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ITEM/SCALE ORIGINS

Emotional Intelligence View 360 and PeopleIndex were developed by Kenneth M. Nowack, Ph.D., who is a licensed psychologist and researcher in the area of 360 degree feedback, emotional intelligence and occupational health. Dr. Nowack is a member of Daniel Goleman's Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations (www.eiconsortium.org).

The most widely accepted model of emotional intelligence (EI) has been influenced by several scientists and researchers. Howard Gardner’s (1983) theory of multiple intelligence lists interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence as unique and different from the mathematical/logical type recognized today as “IQ” or general intelligence. Peter Salovey and John Mayer first proposed their theory of EI in 1990 and Reuven Bar-On (1988) has placed EI in the context of health and well-being. Daniel Goleman (1998) formulated EI in terms of a theory of organizational and job performance. All these models, however, share a common core of basic concepts including Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, and Relationship Management.

A set of critical interpersonal, social and communication competencies were derived in three specific areas: 1) Self Management; 2) Relationship Management; and 3) Communication. Items were rationally constructed to measure the full range of emotional intelligence competencies based on the Goleman (1998) model. Seventeen scales were derived, each measured by 3 to 5 questions using a Likert 1 to 7 frequency scale.

Where possible, items for Emotional Intelligence View 360/PeopleIndex were also drawn from three already validated multi-rater feedback tools (Nowack, 1997) published by Organizational Performance Dimensions (OPD) including Executive View/360, Manager View/360 and Performance View/360.

An initial version was piloted with a group of 165 executives, managers and professional employees within two organizations. Statistical analyses included item-scale correlations, breakdowns by relevant demographic variables (e.g., education, age, gender), internal consistency reliability, and descriptive (scale means, standard deviations, etc.) were run to investigate the psychometric properties of the instrument. Based upon the results of the pilot testing and statistical analysis, some revision in item content and wording was done resulting in the copyrighted 2004 74-item version.
EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE VIEW 360/PEOPLEINDEX COMPETENCIES/DEFINITIONS

SELF MANAGEMENT

Self-Development
Manages one’s own time, energy and abilities for continuous personal growth and maximum performance.

Adaptability/Stress Tolerance
Maintains balance and performance under pressure and stress. Ability to effectively cope with ambiguity and change in a constructive manner.

Self-Control
Manages and control emotions and behavior in the face of interpersonal conflict. Demonstrates patience, rarely overreacts or loses control.

Trustworthiness
Demonstrates and practices high standards of personal and professional integrity. Displays honesty and candor. Creates trusting relationship with others.

Strategic Problem Solving
Analyzes a situation, identifies alternative solutions, and develops specific actions; Gathers and utilizes available information in order to understand and solve organizational issues and problems.

Achievement Orientation
Accomplishes tasks, projects and assignments on time and with quality

RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT

Building Strategic Relationships
Initiates and cultivates strategic internal and external networking relationships that foster both individual and organizational goals. Builds and maintains effective and collaborative relationships with diverse internal and external stakeholders.

Conflict Management
Negotiates and effectively resolve interpersonal differences with others

Leadership/Influence
Utilizes appropriate interpersonal styles and approaches in facilitating a group towards task achievement

Interpersonal Sensitivity/Empathy
Takes actions that demonstrate consideration for the feelings and needs of others

Team/Interpersonal Support
Assists, motivates, encourages and supports others who depend on each other to accomplish tasks, projects and assignments
Collaboration
Establishes and develops cooperative, supportive and collaborative working relationships with others.

COMMUNICATION

Written Communication
Expresses written thoughts and ideas in a clear and concise manner

Two-Way Feedback
Keeps others informed in a timely manner

Oral Communication
Conveys oral thoughts & ideas in a clear and concise manner

Oral Presentation
Presents individual and organizational viewpoints to groups in a clear and persuasive manner

Listening
Listens and understands the verbal communications of others.
EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE VIEW 360 (EIV360) NORMATIVE SAMPLE

The EIV360 normative sample was based on 197 professional employees from 20 diverse industries (profit, non-profit and government). The majority were female (63%), highly educated (73.6% had college or advanced degrees) and split between those under 40 (48%) and older (52%). The majority of the normative sample was Caucasian (69.1%) but included 13% Asian, 8.9% Hispanic, and 4.1% African American (others did not identify ethnicity). The existing normative database is over 3,000 individuals in diverse industry sectors including government, non-profit and the private sector. This growing international database includes employees from the United States, Canada, Europe and Asia.

