



Self-Versus Employees' Appraisal of Managers' Emotional Intelligence. The Case of Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils, Midlands Province, Zimbabwe

Vonai Chirasha¹, Crispin Chipunza², Lewis Dzimbiri³

¹Department of Human Resource Management, Faculty of Social Science, Midlands State University, Gweru, Zimbabwe

²Department of Business Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Central University of Technology, Bloemfontein, South Africa

³Department of Political and Administrative Studies, Faculty of Social Science, Chancellor University, Zomba, Malawi

Email address:

vchirasha@gmail.com (V. Chirasha)

To cite this article:

Vonai Chirasha, Crispin Chipunza, Lewis Dzimbiri. Self-Versus Employees' Appraisal of Managers' Emotional Intelligence. The Case of Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils, Midlands Province, Zimbabwe. *Frontiers in Cognitive Psychology*. Vol. 2, No. 3, 2017, pp. 72-81. doi: 10.11648/j.fcp.20170203.12

Received: June 21, 2017; **Accepted:** July 13, 2017; **Published:** August 10, 2017

Abstract: Emotional Intelligence has become increasingly popular as a management tool for boosting performance at work. Despite this popularity, there is no sustained research in Zimbabwe that substantiates the efficacy of emotional intelligence especially within municipality environments. Using Goleman's four clusters of emotional intelligence self-awareness, emotional intelligence self-management, emotional intelligence awareness of others and emotional intelligence management of others managers rated themselves high as compared to employee ratings. The results indicate that managers may be clueless as to employee perceptions of their behaviour. It is important that managers constantly get feedback from those they lead so that they improve their attitude and behaviour. Using purposive and stratified sampling techniques, 32 managers and 400 subordinates participated in the study. The instrument that measured Goleman's emotional intelligence through self-rating was reliable with Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients ranging from emotional self-awareness 0.846, emotional self-management 0.886, emotional awareness of others 0.939 and emotional intelligence management of others 0.960. The instrument used by employees to rate managers was also reliable with the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients ranging from emotional intelligence self-awareness 0.807, emotional intelligence self-management 0.834, emotional intelligence awareness of others 0.858 and emotional intelligence management of others 0.945. The hypothesis that self-rating and others' rating can-not be same was validated.

Keywords: Goleman s Emotional Competence, Inventory (ECI) Self-Appraisal, Appraisal by Others, Cronbach s Alpha Reliability Coefficients, Accurate Reporting

1. Introduction

Emotional intelligence (EI) covers two aspects. These are the understanding of self, and understanding others and their feelings. Emotional intelligence is all about self-control and taking care of others, a skill which managers can use in managing relations with those they supervise. This is summed up by the five domains which, are, knowing your emotions, managing your own emotions, motivating yourself, recognizing and understanding other people's emotions and managing the emotions of others (Serrat 2009) [31]. Measuring levels of emotional intelligence help in

establishing if managers have the skill of understanding self and others 'emotions and manage them. This would help in identifying the training need for managers in these two municipalities studied to acquire emotional intelligence. The main hypothesis is to test if self-rating and employee rating of managers is the same.

2. Structures of City Councils

The City Councils are run by elected councillors headed by a Mayor and together they form the city's policy-making body. The Council is mainly responsible for legislative, financial and governance issues. Below the Council is the

executive management which is a team of full-time professional officers who are responsible for the implementation of Council decisions and for the day to day running of Council affairs. The city councils' executive management are headed by the Town Clerks and different heads of departments. The Town Clerk is held responsible for any unlawful action by any other official under his/her supervision and should ensure that the departments operate effectively (Commonwealth 2004) [13]. Heads of departments in city councils are seen as team leaders and coordinators of council policies and are responsible for delivering efficient service to the community.

Operating within the sphere of local government demands the development of some fairly detailed understanding of the relationships and processes involved for one to operate within the arena (Bratton and Mattees 2001) [10]. It is for these reasons that the executive management of city councils, need to develop intrapersonal and interpersonal skills which define emotional intelligence. It takes a manager who understands self and regulates self-behaviour to build good interpersonal relationships with others, which in-turn help the manager appreciate relationships and processes in local government. Executive management teams in city councils need to acquire emotional intelligence skills to deal with non-executive managers who are politically-oriented, their subordinates and the public at large. City managers need to remain apolitical, as they are public administrators by profession (Roberts, Burrus, Betancourt, Holtzman, Libbrecht, MacCann, Matthews, Minsky, Naemi and Schulze (2013) [36]. As such, they need to have requisite skills such as emotional intelligence, which help them build relations for a harmonious work environment. In most cases subordinates may not feel the impact of non-executive managers' interference, as their main focus is to please their immediate bosses. City managers thus remain responsible for motivating employees to perform in line with organisational goals.

