leaders ($n=25$) scored in the low average range ($M=98.35$, $SD=12.50$) in Using emotions.

Table 7

AU Leaders’ EI and Gender

Variable	Group	n	M	SD	df	t	P	$ES(d)$
Perceiving	Male	20	94.35	16.97	28.00	0.93	0.31	0.37
	Female	10	98.33	12.91				
Using	Male	20	100.31	12.46	28.00	0.38	0.99	0.15
	Female	10	94.89	12.50				
Understanding	Male	20	97.56	12.05	28.00	1.03	0.49	0.41
	Female	10	103.33	13.19				
Managing	Male	20	101.60	13.67	28.00	0.31	0.43	0.12
	Female	10	100.25	11.57				

It is important to note that the AU leaders score did not score in the competent range on any branches of the *MSCEIT* (110–119), the strength range (120–129), or the significant strength range (130+); however, in no areas did these leaders score as needing improvement (70–89). Although these leaders have relative strengths and weakness that diverge in regard to gender, their overall results indicate that the general population of

leaders surveyed at AU have a functional EI.

Another measure that can be used to better understand individuals' EI scores is the Bias score, which is an indicator of the tendency of respondents to respond positively or negatively to pictures with displays of positive or negative emotion. When an individual has a positive or negative emotion bias, he or she may miss early signals on the opposite ends of his or her bias. Scores can be interpreted as positive (115 or more), neutral (86–114), or negative (85 or less) (Langley, 2016). A positive bias could cause an individual to misinterpret another person's boredom for contentment, while a negative bias score could cause an individual to interpret someone's contentment for boredom. Those with neutral bias scores, such as AU leaders ($M=92.09$, $SD=15.87$), are less prone to such errors and will generally be expected to interpret emotional situations with accuracy.

Team Member JAW and OCB

Next, I examined AU team members. Research Question 2 asked: What is the level of JAW and OCB of the members of selected leaders at AU? Table 8 displays the results of AU Team Members ($n=80$), their mean scores (M), and the standard deviation (SD) on both instruments used in this study.

Both the *OCB-C* and *JAWS* use the 5-point Likert scale for all questions; thus, the scores can range from 1–5. The total mean score for OCB is 2.83 ($SD=0.36$) (see Table 8). This total score is lower than those found in the previous two studies that also used the *OCB-C*. Miles et al. (2002) found OCB levels of 3.46 ($n=203$, $SD=0.70$). Spector and Che (2014) found an OCB level of 3.34 ($n=146$, $SD=0.80$). Table 8 also shows that the highest average of the *OCB-C* test was in the OCB-o with a mean score ($n=80$) of 2.95

Table 8

AU Team Members' OCB and JAW

Variables	Male			Female			Total		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
OCB									
OCB-o	31	2.87	0.66	49	3.00	0.72	80	2.95	0.70
OCB-p	31	2.77	0.38	49	2.86	0.35	80	2.83	0.36
<i>Total</i>	31	2.80	0.66	49	2.96	0.67	80	2.83	0.36
JAWS									
+Emotions	31	3.35	0.76	49	3.31	0.75	80	3.33	0.74
-Emotions	31	2.28	1.32	49	2.18	1.20	80	2.20	1.23
<i>Total</i>	31	2.81	0.28	49	2.96	0.30	80	2.79	0.29

($SD=0.70$). In OCB-p, team members' scores were lower, but not significantly lower ($n=80$, $M=2.83$, $SD=0.36$). Tests of mean differences indicate that the observed differences between male and female team members' OCB-o is not important to consider due to a medium effect size (0.14) and are likely due to random errors (see Table 9).

Results from the *JAWS* are also represented in Table 8. The total mean score for the *JAWS* is 2.79 ($SD=0.29$). The first section of the *JAWS* examines the aspect of experiencing positive or negative emotions in the workplace. The mean score for positive emotions of AU Team Members is 3.33 ($n=80$, $SD=0.74$), which is higher than those reported by Rode (2005). The mean score for negative emotions of AU Team Members is 2.20 ($n=80$, $SD=1.23$), which are lower than those reported in Rode (2005). Tests of mean differences indicate that the observed differences between male and female team members' positive emotions are not important to consider due to a small effect size (0.13) and are likely due to random errors.

The average score for negative emotions is 4.60 ($SD=1.23$) where the average

Table 9

AU Team Members' OCB, JAW, and Gender

Variable	Group	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ES(d)</i>
OCB-o	Male	31	2.87	0.66	63.91	-0.78	0.43	0.14
	Female	49	3.00	0.72				
OCB-p	Male	31	2.77	0.38	57.28	-1.08	0.49	0.20
	Female	49	2.86	0.34				
-Emotion	Male	31	2.28	1.32	56.93	0.20	0.84	0.04
	Female	49	2.18	1.20				
+Emotion	Male	31	3.35	0.75	60.98	0.69	0.49	0.13
	Female	49	3.31	0.74				

score for males is 4.61 ($SD=1.32$) and for females is 4.56 ($SD=1.20$). Tests of mean differences indicate that the observed differences between male and female team members' negative emotions are not important to consider, with a small effect size (0.13), and are likely due to random errors (see Table 9).

Table 10 includes the item statistics for OCB-p; Table 11 has item statistics for OCB-o. By examining these items, one can gain insight into the types of questions used to determine the scores of OCB-p and OCB-o. AU team members had a relatively wide range of scores on the items used to determine OCB-p. While team members picked up meals for others a work ($n=80$, $M=3.54$, $SD=1.05$) relatively often, they were much less likely to defend a co-worker who was being put down or spoken ill of ($n=80$, $M=1.90$, $SD=0.86$). In the area of OCB-o, team members were more likely to offer suggestions for improving the work environment ($n=80$, $M=3.55$, $SD=0.104$) than they were to finish something for a co-worker who had to leave early ($n=80$, $M=2.02$, $SD=0.111$) or offer suggestions to improve how work is done ($n=80$, $M=2.37$, $SD=0.097$).

Table 12 includes item statistics for the *JAWS* subscales: positive and negative

Table 10

OCB-p Item Statistics

#	Statement	Male			Female			Total		
		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Picked up meals for others at work	31	3.50	1.03	49	3.60	1.08	80	3.54	1.05
5	Lent ear to someone with work problem	31	3.25	1.19	49	3.33	1.16	80	3.31	1.14
6	Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a personal problem	31	3.25	1.18	49	3.21	1.05	80	3.22	1.10
7	Changed vacation schedule, work days, or shifts to accommodate a co-worker's needs	31	2.33	1.04	49	2.40	0.99	80	2.36	0.98
11	Helped a less capable co-worker lift a heavy box or other object	31	2.30	1.01	49	2.33	0.90	80	2.31	0.96
18	Went out of the way to give co-worker encouragement or express appreciation	31	2.25	0.91	49	2.21	0.88	80	2.23	0.89
20	Defended a co-worker who was being "put-down" or spoken ill of by other co-workers or supervisor	31	1.85	0.83	49	1.95	0.89	80	1.90	0.86

emotions. Team members ($n=80$) shied away from negative emotion questions that used strong words such as: My job made me feel miserable ($M=1.76$, $SD=0.90$); My job made me feel disgusted ($M=1.67$, $SD=0.99$); My job made me feel frightened ($M=1.71$, $SD=0.86$). Team members were more likely to use more mildly negative words regarding how their jobs made them feel: fatigued ($M=2.89$; $SD=1.12$); annoyed ($M=2.67$; $SD=0.91$); or frustrated ($M=2.78$, $SD=1.03$). Likewise, team members' responses to positive emotion questions gave higher ratings to words that have a milder connotation, such as satisfied ($M=3.66$, $SD=0.91$) or cheerful ($M=3.65$, $SD=0.80$) and lower to those describing more intense positive emotion, such as elated ($M=2.93$, $SD=0.90$), or ecstatic ($M=2.54$, $SD=0.95$).

Table 11

OCB-o Item Statistics

#	Statement	Male			Female			Total		
		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2	Took time to advise, coach, or mentor a co-worker	31	2.35	0.97	49	2.39	0.95	80	2.37	.096
3	Helped co-worker learn new skills or shared job knowledge	31	2.65	1.03	49	2.69	0.99	80	2.67	.100
4	Helped new employees get oriented to job	31	2.62	1.08	49	2.66	1.11	80	2.64	.109
8	Offered suggestions to improve how something is done	31	2.35	1.01	49	2.39	0.90	80	2.37	.097
9	Offered suggestions for improving the work environment	31	3.65	1.00	49	3.45	1.10	80	3.55	.104
10	Finished something for coworker who had to leave early	31	2.00	1.09	49	2.05	1.15	80	2.02	.111
13	Volunteered for extra work assignments	31	2.98	1.11	49	2.90	0.90	80	2.93	.099
14	Took phone messages for absent or busy co-worker	31	3.26	1.13	49	3.25	0.90	80	3.24	.102
15	Said good things about your employer in front of others	31	3.25	1.05	49	3.22	0.99	80	3.23	.105
16	Gave up meal and other breaks to complete work	31	2.56	1.06	49	2.55	1.00	80	2.54	.106
19	Decorated, straightened up, or otherwise beautified common work space	31	2.77	1.10	49	2.80	1.15	80	2.78	.114

Further, given that a score of 3.00 indicates that the respondent feels that way sometimes, the scores on positive and negative emotion seem less definitive. When viewed through this lens, these results may indicate that team members' positive emotions and negative emotions are milder and occur on occasion.

After determining the levels of leaders' EI branch scores, and team members' JAW positive and negative emotions and *OCB-C* subscales, I began to explore the relationship between these two sets of data in order to answer Research Question 3 which asks: What is the nature of the relationship between AU leaders' EI levels ($n=25$) as

Table 12

JAWS Item Statistics (Positive and Negative)

#	Statement	Male			Female			Total		
		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Negative Emotions										
2	My job made me feel angry	31	2.26	0.83	49	2.42	0.87	80	2.37	0.86
3	My job made me feel annoyed	31	2.62	0.95	49	2.70	0.85	80	2.67	0.91
4	My job made me feel anxious	31	2.72	1.07	49	2.48	0.87	80	2.64	0.99
5	My job made me feel bored	31	2.11	1.05	49	2.18	1.07	80	2.14	1.04
8	My job made me feel confused	31	2.29	0.92	49	2.48	0.83	80	2.37	0.87
10	My job made me feel depressed	31	2.04	1.00	49	1.94	0.93	80	2.02	1.02
11	My job made me feel disgusted	31	1.45	0.80	49	2.00	1.15	80	1.67	0.99
12	My job made me feel discouraged	31	2.53	1.01	49	2.27	1.12	80	2.45	1.08
18	My job made me feel frightened	31	1.65	0.88	49	1.85	0.87	80	1.71	0.86
19	My job made me feel frustrated	31	2.87	0.92	49	2.58	1.11	80	2.78	1.03
20	My job made me feel furious	31	1.57	0.75	49	1.88	1.02	80	1.72	0.91
21	My job made me feel gloomy	31	1.91	0.94	49	1.85	0.94	80	1.89	0.93
22	My job made me feel fatigued	31	2.98	1.12	49	2.79	1.05	80	2.89	1.12
24	My job made me feel intimidated	31	1.89	0.80	49	2.15	0.83	80	1.96	0.82
26	My job made me feel miserable	31	1.70	0.79	49	1.85	1.03	80	1.76	0.90
Positive Emotions										
1	My job made me feel at ease	31	3.58	0.91	49	3.48	0.90	80	3.52	0.91
6	My job made me feel cheerful	31	3.72	0.74	49	3.61	0.79	80	3.65	0.80
7	My job made me feel calm	31	3.15	0.93	49	3.36	0.78	80	3.19	0.90
9	My job made me feel content	31	3.46	1.00	49	3.61	0.86	80	3.55	0.94
13	My job made me feel elated	31	2.93	0.88	49	2.91	0.88	80	2.93	0.90
14	My job made me feel energetic	31	3.28	0.95	49	3.21	0.86	80	3.24	0.93
15	My job made me feel excited	31	3.26	0.92	49	3.27	0.94	80	3.23	0.95
16	My job made me feel ecstatic	31	2.54	1.05	49	2.58	0.83	80	2.54	0.95
17	My job made me feel enthusiastic	31	3.30	1.03	49	3.39	0.90	80	3.33	0.99
23	My job made me feel happy	31	3.67	0.82	49	3.61	0.78	80	3.62	0.85
25	My job made me feel inspired	31	3.34	0.95	49	3.39	0.97	80	3.35	0.99
27	My job made me feel pleased	31	3.74	0.71	49	3.55	0.75	80	3.65	0.75
28	My job made me feel proud	31	3.64	0.94	49	3.58	0.97	80	3.61	0.96
29	My job made me feel satisfied	31	3.66	0.89	49	3.67	0.99	80	3.66	0.91
30	My job made me feel relaxed	31	2.91	1.06	49	3.00	0.87	80	2.90	1.00

measured by the MSCEIT test of EI four subscales (Perceiving, Understanding, Using, and Managing) and their team members' ($n=80$) JAW, as measured by the *JAWS*' two subscales: positive and negative emotions, as well as their team members' OCB, as

measured by the *OCB-C* subscales: OCB-o and OCB-p?

To answer this question, I conducted a CCA of the four branches of AU Leaders' EI as measured by the *MSCEIT* with the positive and negative emotion subscales of the *JAWS* and the two subscales of the *OCB-C*: the OCB-o and the OCB-p. CCA, a multivariate technique, is used to extend multiple regression analysis with techniques that are also related to principal components analysis, discriminant function analysis, and *MANOVA* (Myers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2012). The benefit of using CCA for this study is the advantage of being able to analyze several independent and dependent variables simultaneously. During this data analysis, a set of quantitative independent variables were used to predict a set of quantitative dependent variables, by extracting canonical functions whose structure coefficients were used to interpret the predictor and the dependent variates (Myers et al., 2012).

