

Influence Of Leaders' Intrapersonal Competencies On Employee Job Satisfaction

Prakash Singh, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, South Africa

ABSTRACT

Intrapersonal competencies complement the interpersonal skills of emotionally intelligent leaders. Experts believe that general intelligence (IQ) contributes to no more than twenty-five percent of one's overall success. The extent to which employers are capable of indentifying and meeting their employees' job satisfaction needs can be a significant characteristic of their emotional intelligence (EI), in contrast with their cognitive abilities. In this study, the quantitative research method was used to determine the employees' perceptions of their leaders' intrapersonal competencies and their influence on their job satisfaction; the six competencies being self-awareness, self-confidence, self-expression, self-control, adaptability, and optimism. In order to be satisfied at work, the findings of this study clearly indicate that employees prefer to be led by leaders who are confident in their leadership role, who send out clear, unambiguous messages, who maintain self-control, who are adaptable and flexible, who face the future with optimism, and who support the establishment of a collegial working environment. Evidently, the findings corroborate the hypothesis that employees believe that the intrapersonal competencies of leaders have a positive influence on the employees' sense of job satisfaction. This study's findings, therefore, confirm that the key to the leaders' self-knowledge is access to their own feelings and the ability to discriminate among them and draw upon them to guide behaviour in their organisations. It makes a contribution to the emerging research being accomplished on leaders' intrapersonal intelligence with more research still needing to be done on how these competencies impact on the organisational climate and culture.

Keywords: Leaders' Intrapersonal Competencies; Emotionally Intelligent Leaders; Employees' Job Satisfaction; Leaders' Self-Knowledge

INTRODUCTION

Intrapersonal competencies complement the interpersonal skills of emotionally intelligent leaders (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Goleman, 1998; Fehd, 2001). The emotional intelligence (EI) of leaders cannot be disassociated from the job satisfaction needs of their employees and the goals of their organisations (Goleman, 1998; Hochschild, 1983). Productivity could be more than doubled if employees' needs were consistently recognised and met by their employers, as they would be more satisfied in the workplace and therefore would be more willing to give of their best (Goleman, 1998; Weinberger, 2002; Manser, 2005; Singh, Manser & Dali, 2013). Based on several recent studies, experts believe that IQ, or general intelligence, contributes to no more than twenty-five percent to one's overall success (Sterrett, 2000). As Sterrett justifiably points out, emotional intelligence is the "most fundamental dimension of leadership today and in the foreseeable future, and the higher we aspire to or rise in leadership positions, the more important it becomes" (p. 5). Bagozzi, Gopinath and Nyer (1999) explain the concept emotion as:

...a mental state of readiness that arises from cognitive appraisal of events or thoughts; has a phenomenological tone; is accompanied by physiological processes; is often expressed physically (e.g., in gestures, posture, facial features); and may result in specific actions to affirm or cope with the emotion, depending on its nature and meaning for the person having it. (p. 186)

The extent to which employers' are capable of identifying and meeting their employees' needs is a significant characteristic of their emotional abilities in contrast with their cognitive abilities (Goleman, 1998). Several studies confirm that emotions are organised responses that include psychological and sociological perspectives and the study of emotion in the workplace has evolved largely from these two perspectives (Goffman, 1969; Hochschild, 1983; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Bar-On, 1995; Weinberger, 2002). The success of organisational effectiveness therefore is greatly enhanced through the leaders' use of emotionally intelligent techniques and measures (Orme, 2000). These emotionally intelligent techniques are reflected in the emotionally intelligent behaviours (EIBs) of leaders and are referred to as emotional competencies (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997; Goleman, 1998; Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 1999; Manser, 2005; Singh, Manser & Dali, 2013; Singh, 2013). According to Caruso, Mayer, and Salovey (2002), one of the goals of effective leadership is to "create and enhance individual and group relationships" (p. 6).

In her study, Hochschild (1979) found that a perspective of emotion management can provide a lens through which one can inspect the self. She identified *feeling rules* which could be used as guidelines in an organisation that governed how employees felt in contexts that affected them. Abraham (2000) also found that EI was significantly associated with organisational commitment. It had the potential to predict a large amount of the variance in both job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Weinberger, 2002). In their study on EI and transformational leadership behaviour, Sosik and Megerian (1999) observed that those leaders who maintained self-awareness possessed more aspects of EI and were rated as more effective by both their superiors and subordinates than those who were not as self-aware.

EI is regarded as a major predictor of leadership success and is described by Sterrett (2000) as that which differentiates exceptional performance from mediocre performance. It is a form of intelligence that comprises a set of non-cognitive abilities in the affective domain that influences one's ability to perceive or sense and understand the emotions of others (interpersonal or social EI) or to identify and manage one's own emotions (intrapersonal or personal EI) in a manner that elicits appropriate responses and behaviour. It works synergistically with IQ rather than separately from it (Orme & Cannon, 2000). It can be measured, learned and developed. It is regarded as a powerful motivational tool as it inspires confidence and trust in leaders who demonstrate high levels of EI. Expectedly, the ability of leaders to recognise their intrapersonal emotions and then react appropriately will depend to a large degree on their own level of EI (Goleman, 1995). Therefore, in this study, the problem statement investigated is: What is the influence of the leaders' intrapersonal competencies on the job satisfaction of their employees? The hypothesis of this research is: The intrapersonal competencies of leaders have a positive influence on the employees' sense of job satisfaction.