EIV360 SCALE CORRELATIONS

Correlations were run for all 17 competencies as well as the three major EIV360 clusters including Self-Management (SELMGT), Relationship Management (REKMGT) and Communication (COMMUN). The three EIV360 clusters were highly correlated with each other. Correlations among the 17 EIV360 ranged from .56 to .86 with significant associations between them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SELFMT</th>
<th>RELMT</th>
<th>COMMUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELFMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.931(**)</td>
<td>.901(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.931(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.889(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.901(**)</td>
<td>.889(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS

Responses to the 74 questions composing the EIV360 were factor analyzed (N=734) using principal components factoring with iteration and varimax rotation. A total of 5 unique factors were extracted with Eigenvalues greater than 1.0 accounting for a total of 71% of the variance in this analysis. The first factor was the largest accounting for over 60% of the variance and included all 74 items suggesting. This mega-factor might be considered as a global index of self and relationship management (Global EIV factor).

The second factor accounted for 4.17% of the variance and included 10 items focused on self development, self control, achievement orientation, problem solving, completion of tasks and controlling emotions (Self Management).

The third factor accounted for 2.37% of the variance and included 13 items focusing on self control, handling pressure, maintaining poise under stress, controlling emotions, adaptability, self development, and cooperative team behavior (Stress Management/Adaptability).
The fourth factor accounted for 1.95% of the variance and included 5 items focusing on communicating in a manner that influences others, leading others, modifying interpersonal style to persuade others and trustworthiness (Leadership).

The fifth factor accounted for 1.71% of the variance and included 7 items focusing on optimism, building strategic alliances, resisting a desire to speak when it will not be helpful and effective written communications (Relationship Management).

GENDER DIFFERENCES

An analysis was run to identify any significant self-reported gender differences across the 17 EIV360 scales from the perspective of the employees who completed the instrument and his/her raters.

Only two significant findings emerged from this gender analysis. Self-ratings of men were significantly lower than women on the Interpersonal Sensitivity/Empathy competency (N=127; F=5.82, p < .01). Analysis by all raters revealed that women were rated significantly higher than men in the communication competency of Listening (N=867; F=7.82, p < .01).

RATER DIFFERENCES

Each of the 17 EIV360 competencies were analyzed by rater groups to determine whether differences existed between managers, direct reports, peers/team members (N=1,135). Results from this analysis are summarized below with significant differences observed for the competencies of Trustworthiness, Achievement, Building Strategic Relationships, Interpersonal Sensitivity/Empathy, Written Communication and Oral Presentation (all p’s < .01). Manager ratings are slightly more critical than those of direct reports or peers in most cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATER</th>
<th>TRUST</th>
<th>ACHIEVE</th>
<th>RELATION</th>
<th>EMPATHY</th>
<th>WCOM</th>
<th>ORALPRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.08826</td>
<td>1.12702</td>
<td>1.23273</td>
<td>1.15286</td>
<td>1.06069</td>
<td>.98443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.01994</td>
<td>.95959</td>
<td>1.22275</td>
<td>1.17895</td>
<td>1.15434</td>
<td>.95931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.36355</td>
<td>1.23696</td>
<td>1.31572</td>
<td>1.47990</td>
<td>1.23744</td>
<td>1.16720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1285</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.17759</td>
<td>1.09343</td>
<td>1.26329</td>
<td>1.30676</td>
<td>1.18004</td>
<td>1.05546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RELIABILITY & VALIDITY

Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) was calculated for each of the 17 EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE VIEW 360/PEOPLEINDEX scales. These moderately high coefficients range from .67 to .89 establishing the reliability of the instrument.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliability Self (N=1470)</th>
<th>Reliability Raters (N=1493)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Development</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability/Stress Tolerance</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Control</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Problem Solving</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Strategic Relationships</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Influence</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Sensitivity/Empathy</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team/Interpersonal Support</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/Agreeableness</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Way Feedback</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE RESEARCH


Multi-rater feedback is based upon the tenet that congruence between self and others is associated with managerial success and effectiveness (Tornow, 1993; Yammarino & Atwater, 1993). This study investigated the relationship between self and managerial rating congruence on two measures of assessment center performance (overall assessor ratings and in-basket scores) with 144 production supervisors. Results of hierarchical regression analyses indicated that manager ratings of supervisory effectiveness ($R^2_{Ch}=.26$, $p < .01$) and self-ratings on 14 assessment center dimensions ($R^2_{Ch}=.06$, $p<.01$) significantly contributed towards predictions of overall assessor ratings of performance (OAR).