A CCA was conducted using the four subscales of leaders' EI measured by the *MSCEIT* (Perceiving Emotions, Using Emotions, Understanding Emotions, and Managing Emotions) as predictors of a latent variable, organizational climate using variables from the two subscales of team members' *OCB-C*, OCB-o and OCB-p and the two subscales of *JAWS* (positive and negative emotions) of team members to evaluate the multivariate shared relationships between the two sets of variables. The results of this analysis are listed in Tables 13 and 14. Table 13 includes the inter-correlations between the leaders' EI levels on the four branch subscales and the team members' positive and negative emotions and two types of OCB: OCB-o and OCB-p.

As shown in Table 13, the zero order correlations of the independent variables indicate that these are only weakly to moderately correlated among themselves. The

Table 13

EI With JAWS (Positive and Negative), OCB-o, and OCB-p Inter-correlations

	P	Us	Un	M	Oo	Op	Pos	Neg
Perceiving	--							
Using	.49	--						
Understanding	.35	-.01	--					
Managing	.39	.41	.34	--				
OCB-o	-.01	-.13	-.01	.06	--			
OCB-p	.14	-.10	.11	.22	.84	--		
Positive	-.20	-.46	-.43	-.13	.24	.31	--	
Negative	.07	-.07	.58	.22	.11	.03	-.55	--

highest correlation exists between Perceiving Emotions and Using Emotions at 0.49. The lowest correlation was between Perceiving Emotions and Understanding Emotions (0.35).

The zero order correlations of the dependent variables indicate that two of these variables are highly correlated, with a correlation value of 0.84 between OCB-o and OCB-p. The Set 1 variables are also moderately correlated to the Set 2 Variables, with the highest correlation existing between Understanding Emotions and *JAWS* negative emotions, which is 0.58. This would seem to indicate that a leaders' level of Understanding Emotions is associated with their employees' levels of negative emotions within JAW. The next highest correlation was found between leaders' Using Emotions scores and team members' *JAWS* subscale of positive emotions, which is -0.46 closely followed by the correlation between leaders' Understanding Emotions and team members' *JAWS* positive emotions at -0.43. This would seem to indicate that as leaders' level of Using Emotions as well as their level of Understanding Emotions are higher their employees' levels of positive emotions within JAW are lower.

Table 14

EI With JAWS (Positive and Negative), OCB-o, and OCB-p CCA

Variables	Canonical Loadings		Standardized Canonical Coefficients	
Set 1	1	2	1	2
Perceiving	-.370	.170	.270	.090
Using	-.730	-.410	-1.010	-.670
Understanding	-.570	.790	-.790	.570
Managing	-.240	-.490	.340	.540
% of Variance	.260	.270		
Redundancy	.140	.120		
Set 2				
Positive	.960	-.040	1.140	0.460
Negative	-.400	.760	0.210	1.070
OCB-o	.210	.170	0.240	-0.810
OCB-p	.180	.390	-0.390	0.900
% of Variance	.290	.190		
Redundancy	.160	.080		
Canonical Correlation	.740	.660		
Wilk's	.230	.510		
Chi Square	28.420	13.010		
<i>df</i>	16	9		
<i>p</i>	.028	.159		

Canonical loadings, standardized coefficients, canonical correlation and within set variance (% of variance) are shown in Table 14. The analysis yielded four functions since there were four variables in the smallest variable set; in this case, both variable sets had four variables. The first canonical correlation is 0.74 (54.76% overlapping variance). The remaining three canonical correlations were not statistically significant; however, the second canonical correlation accounted for a moderate amount of variance, 0.66 (43.56% overlapping variance). With all four canonical correlations included, $\chi^2(16)=28.42$, $p<0.05$, and with the first canonical correlation removed, $\chi^2(9)=13.01$, $p=0.159$. Subsequent chi-square tests were not statistically significant nor did the remaining

functions account for a significant amount of variance. Therefore, the first canonical function accounted for the only significant relationship between the synthetic variables of leaders' emotional intelligence and their team members' perceptions of organizational climate.

CCA 1 Function 1

Canonical loadings of 0.3 and above (absolute value) are interpreted (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). EI subsets that were correlated with the first canonical variate had the following canonical loadings as shown in Table 14: Perceiving (-0.37), Using (-0.73), and Understanding (-0.57). Organizational climate factors that were correlated with the first canonical variate had the following canonical loadings: Positive Emotion (0.96) and Negative Emotions (-0.40). Taken in pair, the canonical variates in the first function appear to indicate that lower levels of Perceiving, Using, and Understanding emotions in AU leaders produce higher levels of positive emotions and lower levels of negative emotions in team members. Simply stated, the latent variable, EI, produces a reverse of the expectation for its effect on the latent variable organizational climate in that one might expect the team member whose leader has lower EI to have poor perceptions of organizational climate, but the opposite appears to be true for this test population. Reasons for this departure from our conceptual framework in our findings will be explored in Chapter 5.

The standardized canonical coefficients are the standardized coefficients used in the linear equations to combine the observed predictor variables (Perceiving, Using, Understanding, and Managing) and the observed criterion variables (Positive Emotions, Negative Emotions, OCB-o, and OCB-p) into the two latent variables (EI and

organizational climate). The standardized canonical coefficients for the independent variables indicate that the highest canonical loading (the one most strongly related to the latent independent variable) is Understanding (-1.01). The standardized canonical coefficients for the dependent variables (the ones most strongly associated with the latent dependent variable) is JAW positive emotions (-1.14). One might think of these canonical coefficients as having to do with the computation of the variates, while the loadings refer to the relationship of the variables to the construct that was created.

CCA 1 Function 2

EI subsets that were correlated with the second canonical variate in our first CCA had the following canonical loadings: Understanding (0.79), Managing (-0.49), and Using (-0.41). Organizational climate factors that were correlated with the second canonical variate had the following canonical loadings: OCB-p (0.39) and Negative Emotions (0.76). The standardized canonical coefficients for the independent variables for the second function indicate that the highest (the one most strongly related to the latent independent variable) is Using (-0.67), with Understanding at (0.57), and Managing at (0.54). The standardized canonical coefficients for the dependent variables (the ones most strongly associated with the latent dependent variable) is negative emotions (1.07). Other standardized canonical coefficients for dependent variables are OCB-p (0.90), OCB-o (-0.81), and positive emotions (0.46). In a CCA, each function is orthogonal to every other function; therefore, this set of latent predictor and criterion variables is perfectly uncorrelated with the other functions found, so we interpret the second function completely separately from the first. Taken in pair, the canonical variates in the second function appear to indicate that when AU leaders had higher levels of Understanding

emotions and lower levels of Using emotions, their employees had high levels of Negative emotions and moderate levels of organizational citizenship behaviors that benefited people in their workplace. While this second function was not statistically significant, I have chosen to report it for two reasons. First, the variance accounted for by this function that is separate from other functions is moderate (43.56%). Second, while the p value is less than 0.05 ($p=.159$), large sample sizes can yield unrealistically low p values, but this sample is quite small, which may have inflated the p value.

CCA 2

After completing the first CCA, I conducted a second CCA to examine the possibility that the gender of leaders may have been a moderating factor in this study. Research Question 4 asks: What role does the gender of the AU leaders play in the relationship between AU leaders' EI branch subscale scores and their team members' levels of JAW positive and negative emotions and OCB-p and OCB-o? Results from this second CCA are shown in Tables 15 and 16.

A CCA was again conducted using the four subsets of leaders' EI measured by the *MSCEIT* (Perceiving Emotions, Using Emotions, Understanding Emotions, and Managing Emotions) as predictors of organizational climate using variables from the two subsets of team members' *OCB-C*: OCB-o and OCB-p and the two subsets of JAW (positive and negative emotions) of team members to evaluate the multivariate shared relationships between the two sets of variables. However, unlike the first CCA, in this second CCA, the gender of the leaders was also included in the set of predictor variables. The results of this analysis are listed in Tables 15 and 16. Table 15 includes the inter-correlations between the leaders' gender and their EI levels on the four branch subscales

Table 15

EI by Gender With JAWS (Positive and Negative), OCB-o, and OCB-p Inter-correlations

Variable	P	Us	Un	M	G	Pos	Neg	O-o	O-p
Perceiving	--								
Using	.49	--							
Understanding	.35	-.01	--						
Managing	.39	.41	.34	--					
Gender	.14	-.21	.23	-.05	--				
Positive	-.20	-.46	-.43	-.13	-.17	--			
Negative	-.55	.07	-.07	.58	.22	.27	--		
OCB-o	-.01	-.13	-.01	.06	.16	.24	.11	--	
OCB-p	.14	-.10	.11	.22	.40	.31	.02	.84	--

and the team members' positive and negative emotions and two types of OCB: OCB-o and OCB-p.

As shown in Table 15, the zero order correlations of the independent variables indicate that these are only weakly to moderately correlated among themselves. The highest correlation exists between Perceiving Emotions and Using Emotions at 0.49. The next highest correlation between the independent variables is between Using Emotions and Managing Emotions (0.41). The highest correlation between gender and one of the branches of EI is 0.23 with Understanding Emotions. The lowest correlation between gender and one of the branches of EI is with Managing Emotions (-0.05).

The zero order correlations of the dependent variables indicate that two of these variables are highly correlated, with a correlation value of 0.84 between OCB-o and OCB-p. Some Set 1 variables are also weakly to moderately correlated to some of the Set 2 variables, with the highest correlation existing between leaders' Managing Emotions and members' JAWS negative emotions, which is 0.58. The next highest correlation was

Table 16

EI by Gender With JAWS (Positive and Negative), OCB-o, and OCB-p CCA

Variable	Canonical Loading		Standardized Canonical Coefficient	
Set 1	1	2	1	2
Perceiving	0.410	-0.030	-0.230	0.230
Using	0.410	-0.720	0.640	-1.070
Understanding	0.670	0.290	0.590	-0.070
Managing	0.420	0.290	0.070	0.670
Gender	0.610	0.400	0.650	0.190
% of Variance	0.270	0.170		
Redundancy	0.200	0.080		
Set 2				
Positive	-0.730	0.520	-0.820	0.960
Negative	0.550	0.350	0.150	0.930
OCB-o	0.030	0.310	-0.820	-0.640
OCB-p	0.280	0.510	1.220	0.720
% of Variance	0.230	0.190		
Redundancy	0.170	0.090		
Canonical Correlation	0.860	0.690		
Wilk's	0.110	0.420		
Chi Square	42.300	16.350		
<i>df</i>	20	12		
<i>p</i>	0.000	0.180		

found between leaders' Perceiving Emotions scores and team members' *JAWS* subscale of negative emotions, which is -0.55. Other moderate correlations were found between leaders' levels of Using Emotions and team members' levels of positive emotions (-0.46), between leaders' Understanding Emotions and team members' levels of positive emotions (-0.43), and between leaders' Gender and team members' OCB-p (0.40).

Canonical loadings, standardized coefficients, canonical correlation and within set variance (% of variance) are shown in Table 16. The analysis yielded four functions since there were four variables in the smallest variable set. The first canonical correlation is 0.86 (73.96% overlapping variance). The remaining three canonical correlations were not

statistically significant; however, the second canonical correlation accounted for a moderate amount of variance, 0.69 (47.61% overlapping variance). With all four canonical correlations included, $\chi^2(20)=42.30, p<0.00$ and with the first canonical correlation removed, $\chi^2(12)=16.35, p=0.18$. Subsequent chi-square tests were not statistically significant nor did the remaining functions account for a significant amount of variance. Therefore, the first canonical function accounted for the only significant relationship between the synthetic variables of leaders' EI combined with gender and their team members' perceptions of organizational climate.

CCA 2 Function 1

Canonical loadings of 0.3 and above (absolute value) are interpreted (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). EI subsets that were correlated with the first canonical variate had the following canonical loadings as shown in Table 16: Perceiving (0.41), Using (0.41), Understanding (0.67), and Managing (0.42) and Gender (.61). Organizational climate factors that were correlated with the first canonical variate had the following canonical loadings: Positive Emotion (-0.73) and Negative Emotions (0.55). Taken in pair, the canonical variates in the first function appear to indicate that higher levels of Perceiving, Using, Understanding, and Managing emotions and Gender in AU leaders produce lower levels of positive emotions towards work and higher levels of negative emotions in team members. Simply stated, the latent variable, employees who have lower levels of positive emotions and higher levels of negative emotions are associated with leaders with lower levels of EI and being female.

The standardized canonical coefficients are the standardized coefficients used in the linear equations to combine the observed predictor variables (Perceiving, Using,

Understanding, Managing, and Gender of leaders) and the observed criterion variables (Positive Emotions, Negative Emotions, OCB-o, and OCB-p) into the two latent variables (EI with gender as a moderating factor and organizational climate). The standardized canonical coefficients for the independent variables indicate that the highest canonical loading (the one most strongly related to the latent independent variable) is gender (0.65), which is closely followed by Using Emotions (0.64). The standardized canonical coefficients for the dependent variables (the ones most strongly associated with the latent dependent variable) are OCB-p (1.22), OCB-o (-0.82), and JAW positive emotions (-0.82). One might think of these canonical coefficients as having to do with the computation of the variates, while the loadings refer to the relationship of the variables to the construct that was created.

CCA 2 Function 2

EI subsets in the second CCA that were correlated with the second canonical variate had the following canonical loadings: Using (-0.72) and Gender (0.40). Organizational climate factors that were correlated with the second canonical variate had the following canonical loadings: OCB-p (0.51), OCB-o (0.31), Positive Emotions (0.52) and Negative Emotions (0.35). The standardized canonical coefficients for the independent variables for the second function indicate that the highest (the one most strongly related to the latent independent variable) is Using (-1.07) and Managing (0.67). The standardized canonical coefficients for the dependent variables (the ones most strongly associated with the latent dependent variable) is positive emotions (0.96) closely followed by negative emotions (0.93). Other standardized canonical coefficients for dependent variables are OCB-p (0.72) and OCB-o (-0.64). In a CCA, each function is

orthogonal to every other function; therefore, this set of latent predictor and criterion variables is perfectly uncorrelated with the other functions found, so we interpret the second function completely separately from the first. Taken in pair, the canonical variates in the second function appear to indicate that when AU leaders had lower levels of Using emotions and higher levels of Managing and Understanding emotions when Gender is included as a factor, their employees had higher levels of Positive and Negative emotions and organizational citizenship behaviors that benefited people in their workplace (OCB-p) with lower levels of OCB-o. While this function was not statistically significant, I have chosen to report it for two reasons. First, the variance accounted for by this function that is separate from other functions is moderate (47.61%). Second, while the p value is greater than 0.05 ($p=.18$), large sample sizes can yield unrealistically low p values, but this sample is quite small, which may have inflated the p value.