ELUCIDATION OF INTRAPERSONAL COMPETENCIES

Emotional intelligence as a concept has its roots from Thorndike's (1920) construct of social intelligence and later, it was Goleman (1995, 1998) who brought the construct into the limelight (Nordin, 2011). The concept of EI was first proposed by Salovey and Mayer (1990) to describe qualities such as understanding one's feelings, having empathy for others' feelings and the ability to regulate emotions in such a manner that they enhance living. Their notion was not meant to challenge the validity of the most widely recognised measurement of intelligence, namely the Intelligence Quotient (IQ), but rather to suggest that there is another form of intelligence that has a far greater effect on the achievement of success. EI is not in opposition to IQ, but according to Stein and Book (2001), it is an extension of the human's potential to succeed in a people-orientated environment. It is also pointed out by Stein and Book (2001) that EI is not the antithesis of IQ, but rather it is a combination of both emotion and cognition. Goleman (1995) defined emotional intelligence as "being able to motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to control impulses and delay gratifications; to regulate one's moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to emphasize and to hope" (p. 34).

There are two definitions offered by Mayer and Salovey (1993) that Noyes (2003) describes as being pivotal to the understanding of EI. The first definition describes EI from a social perspective:

...the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions as to assist thought, to understand the emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth.

Their second definition is from an internal perspective and focuses on the self:

...a type of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others' emotions. To discriminate among them, and to use the information to guide one's own thinking and actions.

Goleman (1995) construed EI as an individual's ability to "motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to control impulses and delay gratification; to regulate one's moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to empathize and to hope" (p. 34). Bar-On (1995) also explicated EI as "an array of capabilities, competencies and skills which influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures" (p. 5). Intrapersonal Intelligence, according to Gardner (1983) "is a correlative ability turned inward. It is a capacity to form an accurate, veridical model of oneself and to be able to use that model to operate effectively in life" (p. 25). He contends that the key to self-knowledge is "access to one's own feelings and the ability to discriminate among them and draw upon them to guide behaviour" (p. 9). Gardner elucidated the concept of intrapersonal intelligence further, as follows:

*The core capacity at work here is **access to one's feeling life** – one's range of affects or emotions: the capacity instantly to effect discriminations among these feelings and, eventually, to label them, to enmesh them in symbolic codes, to draw upon them as a means of understanding and guiding one's behaviour. In its most primitive form, the intrapersonal intelligence amounts to little more than the capacity to distinguish a feeling of pleasure from one of pain and, on the basis of such a discrimination, to become more involved in or to withdraw from a situation. At its most advanced level, intrapersonal knowledge allows one to detect and to symbolize complex and highly differentiated sets of feelings. (p. 239)*

Recent studies confirm that interpersonal intelligence is the ability to read the moods, intentions, and desires of others and potentially to act on this knowledge; whereas intrapersonal intelligence involves the examination and knowledge of one's own feelings (Taylor & Bagby, 2000). In his study of EI, Manser (2005) identified six key intrapersonal competencies of collegial leaders: self-awareness, self-confidence, self-expression, self-control, adaptability, and optimism (Singh, Manser & Dali, 2013). These six competencies form the conceptual framework of this study. Important intrapersonal (personal) skills also analysed by Fehd (2001) are:

1. *Attitude.* Attitude is described by Fehd (2001) as those underlying personal beliefs that people have about other people, the world at large and how they perceive themselves. It can be described in terms of the two extreme states of attitudinal perspectives, namely pessimism and optimism. Optimism can be described as a positive attitude towards oneself, others and daily situations. It is a state of mind that can be learned and improved.
2. *Intuition.* Intuition is described by Fehd (2001) as *gut feel*. It is an initial impression that people often ignore because there is no logical reason for the emotional awareness felt. Intuition is often an accurate impression and according to Fehd (2001), it too can be developed and thereby allow one to be more critically aware of the power of intuitive responses. One needs to be subconsciously less reactive and consciously more reflective.
3. *Emotional Savvy.* Emotional savvy involves being aware of one's emotions. This awareness helps one to manage emotions rather than being managed by them (Fehd, 2001). Emotional control (savvy) allows unmanaged emotions to diminish and thus reduce the occurrence of rash decisions based on unmanaged emotional turmoil, which could cause unnecessary personal hurt and organisational discord. It is best described as the difference between a managed emotional state of assertion as opposed to the chaotic emotional states of aggression or passive withdrawal. People with emotional savvy are acutely aware of their feelings and are able to communicate these feelings assertively when necessary and appropriate.
4. *Creativity.* Creativity is described by Fehd (2001) as the ability to look at the world from a different point of view. According to Fehd (2001), traditional ways of thinking need to change so that things are perceived in less conventional ways. One needs to be consciously aware of new possibilities through less linear, logic-based left-brain thinking.
5. *Compassion.* It is also suggested by Fehd (2001) that compassion is described as empathy combined with insight. It is the ability to be sensitive to people's emotions on the one hand, and acknowledging that people need sensitive treatment from time to time on the other. According to Fehd (2001:8), leaders with high levels of EI have a strong sense of compassion that nurtures employees and their organisations.

6. *Resilience*. Resilience is most prominent when, in the face of adversity and extreme difficulty, one is able to make a meaningful and effective contribution to an organisation. It is in these most difficult times that the emotionally intelligent become most prominent. Resilient people remain focused; they are positive, flexible, organised and above all they are proactive (Fehd, 2001). Resilient people don't take setbacks personally; rather they see them as positive challenges that need organisational planning, proactive decision-making and flexibility in understanding the needs of others in such negative circumstances.

One's EI is measured as with the Fehd model, from a personal (intrapersonal) and a social (interpersonal) perspective. One's EI is therefore determined by measuring how one understands and accurately interprets the emotions of others in order to guide responses and how one is able to understand and control one's own emotions. It is this understanding of self (intrapersonal) that allows one to accept one's positive and negative attributes, as well as one's shortcomings and strengths. With this acceptance and understanding come feelings of inner strength, self-confidence and self-adequacy which are vital to success (Orme, 2000).