City councils' propinquity to powerful political institutions and policy makers expose them to power conflicts, competition to influence decisions and policies and continuous clashes among various stakeholders, including the professional leaders and their employees (Commonwealth 2004) [13]. As public institutions, city councils also deal with stakeholders of all categories ranging from the street vendors to the professionals. Emotional intelligence may be considered a requisite skill for handling all these pressures. Emotional intelligence has become such an important skill in public arenas like city councils to help employees create a conducive working environment for self and others. The need for city council managers to remain professional can-not be over emphasised.

3. Models of Emotional Intelligence

There are two models of emotional intelligence. There is the *ability model* as defined by Mayer and Salovey (1990), and *mixed intelligence model* as defined by Bar-On (1997) [3] and (Goleman 2002) [18]. The *ability model* covers four

aspects, which are perceiving emotions, using emotions to facilitate thought, understanding emotions and managing emotions (Mayer and Salovey 1997) [23]. This model tries to meet the traditional definitions of intelligence. (Mayer and Salovey 1997) [23]'s model of emotional intelligence addresses issues of emotions and how the emotions correlate with Intellectual Quotient (IQ) as these are viewed as types of intelligences. This means that as the individual identifies and manages his/her own emotions and others', he or she is supported by the IQ to make good judgements or decisions. An emotionally intelligent person can harness negative emotions in others and manage them to achieve intended goals (Dak 2010) [14]. The *mixed intelligence model* is pursued by two different scholars who are Bar-On's (1997) [3] and (Goleman 2002) [18]. Bar-On (1997)'s model of emotional intelligence views emotional intelligence as a *mixed intelligence* that comprises of cognitive ability and personality aspects. The Bar-On's *mixed intelligence model* of emotional intelligence addresses a number of emotional and social abilities including the ability to be aware of self, and express oneself, the ability to deal with strong emotions and the ability to adapt to change and solve problems of a social or personal nature are (Bar-On's 1997) [3]. Bar-On's (2002) [4] view of emotional intelligence, however, relates to the potential for performance and success rather than the outcome oriented. This implies that the Bar-On (1997) [3]'s *mixed intelligence model* measures an individual's potential to success and capacity to perform. Goleman (2002) [18] significantly extends this idea, of a *mixed intelligence model*, viewing evolutionary changes in the human brain as critical to forming an understanding of the use and abuse of emotions. The mixed model of emotional intelligence covers five domains which are: knowing your emotions, managing your own emotions, motivating yourself, recognizing and understanding other people's emotions and managing the emotions of others. Goleman's new view of emotional intelligence as *mixed intelligence model* involves cognitive ability and personality aspects just like Bar On's (Stys and Brown 2004) [34]. It is the level of exercising the five domains that helps shape a leader's behaviour towards subordinates at the work place. It is assumed that when leaders shape their behaviour, this has a high significance on employees' behaviour and attitudes which are critical to employee performance. The difference between Goleman's (2002) [18] view of emotional intelligence and Bar On's (2002) [4] view, is that the first model is outcome oriented as it focuses on cognitive and personality factors as able to influence work place success, while the latter argues that individuals with emotional intelligence may only have potential for success.

4. Managers' Emotional Intelligence

According to Das (2010) [15], managers with low emotional intelligence have been said to have exaggerated optimism, curiosity and no self-confidence. People with low emotional intelligence are believed to disregard future

consequences of one's bad behaviour (Simmons 2001) [32]. Managers with low emotional intelligence may not realise the potential of making others feel inadequate, frightened, angry, annoyed or guilty. There is therefore need for city council managers to be alert and conscious to such low emotion developments so that they remain objective (Riggio, Murphy & Pirizollo 2002) [35]. (Simmons 2001) [32] asserts that managers with low emotional intelligence are insecure around people who display their emotions. This implies that such people may not have self-control and are the type of people who overreact without carefully giving it a thought.

On the contrary, people with high emotional intelligence are in control of their emotions and those of others. The behaviour of a person with high emotional intelligence is driven by genuine desires and not by arbitrarily set goals. Certain activities are purposefully avoided because the outcome would not be good. This is supported by Avolio and Yammarino (2002) [2] who argue that the best leaders may be well receptive to their employees' emotions, but still defy the impulse to intervene when an employee encounters a challenge because it might not produce the best outcome for the organisation. Leadership studies by Riggio *et al* (2002) [35] have found high levels of emotional intelligence in transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is that which inspires, motivates and develops others while generating awareness of organisational goals leading to increased employee performance and satisfaction (Bass & Riggio 2006) [5].