Summary of Major Findings

This chapter contains a summary and analysis of the statistical testing done to answer the research questions: What is the level of emotional intelligence among selected leaders at AU? The results of the *MSCEIT* indicate that neither the composite measure of AU leaders, nor the male or female group, scored in the competent range on any branches of the *MSCEIT* (110–119), the strength range (120–129), or the significant strength range (130+); however, in no areas did these leaders score as needing improvement (70–89). Although these leaders have relative strengths and weakness that diverge in regard to gender (some are likely to due to random error while others are not), their overall results indicate that the sample of leaders surveyed at AU have a functional EI.

What is the level of JAW and OCB of the members of selected leaders at AU?

The *OCB-C* and *JAWS* both use the 5-point Likert scale for all questions; thus, the scores can range from 1–5. The total mean score for *OCB-C* is 2.83 ($SD=0.36$) while the total mean score for the *JAWS* is 2.79 ($SD=0.29$). AU team members' scores are lower than those found in the two previous studies that also used the *OCB-C*. AU team members' JAW negative emotion scores (2.20) are lower than those (2.44) reported by Rode (2005), while AU team members' positive emotion scores (3.33) are considerably higher than those (2.63) reported by Rode.

What is the nature of the relationship between AU leaders' EI levels as measured by the *MSCEIT* test of EI and their team members' JAW, as measured by the *JAWS*' two subscales: positive and negative emotional experiences, and their team members' OCB, as measured by the subscales: OCB-o and OCB-p? To answer this question, a CCA was conducted. To create the latent variable EI, I used the four subscales of leaders' EI measured by the *MSCEIT* (Perceiving Emotions, Using Emotions, Understanding Emotions, and Managing Emotions). To create the latent variable, organizational climate, I used the variables from the two subscales of team members' OCB: OCB-o and OCB-p, and I used the two subscales of JAW (positive and negative emotions) of team members. These various subscales were used to evaluate the multivariate shared relationships between the two sets of variables. The analysis yielded four functions, with the first canonical correlation, which was the only statistically significant one, yielding 0.74 (54.76% overlapping variance). Upon analysis of canonical loadings, the canonical variates in the first function appear to indicate that lower levels of Perceiving, Using, and Understanding emotions in AU leaders produce higher levels of positive emotions and lower levels of negative emotions in team members, a result that is the opposite of what I

expected based on the conceptual model, the HEWC. Further, when gender was included as a moderating factor, the results aligned even less closely with the conceptual model. My final research question asked: What role does the gender of the AU leaders play in the relationship between AU leaders' EI and their team members' levels of JAW and OCB? A second CCA using the four subsets of leaders' EI measured by the *MSCEIT* (Perceiving Emotions, Using Emotions, Understanding Emotions, and Managing Emotions) as predictors of organizational climate using variables from the two subsets of team members' *OCB-C*: OCB-o and OCB-p and the two subsets of JAW (positive and negative emotions) of team members was conducted to evaluate the multivariate shared relationships between the two sets of variables with the gender of the leaders included in the set of predictor variables. Results of this second CCA indicate that employees who have lower levels of positive emotions and higher levels of negative emotions are associated with leaders with lower levels of EI and being female. Thus, the gender of their leader does seem to play an important role in organizational climate perceptions of employees, causing team members to have lower JAW if their female leader has lower EI.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

What factors contribute to organizational success? Few would argue that leaders and employees have a significant effect on the success of an organization, because the individuals who are in charge and those who are conducting the operations of the organization are crucial factors in every organization. Many features have been investigated both in the realm of leadership and in that of the workers and team members who work with and for those leaders. An area of interest in recent years in the study of psychological elements related to leadership is EI, which has served as a balancing factor to the previously overwhelming interest in intelligence as an indicator of cognitive ability. More specifically, the relationship between the EI levels of leaders and the success of their organizations has been the subject of various recent studies (Jafri et al., 2016; Mayer, 2001; Peterson et al., 2003, p. 799; Watkin, 2002). Other studies have examined links between employees' JAW, how they feel about their jobs, and organizational success as well as employees' OCB (the behaviors they do that benefit others and the organization that are not linked to their job descriptions) and organizational success.

Purpose of the Study

This study was conducted to investigate how the EI of leaders affects some aspects of organizational climate in regards to employees' emotions about their work and their helping behaviors at work with additional consideration given to how the gender of leaders may influence this relationship, illuminating any connections that may exist between leaders' EI and organizational climate in terms of employees' JAW and OCB. Some researchers posit that happy employees are more effective at helping achieve the mission of their organization (Dasborough, 2006; Farooqui, 2012; LePine et al., 2002).

More specifically, this study sought to examine the EI of leaders at AU, a small, private university in the Midwest. I used an instrument grounded theoretically in the EI ability-based model, the *MSCEIT* as a means of measuring the four branches of leaders' EI (perceiving emotions, using emotions—facilitating thought, understanding emotions, and managing emotions), the *JAWS* to measure the positive and negative emotions of team members towards their work, and the *OCB-C* to examine two subscales of OCB in team members: OCB-p and OCB-o. I believed that the study would find that leaders, whether male or female, with high EI would have team members with higher levels of JAW and higher levels of OCB and that leaders, whether male or female with low EI would have team members with lower levels of JAW and lower levels of OCB.

Summary of Literature Review

A concept originating in work of Gardner in the early 1980s that expanded the idea of intelligence, EI is defined in several ways by various researchers. A commonly agreed upon definition delineates EI as the capacity to be able to recognize one's feelings and the feelings of others in a manner that leads to motivation for behaviors and to

managing emotions both within oneself and in the context of relationships, allowing emotions to guide both how one thinks and acts (Goleman, 1998; Mayer et al., 2004b, 2012; Salovey & Mayer, 1989). Individuals with high EI are adept at building relationships with others, at monitoring and controlling the emotions they feel, and at perceiving and responding in an adept manner to the emotions of others.

Multiple theoretical models of EI have been conceptualized, with three producing the highest level of interest within the field—the personality-based model of Bar-On (2000), the EI ability-based model by Mayer and Salovey (1997), and the emotional competencies model by Goleman (1998). I chose to embrace the Mayer and Salovey model as this model’s hierarchy of abilities (perception, assimilation, understanding, and regulation) most closely aligns with widely accepted models of traditional intelligence and can be measured in a similar manner. Those who measure EI choose an assessment that aligns with their theoretical beliefs about EI. This study embraces the use of the *MSCEIT* since this instrument includes more than a self-report. The performance-based aspects of this assessment lend credence to results.

The study of EI has generated increasing levels interest in recent years, and various studies have indicated that leaders with high EI are more effective leaders than those with low EI (Adebayo et al., 2012; Bradberry & Greaves, 2009; Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Collins, 2013; Goleman, 1998, 2004; Hernon & Rossiter, 2006). Given that leaders must often deal with employees in both visioning and in confrontational aspects of the job, having high levels of EI conceivably can benefit those leaders’ ability to successfully navigate the complex world of leadership. This is especially true in jobs that require high levels of emotional labor (Newman & Smith, 2014). Leaders with high

EI can harness their skills in recognizing and managing emotions by dealing with and preventing conflict and other problems.

Less research has been conducted examining the link between leaders' EI and gender in regard to the way colleagues and employees rate those leaders. The level of importance of EI on relationships between employers and employees has been linked to gender (Farooqui, 2012; Gholami et al., 2015). Furthermore, much of the existing research repeatedly points to a double bind that female leaders face, in that traditional expectations of leader behavior conflict with traditional expectations of the female gender role. Women who are self-confident and assertive are frequently viewed as arrogant and abrasive, while men with those same qualities are viewed in a positive light, as those qualities mesh better with the male gender role (Bark et al., 2014; Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Gallant (2014) found that female leaders are judged on soft skills as well as job skills, while males are much more likely to be judged solely on job skills. Johnson (2013) found that female leaders are viewed positively only if they are tough as well as compassionate but are then often judged as being too compassionate to be an effective leader. Zenger and Folkman (2012) reiterate this point in their findings that female leaders who fulfill traditional gender role expectations are better liked but less respected. Hopkins (2004) found that gender role expectations can also lead to male leaders being viewed as less effective if they are too compassionate or democratic, since this is incongruent with their gender role.

Although these studies may not directly include all the variables in this study, they shed light on the manner in which gender of leader affects the expectations of their

colleagues and employees, which would include how their interactions are governed by their levels of EI

In this study, organizational climate has been linked to EI through the use of assessments that indirectly measure recognized aspects of organizational climate: JAW and OCB. Organizational climate is multidimensional and subjective, describing the nature of individual employees' experiences in that organization (DeCottils & Koys, 1980). Researchers generally agree that a positive organizational climate leads to a more successful organization, as employees in organizations with positive climates are encouraged and motivated to perform at the highest levels (Hemmelgarn et al., 2006; Holloway, 2012; Momeni, 2009; Neagu & Nicula, 2012). This type of climate has much overlap with leader behavior (Momeni, 2009); self-awareness and self-management of emotions have a strong correlation to levels of organizational climate.

Job affective well-being is a phrase describing how employees feel about their job and is measured with a scale of the same name, designed to gauge people's emotional reactions to their jobs over a 30-day period (Van Katwyk et al., 2000). The emotions measured by the *JAWS* lie along two dimensions of pleasurable and arousal. Respondents' scores can be categorized as being positive or negative emotions. Various studies would seem to indicate that happy workers are productive workers, and that higher levels of positive emotions as measured with the *JAWS* assessment and other similar assessments are associated with improved organizational outcomes (Staw et al., 1986). Leaders would thus do well to be interested in their employees' feelings about their work.

Another factor that leaders should consider are the levels of their employees'

OCB. This term describes a concept that was developed in the early 1980s to describe discretionary behavior exhibited by employees with no expectation of reward that can benefit organizations or people within those organizations (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983). Organizational citizenship behavior includes helping behaviors that are undertaken voluntarily to help others or to prevent problems. OCB is measured with the *OCB-C*, which asks employees to self-report by completing several questions regarding their work behaviors in the last month. The *OCB-C* results can be reported as two subscales that indicate levels of an employees' OCB that benefit the organization or other people within the organization.

Many of the elements of JAW and those of OCB align with dimensions with the construct—organizational climate. Leaders and their EI have been much studied, and some researchers have already begun to seek connections between a leader's EI and his or her employees' perceptions of organizational climate.

Summary of the Methodology

Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following research questions: What is the level of EI among selected leaders at AU? What is the level of JAW and OCB of the members of selected leaders at AU? What is the nature of the relationship between AU leaders' EI levels as measured by the *MSCEIT* test of EI and their team members' JAW, as measured by the *JAWS*' two subscales: positive and negative emotional experiences, and their team members' OCB, as measured by the *OCB-C* subscales: OCB-o and OCB-p? What role does the gender of the AU leaders play in the relationship between AU leaders' EI and their team members' levels of JAW and OCB?

Research Design

A quantitative correlational research method was chosen as an appropriate method for the research study in which a relationship or link is sought between AU leaders' EI as indicated by the results of the *MSCEIT* (Mayer et al., 1999) and their team-members' JAW, as measured by the *JAWS*, and OCB, as measured by the *OCB-C*. The reason I chose these research questions and methodology is to benefit AU leaders, team members, and students by facilitating AU leaders' improved understanding of their EI levels, and to help those leaders understand the effect of their own EI levels on their employees' JAW and OCB while competently and accurately contributing to the scientific body of knowledge relevant to the variables being investigated.

The correlational research method was appropriate as a research strategy for this study because the data sampling and collection design used results from the *MSCEIT*, the *JAWS*, and the *OCB-C*, all of which generated quantitative data. As this research approach attempts to describe trends and to explain statistical relationships among the variables rather than seeking to generate theory or explain phenomena, quantitative methods were appropriate. The correlational research method I selected to search for relationships between the chosen variables was based on the results of the literature review. The quantitative method required the use of the *MSCEIT*, the *JAWS*, and the *OCB-C* to gather data. The results of the *MSCEIT*, the *JAWS*, and the *OCB-C* answered the research questions using CCA.

Summary of the Major Findings

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the role EI of leaders' plays on organizational climate as viewed through the lenses of OCB and JAW within an

organization. The study included four independent variables, the four elements of EI (perceiving emotions, using emotions [facilitating thought], understanding emotions, and managing emotions) of each AU leader, which were measured using the *MSCEIT*, and four dependent variables: the positive and negative emotion totals of JAW of employees who work for each leader, measured by the *JAWS*; and the two categories of OCB of employees who work for each leader (OCB-o and OCB-p), as measured by the *OCB-C*. One moderating factor was also considered: gender of leaders.

First, I asked: What is the level of EI among selected leaders at AU? Scores on the *MSCEIT* indicate that AU leaders have low average scores on three branches of EI: Perceiving emotions in themselves and others, Understanding emotions, and Using emotions to facilitate thought, while they had high average scores on managing emotions.

The highest branch score for male leaders was in the area of managing emotions, in which they scored a high average score, indicating that these leaders modulate their emotions well as well as that of others in ways that contribute to personal understanding and growth, to problem solving, and to guiding thought processes. Female leaders also scored in the high average range in managing emotions, indicating that both male and female leaders at AU are slightly better at managing emotions than the normative population. Differences between male and female leaders are likely due to random errors, as the effect size of a test of mean differences was small to medium between genders for the Perceiving branch of EI (0.37), small for the Using branch (0.15), small to medium for the Understanding branch, and small for the Managing branch (0.12).

It is important to note that neither the composite of AU leaders, nor the male group or female group, scored in the competent range on any branches; however, in no

areas did these leaders score as needing improvement. Although these leaders have relative strengths and weaknesses, their overall results indicate that the general population of leaders surveyed at AU have a functional EI that is similar to that of the normative population.

Next, I asked: What is the level of JAW and OCB of the members of selected leaders at AU? Team members of these AU leaders were examined in the areas of JAW through their scores of positive and negative emotions about their jobs and OCB through their scores on the *OCB-C*.