In the knowledge, attitude, behaviour (K-A-B) model, EI is compacted into six areas which Sterrett (2000) explains, are also divided into two dimensions, namely the self (intrapersonal) and social (interpersonal) dimensions. The intrapersonal dimension is characterized by the following competencies: *Knowledge (Self-Awareness)*. Accurately knowing our feelings, preferences, goals and values. Sensing how others feel about us and using that information to guide our behaviour.

1. *Attitude (Self-Confidence)*. A 'can do' attitude, a belief in ourselves. Overcoming self-doubt and taking reasonable risk. Being assertive and not aggressive. Being goal directed. Admitting mistakes and moving on.
2. *Behaviour (Self-Control)*. Dealing well with stress, controlling emotional moods or outbursts without over control. Being adaptable. Balancing rational and emotional considerations.

Goleman, Boyatzis and Mckee (2002) divide the intrapersonal competencies in two categories, namely self-awareness and self-management. Self-awareness competencies comprise emotional self-awareness, accurate self-assessment, and self-worth which is an indication of a strong and a positive sense of self-worth. Self-management is characterized by self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, achievement orientation and initiative which clearly suggests a readiness to seize opportunities. Leaders who have underdeveloped emotional intelligence can fail to meet their organisations' goals. Many of these leaders tend to rely on limited technical or specifically acquired skills to propel them through the minefields of organizational existence and this is not enough to carry them through turbulent economic crises upon crises, resulting in leadership and organizational dysfunction (Macaleer & Shannon, 2002). Such leaders can experience a loss of self-confidence that impacts negatively on their self-esteem.

In an examination of the relationship between EI and effective leadership, Gardner and Stough (2002) predict that there will be a strong relationship between high EI and strength of leadership. They also point out that there are significant correlations between the EI of leaders and the emotional demands made on them. The ability to manage and monitor emotions within oneself and others correlated with the inspirational motivation and individualized consideration components of transformational leadership. Secondly, the ability to monitor emotions within oneself and others correlated significantly with the transformational leadership components of idealised attributes and idealised behaviours. An integral part of leadership therefore needs to concentrate on the development of EI in order for development to take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, trust and self-confidence.

As explained by Maryl, Hardin, Olibas, Rodgers and Spiller (2004), the confidence displayed should reveal the leader's sense of self-confidence, the leader's confidence in the group's abilities, the group's confidence in the leader and the group's confidence in its own abilities. Such confidence is described by Maryl *et al.* as the way in which employees and leaders share common values, goals, accountability and a sense of trust built on a foundation of collegiality. Several recent studies (Nelson & Low, 2003; Tang, Yin & Nelson, 2010) also confirm that EI is a learnt ability through a transformative learning process to identify, experience, understand, and express human emotions in productive ways. Such a conceptualization of EI alludes to a skills-based approach in the workplace to develop the emotional abilities of leaders and employees in terms of:

- Knowing and valuing self;
- Building and maintaining a variety of strong, productive, and healthy relationships;
- Getting along and working well with others in achieving positive results;
- Effectively dealing with the pressures and demands of work.

According to Singh (2005), the objectives of shared leadership and collegiality should help create an enabling environment, which is guided by that organisation's shared vision and mission statement. This connotes that a sense of job satisfaction could be associated with the demonstration of professional behaviour by emotionally intelligent leaders towards employees based on attitudes and virtues that are also evident in the organisation's shared vision and mission statement (Ihara, 1998).

RESEARCH DESIGN

The quantitative research method was used to determine the influence of the leaders' intrapersonal competencies on the job satisfaction of their employees. A sample of four hundred and seventy-four employees from two hundred organizations participated in this study. The subjects chosen to participate in the study were selected following a process, described by McMillan and Schumacher (2001) as nonprobability convenience sampling because the group of subjects was selected on the basis of their accessibility and availability in South Africa (Manser, 2005). A multi-respondent survey design was used. In such a design, the focus is on relationships between and among variables in a single group (Robson, 2002; Manser, 2005; Singh & Manser, 2008). Section A of the survey focused on the demographic variables of the participants while section B collected data on their job satisfaction. Section C, which is not part of this paper's research analysis, focused on the leaders' interpersonal competencies. In section D, the questionnaire identified six intrapersonal competencies that the respondents' employers should possess. These are: self-awareness (D1), self-confidence (D2), self-expression (D3), self-control (D4), adaptability (D5), and optimism (D6). The 57 questions posed asked the respondents to rate their leaders according to the strength of the observable intrapersonal EI characteristics in a collegial environment. The value of Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine the reliability of the research; it verified that the research was reliable, that the questionnaire was consistent and the scores had insignificant error. The score of 0.923 was regarded as significant. To ensure the content and construct validity of the questionnaire focusing on the intrapersonal intelligence of leaders, a study of relevant literature (Gardner, 1983; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 1999; Goleman, 1995, 1998; Bar-On, 1995; Cooper & Sawaf, 1997; Fehd, 2001; Sterrett, 2000; Orme, 2000; Goleman, Boyatzis & Mckee, 2002) was undertaken.