There is however a level when too much emotional intelligence can be harmful to decision making. Foo, Elfenbein, Tan and Aik (2005) [17] support this view when they suggest that some people with high emotional intelligence end up with lower performance in a negotiation simulation because they are likely to give in to their subordinates in an effort to come up with an integrative solution. If one has too much control of self and others then he or she borders on alexithymia. Alexithymia is the inability to identify emotions in self, which normally has effects on individual ability to do work and relate to other people (Lane, Sechrest, Shapiro and Kaszniak 2000) [21]. Individuals may become too sensitive and this may even affect their approach to work and life causing a lot of distress over minor issues. Social awareness or sensitivity are beneficial as long as an individual is able to regulate own emotions especially at workplace as tasks would still need to be carried out. In such cases of alexithymia, an organization may incur losses due to action taken by the leader to concede to colleagues or subordinates in an effort to build strong relationship. The question, however is 'when is too much emotional intelligence harmful? This is a gap that requires further research.

Indicators of high or low emotional intelligence in a department can be shown by employee retention and turnover associated with unresolved conflict, employee attendance rates, employee productivity and efficiency and longevity in relationships between managers and employees among others (Cherniss and Goleman 2001) [11].

5. Measurement of Emotional Intelligence

Measurement of emotional intelligence addressed issues to do with the levels of emotional intelligence, instruments used to measure levels of (EI) and the shortcomings encountered in measuring (EI). Levels of emotional intelligence can be defined as the rankings drawn from the psychometric tests that are obtained from *ability intelligence model* and *mixed intelligence model* that cover self-report measures and other report measures (Dulewicz, V. Higgs, M. & Slaski M. 2003) [16]. For both self-appraisal approach and appraisal by others, low emotional intelligence was anything below 2 (≥ 2), moderate emotional intelligence was = 3 while high emotional intelligence was in the range of 4 and above (≤ 4).

The strength of measuring emotional intelligence through multi-rater, in particular, is that it provides feedback especially to the senior-level employees, who rarely interact with junior employees. This helps managers to appreciate how they are perceived by others and can influence them to improve in behaviour and performance. This assertion is supported by Sala (2002) [27] who postulates that higher-level employees normally score themselves high in emotional intelligence competencies, and have less similarity with others' perceptions. This is mostly so because senior managers have fewer opportunities to get feedback, as subordinates do not participate in their performance measurements.

The other shortcoming in the measurement of emotional intelligence is personal bias. According to Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (2000) [24] if the individual's self-concept is inaccurate, an individual may end up rating self on the image one has of self which are not true thoughts, behaviour and attitudes. Self-report measurements might depend on one's mood. Self-report measures have also been said to be vulnerable to social desirability motives which give a biased reporting (Boyatzis 2000) [7]. Emotional intelligence computations are also more likely to reflect an individual's perceived emotional intelligence rather than his or her actual levels of emotional intelligence (Muyia 2009) [26].

Other report measures involve individuals who are familiar with a person to rate on the extent that certain statements describe that person. (Stys and Brown 2004) [34] argue that such report measures have a weakness of measuring a person's reputation and not their true self and thus have been found inaccurate when judging internal cognitive abilities.

6. Methodology

The research used a quantitative approach. The research used purposive sampling to identify 32 line managers representing management, and stratified random sampling was used to select 400 employees who constituted more than 10% of the total population for both city councils. The study used Goleman's Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI version 2.0), to measure levels of emotional intelligence among managers through self-appraisal and employees'

appraisal. The attributes that were measured were identifying feelings, linking feelings to behavior, self-control, transparency, adaptability, achievement, initiative, assertiveness, calmness, result-oriented, motivation, inspiration, optimistic, service orientation, empathy developing others, relationship management, team-working and collaboration, influencing others, effective communication and conflict resolution. The outcomes that were surveyed were trust, commitment and respect.