Both the *OCB-C* and *JAWS* use the 5-point Likert scale for all questions; thus, the scores can range from 1–5. The AU team members had a total mean score for *OCB-C* of 2.83 ($SD=0.36$) (see Table 7). This total score is lower than those found in the two previous studies that also used the *OCB-C*. Miles et al. (2002) found OCB levels of 3.46 ($n=203$, $SD=0.70$). Spector and Che (2014) found an OCB level of 3.34 ($n=146$, $SD=0.80$). Another means of comparing OCB scores is to look at differences in the way the team members scored on the two subscales. AU team members scored higher on OCB-o than they did on OCB-p. the subscales of the *OCB-C* that measure OCB-o and OCB-p.

However, subsequent analysis using canonical correlation showed that OCB-o and OCB-p are very highly correlated and measure basically the same thing in this sample.

Team members' JAW was tested with the *JAWS*. On a 5-point Likert scale, the total mean score for the *JAWS* is 2.79 ($SD= 0.29$). The first section of the *JAWS* examines the aspect of experiencing positive or negative emotions in the workplace. The average

mean score for positive emotions of AU team members is 3.37 ($n=80$, $SD=0.74$). The average score for negative emotions is 2.20 ($SD=1.23$).

Levels of positive and negative emotions (*JAWS*) in other studies might also shed light on the levels found in this study. Van Katwyk et al. (2000) found positive emotion levels of 2.43 and negative emotion levels of 1.19 in their study of 114 civil service employees from the University of South Florida. Rode (2005) compared findings from studies done in the U.S. ($n=405$) to those found in a study of social workers in Slovenia ($n=94$). U.S. workers had a negative emotion level of 2.44 and a positive emotion level of 2.63. Slovenian workers had a negative emotion level of 2.16 and a positive emotion level of 2.95. AU team members' negative emotion scores (2.20) are less negative than those found in the U.S. (Rode, 2005) and slightly more negative than those found in the Slovenian sample, while AU team members' positive emotion scores (3.33) are considerably more positive than those found in Rode's study (2005) and the Slovenian sample.

Interestingly, the individual items on the *JAWS* showed considerable variability in team member scores. Some questions that were negative emotion questions had a much lower mean than others, which was likely due to the strength of the emotion described. Team members had low scores on negative emotion questions involving words such as miserable (1.76), disgusted (1.67), and frightened (1.71). Their scores on negative emotions were much higher on items with milder connotations to the words, such as fatigued (2.89), annoyed (2.67), and frustrated (2.78). This apparent reticence to embrace absolutes was also true for positive emotion items. For example, they shied away from saying that their jobs made them feel ecstatic (2.54) or elated (2.93) but were more likely

to say that their jobs made them feel satisfied (3.66), pleased (3.65), and cheerful (3.66). The positive emotion levels were close to 3 ($M=3.33$, $SD=0.74$). The indicator for three on the *JAWS* is Sometimes, which is a non-specific indicator that could have many possible meanings to various respondents depending on their own temperament and interpretations of the term. Three is not a midpoint but rather is an indicator. Each number on the *JAWS* reflects relative differences that allow us to make comparisons.

By considering the scores of other groups on the *JAWS*, we allow ourselves to make some inferences regarding the scores of the team members tested in this study. The *JAWS* scores collected by other researchers reveal similar differences between individual items on the instrument, especially on the negative emotion items (Basinska, Gruscynska, & Schaufeli, 2014).

Two canonical correlation analyses were conducted to answer the third and fourth research questions: What is the nature of the relationship between AU leaders' EI levels as measured by the *MSCEIT* test of EI and their team members' JAW, as measured by the *JAWS*' two subscales: positive and negative emotions, and their team members' OCB, as measured by the *OCB-C* subscales: OCB-o and OCB-p? What role does the gender of the AU leaders play in the relationship between AU leaders' EI and their team members' levels of JAW and OCB?

To begin answering the third research question: What is the nature of the relationship between AU leaders' EI levels as measured by the *MSCEIT* test of EI and their team members' JAW, as measured by the *JAWS*' two subscales: positive and negative emotional experiences, and their team members' OCB, as measured by the *OCB-C* subscales: OCB-o and OCB-p?, I conducted a CCA using the four subsets of

leaders' EI as measured by the *MSCEIT* (Perceiving Emotions, Using Emotions, Understanding Emotions, and Managing Emotions) as predictors of organizational climate using variables from the two subsets of team members' OCB (OCB-o and OCB-p) and the two subsets of JAW (positive and negative emotions) of team members to evaluate the multivariate shared relationships between the two sets of variables. The results of the first canonical correlation indicate that the four independent variables, the branches of EI, are only weakly to moderately correlated among themselves.

In the dependent variable set, OCB-o and OCB-p were highly correlated among themselves, so highly that they can be considered to be measuring the same thing. Overall, the independent variables and dependent variables were moderately correlated, with the highest correlation existing between Understanding Emotions and *JAWS* negative emotions, which would seem to indicate that the ability level of AU leaders to understand emotions and use them to facilitate thought is associated with their employees' levels of negative emotion within their JAW. The next strongest correlation was between leaders' Using Emotions and team members' *JAWS* positive emotions, which was closely followed by leaders' Understanding Emotions and team members' *JAWS* positive emotions, which would seem to indicate that a leaders' level of Understanding Emotions as well as Using Emotions are associated with their employees' levels of positive emotions within JAW.

The first CCA yielded one significant function, which showed that the latent predictor variable, leaders' EI, could account for over half of the variance (54.76%) in the latent criterion variable, team members' perceptions of organizational climate. The EI branches that loaded above the standard 0.3 (absolute value) level were Perceiving,

Using, and Understanding. The organizational climate subsets that were associated with this function were positive emotions and negative emotions. Taken in pair, the canonical variates in the first function appear to indicate that lower levels of Perceiving, Using, and Understanding emotions in AU leaders produce higher levels of positive emotions towards work and lower levels of negative emotions towards work among team members. Simply stated, the latent variable, EI, produces a reverse of the expectation for its effect on the latent variable organizational climate in that one might expect the team member whose leader has lower EI to not have good perceptions of organizational climate, but the opposite appears to be true for this test population. This finding, which is incongruous with other research, makes the next CCA done in this study more important, as it indicates the importance of considering the gender of leaders when looking for meaningful relationships between leaders' EI and team members' perceptions of organizational climate.

The second function from the first CCA was not significant but was interpreted because it accounted for a moderate amount of variance (43.56%). Taken in pair, the canonical variates in the second function appear to indicate that when AU leaders had higher levels of Understanding emotions and lower levels of Managing and Using emotions, their employees had high levels of negative emotions and moderate levels of OCB that benefited people in their workplace. Detailed analysis of this function appears in Chapter 4, but will not be discussed here due to the lack of significance of this second function.

After completing the first CCA, I conducted another CCA to answer the final research question: What role does the gender of AU leaders play in the relationship

between AU leaders' EI and their team members' levels of JAW and OCB?

A CCA was again conducted using the four subsets of leaders' EI measured by the *MSCEIT* (Perceiving Emotions, Using Emotions, Understanding Emotions, and Managing Emotions) as predictors of organizational climate using variables from the two *OCB-C* subsets of team members' OCB-o and OCB-p and the two subsets of JAW (positive and negative emotions) of team members to evaluate the multivariate shared relationships between the two sets of variables. However, in this CCA, the gender of the leaders was included in the set of predictor variables.

Zero order correlations indicate that the most highly correlated independent variables are Perceiving Emotions and Using Emotions and Using Emotions and Managing Emotions. Again in this CCA, the dependent variables, OCB-o and OCB-p, are highly correlated. Some Set 1 variables are also weakly to moderately correlated to some of the Set 2 variables, with the highest correlation existing between leaders' Managing Emotions and members' JAW negative emotions, which is 0.58. This would seem to indicate that a leaders' level of Managing Emotions is associated with their employees' levels of negative emotions within JAW. The next highest correlation was found between leaders' Perceiving Emotions scores and team members' *JAWS* subscale of negative emotions, which is -0.55, meaning that these two variables are negatively associated or inversely related. This would seem to indicate that as leaders' levels of Perceiving Emotions are higher, their employees' levels of negative emotions within JAW go up. Other moderate correlations were found between leaders' levels of Using Emotions and team members' levels of positive emotions (-0.46), between leaders' Understanding

Emotions and team members' levels of positive emotions (-0.43), and leaders' Gender and team members' OCB-p.

The CCA yielded four functions with the first canonical correlation at 0.74 (73.96% overlapping variance). The remaining three canonical correlations were not statistically significant; therefore, the first canonical function accounted for the only significant relationship between the synthetic variables of leaders' EI combined with gender and their team members' perceptions of organizational climate.

EI subsets that were correlated with the first canonical variate were: Perceiving (0.41), Using (0.41), Understanding (0.67), and Managing (0.42) and Gender (0.61). Organizational climate factors that were correlated with the first canonical variate were: positive emotion (-0.73) and negative emotions (0.55). Taken in pair, when Gender is included as a predictor, the canonical variates in the first function appear to indicate that employees who have lower levels of positive emotions and higher levels of negative emotions are associated with leaders with lower levels of EI and being female.

Discussion of Major Findings

The HEWC model I developed to explain the relationship between the variables in this study does not seem to hold true as a meaningful framework for considering the relationship between the variables in this study: leaders' EI as indicated by their scores on the four branches of EI as measured by the *MSCEIT* and employees' JAW as indicated by their positive and negative emotion scores as well as employees' OCB as indicated by their scores on the *OCB-C* subscales: OCB-o and OCB-p, with an examination of leaders' gender as a moderating factor.

Because leaders' EI has been linked to enhanced organizational climate

(Lyubomirsky et al., 2005; Mayer et al., 2004b; Newman & Smith, 2014), which can be linked to employees' JAW and OCB (Gholami et al., 2015), analysis of the relationship between these variables is important. Additionally, because the level of importance of EI on relationships between employers and employees has been linked to gender (Farooqui, 2012; Gholami et al., 2015), the study of this construct as a moderating factor was also important.

In summary, the study's findings in the first CCA, which did not include gender, indicate that when AU leaders have low EI, their employees have high positive emotions and low negative ones. These results are in the opposite direction than I expected and are counter-intuitive for those familiar with EI research.

When considering what may have caused these unexpected results, I reflected on many factors. One possible explanation of these results is that AU leaders' levels of EI were not extreme in that their levels all fell within the functional range, not rising to the "competent" level nor falling to the "needs-improvement" level. If the leaders' scores had been more extreme in either direction, a different relationship may have been found between their branch EI scores and their team members' organizational climate indicators of JAW and OCB. If I were to conduct a post-hoc study of the outliers, those leaders with the highest levels of EI and those with the lowest levels and their team members' OCB and positive and negative emotions in their JAW scores, results more aligned with other studies' findings might be found.

Perhaps another reason the findings of this study are not harmonious with expectations is that AU is an extremely diverse institution with high levels of faculty and staff who were not born and reared in the United States. Of the leaders included in this

study, 33.3% were foreign-born. As the *MSCEIT* norms are based on a pre-dominantly Western sample, caution should perhaps be used with interpreting scores of individuals who are not from Western countries due to the likelihood that cultural variations may influence their scores.

Another possible explanation could depend on the nature of the institution that AU is. This workplace is a faith-based institution where many of the employees may have internalized the mission of the institution stating that AU is a distinctive Seventh-day Adventist institution, transforms its students by educating them to seek knowledge and affirm faith in order to change the world. Such employees may choose to have positive emotions and may decrease negative emotions regardless of their leaders' EI because they feel positive about furthering the mission of the institution that furthers the faith-base of which they are members. The very act of participating in the survey is an organizational citizenship behavior that could have skewed the results to some extent. These busy team members ($n=83$), who took time to take a survey with no incentive other than to further research and scholarship, may have answered differently than the many who were sent the survey link who did not choose to participate ($n=157$). Also, of the 103 leaders who were asked to take the *MSCEIT*, only 32 responded. This type of individual may be inherently different than the other 71 leaders at AU. Additionally, many employees who work for their own church believe they are working for God rather than people. Even if their earthly leaders at AU do not have high EI, such team members may be able to use such reasoning to maintain positive perceptions of organizational climate.

Another factor that may have influenced the outcome of the study is the scoring on the *JAWS*, where some strongly negative words were lumped with mildly negative

words to form the negative emotion score and strongly positive words were combined with mildly positive words to obtain the positive emotion score. Respondents may feel bored and give that a higher score and not disgusted, giving that a lower score. Therefore, a mean score close to the middle of the scale may not truly reflect what those seeing a score close to the midpoint of the scale might think.

Why did the results conflict with much of what has been found in prior research? Solan's (2008) results also conflict with prior research. In her study of leaders at a university for continuing education, she found that leaders' EI did not predict employees' OCB. She believes that workload may be an important consideration. If team members are too stressed by dealing with high workload, as indicated in her study by higher enrollments, these employees might not have had time for any discretionary OCB, regardless of their leaders' EI. Their leader may have had very high levels of EI, but the team members with no time due to high workload could not engage in the types of behaviors measured as OCB. At AU, downturns in enrollment have resulted in lower budgets, which may have increased the responsibility and workload per team member. This could have affected the results of this study and might explain why the CCA did not find OCB-o or OCB-p to be an important part of latent variable of organizational climate.

Other researchers have also found that their studies have produced results that conflict with research on EI. Shank (2012) states that her results were "contrary to the researcher's intuitive sense" (p. 87) in her study of leaders EI ($n=257$) in a higher educational institution. At times, perhaps due to the presence of factors that have yet to be studied that are unique to institutions of higher education or to other specific settings, research on EI can yield results that are counterintuitive. A possible explanation for

differences from the literature when studying leaders in higher education, as was done in this study, is that in higher education, teaching faculty who made up 62.50% ($n=50$) of the team members who responded, often work independently. Their incentives and motivation are not linked to the opinion of their chair or dean so much as it is to recognition in their discipline. Perhaps their responses on the *OCB-C* and *JAWS* are more closely associated with another factor than their leaders' EI, as this factor may not be particularly impactful on teaching faculty.