RESULTS: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Correlation between Job Satisfaction (B) and Intrapersonal Competencies

Two measures of relationship were used in this study, namely the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (r) and Spearman Rank (ρ or ρ). The calculation of r is to show the linear relationship between any two of the variables. According to Huysamen (1997), the calculation of r and ρ provides an objective measure of the strength of the relationship between the two variables. The level of significance for a two-tail test is 0.01. It is pointed out by McMillan and Schumacher (2001) that the degree to which subjects maintain the same relative position on any two measures is shown by ρ . The Pearson Correlation (ρ or ρ) of the variables job satisfaction (B) and the intrapersonal EIBs (D1-D6) are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Pearson's Correlation Coefficients for B and D1-D6

		B	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6
B	Pearson Correlation	1	.572**	.636**	.602**	.524**	.556**	.595**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D1	Pearson Correlation	.572**	1	.748**	.667**	.603**	.600**	.657**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D2	Pearson Correlation	.636**	.748**	1	.663	.613**	.652**	.660**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D3	Pearson Correlation	.602**	.667**	.663**	1	.643**	.610**	.709**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D4	Pearson Correlation	.524**	.603**	.613**	.643**	1	.648**	.633**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D5	Pearson Correlation	.556**	.600**	.652**	.610**	.648**	1	.725**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D6	Pearson Correlation	.595**	.657**	.660**	.709**	.633**	.725**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474

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

Table 1 presents the findings of the Pearson's Product-Moment Coefficient used to show the symmetric measures and the relationships between the variables. According to Huysamen (1997), the positive relationship indicated in Pearson's r @ $p < 0.01$ as shown in Table 1 can be regarded as being significant. The Pearson correlation values as indicated in Table 1 are greater than 0, indicating a positive correlation between the variables B and D1-D6. Thus a significant relationship exists amongst the variables. The Pearson correlation values are within the range of 0,50 to 1,0, suggesting a strong relationship between the variables B and D1-D6. A significant relationship therefore exists between the variables with a highly significant p – value of 0, which is less than 0,01. For example, the Pearson correlation between D2 (confidence) and B (job satisfaction) is 0,636 with a highly significant p -value of 0 which is less than 0,01. Of the total number of respondents, 324 of them ranked their leader as being strong in the confidence behaviour and 150 ranked their leader as being weak. This indicates that a significant relationship exists between D2 and B, hence suggesting quite a strong relationship between the confidence behaviour of the leader and the job satisfaction of employees.

The Spearman ρ or rho correlation of the variables job satisfaction (B) and the intrapersonal EIBs (D1-D6) are presented in Table 2. The positive relationship indicated in Spearman's ρ @ $p < 0.01$ as shown in Table 2 can, as Huysamen (1997) suggests, also be regarded as being statistically significant. The Spearman's correlation values as indicated in Table 2 are greater than 0, indicating a positive correlation between the variables B and D1-D6. Thus a significant relationship exists amongst the variables. The correlation values as presented in Table 2 are within the range of 0,50 to 1,0, suggesting a strong relationship between the variables B and D1-D6. A significant relationship therefore exists between the variables with a highly significant p – value of 0, which is less than 0,01.

Table 2: Spearman's Correlation Coefficients ρ for B and D1-D6

		B	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6
B	Correlation Coefficient	1	.572**	.636**	.602**	.524**	.556**	.595**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D1	Correlation Coefficient	.572**	1	.748**	.667**	.603**	.600**	.657****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D2	Correlation Coefficient	.636**	.748**	1	.663**	.613**	.652**	.660**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D3	Correlation Coefficient	.602**	.667**	.663**	1	.643**	.610**	.709**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D4	Correlation Coefficient	.524**	.603**	.613**	.643**	1	.648**	.633**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D5	Correlation Coefficient	.556**	.600**	.652**	.610**	.648**	1	.725**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474
D6	Correlation Coefficient	.595**	.657**	.660**	.709**	.633**	.725**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	474	474	474	474	474	474	474

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

The correlation coefficients presented in Table 1 and Table 2 clearly show that the bivariate distribution of the two variables, the respondents' sense of job satisfaction and their leaders' intrapersonal EIBs have a positive and significant relationship. Both Pearson r and Spearman ρ indicate that the two variables are significant and therefore directly related. In other words, the more satisfied an employee is at work, the higher a leader's intrapersonal EIBs are likely to be. Conversely, the more dissatisfied an employee is at work, the lower a leader's intrapersonal EIBs are likely to be. However, this must be interpreted in relation to other variables (e.g. remuneration, working hours) that can influence the job satisfaction of employees.

Self-Awareness (D1) and Job Satisfaction (B)

The responses reflect that of the 150 respondents who indicated that they are dissatisfied at their place of work, 96 of them (64%) rate their principals' self-awareness as being low. Of the 324 respondents who indicate that they were satisfied at their place of work, 293 (90.4%) rate their leaders' self-awareness as being high. The Pearson Chi-Square value (0.000) and the Fisher's Exact test value (0.000) indicate that there is a significant relationship between the employees' job satisfaction and the leaders' demonstration of their self-awareness competency. The findings of the Pearson's Product-Moment Coefficient and the Spearman Rank Correlation are used to show the symmetric measures and the relationships between the variables. The positive relationship value of .572 indicated in Pearson's r and Spearman's ρ $p < 0.01$ as shown in Table 1 and Table 2 is also significant. Clearly this finding reveals that the self-awareness competency of leaders enhances the workers' sense of job satisfaction.

The findings strongly suggest that employees feel comfortable with leaders who give the impression that they know how they are feeling and why. Part of a leader's demonstration of self-awareness as explained by Caruso and Salovey (2003), is that they do not seem to be under duress and that transformation and change do not cause them undue alarm. As Goleman (1998) suggests, a leader's self-awareness intrapersonal competency reflects a leader who is not reckless or overly cautious in decision-making. There is a sense of adventure without being directionless and they seem to be relaxed even in the face of adversity. These leaders are self-controlled, cautious, and are able to recognize their own weaknesses; and they feel secure and relaxed and appear to be self-motivated. Such leaders are committed to their organisations and enjoy being at work.