In-agreement/good raters and over-estimators were rated significantly higher in assessment center exercises by assessors compared to under-estimators (Tukey's HSD test, $p<.01$). Results from additional hierarchical regression analyses indicated that self-ratings incrementally contributed to predictions of in-basket performance ($R^2_{Ch}=.04$, $p<.05$) above that of manager ratings on task management skills ($R^2_{Ch}=.33$, $p<.01$). In-agreement/poor raters and under-estimators had lower overall in-basket scores than in-agreement/good raters or over-estimators. Implications of these findings in terms of previous and future research are discussed.


This study explored the relationship between gender, self-ratings and other ratings. Analysis of variance by gender and rater were conducted for 1218 subjects.

Analysis of variance with the aggregate data revealed that males ($N=801$) significantly reported higher self-ratings than females ($N=417$) in the competencies of active listening, oral presentation, delegation, team building, conflict management, and problem-solving (all $p$'s < .01). Separate analysis by each rater group (direct reports, supervisors, peers, team members) revealed that other rater groups significantly rated females higher than males on the majority of 20 managerial competencies (all $p$'s < .01).

Supervisor ratings of both men and women were significantly more critical than other rater groups overall. However, supervisor significantly rated females higher than males in 12 of the 20 the competencies including two-way feedback, oral communication, oral presentation, vision/goal setting, planning/organizing, administrative control, performance evaluation, rewarding/recognizing, interpersonal sensitivity, performance management, coaching/developing others and leadership/influence (all $p$ ’s < .01).

These findings suggest that males tend to inflate self-ratings relative to females in the areas of communication, task management and problem solving. These results are consistent with prior multi-rater feedback research suggesting that women are consistently evaluated more effectively than their male counterparts.
EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE RELATED PUBLICATIONS


- Nowack, K. (June 2002). Does 360 degree feedback negatively effect company performance: Feedback varies with your point of view. HR Magazine, Volume 47 (6), June 2002


**Objective:** To explore the relationships between emotional intelligence and learner autonomy among students enrolled in an adult degree completion program. We hypothesized a positive statistical relationship between emotional intelligence and learner autonomy and that they both contribute to higher GPAs and higher retention rates.

**Measures:** PeopleIndex and the learner autonomy intentions measured the Learner Autonomy Profile (LAP) Short Form (SF) were used in this study. The LAP-SF measures a learner's intentions in the areas of learner desire, learner resourcefulness, learner initiative, and learner persistence. Student success was measured by cumulative grade point average (GPA).

**Design:** One-hundred forty-one nontraditional undergraduates enrolled at a small, private, liberal arts college in the northeastern U.S. completed web-based surveys measuring emotional intelligence and learner autonomy.

**Results:** The researchers predicted there would be a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and learner autonomy. They tested this hypothesis by running Spearman’s rho correlations using overall emotional intelligence scores and overall learner autonomy scores (as opposed to using sub-constructs). For this test, they only used participants who completed both PeopleIndex and the LAP-SF (N=86). They found a positive correlation ($r = .486; p = .000; < .01$). There is no demonstration of cause and effect; however, there is a strong positive correlation.

They also predicted that there is a positive relationship between EI & LA and retention. For this test, they only used participants who completed both PeopleIndex and the LAP-SF (N=86). The final number of participants for this test was 73. We tested this hypothesis by conducting logistic regression. We loaded all three group level EI constructs (self-management, relationship management, and communication) as well as all four learner autonomy constructs (learner desire, learner resourcefulness, learner initiative, and learner persistence) as independent variables. The dependent variable was retention (graduates and non-graduates). Of the PeopleIndex competency groups, communication ($p = .051$) and relationship...
management (p = .022) were the highest predictors of retention. Overall scores on **PeopleIndex** were the single best predictor of overall learner autonomy. Self-management, but not Communication or Relationship Management was significant predictors of learner autonomy in regression analyses.

**Conclusions:** **PeopleIndex** was significantly associated with both retention and learner autonomy. These findings provide both construct and criterion related validity of **PeopleIndex**.