This study's findings in the second CCA, which did include gender, indicate that employees who have lower levels of positive emotions and higher levels of negative emotions are associated with leaders with lower levels of EI and being female. Thus, the gender of their leader does seem to play an important role in organizational climate perceptions of employees, causing team members to have lower JAW if their female leader has lower EI. Gender is evidently an influential factor in a study of leaders' EI and its effects on employees' perceptions of organizational climate.

When searching for understanding of these results, I found that other researchers have learned that female leaders are held to a double standard due to the conflicting expectations of others regarding the role of leader and traditional gender roles (Bark et al., 2014; Gallant, 2014; Hopkins, 2004; Johnson, 2013; Zenger & Folkman, 2012). When male leaders are assertive, independent, decisive, and aggressive, they are viewed more positively as leaders than female leaders who exhibit similar traits. This dichotomy is surmised to occur due to the manner in which male gender role expectations align much more closely with the ideal leader role than do the traditional female gender role expectations.

I propose that the AU male leaders with lower EI levels may make decisions and choices similar to those made by AU female leaders with low EI, but the male leaders are perceived less negatively because they are male and because their behaviors align more closely with the leader role expectations of their team members. Thus, male leaders are held to a different standard than female leaders. When male leaders make less favorable choices due to low EI, organizational climate is less impacted because the male leader is not expected to exhibit behaviors that are nurturing or compassionate or to behave in ways that one with a higher EI would behave. Female leaders are expected to display those behaviors due to their gender role expectations. When a female leader makes less favorable choices due to low EI, organizational climate is more strongly impacted because team members expect female leaders to be strong in the so-called soft skills, such as being unselfish, care-taking, and nice and are disappointed if the female leader is not as strong in these types of skills. In this manner, leaders' gender and EI strongly impact employees' perceptions of organizational climate.

In post-hoc analyses, I found that of the original 258 team members who were asked to participate, only 80 responded to the survey. Of the 80, 49 (61.25%) were female. Of the 258, 119 (46.14%) were female. Thus, a disproportionate portion of the sample were female, which may have skewed results. Of the 103 leaders who were asked to participate in this study, 27 (26.21%) were female. Of the 30 who chose to participate, 10 (33.33%) were female. This means that a larger percentage of those who responded were female than those who could have chosen to respond.

In additional post-hoc analyses, I examined team members' OCB and JAW through the lens of leader gender (see Table 17). Test of mean differences show that

Table 17

AU Team Members' OCB and JAWS by Gender of Leader

Variable	<i>n</i>	OCB-o	<i>SD</i>	OCB-p	<i>SD</i>	+Emot	<i>SD</i>	-Emot	<i>SD</i>
Male Leaders									
Male TM	20	2.71	0.74	2.67	0.38	3.43	0.74	4.79	1.52
Female TM	30	2.94	0.75	2.80	0.34	3.38	0.74	4.33	1.20
Female Leaders									
Male TM	11	3.21	0.30	3.00	0.15	3.52	0.85	4.27	0.70
Female TM	19	3.09	0.68	2.97	0.35	3.21	0.77	4.41	1.15

while there is no difference in the OCB-o of female team members who have a male leader or a female leader, there is a small to medium difference ($ES=0.40$) between the OCB-o of male team members with a male leader (2.71) and a female leader (3.21). While there is only a small difference ($ES=0.24$) between the OCB-p of female team members with a male leader (2.80) and female team members with a female leader (2.97), there is a larger difference ($ES=0.50$) between the OCB-p of male team members with a male leader (2.67) and male team members with a female leader (3.00). The male team members have higher OCB-p when they have a female leader. There are no real differences in the means of male and female team members' positive and negative emotions due to their leader being male or female. This is interesting because the second CCA found that employees with lower levels of positive emotions and higher levels of negative emotions are associated with leaders with lower levels of EI and being female.

Next, I examined leader type in a quest to discover some factor that may have caused the unexpected nature of the results. The test of mean differences shows no difference between team members' OCB-o, OCB-p, positive emotions, or negative

emotions whether their leader is a teacher leader, an administration leader, or an operations leader (see Table 18). However, when the data was further examined through the lens of leader type, leader gender, and team member gender, some important differences emerged, causing the leader to ask: Does the type of leader and gender of the leader cause differences in the means of male and female team members' JAW and OCB? The OCB-o levels of male team members were higher when they had a female teaching leader than when they had a female operations leader that had a moderate effect size ($ES=0.57$). Could team members in the operations area react more negatively to female leaders? OCB-o levels of female team members were higher when they had a male teaching leader than when they had a male operations leader ($ES=0.49$), which is a moderate effect size. Perhaps male operations leaders did not relate well to female employees in some manner. The OCB-o levels of male team members were also higher when they had a male teaching leader than when they had a male operational leader, but the effect size was smaller ($ES=0.35$).

Effect sizes were somewhat larger when examining mean differences for OCB-p. Male team members had higher OCB-p when they had a female teaching leader than when they had a female operations leader ($ES=0.62$), a moderate effect size, as did female team members ($ES=0.67$), a moderate effect size (see Table 19). Female teaching leaders also were linked to higher OCB-p levels in team members than female administrative leaders in both female team members ($ES=0.57$) and male team members ($ES=0.62$), both of which are moderate effect sizes. Male teaching leaders were also linked to higher OCB-p levels in female team members than male operations leader ($ES=0.55$), which is a moderate effect size. Male teaching leaders were also linked to

Table 18

AU Team Members' OCB and JAWS by Leader Type

Variable	<i>n</i>	OCB-o	<i>SD</i>	OCB-p	<i>SD</i>	+Emot	<i>SD</i>	-Emot	<i>SD</i>
Teacher	15	3.00	0.69	2.87	0.36	3.35	0.69	4.65	1.16
Administration	15	2.90	0.75	2.81	0.41	3.29	0.80	4.64	1.36
Operation	50	2.89	0.64	2.81	0.37	3.23	0.80	4.96	1.45

higher OCB-p levels in female team members with male administrative leaders ($ES=0.54$), which is a moderate effect size. Male teaching leaders were linked to higher OCB-p levels in male team members who had male operations leaders ($ES=0.32$), which may not be significant due to its small effect size.

When examining the positive emotions of team members, I found moderate effect sizes for the differences between male ($ES=0.58$) team members and female ($ES=0.48$) team members who had a female teaching leader and those who had a female operations leader. The largest effect sizes were found when examining female team members' higher levels of negative emotions when they had a female teaching leader ($ES=0.77$) than those female team members with a female administrative leader. Another large effect size was found between female team members' higher levels of negative emotions who had a female teaching leader ($ES=0.76$) and those with a female operations leader.

These differences caused me to conduct a post hoc analysis of EI levels of leaders by leader type (see Table 20). However, a test of mean differences shows no meaningful difference between the EI of leaders by leader job type. Since the leaders' EI was not actually different based on their leader type or gender, I conclude that more credence should be given to the idea that team members respond differently to leaders based on the

Table 19

AU Team Members' OCB and JAWS by Leader Type and Gender

Leader Type	Male OCB-o (<i>SD</i>)	Female OCB-o (<i>SD</i>)	Male OCB-p (<i>SD</i>)	Female OCB-p (<i>SD</i>)	Male +Emot (<i>SD</i>)	Female +Emot (<i>SD</i>)	Male -Emot (<i>SD</i>)	Female -Emot (<i>SD</i>)
Operations								
Male	2.44 (0.78)	2.53 (0.63)	2.45 (0.44)	2.55 (0.88)	3.06 (0.44)	3.01 (0.76)	2.83 (0.57)	2.67 (0.54)
Female	2.77 (0.55)	2.89 (0.69)	2.49 (0.42)	2.51 (0.66)	3.01 (0.58)	2.69 (0.59)	2.93 (0.27)	2.48 (0.52)
Administration								
Male	2.89 (0.27)	2.81 (0.35)	2.78 (0.43)	2.99 (0.44)	2.87 (0.78)	3.88 (0.41)	3.25 (0.59)	3.02 (0.83)
Female	3.22 (0.79)	2.98 (0.79)	2.52 (0.39)	2.63 (0.81)	3.33 (0.37)	3.99 (0.49)	2.88 (0.37)	2.61 (0.29)
Teaching								
Male	2.89 (0.33)	3.22 (0.32)	2.77 (0.49)	3.59 (0.31)	2.84 (0.37)	4.11 (0.79)	3.28 (0.57)	2.78 (0.34)
Female	3.33 (0.44)	3.16 (0.47)	3.02 (0.38)	3.55 (0.49)	3.00 (0.56)	3.40 (0.71)	3.11 (0.55)	3.99 (0.76)

Table 20

AU Leaders' Total EI by Job Type

Variable	EI	SD
Operations		
Male	97.83	7.34
Female	98.88	8.04
Administration		
Male	102.56	12.66
Female	101.99	11.33
Teaching		
Male	99.73	7.67
Female	98.76	9.87

alignment of leader role to gender identity role, judging female leaders more negatively than males for similar behaviors.

Another possible explanation for the confusing nature of these results is the possibility that a third variable exists that perhaps has a negative correlation with OCB and JAW. This third variable could perhaps have something to do with the level of respect that the team members hold for their leader, which could perhaps be a factor related to age. Bii et al. (2012) found a significant positive linear relationship in their study of university leaders ($n=113$) between age and EI ($R^2=0.67$, $F=28.18$, $t=12.9$, $p=0.000$, $\beta=0.843$) and concluded that older leaders have higher EI levels. Fernandez-Berrocal, Cabello, Castillo, and Extremera's (2012) research strongly supports the idea that age could be an important third variable to consider. Their research shows that "gender differences initially reported for EI are mediated completely by age for the branches of facilitation and understanding, for strategic area and for total score, and partially by age for the dimension of emotional managing" (p. 77).

The age of leaders at AU ranged from age 36 to age 73. Those leaders in the

31–40-year-old age bracket ($n=2$) had a mean for their overall EI score that was 23 points lower than the mean of leaders in the 71–80 age bracket ($n=1$). The middle groups of leaders ages 41–70 ($M=27$, $M=99.82$) were all very close to each other by decade. However, as a group, the middle age brackets were around 10 points higher than the youngest bracket and 10 points lower than the oldest bracket. The number of respondents in the highest and lowest of these age brackets was very low, so drawing conclusions from this data would be ill-advised; however, further study might find that age is a third variable that should be further analyzed in studies such as this one.

Conclusion

In conclusion, leaders' EI at AU can be linked to some aspects of organizational climate. Leaders' branch scores on the *MSCEIT* in this study were good predictors of employees' perceptions of some aspects of organizational climate (as indicated by their scores on the subscales of the *JAWS* and *OCB-C*) when gender was included as a moderating factor. In this study, employees who have lower levels of positive emotions and higher levels of negative emotions are associated with leaders with lower levels of EI and being female. Leaders' EI matters in how employees feel about their jobs when gender is considered. This study's findings serve as an important reminder that simplistic explanations of the construct of leadership are unwise. Organizations, organizational success, leadership, leader qualities, gender roles, and organizational climate are all complex constructs that are intricately inter-related.

Recommendations

The current study raises several possible recommendations.

For Practice

Based on my findings, I recommend that leaders in higher education and possibly other fields become aware of their levels of EI and of the potential impact their EI has on employees in regards to organizational climate. If leaders are educated about EI and how leader EI can impact organizational success, they may be more willing to complete assessments to determine their EI and their relative strengths and weaknesses within the branches of EI. This knowledge can motivate leaders to seek growth in their EI, especially if they are taught that EI can be developed and improved. Based on this study's results, this could be of particular importance to female leaders.

For Future Research

Future researchers should consider expanding on this study in several ways. First, more studies within higher education settings could allow for comparison of results on leaders' EI's impact on organizational climate. Larger sample size could help the results be more readily generalized. Using a shorter EI test could potentially help more leaders be willing to engage in future studies. According to Fernandez-Berrocal et al. (2012) and Singh (2012), gender differences in EI can be understood best when taking into account the mediating effect of age. Future studies of this sort should consider including age. Conducting studies in much larger organizations might allay employees' fears that their scores on organizational climate could be linked back to their departments or to them as individuals, thus helping them be more forthright in their answers on the self-reporting instruments. An educational campaign with leaders on what EI is, how it impacts organizational success and climate, and how it can be grown in advance of the study might help more leaders be willing to participate in a study such as this. Additionally, I

recommend that several instruments be used to gauge organizational climate rather than the two chosen for this study, as the *JAWS*, in particular, had a great deal of variation in item means. Follow-up studies should include qualitative measures such as interviews with team members to gain insight on their gender role perceptions, their expectations of leaders, and specifically how they relate to their leaders. Expanding the means of measurement of organizational climate beyond JAW and OCB would give a fuller measure of organizational climate allowing for a more accurate look at how leaders' EI affects organizational climate.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST (OCB-C)

How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?	Never	Once or twice	Once or twice per month	Once or twice per week	Every day
1. Picked up meal for others at work	1	2	3	4	5
2. Took time to advise, coach, or mentor a co-worker.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Helped co-worker learn new skills or shared job knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Helped new employees get oriented to the job.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a work problem.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a personal problem.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Changed vacation schedule, work days, or shifts to accommodate co-worker's needs.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Offered suggestions to improve how work is done.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Offered suggestions for improving the work environment.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Finished something for co-worker who had to leave early.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Helped a less capable co-worker lift a heavy box or other object.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Helped a co-worker who had too much to do.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Volunteered for extra work assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Took phone messages for absent or busy co-worker.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Said good things about your employer in front of others.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Gave up meal and other breaks to complete work.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Volunteered to help a co-worker deal with a difficult customer, vendor, or co-worker.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Went out of the way to give co-worker encouragement or express appreciation.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Decorated, straightened up, or otherwise beautified common work space.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Defended a co-worker who was being "put-down" or spoken ill of by other co-workers or supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5

Copyright 2011 Suzy Fox and Paul E. Specto. All rights reserved. Used with permission of the authors.

APPENDIX B

JOB-RELATED AFFECTIVE WELL-BEING SCALE (JAWS)

Below are a number of statements that describe different emotions that a job can make a person feel. Please indicate the amount to which *any part of your job* (e.g., the work, coworkers, supervisor, clients, pay) has made you feel that emotion in the past 30 days.