Leaders with a strong sense of self-awareness reveal what Bar-On (2000) describes as commitment to the organization and the leadership tasks that come with their position. The findings support Bar-On (2000) who

expresses the view that employees are encouraged by a leader with a sense of self-awareness because they are not afraid to admit their weaknesses neither are they reserved in the utilisation of their strengths. The findings also support the views of Goleman (1998), because the EIB characteristics of self-motivation, zest and positive energy create an aura that makes others feel safe and secure, which when decisions are made make them easier to accept and support. These EIB characteristics that represent a leader's sense of self-awareness are all linked to what Goleman (1998) describes as the ability to recognise one's emotions and their effects that help create a sense of job satisfaction amongst educators.

Self-Confidence (D2) and Job Satisfaction (B)

The second intrapersonal competence of a leader is self-confidence. The responses reflect that of the 150 respondents who indicated that they are dissatisfied at their place of work, 106 of them (71%) rate their leaders' self-confidence as being low. Of the 324 respondents who indicated that they are satisfied at their place of work, 295 (91%) rate their leaders' self-confidence as being high. The Pearson Chi-Square value (0.000) and the Fisher's Exact Test value (0.000) indicate that there is a significant relationship between the employees' job satisfaction and their leaders demonstration of their self-confidence. The findings of the Pearson's Product-Moment Coefficient and the Spearman Rank Correlation are used to show the symmetric measures and the relationships between the variables. The positive relationship value of .636 indicated in Pearson's r and Spearman's ρ $p < 0.01$ as shown in Table 1 and Table 2 is also significant.

The evidence presented indicates that a confident leader who is not afraid to be future-focused helps create a feeling of job satisfaction amongst employees. The link between job satisfaction and what Strümpfer and Mlonzi (2001) refer to as organisational commitment, which includes ensuring that the organisation's vision, mission and core values are constantly being reviewed and adapted to suit the needs of the employees, is supported by the findings. A confident leader makes use of inclusive leadership strategies within a collegial environment to not only keep ahead of the wave of changes, but to be proactive in the creation of new opportunities for its employees and the organisation (Bazerghi, 2003).

A confident leader leads from the front and as McCann (2000) suggests, sets an example of self-assurance that enthruses confidence in others to follow. This is not a bombastic leader but rather as McCann (2000) points out, there is a confident attitude that is evident in the face of adversity that others admire. There is a willingness to defend the rights of others in any situation, for the right reasons and in the appropriate manner and as the evidence suggests this characteristic is appreciated by employees. The view held by Short (1998) that leaders need to develop intrapersonal competencies is relevant to the competency of self-confidence identified as a leadership ability to recognise personal faults and then deal with them. The evidence also supports the point made by Lam and Kirby (2002) that there is a professional sensitivity required from leaders when it comes to recognising others' emotions and an understanding of the pressures that their workers can face.

It is therefore clearly evident by the correlations presented in Table 1 and Table 2 that employees feel satisfied in an environment where the leader is not afraid to make a mistake and will take delight in learning from the experiences gained. Knowledge and skills are shared and all human potential will be utilised to the best advantage for the organisation because as Gazzard (2002) points out, there is a commitment to quality and an element of surprise in the innovations that occur because leaders and their employees feel confident to deal with different eventualities. The findings reveal that a confident leader who is the chief catalyst and the initiator of development and change will help foster a feeling of job satisfaction amongst employees.

Self-Expression (D3) and Job Satisfaction (B)

The third intrapersonal competency is the leader's self-expression. The responses reflect that of the 150 respondents who indicate that they are dissatisfied at their place of work, 99 of them (66%) rate their leaders' ability to express themselves accurately as being low. Of the 324 respondents who indicate that they are satisfied at their place of work, 296 (91%) rated their leaders' ability to express themselves as being high. The Pearson Chi-Square value (0.000) and the Fisher's Exact Test value (0.000) in Table 1 and Table 2 indicate that there is a significant relationship between the employees' job satisfaction and their leaders' demonstration of the intrapersonal

competency of self-expression. The findings of the Pearson's Product-Moment Coefficient and the Spearman Rank Correlation are used to show the symmetric measures and the relationships between the variables. The positive relationship value of .602 indicated in Pearson's r and Spearman's ρ $p < 0.01$ as shown in Table 1 and Table 2 as .602 are significant.

Positive self-expression as an EIB is evident in a leader who creates a climate of opportunity and growth for others in a collegial environment and clearly enhances an employee's sense of job satisfaction as the evidence suggests. The leader who demonstrates emotionally intelligent self-expression rejoices in the success of others and makes a concerted effort to remain out of the limelight. Such behaviours support the view held by Kouzes and Posner (1995) that respect for such a leader is generated through the humbleness and humility that the leader demonstrates in enabling others to believe in their own self-worth. The creation of opportunity as suggested by Singh (2005), is evident when collegial leaders empower their employees to take the lead in their particular areas of expertise regardless of their hierarchical position. The evidence also supports the view of Kast and Rosenzweig (1985) who note that when good performance is rewarded with sincere praise and intrinsic rewards by the leaders, required levels of commitment abound as employees are constantly made to feel worthwhile and special. The point raised by Senge (1996) that a leader should serve others, particularly in an atmosphere of collaborative teamwork and a shared vision, is supported by this study's findings.

Self-Control (D4) and Job Satisfaction (B)

The fourth intrapersonal competency is the leader's ability to maintain self-control. The scores reflect that of the 150 respondents who indicate that they are dissatisfied at their place of work, 110 of them (73%) rate their leaders' ability to maintain self-control as being low. Of the 324 respondents who indicate that they are satisfied at their place of work, 262 (81%) rate their leaders' ability to maintain self-control as being high. The Pearson Chi-Square value (0.000) and the Fisher's Exact Test value (0.000) indicate that there is a significant relationship between the employees' job satisfaction and the leaders' ability to maintain their self-control. The findings of the Pearson's Product-Moment Coefficient and the Spearman Rank Correlation are used to show the symmetric measures and the relationships between the variables. The positive relationship value of .524 indicated in Pearson's r and Spearman's ρ $p < 0.01$ as shown in Table 1 and Table 2 is also significant.