**Objective:** To explore the relationships between emotional intelligence, organizational commitment and job performance.

**Measures:** The data collection instruments used included the Management View 360 Questionnaire as an index of job performance, PeopleIndex for emotional intelligence and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire for organizational commitment.

**Design:** The population in the study is the administrative management group of UiTM. There are fourteen UiTM branch campuses from all states in Malaysia including the main campus at Shah Alam. The management group is composed of the assistant registrars, librarians and treasury officers. The researcher got the name list of administrative management group from UiTM main campus at Shah Alam. The total sample size for this study was 153 administrators who completed all of the measures above.

**Results:** Job performance was positively related to emotional intelligence ($r = .761$, $p = 0.001$) and organizational commitment ($r = .366$, $p = .001$). The strongest relationship was found to exist between job performance and emotional intelligence, followed by organizational commitment and job performance. The positive correlation coefficient of emotional intelligence ($r = .761$, $p = 0.001$) indicates that as emotional intelligence increases, so does job performance. And job performance was also positively related to organizational commitment ($r = .366$, $p = 0.001$). Job performance is positively related to emotional intelligence dimensions: self-management ($r = .742$, $p = 0.001$), relationship-management ($r = .746$, $p = .001$) and communication ($r = .766$, $p = .001$). They are all statistically significant. Overall emotional intelligence was significantly associated with organizational commitment ($r = .354$, $p = .001$).

**Conclusions:** The results of the study revealed that all the emotional intelligence dimensions are positively related to job performance with the highest correlation of 0.766 for communication, followed by 0.746 with relationship-management and self-management (0.742). Emotional intelligence is also significantly correlated with organizational commitment. Overall, these findings provide additional criterion related validity of the PeopleIndex measure of emotional intelligence.
Agustin, V. et al. (2006). The Relationship Between the Competencies of Emotional Intelligence and the Performance of Selected Junior Thomasian Nursing Students in their Related Learning Experience Course. Unpublished Manuscript

Objective: This study explored the relationship between emotional intelligence and performance of third year nursing students in a clinical course.

Measures: Emotional Intelligence View 360, Clinical evaluation scores on Nurses Related Learning Experience (RLE; 60% professional and 40% personal), and overall grade point average.

Design: The population in the study was 48 third year nursing at the University of Santo Tomas, College of Nursing. Students were asked to complete the Emotional Intelligence View 360 as part of their curriculum during the year.

Results: Self-Management competences were significantly correlated (all p’s< .01) with RLE scores for both self ratings (ranged from .40 to .93) and other ratings (ranged from .69 to .99). Relationship Management competencies were significantly correlated (all p’s< .01) with RLE scores for both self ratings (ranged from .40 to .93) and other ratings (ranged from .55 to .98). Finally, Communication competencies were all significantly correlated (all p’s < .01) with RLE for both self-ratings (ranged from .66 to .99) and other ratings (ranged from .63 to .99). Self and other emotional intelligence ratings were significantly associated with overall grade point average ranging from .84 to .97 (all p’s < .01).

Conclusions: The results of the study suggest that high levels of emotional intelligence assessed by Emotional Intelligence View 360 are associated with academic and clinical success in nurses. These findings provide support for criterion related validity of this measure.
Objective: This study explored the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership.

Measures: Emotional Intelligence View 360 and the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-36).

Design: The population in the study was 57 managers in a multinational company within the electronics industry.

Results: Transformational leadership scales of the MLQ-36 were significantly associated with Self-Management ($r = .93, p < .01$), Relationship Management ($r = .70, p < .01$) but not Communication competencies ($r = .52, p = .16$). Transactional leadership was significantly correlated with Self-Management ($r = .95$) but not significantly with Relationship Management ($r = .70$) or Communication ($r = .36$). Finally, Laissez-Fair leadership was not significantly correlated with Self-Management ($r = -.15$), Relationship Management ($r = -.42$) or Communication ($r = .40$). Transformational leadership was significantly correlated with Transactional Leadership ($r = .91, p < .01$) and modestly correlated with Laisse-Faire Leadership ($r = .40$).

Conclusions: The results of the study suggest that high levels of emotional intelligence assessed by Emotional Intelligence View 360 are associated with various aspects of Transformational and Transaction Leadership. The significant association between Relationship Management measured by Emotional Intelligence View 360 and Transformational Leadership provides some evidence of construct validity of this measure.
Objective: This study explored the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership.