Please check one response for each item that best indicates how often you've experienced each emotion at work over the past 30 days.	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Quite often	Extremely often
1. My job made me feel at ease					
2. My job made me feel angry					
3. My job made me feel annoyed					
4. My job made me feel anxious					
5. My job made me feel bored					
6. My job made me feel cheerful					
7. My job made me feel calm					
8. My job made me feel confused					
9. My job made me feel content					
10. My job made me feel depressed					
11. My job made me feel disgusted					
12. My job made me feel discouraged					
13. My job made me feel elated					
14. My job made me feel energetic					
15. My job made me feel excited					
16. My job made me feel ecstatic					
17. My job made me feel enthusiastic					
18. My job made me feel frightened					
19. My job made me feel frustrated					
20. My job made me feel furious					
21. My job made me feel gloomy					
22. My job made me feel fatigued					
23. My job made me feel happy					
24. My job made me feel intimidated					
25. My job made me feel inspired					
26. My job made me feel miserable					
27. My job made me feel pleased					
28. My job made me feel proud					
29. My job made me feel satisfied					
30. My job made me feel relaxed					

Copyright Paul T. Van Katwyk, Suzy Fox, Paul E. Spector, E. Kevin Kelloway (2006)

APPENDIX C

SURVEY INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL

Hello,

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you can withdraw at any time. You are free to skip any question that you choose.

If you have questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact Robert L. Overstreet at overstrr@andrews.edu or by phone at 269-357-5145. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the Andrews University Institutional Review Board at irb@andrews.edu or 269-471-6361.

By beginning the survey, you acknowledge that you have read this information and agree to participate in this research, with the knowledge that you are free to withdraw your participation at any time without penalty. By clicking “I agree” below you are indicating that you are at least 18 years old, have read and understood this consent form and agree to participate in this research study. Please print a copy of this page for your records.

APPENDIX D

EMAIL TO AU LEADERS

I am a student in the Andrews University Leadership program. For my dissertation, I am conducting research on the link between leaders' emotional intelligence (EI) and organizational climate as measured by their employees' job-related affective well-being and their organizational citizenship behaviors. Team leaders' emotional intelligence will be measured by the MAYER-SALOVEY-CARUSO EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE TEST, and team members' job-related affective well-being will be measured by the Job-related Affective Well-being scale while their organizational citizenship behavior will be measured by the OCB test.

You have been identified as a leader at Andrews University with whom a minimum of three employees report for job performances, and as such, I would like to invite you to participate in this study. If you agree to take part in this study, you are asked to complete an online survey/questionnaire by clicking on the link below. This survey/questionnaire is the MAYER-SALOVEY-CARUSO EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE TEST (MSCEIT), which will take approximately 45 minutes to complete and about one hour to go over the results if you desire to go over the results with me.

If you agree to participate and you take the MSCEIT, I will then send an email to your employees asking them to participate in my study. This email (see below) will contain a link to a survey that has 20 questions for the OCB and 30 for the JAWS. The 50 items should take no more than 30–40 minutes to complete.

By participating in this study, you will be contributing to the knowledge about Organizational Climate. The results from the study will be presented in educational settings and at professional conferences, and the results might be published in a professional journal. You are welcome to request a copy of the research findings once the study has been completed. As a leader, you will also benefit from this research by understanding your emotional intelligence levels and relative strengths and weaknesses in this area, which can be presented to you in report form and with explanation provided by the research if desired.

We believe there are no known risks associated with this research study. To be sure that your information is kept confidential to all but the researcher, each AU Leader and AU Team Member will be assigned a code number that will only be linked to that individual's name in a list that will be kept in a locked file. (All team members in the same department will be given the same code number and will not be able to be distinguished from other team members within that department.) When the study is completed and all data have been analyzed, the list of code numbers will be destroyed. All information regarding scores will be linked to code numbers rather than to specific names. No participant's name will be used in any report.

I'd like to thank you in advance for being willing to contribute to this study by taking the survey I will send you if you let me know you're willing to participate. One of the outcomes that I am hoping to achieve through this study is that Andrews University will be made stronger as leaders become more cognizant of their EI and how their EI levels affect organizational climate. One of the most encouraging elements of emotional intelligence is that it can be improved through training. As leaders learn about their EI, we hope that they will also be motivated to work to improve in areas of relative weakness, which will, we hope, have positive effects on the climate at Andrews University.

Click here to complete the MSCEIT (test of emotional intelligence): >>>>>>>>>>. At the beginning of the test, you will be asked to give your informed consent to participate.

Sincerely, Robert Overstreet

APPENDIX E

EMAIL TO AU TEAM MEMBERS

Greetings,

I am a student in the Andrews University Leadership program. For my dissertation, I am conducting research on the link between leaders' emotional intelligence (EI) and organizational climate as measured by their employees' job-related affective well-being (JAWS) and their organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB).

Team leaders' emotional intelligence will be measured by the MAYER-SALOVEY-CARUSO EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE TEST, and team members' job-related affective well-being will be measured by the Job-related Affective Well-being scale while their organizational citizenship behavior will be measured by the OCB test.

Your leader has been identified as a leader at Andrews University with whom a minimum of three employees report for job performances, and as such, he or she was invited to participate in this study, and he or she has consented and taken a test to measure EI. In order to learn about how AU leaders' EI affects organizational climate, I need to test both the leaders' EI and their team members' OCB and JAWS. Since your leader agreed to participate, I am also inviting you to participate. If you agree to take part in this study, you please click on the link below to complete an online survey/questionnaire that has 20 questions for the OCB and 30 for the JAWS. The 50 items should take no more than 30–40 minutes to complete.

By participating in this study, you will be contributing to the knowledge about Organizational Climate. The results from the study will be presented in educational settings and at professional conferences, and the results may be published in a professional journal. You are welcome to request a copy of the research findings once the study has been completed.

We believe there are no known risks associated with this research study. To be sure that your information is kept confidential to all but the researcher, each AU Leader and AU Team Member will be assigned a code number that will only be linked to that individual's name in a list that will be kept in a locked file. Only the researcher will be able to access the list of codes that link back to names. When the study is completed and all data have been analyzed, this list will be destroyed. All information regarding scores will be linked to code numbers rather than to specific names. No participant's name will be used in any report. Even the researcher will not be able to tell which survey belongs to individual team members, as all team members in each department will share a code which simply identifies the participant as a team member of a department. Your leader will not be given the results of your survey but will rather see an aggregate of results for all AU Team Members from all over campus who complete the survey. Your leader will see his or her own results on the EI test and receive information on how to capitalize on strengths and on how to augment relative weak areas, but he or she will not be given your results other than in the report that combines and averages the scores of all Team Members at AU who participate in the study.

I'd like to thank you in advance for being willing to contribute to this study by taking the survey I will send you if you let me know you're willing to participate. One of the outcomes that I am hoping to achieve through this study is that Andrews University will be made stronger as leaders become more cognizant of their EI and how their EI levels affect organizational climate. One of the most encouraging elements of emotional intelligence is that it can be improved through training. As leaders learn about their EI, we hope that they will also be motivated to work to improve in areas of relative weakness, which will, we hope, have positive effects on the climate at Andrews University.

Click here to complete the OCB (test of organizational citizenship behavior) and the JAWS (test of job-affective related well-being): >>>>>>>>>>. At the beginning of the test, you will be asked to give your informed consent to participate.

Sincerely, Robert Overstreet

APPENDIX F

EMAIL TO AU TEAM MEMBERS

Hello Andrews University Team Member,

I am conducting a research project examining the relationship between leaders' emotional intelligence (EI) and organizational climate as measured by their employees' job-related affective well-being and their organizational citizenship behaviors. **One of the leaders within your department has already taken the EI test that is part of this study, and now I am asking you to please take this survey, which will complete the remainder of my research.**

This **anonymous** (see confidentiality statement below) survey should take no more than 10-15 minutes to complete and has been approved by the Andrews University IRB. The survey can be found at: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/RQCJZ2F>. Please know that your responses will not be associated with your personal identity. The data will be analyzed as a group, not individually. There are no known risks in answering this questionnaire. If, however, you feel uncomfortable at any time while completing this survey, you may opt to skip that question or stop completing this questionnaire. You will not benefit financially by participating in this study. The results of this study may be published as research reports, research articles, or presented in research seminars, forums or conferences.

Thank you so much for your help!

Sincerely, Robert Overstreet

APPENDIX G

INFORMED CONSENT AGREEMENT: AU LEADERS

Please read this consent agreement carefully before you decide to participate in the study.

Purpose of the research study: The purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between leaders' emotional intelligence (EI) and organizational climate as measured by their employees' job-related affective well-being and their organizational citizenship behaviors.

What you will do in the study: If you agree to participate, you will answer questions for approximately 45 minutes. You can skip any question that makes them uncomfortable and they can stop the interview/survey at any time.

Time required: The study will require about 45 minutes of your time.

Risks: There are no anticipated risks in this study.

Benefits: One of the anticipated outcomes of this study is for Andrews University to be made stronger as leaders become more cognizant of their EI and how their EI levels affect organizational climate. One of the most encouraging elements of emotional intelligence is that it can be improved through training. As leaders learn about their EI, we hope that they will also be motivated to work to improve in areas of relative weakness, which will, we hope, have positive effects on the climate at Andrews University.

Confidentiality: To be sure that your information is kept confidential to all but the researcher, each AU Leader and AU Team Member will be assigned a code number that will only be linked to that individual's name in a list that will be kept in a locked file. Only the researcher will be able to access the list of codes that link back to names. When the study is completed and all data have been analyzed, this list will be destroyed. All information regarding scores will be linked to code numbers rather than to specific names. No participant's name will be used in any report. Leaders will not be given the results of team members' surveys but will rather see an aggregate of results for all AU Team Members from all over campus who complete the survey. Each leader will see his or her own results on the EI test and receive information on how to capitalize on strengths and on how to augment relative weak areas.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in the study is completely voluntary.

Right to withdraw from the study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

How to withdraw from the study: If you want to withdraw from the study after you have started the survey, please simply close the survey without finishing it if you have not yet reached the end. Incomplete surveys will not be used and will be deleted. If you decide to withdraw after you complete the survey, please email me, and your survey results will not be included in the data and your survey will be deleted. This will only be possible if you make your request before the results are aggregated and reported. However, at that time, your results will not be able to be linked to you in any way. There is no penalty for withdrawing.

Payment: You will receive no payment for participating in the study

If you have questions about the study, contact: If you have questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact Robert L. Overstreet at overstrr@andrews.edu or by phone at 269-357-5145.

If you have questions about your rights in the study, contact:

Mordekai Ongo, Ph.D.

Research Integrity and Compliance Officer

Andrews University

irb@andrews.edu

(269) 471-6361

Agreement:

I agree to participate in the research study described above.

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

You may request a copy of this form for your records.

APPENDIX H

INFORMED CONSENT AGREEMENT: AU TEAM MEMBERS

Please read this consent agreement carefully before you decide to participate in the study.

Purpose of the research study: The purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between leaders' emotional intelligence (EI) and organizational climate as measured by their employees' job-related affective well-being and their organizational citizenship behaviors.

What you will do in the study: If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey/questionnaire that has 20 questions for the OCB and 30 for the JAWS. The 50 items should take no more than 30–40 minutes to complete. If you agree to participate, please click on the link below to Survey Monkey where you will be asked to give your consent to participate before completing the survey. You can skip any question that makes them uncomfortable and they can stop the interview/survey at any time.

Time required: The study will require about 30–40 minutes of your time.

Risks: There are no anticipated risks in this study.

Benefits: One of the anticipated outcomes of this study is for Andrews University to be made stronger as leaders become more cognizant of their EI and how their EI levels affect organizational climate. One of the most encouraging elements of emotional intelligence is that it can be improved through training. As leaders learn about their EI, we hope that they will also be motivated to work to improve in areas of relative weakness, which will, we hope, have positive effects on the climate at Andrews University.

Confidentiality: To be sure that your information is kept confidential to all but the researcher, each AU Leader and AU Team Member will be assigned a code number that will only be linked to that individual's name in a list that will be kept in a locked file. (Team members from each department will not be able to be distinguished from other members in their department, as all team members in one department will have identical codes.) Only the researcher will be able to access the list of codes that link back to names, and even he will not be able to distinguish team members other than by department. When the study is completed and all data have been analyzed, this list will be destroyed. All information regarding scores will be linked to code numbers rather than to specific names. No participant's name will be used in any report. Your leader will not be given the results of your survey but will rather see an aggregate of results for all AU

Team Members from all over campus who complete the survey. Your leader will see his or her own results on the EI test and receive information on how to capitalize on strengths and on how to augment relative weak areas, but he or she will not be given your results other than in the report that combines and averages the scores of all Team Members at AU who participate in the study.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in the study is completely voluntary.

Right to withdraw from the study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

How to withdraw from the study: If you want to withdraw from the study after you have started the survey, please simply close the survey without finishing it if you have not yet reached the end. Incomplete surveys will not be used and will be deleted. If you decide to withdraw after you complete the survey, please email the researcher, and your survey results will not be included in the data and your survey will be deleted. This will only be possible if you make your request before the results are aggregated and reported. However, at that time, your results will not be able to be linked to you in any way. There is no penalty for withdrawing.

Payment: You will receive no payment for participating in the study.

If you have questions about the study, contact: If you have questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact the researcher(s), Robert L. Overstreet at overstrr@andrews.edu or by phone at 269-357-5145.

If you have questions about your rights in the study, contact:

Mordekai Ongo, Ph.D.

Research Integrity and Compliance Officer

Andrews University

irb@andrews.edu

(269) 471-6361

Agreement:

I agree to participate in the research study described above.

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

You may request a copy of this form for your records.