The characteristics of a leader's self-control are observed by employees on a daily basis. This particular EIB can be viewed as a measure of a leader's ability to cope during times of stress and pressure. The evidence supports the view expressed by Goleman (1998) that workers feel secure and content in the presence of leaders who display emotional self-regulation and is in control of their emotions. According to Goleman (1998), in times of pressure, leaders demonstrate self-control by remaining calm and in control of the situation and of themselves. This also has a calming effect on employees and enhances opportunities for objective solutions and what Bush (1995) describes, as greater empowerment through delegation and joint decision-making. The result is the creation of a collegial environment that enhances a sense of job satisfaction. Above all, if there is a leader who is a bastion of controlled emotion, the evidence suggests that it helps workers feel happy at work.

There may be times when leaders are emotional but such emotions need to be controlled so that rational decisions or suggestions are made without being illogically rash. A leader with self-control remains fair, rational and objective and according to Slaskil and Cartwright (2003), relatively stress free because there is a willingness to listen and to be guided and in so doing, professional relationships are created that encourage feelings of togetherness and trust in a community where holonomy flourishes (Singh, Manser & Dali, 2013).

A self-controlled leader is well organised. One does not get the impression that the leader is in a state of duress because of all that needs to be done; as Harris (2002) suggests, there is an atmosphere of contentment that abounds. Their ability to manage time and create the impression that there is always time to deal with people, no matter how busy they may be, are all ingredients that Millinger (2004) regards as being in control of one's emotions. Such emotional control helps create a leader who is in control of situations, of others and in control of themselves. This kind of control does not mean control through power but as Gold, Evans, Earley, Halpin, and Collarbone (2003) suggest, it is a commitment to quality that comes from within the guise of someone who is emotionally well balanced, logical in the face of adversity and calm under pressure. It is a controlled presence demonstrated by leaders that helps create a sense of job satisfaction amongst employees.

Adaptability (D5) and Job Satisfaction (B)

The penultimate intrapersonal competency is a leader's adaptability, which the evidence shows also helps generate a feeling of job satisfaction amongst employees. The responses reflect that of the 150 respondents who indicate that they are dissatisfied at their place of work, 107 of them (71%) rate their leaders' ability to be adaptable as being low. Of the 324 respondents who indicate that they are satisfied at their place of work, 275 (85%) rate their leaders' ability to be adaptable as being high. The Pearson Chi-Square value (0.000) and the Fisher's Exact Test value (0.000) indicate that there is a significant relationship between an employee's job satisfaction and a leader's ability to be adaptable. The findings of the Pearson's Product-Moment Coefficient and the Spearman Rank Correlation are used to show the symmetric measures and the relationships between the variables. The positive relationship value of .556 indicated in Pearson's r and Spearman's ρ $p < 0.01$ as shown in Table 1 and Table 2 is also significant.

The leaders' ability to be adaptable is demonstrated primarily in what Lee (2005) describes as the way that they cope with the ever-changing nature of their human resource needs. The findings confirm that employees feel confident with a leader who is adaptable, flexible and supportive when it comes to decision-making, innovative change and development. The findings also support the view expressed by Goleman (1998) that workers will support an adaptable leader who relies on transformational thinking and shared decision-making in order to instil a belief that shared innovation and collective creativity rely on the competencies of all employees. The adaptable leader therefore is not selfishly reckless but utilises what Orme (2001) refers to, as advanced common sense in order to be guided by others' points of view.

The findings indicate that an employee's sense of job satisfaction is enhanced by an adaptable leader who, as an initiator of change, will support well conceived plans, ideas and proactive thinking that are tabled for the good of the organisation. There is a sense that, as Goleman (1998) suggests, an adaptable leader is a solution seeker rather than one who takes delight in only identifying problems. The findings also support the view held by Dalin (1994) that in an effective organisation there is an air of excitement that surrounds an adaptable leader. Clearly the findings support the notion that workers feel comfortable in such an environment and welcome adaptability and flexibility as leadership attributes that make them feel satisfied at work. An adaptable leader is not a bureaucrat, but is a collegial team-player who sets the tone for transformation and professional growth and change. A leader's adaptability is as the findings suggest, an intrapersonal EIB that enhances an employee's sense of job satisfaction.

Optimism (D6) and Job Satisfaction (B)

The final intrapersonal competency is optimism. The statistically significant findings indicate that the respondents see it as being an EIB that helps develop a sense of job satisfaction. The responses reflect that of the 150 respondents who indicated that they are dissatisfied at their place of work, 108 of them (72%) rated their leaders' optimism as being low. Of the 324 respondents who indicated that they are satisfied at their place of work, 283 (87%) rate their leaders' optimism as being high. The Pearson Chi-Square value (0.000) and the Fisher's Exact Test value (0.000) indicate that there is a significant relationship between an employee's job satisfaction and a leader's optimism. The positive relationship value of .595 indicated in Pearson's r and Spearman's ρ $p < 0.01$ as shown in Table 1 and Table 2 is also significant.

Employees will feel secure with, and therefore follow, a leader who has a positive outlook and who views the future as a set of positive challenges and untapped opportunities that will be met with energy and vibrancy. The findings indicate that a leader's sense of optimism is a source of inspiration for those around them and it sets the tone for the way that employees feel about their place of work. An optimistic leader is a happy leader and as a result this causes workers to be happy. The optimism demonstrated by leaders, described by Foster (2000:89), as a means of helping people live together in an optimistic climate by teaching the importance of tolerance and compassion, is also supported by the findings, as tolerance and compassion are viewed as qualities that enhance a feeling of job satisfaction. Optimism energises workers to meet challenges with a renewed zest and vigour, and obstacles and setbacks are seen as part of the natural order of things, which are overcome by the need to achieve through the effective utilisation of the skills at one's disposal (Mertler, 2002).