Measures: Emotional Intelligence View 360 and the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (Avolio & Bass).

Design: The population in the study included 23 female managers from several businesses/industries from Canada (6), Mexico (10), and the UK (7).

Results: Regression analysis was calculated using the MLQ variables as the dependent variables and the total EQ and its three principal areas (self management, relationship management and communication) as the independent variables and predictors. As shown below, the strongest positive relationship found was the one between total EQ and total Transformational leadership (r=0.67).

While the weakest positive relationship was between one of the components of transactional leadership: management by- exception (Active) and total EQ (r=0.15). The coefficient of determination for the correlation between total EQ and total Transformational leadership was 0.45 (r²=0.45). Total Transformational leadership was significantly correlated with Self Management (r = .66), Relationship Management (r = .65) and Communications (r = .54), all p’s < .01.

Correlations among total EQ and MLQ Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>IIA</th>
<th>IIB</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>TTR</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>MEA</th>
<th>MEP</th>
<th>LF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: EQ= total emotional intelligence; TT = Total Transformational; IIA= Idealised Influence (Attributed); IIB= Idealised Influence (Behaviours); IM= Inspirational Motivation; IS= Intellectual Stimulation; IC= Individual Consideration; TTR= Total Transactional; CR= Contingent Rewards; MEA= Management by- Exception(Active); MEP= Management by Exception(passive); LF= laissez-faire.

Conclusions: The results of the study suggest that high levels of emotional intelligence assessed by Emotional Intelligence View 360 are associated with various aspects of Transformational and Transaction Leadership. The significant association between Emotional Intelligence View 360 and Transformational Leadership provides some evidence of construct validity of this measure.

**Objective:** This study explored the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership.

**Measures:** Emotional Intelligence View 360 and the Transformational Leadership Scale (Podsakoff et al. 1990). A measure of satisfaction with leadership, global satisfaction, and follower’s performance were also included in this study.

**Design:** The population in the study was 120 managers working within a banking organization in Portugal and 299 of their direct reports.

**Results:** Using a correlational research design, results confirmed the existence, in the perception of leaders and followers, of: (1) greater levels of EI and transformational leadership in leader perception in comparison to followers (all p’s < .05)); (2) a positive correlation between perceptions of overall EI, Self-Management, Relationship Management and Communications and transformational leadership behaviors in leaders (r = .74, .68, .76, .64, respectively; all p’s < .01)), and (3) a positive correlation between EI, transformational leadership behaviors in leaders and performance and satisfaction in their followers (only the EI communications scale significantly was associated with follower’s performance; r = .18, p < .05).

An exploratory principal components factor analysis with Varimax rotation revealed 5 factors with eigenvalues over 1.0 all accounting for over 57% of the explained variance. The first 3 factors found in the 5 factors forced factor analysis seem to be associated to a kind of g factor of emotional intelligence (accounting for 44.94%, 3.79% and 3.41% of the variance); the 4th factor is associated with emotional competencies which are considered relevant to organizational context (2.90%) and, the 5th factor seems to be concerned with the dimension Relationship Management (2.08% of the variance). Global EI was also significantly associated with both transformational leadership (r = .74) and transactional leadership (r = .59), all p’s < .01). Each of the three EI scales (Self-Management, Relationship Management and Communications) was also significantly associated separately with transformational and transactional leadership measured by the Transformational Leadership Scale (Podsakoff et al. 1990).

**Conclusions:** The results of the study suggest that high levels of emotional intelligence assessed by **Emotional Intelligence View 360** are associated with various aspects of Transformational and Transaction Leadership. The significant association between **Emotional Intelligence View 360** and Transformational Leadership provides some evidence of construct validity of this measure.

**Objective**: This study is exploring the relationship between emotional intelligence and team performance.

**Measures**: PeopleIndex, Team Satisfaction (Earley & Mosakowski); Team Learning Scale (Druskat & Kayes); Instructor Ratings of team performance; Peer ratings using the Team Building Scale (Maurer, Raju & Collins); Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale; Trust among team members (Earley & Mosakowski) and the Big Five Personality Inventory (BFI; John).

**Design**: The population in the study will consist of 60 teams (approximately 150) graduate students in the Organizational Dynamics, Human Relations & Social Work program

**Results**: Available 2008

**Conclusions**: 