REFERENCE LIST

- Abdul, L. A. & Ehiobuche, C. (2011). Emotional intelligence and managerial competence. *Insight to a Changing World*, 4, 41–58.
- Abdussamad, J., Akib, H., & Jasruddin, P. (2015). Effect of transformational leadership and organizational culture on employee performance toward the department of education, youth and sports Gorontalo Province, Indonesia. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 7(1), 386–390.
- Adebayo, J., Olayide, R., & Saheed, O. (2012). Influence of leadership styles and emotional intelligence on job performance of local government workers in Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, 3(4), 973–982.
- Acikgoz, A., Gunsel, A., Bayyurt, N., & Kuzey, C. (2014). Team climate, team cognition, team intuition, and software quality: The moderating role of project complexity. *Group Decision & Negotiation*, 23(5), 1145–1176.
- Adnan, A., Chaudhry, A. A., & Malik, M. I. (2012). Emotional intelligence and students' academic performance: A study conducted in Pakistan and Afghanistan. *Science Series Data Report*, 4(3), 61–66.
- Akerjordet, K. & Severinsson, E. (2010). The state of the science of emotional intelligence related to nursing leadership: An integrative review. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 18, 363–382.
- Argyle, M. (1989). *The social psychology of work* (2nd ed.). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Ashkanasy, N. M. & Daus, C. S. (2005). Rumors of the death of emotional intelligence in organizational behavior are vastly exaggerated. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 441–452.
- Anderson, J. (2008). Depression, stress, and work: How occupation can affect mental health. *Journal of Controversial Medical Claims*, 15(1), 6–15.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Barbuto Jr., J. E. & Burbach, M. E. (2006). The emotional intelligence of transformation leaders: A field study of elected officials. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(1), 51–64.
- Barent, J. M. (2005). *Principals' levels of emotional intelligence as an influence on school culture*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI 3162848).
- Bark, Escartin, & Van Dick, (2014). Gender and leadership in Spain: A systematic review of some key aspects. *Sex Roles*, 70(11-12), 522-537.
- Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21(3), 157–161.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Basinska, Gruscynska, & Schaufeli, (2014). Psychometric properties of the polish version of the Job-related Affective Well-being Scale. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 27(6), 993-1004
- Bateman, T. S. & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee “citizenship.” *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587–595.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): A test of emotional intelligence*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: insights from the emotional quotient inventory. In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 363–388). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bar-On, R. (2004). The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Rationale, description, and summary of psychometric properties. In G. Geher (Ed.): *Measuring emotional intelligence: common ground and controversy* (pp. 111–142). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence. *Psicothema*, 18, 13–25.
- Bass, B. & Riggio R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Benjamin, B., Gulliya, T., & Crispo, A. W. (2012). Emotional intelligence and organizational culture. *Insights to a Changing World*, 1, 52–64.
- Bergeron, D. M. (2007). The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: Good citizens at what cost? *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1078–1095.

- Bii, P. K., Lucas, O., Mwengei, O. K. B., Koskey, N., Korir, E., & Yano, E. M. (2012). Age: A determinant of management's emotional intelligence competency. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research & Policy Studies*, 3(6), 807–811.
- Bird, K. & Sultmann, W. (2010). Social and emotional learning: Reporting a system approach to developing relationships, nurturing well-being and invigorating learning. *Emotional & Child Psychology*, 27(1), 143–155.
- Borman, W. C. & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmidt, W. C. Borman, A. Howard, A. Kraut, D. Ilgen, B. Schneider, & S. Zedeck (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyatzis, R. (2006). Using tipping points of emotional intelligence and cognitive competencies to predict financial performance of leaders. *Psicothema*, 18, 124–131.
- Boyatzis, R., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: insights from the emotional competence inventory (ECI). In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.): *Handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 343–362). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brackett, M. & Salovey, P. (2006). Measuring emotional intelligence with the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT). *Psicothema*, 18, suppl. 34–41.
- Bradberry, T. & Greaves, J. (2005). *The emotional intelligence quick book: Everything you need to know to put your EQ to work*. New York, NY: Fireside.
- Bradberry, T. & Greaves, J. (2009). *Emotional intelligence, 2.0*. San Diego, CA: Talent Smart.
- Butler, C. & Chinowsky, P. (2006). Emotional intelligence and leadership behavior in construction executives. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 22(3), 119–125.
- Carlos-Alegre, J. (2005). *Workgroup Climate Assessment (WCA) tool and guide for facilitators*. Retrieved from <https://www.msh.org/resources/workgroup-climate-assessment-wca-tool-and-guide-for-facilitators>
- Carmeli, A., Yitzhak-Halevy, M., & Weisberg, J. (2009). The relationship between emotional intelligence and psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(1), 66–78.
- Carmeli, (2003). The relationship between emotional intelligence and work attitudes, behaviour and outcomes: An examination among senior managers: *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 18(8), 758-813.

- Caruso, D. (2016). *EI skills group*. Retrieved from <http://www.eiskillsgroup.com/example-items>
- Caruso, D. R. & Salovey, P. (2004). *The emotionally intelligent manager: How to develop and use the four key emotional skills of leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Castro, M. L. & Martins, N. (2010). The relationship between organizational climate and employee satisfaction in a South African information and technology organization. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36(1), 6–16.
- Cavolla, (2008) Social Intelligence and the biology of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 9(1), 24–36.
- Cherniss, (2003) *Promoting emotional intelligence in organizations: Make training in emotional intelligence effective*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development
- Cherniss, C. & Goleman, D. (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chovwen, C. (2012). Predictors of organizational commitment of factory employees. *Ifa Psychologia*, 20(2), 184–191.
- Coleman, V. I. & Borman, W. C. (2000) Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10, 25–44.
- Collins, B. (2013). Lessons learned for future leaders. *Journal of Environmental Health*, 75(6), 4–5.
- Cooper, R. K. & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: Emotional intelligence in leadership and organization*. New York, NY: Grosset Putnam.
- Cote, S., Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., & Miners, C. T. H. (2010). Emotional intelligence and leadership emergence in small groups. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21(3), 496–508.
- Darwin, C. (2007). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals*. New York, NY: Filiquarian. (Original work published 1872)
- Dasborough, M. T. (2006). Cognitive asymmetry in employee emotional reactions to leadership behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 163–178.
- DeCotils, T. A. & Koys, D. J. (1980, Aug.). The identification and measurement of the dimensions of organizational climate. *Academy of Management Proceedings*. (Meeting Abstract Supplement), 171–175.

- Delmatoff, J. & Lazarus, I. (2014). The most effective leadership style for the new landscape of healthcare. *Journal of Healthcare and Management*, 59(4), 245–249.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499–512.
- Denison, D. R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(3), 619–654.
- Diener, E. (1994) Assessing subjective well-being: Progress and opportunities. *Social Indicators Research*, 31, 103–157.
- Diener, E. & Diener, M. (1995). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 68, 653–663.
- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276–302.
- Dinu, V. (2013). Organizational climate diagnosis-connections with employee-organizational fit: Case study. *Social Behavioral Sciences*, 2(70), 139–146.
- DiPaola, M, Tarter, C., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Measuring organizational citizenship in schools: The OCB Scale. In W. K. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Leadership and reform in American public schools*. 319–341. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Donaldson-Feilder, E. J. & Bond, F. W. (2004). The relative importance of psychological acceptance and emotional intelligence to workplace well-being. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 32, 187–203.
- Dulewicz, V. & Higgs, M. (2003). Leadership at the top: The need for emotional intelligence in organizations. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11(3), 193–210.
- Eagly & Karau, (2002). Role of congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychology Review*, 109(3) 573-598.
- Eason, T. (2009). Emotional intelligence and nursing leadership: A successful combination. *Creative Nursing*, 15(4), 184–200.
- Elías, M.J., Tobías, S.E., & Friedlander, B.S. (1999). Emotionally intelligent parenting: how to raise a self-disciplined, responsible and socially skilled child. New York: Harmony/ Random House
- Fancher, R. E. (1985). *The intelligence men: Makers of the IQ controversy*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

- Farooqui, M. R. (2012). Measuring organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as a consequence of organizational climate. *Asian Journal of Business Management*, 4(3), 294–302.
- Feather, R. (2009). Emotional intelligence in relation to nursing leadership: Does it matter? *Journal of Nursing Management*, 17, 376–382.
- Fernandez-Berrocal, P., Cabello, R., Castillo, R., & Extremera, N. (2012). Gender differences in emotional intelligence: The mediating effect of age. *Behavioral Psychology*, 20(1), 77–89.
- Fernandez-Berrocal, P. & Extremera, N. (2006). Emotional intelligence: A theoretical and empirical review of its first 15 years of history. *Psicotherma*, 18, 7–12.
- Fields, D. (2002). *Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fiedler, F. E. & Garcia, J. E. (1987). *New approaches to effective leadership: Cognitive resources and organizational performance*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Fineman, S. (1975). The influence of perceived job climate on the relationship between managerial achievement motivation and performance. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 48(2), 113–124.
- Fletcher, R. B. & Hattie, J. (2011). *Intelligence and intelligence testing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Frijda, N. H. (1986). *The emotions*. London, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox and Spector (2011) Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 5(9), 291-309.
- Furnham, A. & Petrides, K. V. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence and happiness. *Social Behavior & Personality*, 31, 815–824.
- Gallant, A. (2014). Symbolic interactions and development of women leaders in higher education. *Gender, Work, & Organization*, 21(3), 203–216.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York, NY: Bantam.
- Gardner, 1999 *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gardner, L. & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(2) 68–78.

- Geher, G. (Ed.). (2004). *Measuring emotional intelligence: Common ground and controversy*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- George, J. M. & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 310–329.
- George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance*, 10, 153–170.
- Ghanbari, S. & Eskandari, A. (2013). Organizational climate, job motivation, and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Management Perspective*, 1(3), 1–14.
- Gershwin, M. C. (1994). What workplace education programs need to know about behavioral change: Tapping the work of Kurt Lewin. *Information Analyses*, 70, 4–15.
- Gholami, S., Keykale, M. S., Tir, M., Ramandi, F. D., Karim, M., & Rajaei, R. (2015). Investigation the relationship between organizational climate and organizational citizenship behavior among staff in hospital. *International Journal of Public Health, Pharmacy & Pharmacology*, 1(1), 14–22.
- Glasser, W. (1998). *Choice theory*. New York, NY: Harper-Collins.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (2001). Emotional intelligence: perspectives on a theory of performance. In C. Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace* (pp. 220-230) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 82, 82–91.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A., (2002). *The new leaders: Transforming the art of leadership into the science of results*. London, UK: Little Brown.
- Graham, J. W. (1989). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, operationalization, and validation*. Unpublished working paper, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal*, 4, 249–270.
- Greenockle, (2010) The new face in leadership: Emotional intelligence. *Quest*, 62(3) 260-267.

- Hatcher, C. (2003). Refashioning a passionate manager: Gender at work. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10(4), 391–422.
- Hemmelgarn, A. L., Glisson, C., & James, L. R. (2006). Organizational culture and climate: Implications for services and interventions research. *Clinical Psychology: Science & Practice*, 13(1), 73–89.
- Hernon, P. & Rossiter, N. (2006). Emotional intelligence: Which traits are most prized? *College & Research Libraries*, 67(3), 260–275.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Holloway, J. B. (2012). Leadership behavior and organizational climate: An empirical study in a non-profit organization. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 5(1), 9–35.
- Hopkins, (2004) Managing conflict with emotional intelligence: Abilities that make a difference. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(2), 226-244.
- Jafri, M. H., Dem, C., & Choden, S. (2016). Emotional intelligence and employee creativity: Moderating role of proactive personality and organizational climate. *Business Perspectives & Research*, 4(1), 79–88.
- James, L. R. & Jones, A. P. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81(12), 1096–1112.
- Johnson, A. (2011). *The impact of managerial emotional intelligence perceptions on the occupational well-being of employees in a police department*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (3482199).
- Johnson, B. & Stevens, J. J. (2006). Student achievement and elementary teachers' perceptions of school climate. *Learning Environment Research*, 9, 111–122.
- Johnson, C. (2013). From Obama to Abbott: Gender identity and the politics of emotion. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 28(75), 14–29.
- Jordan, P. & Troth, A., (2011) Emotional Intelligence and leader member exchange: The relationship with employee turnover intentions and job satisfaction. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(3), 260–280.
- Kaschub, M. (2002). Defining emotional intelligence in music education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 103(5), 9–15.
- Katz, D. (1964). Motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131–146.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.

- Kluemper, D. H. (2008). Trait emotional intelligence: The impact of core-self evaluations and social desirability. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 44, 1402–1412.
- Kreitz, P. A. (2009). Leadership and emotional intelligence: A study of university library directors and their senior management teams. *College & Research Libraries*, 70(6), 531–554
- Landy, F. J. (2005). Some historical and scientific issues related to research on emotional intelligence. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 411–424.
- Langley, (2016). *The influence of emotion on memory for a crime* (Digital thesis or dissertation). Retrieved from Digital Commons, Georgia Southern (2489).
- Law, K., Wong, C., Huang, G., & Li, X. (2008). The effects of emotional intelligence on job performance and life satisfaction for the research and development scientists in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 25, 51–69.
- Lazarus, (1991). *Emotion and adaption*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- LeBaron, M. (2003). *Cross-cultural communication. Beyond intractability: Conflict Research Consortium*. Boulder, CO: University Press.
- LeDoux, J. (1996). *The emotional brain: The mysterious underpinnings of emotional life*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Lee, K. & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 131–142.
- Legree, P., Mullins, H., & Psotka, J. (2016). Profile similarity metrics as an alternate framework to score rating-based tests: MSCEIT re-analyses. *Intelligence*, 47, 159–174.
- Leiter, (1991) Coping patterns as predictors of burnout: The function of control and escapist coping patterns. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12(3), 123-144.
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A. & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 52–65.
- Lewin, K., Lippit, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 271–301.
- Lin, H. (2006). Inter-organizational and organizational determinants of planning effectiveness for Internet-based inter-organizational systems. *Information & Management*, 43(4), 423–433.