It is aptly pointed out by Singh and Manser (2002), that in order for a collegial environment to flourish for the benefit of all, there need to be opportunities for people to develop their skills. The creation of opportunity cannot flourish in a climate of negativity. Therefore, as Millinger (2004) suggests, and as the findings confirm, a leader's optimism forms the nucleus of a positive collaborative climate and a collegial environment where a sense of job satisfaction amongst employees is enhanced. According to Goleman (1998), in a collegial environment where the common goal and shared vision are built on positive innovation and creative ideas, employees will experience a spirit of enthusiasm. Also as Cooper and Sawaf (1997) suggest, a work environment needs to be enthused by a satisfied and emotionally contented workforce where rewards are intrinsic and the benefits are there for all to see in the guise of a happy and committed staff. The findings of this study support these views and show that there is a significant correlation between a leader's optimism and an employee's sense of job satisfaction.

The findings in this study confirm the presence of appropriate intrapersonal competencies in the leadership structure of the organisation as follows:

- Leaders make use of appropriate leadership strategies and they know their employees well.
- They are able to recognise their own strengths and weaknesses through their own self-awareness.
- They are confident in their roles as leaders.
- Their feelings are clearly recognisable.
- They are in control of their emotions and they do not vacillate between emotional extremes.
- They are adaptable and flexible in their thinking and actions.
- They remain optimistic.

Intrapersonal competencies empower leaders to “detect and symbolize complex and highly differentiated sets of feelings” (Gardner, 1983, p. 239) in developing their personal behaviours to address the job satisfaction needs of their employees.

CONCLUSION

Employees who are satisfied at their place of work rate their leaders' intrapersonal competencies as being high. They also believe that a leader's intrapersonal competencies influence their sense of job satisfaction. Employees who indicate that they are unhappy at their place of work rate their leaders' intrapersonal competencies as being low. They also believe that a leader's intrapersonal intelligence influence their feeling of job satisfaction. The leader's appropriate intrapersonal competencies are crucial to the creation of a motivated and satisfied employee team. All of the competencies of leaders identified in this study can therefore be described as intervening variables that influence an employee's sense of job satisfaction. The number of responses that indicate that each of the intrapersonal competencies of a leader that will have an influence on an employee's sense of job satisfaction, ranges from 93% (a leader's sense of self-awareness) to 99% (a leader's ability to be adaptable). As the responses are significantly similar, it can be stated that the respondents indicate that all the intrapersonal competencies of a leader can influence an employee's sense of job satisfaction.

The findings of this study strongly suggest that in order to be satisfied at work, employees prefer to be led by leaders who are confident in their leadership roles; who send out clear unambiguous messages; who maintain self-control; who are adaptable and flexible; who face the future with optimism and who support the establishment of a collegial working environment. Evidently, the findings corroborate the hypothesis that employees believe that the intrapersonal competencies of leaders have a positive influence on the employees' sense of job satisfaction. This study's findings therefore confirm that the key to the leaders' self-knowledge is access to their own feelings and the ability to discriminate among them and draw upon them to guide behaviour in their organisations. This exploratory study makes a contribution to the emerging research being accomplished on leaders' intrapersonal intelligence with more research still needing to be attempted to determine to what extent these competencies of leaders can reshape the organisations' climate and culture.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Prakash Singh, D.Ed., is a professor of education at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in Port Elizabeth, South Africa. He is currently a rated researcher by the National Research Foundation in South Africa, and is a former Senior Research Fulbright scholar. Professor Singh is the author of *Innovative Strategies to Develop Better Schools* and co-author of *Principal Leadership*. He has also published widely in peer-reviewed journals, focusing on collegial leadership, traditional bureaucratic management practices, organisational effectiveness, emotional intelligence, tobeophobia, and self-regulated learning. Professor Singh has presented numerous papers at international conferences. E-mail: Prakash.Singh@nmmu.ac.za

REFERENCES

1. Abraham, R. (2000). The role of job control as a moderator of emotional dissonance and emotional intelligence-outcome relationships. *Journal of Psychology*, 134(2): 169-184.
2. Ashforth, B.E. & Humphrey, R.H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48(2): 97-125.
3. Bagozzi, R., Gopinath, M. & Nyer, P. (1999). The role of emotions in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 27(2): 184-206.
4. Bar-On, R. (1995). *EQ-I: The Emotional Quotient Inventory manual: A test of emotional intelligence*. New York: Multi-Health Systems.
5. Bar-On, R. (2000). *Handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
6. Bazerghi, E. (2003). Emotionally intelligent leadership. Retrieved from: www.humanperformancestrategies.com
7. Bush, T. (1995). *Theories of educational management*. London: Paul Chapman.
8. Caruso, D.R., Mayer, J.D. & Salovey, P. (2002). Emotional intelligence and emotional leadership. In R. Riggio, S. Murphy & F. Pirozzolo (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
9. Caruso, D. & Salovey, P. (2003). *The emotionally intelligent manager*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
10. Cooper, R. K. & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: Emotional intelligence in leadership and organizations*. New York: Berkley Publishing Group.
11. Dalin, P. (1994). *How schools improve*. London: Cassell.
12. Fehd, L. (2001). *Emotional intelligence: an executive handbook*. Austin: Good Pages.
13. Foster, R. (2000). Leadership in the twenty-first century: Working to build a civil society. *National Civic Review*, 89:87-91.
14. Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
15. Gardner, L. & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, 23:68-78.
16. Gazzard, A. (2002). Emotional intelligence, the witness and education. *Encounter*, 15:20-29.
17. Goffman, E. (1969). *Strategic interaction*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
18. Gold, A., Evans, J., Earley, P., Halpin, D. & Collarbone, P. (2003). Principled principals. *Educational Management and Administration*, 31:2.
19. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
20. Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
21. Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. & McKee, A. (2002). *The new leaders: Transforming the art of leadership into the science of results*. London: Little Brown.
22. Harris, A. (2002). Effective leadership in schools facing challenging contexts. *School Leadership & Management*, 22:15-26.
23. Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85(3), 551-575.
24. Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
25. Huysamen, G.K. (1997). *Descriptive statistics for the social and behavioural sciences*. Cape Town: Creda.
26. Ihara, C.K. (1998). *Professional ideals*. California: Wadsworth.
27. Kast, F.E. & Rosenzweig, J.E. (1985). *Organization and management*. New York: McGraw Hill.

28. Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
29. Lam, L.T. & Kirby, S. (2002). Is emotional intelligence an advantage? An exploration of the impact of emotional and general intelligence on individual performance. *Journal of Social Psychology, 142*:133-144.
30. Lee, Q. (2005). Leadership levels and issues. *Lean briefing newsletter of Lean manufacturing strategy*. Retrieved from: www.strategosinc.com/leadership
31. Macaleer, W.D. & Shannon, J.B. (2002). Emotional intelligence: How does it affect leadership? *Employment Relations Today*. Retrieved from: www.interscience.wiley.com
32. Manser, P.G. (2005). The influence of school principals' emotionally intelligent behaviours on the job satisfaction of educators in the Eastern Cape. (Unpublished PhD thesis). Port Elizabeth: Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.
33. Maryl, C., Hardin, F., Olibas, L., Rodgers, T. & Spiller, K. (2004). Case study of characteristics of effective leadership in graduate student collaborative work. *Education, 124*:721-728.
34. Mayer, J.D. & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. Retrieved from: <http://trochim.human.cornell.edu/gallery/young/emotion.htm>
35. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (1999). *Test manual for the MSCEIT v.2: The Mayer, Salovey & Caruso emotional intelligence test*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
36. McCann, J. (2000). Wanted: A reality check. *Community College Week, 12*: 4.
37. McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education*. New York: Longman.
38. Mertler, C.A. (2002). Job satisfaction and perception of motivation among middle and high school teachers. *American Secondary Education, 31*:43-44.
39. Millinger, C.S. (2004). Helping new teachers cope. *Educational Leadership, 61*: 66-73.
40. Nelson, D.B. & Low, G.R. (2003). *Emotional intelligence: Achieving academic and career excellence*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
41. Nordin, N. (2011). The influence of emotional intelligence, leadership behavioural and organizational commitment on organizational readiness for change in higher learning institution. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29*: 129-38.
42. Noyes, B.R. (2003). Emotional intelligence and leadership. *Leadership International*. Retrieved from: www.leadershipinternational.com
43. Orme, G. (2000). The developing world of emotional intelligence. Available from: info@ejuk.com
44. Orme, G. (2001). *Emotionally intelligent living*. London: Crown House.
45. Orme, G. & Cannon, K. (2000). Everything you wanted to know about implementing an emotional intelligence programme (but were afraid to ask). EQ Network. Retrieved from: www.Eiuk.com
46. Rafaeli, A. & Sutton, R. I. (1987). Expression of emotion as part of the work role. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(1): 23-37.
47. Rafaeli, A. & Sutton, R. I. (1990). Busy stores and demanding customers: How do they affect the display of emotion? *Academy of Management Journal, 33*: 623-627.
48. Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research: a resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers*. Oxford: Blackwell.
49. Salovey, P. & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9*(3): 185-211.
50. Senge, P. (1996). Leading learning organisations. *Training and Development, 50*:36-37.
51. Short, P.M. (1998). Empowering leadership. *Contemporary Education, 69*:70-74.
52. Singh, P. (2005). Use of the collegial leadership model of emancipation to transform traditional management practices in secondary schools. *South African Journal of Education, 25*:11-18.
53. Singh, P. (2013). Influence of the leaders' emotionally intelligent behaviours on their employees' job satisfaction. *International Business & Economics Research Journal, 12*(7): 799-814.
54. Singh, P. & Manser, P. (2002). Collegiality in education: a case study. *South African Journal of Education, 22*:56-64.
55. Singh, P. & Manser, P. (2008). Correlation between the perceived emotionally intelligent interpersonal behaviours of school principals and the job satisfaction of their teachers. *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture & Change Management, 8*(1), 189-200.
56. Singh, P., Manser, P. & Dali, C. (2013). *Principal leadership*. Saarbrucken, Germany: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.

57. Slaskil, M. & Cartwright, S. (2003). Emotional intelligence training and its implications for stress, health and performance. *Stress & Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress*, 19:233-239.
58. Sosik, J. J., & Megerian, L. E. (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance: The role of self-other agreement on transformation leadership perceptions. *Group and Organization Management*, 24(3): 367-390.
59. Stein, S. & Book, H. (2001). *The EQ edge. Emotional intelligence and your success*. Toronto: Stoddart.
60. Sterrett, A.S. (2000). *The manager's pocket guide to emotional intelligence*. Massachusetts: HRD Press.
61. Strümpfer, D. J. W. & Mlonzi, E. N. (2001). Antonovsky's sense of coherence scale and job attitudes: three studies. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 31: 31-54.
62. Tang, H.W.T., Yin, M.S. & Nelson, D.B. (2010). The relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership practices. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(8): 899-926.
63. Taylor, G.J. & Bagby, R.M. (2000). An overview of the alexithymia construct. In R. Bar-On & J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
64. Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Magazine*, 140: 227-235.
65. Weinberger, L.A. (2002). Emotional intelligence: Its connection to HRD theory and practice. *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(2): 215-243.