- Lo, M. & Ramayah, T. (2009). Dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in a multicultural society: The case of Malaysia. *International Business Research*, 2(1), 48–55.
- Lopes, P., Salovey, P., & Straus, R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, personality, and the perceived quality of social relationships. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 35, 641–658.
- Lowe, (2003) Exploring coping reactions to work-stress: Applications of an appraisal theory. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 7(6), 393-400.
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 695–706.
- Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 803–855
- Maamari, B. E. & Messarra, L.C. (2012). An empirical study of the relationship between organizational climate and organizational citizenship behavior. *European Journal of Management*, 12(3), 165–174.
- Makikangas, A., Feldt, T., & Kinnunen, U. (2007). Warr's scale of job-related affective well-being: A longitudinal examination of its structure and relationships with work characteristics. *Work & Stress*, 21(3), 197–219.
- Makikangas, A., Hyvonen, K., Leskinen, E., Kinnunen, U., & Feld, T. (2011). A person-centered approach to investigate the development trajectories of job-related affective well-being: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Organizational & Organizational Psychology*, 84(2), 327–346.
- Margarita, M., Reyes, V., & Zapata, D. (2014). Relationship between organizational climate and its dimensions and knowledge-sharing behavior among knowledge workers. *Intro Journal Psychology*, 7(2), 64–75.
- Maslow, A. H. (1976). *Maslow on management*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Mayer, J. D. (1999, September). Emotional intelligence: Popular or scientific psychology? *APA Monitor*, 30, 50.
- Mayer, J. D. & Mitchell, D.C. (1998). Intelligence as a subsystem of personality: From Spearman's g to contemporary models of hot processing. In W. Tomic & J. Kingma (Eds.), *Advances in cognition and educational practice* (Vol. 5., pp. 43–75). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Mayer, J.D., Panter A.T., Caruso, D.R. (2012). Does personal intelligence exist? Evidence from a new ability-based measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 94(2) 124-140

- Mayer, J. D. & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3–31). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) User's Manual*. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004a). A further consideration of issues of emotional intelligence. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 249–255.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004b). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197–215.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2011). Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test. *Multi-Health Systems Incorporated*. Retrieved from <http://romania.testcentral.ro/media/msceit-m-en-pdf-CMYTTYWY.pdf>
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence as a standard intelligence. *Emotion*, 1(3), 232–242.
- McGregor, (2005) *Is it rape? On acquaintance rape and taking women's consent seriously*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Silent messages*. New York, NY: Wadsworth.
- Miles, D. E., Spector, P. E., Borman, W. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment*, 10(1–2), 51–56.
- Miller, M. (1999). Emotional intelligence helps managers succeed. *Credit Union Magazine*, 65(7), 25–26.
- Momeni, N. (2009). The relation between managers' emotional intelligence and the organizational climate they create. *Public Personnel Management*, 38(2), 35–48.
- Morrissy, L., Borman, P., & Mergler, A. (2013). Nursing a case of the blues: An examination of the role of depression in predicting job-related affective well-being in nurses. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 34(3), 158–168.
- Muhammad (2006). Emotional Intelligence and organizational productivity: A conceptual study. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 15(6): 821-825
- Myers, L., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. (2012). *Applied multivariate research design and interpretation* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Neagu, E. R. & Nicula, V. (2012). Influence of organizational culture on company performance. *Management & Finance*, 4(68), 420–425.
- Nelson, D. & Low, G. (2005). Emotional intelligence: The role of transformative learning in academic excellence. *Texas Study of Secondary Education*, 13, 7–10.
- Newman, M. & Smith, K. H. (2014). Emotional intelligence and emotional labour: A comparison study using Emotional Capital Report (ECR). *Education & Society*, 32(1), 41–62.
- Novac, C. & Bratanov, C. I. (2014). The impact of the leadership style on the organizational climate in a public entity. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, 2(1), 155–179.
- Opengart, R. (2005). Emotional intelligence and emotion work: examining constructs from an interdisciplinary framework. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(1), 49–63.
- Organ, D. W. & Konovsky, M. (1988). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 157–164.
- Parker, P. & Sorensen, J. (2008). Emotional intelligence and leadership skills among NHS managers: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Clinical Leadership*, 16, 137–142.
- Patterson, M. G., Warr, P. B., & West, M. A. (2004). Organizational climate and company performance: The role of employee affect and employee level. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 77(2), 193–216.
- Payne, W. L. (1985). *A study of emotion: Developing emotional intelligence, self-integration, and relating to fear, pain and desire*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (8605928)
- Pena-Suarez, E., Muniz, J., Campillo-Alvarez, A., Fonseca-Pedrero, E., & Garcia-Cueto, E. (2012). Assessing organizational climate: Psychometric properties of the CLIOR Scale. *Psicothema*, 25(1), 137–144.
- Peterson et al. (2003). Character strengths before and after September 11. *Psychological Science*, 14(1), 381–384.
- Petrides, K. & Furnham, A. (2000). Gender differences in measured and self-estimated trait emotional intelligence. *Sex Roles*, 42(5), 449–464.
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C.A., & Williams, E.S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897 - 933.

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Pain, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(6), 107–142.
- Podsakoff, P. M. & MacKenzie S. B. (1997) Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 3(82), 262–270
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Pain, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563.
- Popa, B. M. (2011). The relationship between performance and organizational climate. *Journal of Defense Resources Management*, 2(2), 137–143.
- Purcell, S. L. & Wilcox, D. M. (2007). Defining and examining technology intelligence. *Curriculum & Teaching Dialogue*, 9(1-2), 279–291.
- Ramandi, F. D., Karimi, M., & Rajaei, R. (2015). Investigation the relationship between organizational climate and organizational citizenship behavior among staff in hospital. *International Journal of Public Health, Pharmacy & Pharmacology*, 1(1), 14–22.
- Ramchunder, Y. & Martins, N. (2014). The role of self-efficacy, emotional intelligence and leadership style as attributes of leadership effectiveness. *Original Research*. 40(1), 1–11.
- Randhawa, G. & Kaur, K. (2015). An empirical assessment of impact of organizational climate on organizational citizenship behavior. *Paradigm*, 19(1), 65–78.
- Reichers, A. E. & Schneider, B. (1990). Climate and culture: An evolution of constructs. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (pp. 1–39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rode, N. (2005). Translation of measurement instruments and their reliability: An example of job-related affective well-being scale. *Metodoloskizvezki*, 2(1), 15–26.
- Roxana, E. & Nicula, V. (2012). Influence of organizational culture on company performance. *Management & Economics*, 4(68), 420–424.
- Russell (1979) Affective space is bipolar. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2(37) 345-356.
- Salovey, P. (2005). The science of emotional intelligence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 6.

- Salovey, P. & Mayer, J. D. (1989). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, & Personality*, 9(3), 185–211.
- Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Goldman, S. L., Turvey, C., Palfai, T. P., & Pennebaker, J. W. (Eds.). (1995). *Emotion, disclosure, and health* (pp. 125–154). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, xiv, 337.
- Samman, E. (2007). Psychological and subjective well-being: A proposal internationally comparable indicators. *Oxford Development Studies*, 35(4) 459–486
- Sand, T., Cangemi, J., & Ingram, J. (2011). Say again? What employees really want from their jobs? *Organization Development Journal*, 29(2), 101–107.
- Sardana, G. D. & Vrat, P. (1984). Models of productivity measurement: Survey and critical appraisal, reading material. *APO Seminar on Productivity Measurement and Analysis*. New Delhi, India: National Productivity Council.
- Schneider, B., Chung, B., & Yusko, K. P. (1993). *Service climate for service quality*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2011). Perspectives on organizational climate and culture. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 373–414). Washington, DC: APA.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Bobik, C., Coston, T. D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C., . . . Wndorf, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 141(4), 523–536.
- Segal, J. (1997). *Raising your emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Owl Books.
- Seifert, T. A. (2005). The *Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-Being*. Retrieved from <http://www.liberalarts.wabash.edu/ryff-scales/>
- Seligman, M. & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5–14.
- Sewell, G. (2009). Emotional intelligence and the Army Leadership Requirements Model. *Military Review*, 89(6), 93–97.
- Singh, L. K. (2012). Influence of age and gender on the emotional intelligence of managers. *Business Review*, 30, 1-31.
- Staw, B., Bell, N., & Clausen, J., (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(1), 56–77.
- Shahhosseini, M., Silong, A. D., Ismaill, I. A., & Uli, J. N. (2012). The role of emotional intelligence on job performance. *International Journal of Business & Social Science*, 3(21), 241–246.

- Shank, J. C., (2012). *Emotional intelligence and educational leadership: Measuring the emotional intelligence of educational leaders and their corresponding student achievement*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3510549).
- Shapiro, D. (2009). Why repressing emotions is bad for business. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(11), 30.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.
- Solan, A. M. (2008). *The relationships between emotional intelligence, visionary leadership, and organizational citizenship behavior in continuing higher education*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3325538).
- Spector, P. E. (2002). *Overview of the Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS)*, Retrieved from <http://chuma.cas.usf.edu/~spector/scales/jawspage.html>
- Spector, P. E. & Che, X.X. (2014). Re-examining citizenship: How the control of measurement artifacts affects observed relationships of organizational citizenship behavior and organizational variables. *Human Performance*, 27, 165–182.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35–71.
- Stumpf, S. A., Brief, A. P., & Hartman, K. (1987). Self-efficacy expectations and coping with career-related events. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31(2), 91–108
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tang, T. L.-P., Sutarso, T., Davis, G. M.-T. W., Dolinski, D., Ibrahim, A. H. S., & Wagner, S.L. (2008). To help or not to help? The good Samaritan effect and the love of money on helping behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(4), 865–887.
- Tellegen, A. (1985). Structures of mood and personality and their relevance to assessing anxiety, with an emphasis on self-report. In A. H. Tuma & J. D. Maser (Eds.), *Anxiety and the anxiety disorders* (pp. 681–706). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thumin, F. & Thumin, L. (2011). The measurement and interpretation of organizational climate. *Journal of Psychology*, 145(2), 93–109.
- Tofighi, M., Tirgari, B., Fooladvandi, M., Rasouli, F., & Jalali, M. (2015). Relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior in critical and emergency nurses in south east of Iran. *Ethiopian Journal of Health Science*, 25(1), 79–88.

- Truxillo, D. M., Erdogan, B., Bauer, T. N., & Hammer, L. (2009). Perceptions of overall fairness: Are effects on job performance moderated by leader-member exchange. *Human Performance, 22*, 432–449.
- VandeWaa, E. & Turnipseed, D. (2012). Emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior of university professors. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 6*(7), 1–12.
- Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 219–230.
- Van Lent, A. A. (2013). *The effects of job security and regulatory focus on well-being and engagement with exploratory analyses of generational differences* (Unpublished master's thesis). Universiteit Utrecht, Netherlands.
- Van Rooy, D. L. & Viswesvaran, C. (2004). Emotional intelligence: A meta-analytic investigation of predictive validity and homological net. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 71–95.
- Varca, P. (2004). Service skills for service workers: emotional intelligence and beyond. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal, 14*(6), 457–467.
- Verbeke, W., Volgering, M., & Hessels, M. (1998). Exploring the conceptual expansion within the field of organizational behavior: Organizational climate and organizational culture. *Journal of Management Studies, 35*(3), 303–329.
- Wang, M. (2009). Does organizational support promote citizenship in service settings? The moderating role of service climate. *Journal of Social Psychology, 149*(6), 648–676.
- Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudemonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 64*, 678–691.
- Watkin, C. (2002). Developing emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment, 8*(2), 98–92. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00137
- Watson, D. & Clark, L. (1984). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *American Psychological Association, 54*(6), 1063–1070.
- Wechsler, D. (1997). *WAIS-III: Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale* (3rd ed.). San Antonio, TX. Psychological Corporation.
- Williams, L. J. & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*, 601–617.

- Wharam, J. (2009). *Emotional intelligence*. Winchester, UK: O Books.
- White, G. (2005). *Postnatal moods: Emotional changes following childbirth*. Auckland, New Zealand: Random House.
- Winslow, E. A. (1948). World Health Organization (International conciliation, Mar. 1948, no. 437 (i.e. 439); International conciliation, Mar. 1948, no. 437. New York, NY: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Wright, T. & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 84–94.
- Yuan, B. J. C., Hus, W. L., Shieh, J. H., & Li, K. P. (2012). Increasing emotional intelligence of employees: Evidence from research and development teams in Taiwan. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 40(10), 1713–1724.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. (2004). Emotional intelligence in the workplace: A critical review. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53(3), 371–399.
- Zenger, J. & Folkman, J. (2012). Are women better leaders than men? *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2012/03/a-study-in-leadership-women-do>

VITA

Robert L. Overstreet

Profession Education and Academic Degrees

- 2017 Candidate, Doctor of Philosophy, Leadership, Andrews University,
 Berrien Springs, MI
- 1995 Master of Science Education in Education Administration at University of
 Tennessee, Chattanooga
- 1994 Bachelor of Science, Physical Education, Southern College of Seventh-
 day Adventists, Collegedale, TN

Higher Education Professional Experiences

Dalton State College, Dalton, GA

- 2015-2016 Undergraduate and graduate courses including: Teaching Methods of
 Social Studies, EDUC 3246; Curriculum and Assessment, EDUC 3287;
 Exploring Multicultural Methods, EDUC 2120; Field Supervision for
 Student Teachers; Assistant Dean, School of Education

K-12 Professional Experiences

- 2011-2015 Principal, Andrews Academy, Andrews University
- 2009-2011 Vice-principal, Forest Lake Elementary Center, Florida Conference
- 2005-2009 Principal, Jacksonville Adventist Academy, Florida Conference
- 2000-2005 Principal, Madison Campus Elementary, Kentucky/Tennessee Conference
- 1995-2000 Multi-grade teacher for all subjects, Florida Conference

Scholarly Activities and Research

- 2013 Book Review: Classroom Instruction That Works (2nd ed.). *Journal of
 Adventist Christian Leadership*, 6, Spring
- 2013 Book Review: Ego vs. EQ. *Journal of Adventist Christian Leadership*, 7,
 Fall
- 2014 Book Review: The Power of Invisible Leadership: How a Compelling
 Common Purpose Inspires Exceptional Leadership. *Journal of Adventist
 Christian Leadership*, 8(1), Spring
- 2016 Presentation, Center of Academic Excellence, Dalton State College: The
 Effect of Leaders Emotional Intelligence on Employees
- 2016 Presentation, Association of Teacher Excellence, Louisville, KY: The Art
 of Becoming an Emotionally Intelligent Instructor