To establish the levels of managers' emotional intelligence through self and employees' appraisals, Goleman's (2002) (ECI version 2.0) was used. A five point likert scale moving from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree was used. For each manager, low emotional intelligence was anything below 2 (≤ 2), mean score emotional intelligence was =3, while high emotional intelligence was in the range of 4 and above ($4 \geq$). This section looks at the views expressed by managers through self-rating and employees appraisal of managers. Both questionnaires had 20 items expressed as B1 to B20. Various constructs that address different qualities of managers are summarized in tables under findings and discussions. Overall measures of each construct are obtained using the multivariate statistical principal components based latent factors which was used to calculate the Managers' Emotional Self-Awareness (MESA), Managers' Self-Management (MESM), Managers' Emotional Awareness of Others (MEAO) and Managers' Emotional Management of Others (MEMO). The so constructed latent factor will then be a representative variable for the construct of interest.

7. Findings and Discussion

7.1. Demographic Factors

The two city council managers had a response rate of 24 (77.41%). The two city councils were male dominated 18 (75), with 20 (83%) being married. Out of a total of targeted population of 400 employees, 274 appraised managers on their level of emotional intelligence. The summaries presented in Table 1 are for the employees who assessed their managers.

Table 1. Biographical information of the employee respondents.

Personal details	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Town	Gweru	135	49.3%
	Kwekwe	139	50.7%
	Town Clerk's office	15	5.5%
	Chamber secretary	63	23.0%
2. Department	Finance	52	19.0%
	Housing	34	12.4%
	Health	47	17.2%
	Engineering	63	23.0%
	Gweru city	65	23.7%
	Mkoba	34	12.4%
	Mtapa	36	13.1%
3. Location	Kwekwe town	51	18.6%
	Mbizo	10	3.6%
	Works yard	36	13.1%
	Dandaro	15	5.5%
	Water/sewer	27	9.9%
4. Gender	Male	172	62.8%
	Female	102	37.2%
5. Marital Status	Married	215	78.5%
	Not married	59	21.5%

The results show that Gweru and Kwekwe had had almost equal levels of representation in the research sample (49.3% for Gweru and 50.7% for Kwekwe). As far as location is concerned, the table shows that Gweru city had the highest representation (23.7%) followed by Kwekwe town (18.6%) with the least being Mbizo with only 3.6%. The majority of the respondents were female (62.8%) and males constituted 37.2% of the participants. The departments of Engineering (23.0%), Chamber secretary (23.0%), Finance (19.0%) and Health (17.2%) dominated the research sample in that order with the Town Clerks and Housing departments have lesser representation. Married participants were the majority (78.5%) as compared with 21.5% who were not married.

7.2. Levels of Emotional Intelligence-Self-Rating

The results for managers' emotional self-awareness are summarised in tables below using Goleman's four clusters of Emotional Intelligence Self-Awareness, Emotional Intelligence Self-Management, Emotional Intelligence Awareness of Others and Emotional Intelligence Management of Others.

Table 2. Managers' Emotional Intelligence –Self-Rating.

Managers' Emotional Self Awareness (Self Rating)	Low/Very Low%	Average %	High/Very High%	Mean	St Dev	Latent Factor (Principal Component) Coefficient	% of total variation	Reliability-Cronbach's alpha
Conscientious	20.77	45.83	33.33	3.208	1.021	0.826	69.46%	0.846
Optimism	37.5	50.0	12.5	2.667	0.963	0.681		
Adaptability	25.0	37.5	37.5	3.250	0.989	0.858		
Transparency	25.0	41.7	33.3	3.083	0.929	0.946		
Managers' Emotional Self-Management (Self Rating)								
Self-Confidence	20.8	50.0	29.2	3.125	0.947	0.868	81.78%	0.886
Self-Control	29.2	33.3	37.5	3.250	1.073	0.926		
Calmness	33.3	29.2	37.5	2.917	1.176	0.918		
Managers' Emotional Awareness of others (Self Rating)								
Empathy	33.3	41.7	25.0	2.958	1.122	0.948	84.95%	0.939
Inspiration	25.0	54.2	20.8	2.917	1.060	0.926		

Managers' Emotional Self Awareness (Self Rating)	Low/Very Low%	Average %	High/Very High%	Mean	St Dev	Latent Factor (Principal Component) Coefficient	% of total variation	Reliability-Cronbach's alpha
Service Orientation	25.0	37.5	37.5	3.125	0.947	0.945		
Respect	20.8	41.7	33.3	3.375	1.056	0.866		
Managers' Emotional Management of others (Self Rating)								
Initiative	33.3	29.2	37.5	3.000	1.180	0.856		
Conflict Management	29.2	37.5	33.3	3.042	1.197	0.957		
Relationship Management	20.8	50.0	33.3	3.167	0.868	0.938		
Team Work	33.3	33.3	33.3	3.042	1.160	0.913		
Developing Others	33.3	37.5	29.2	3.083	1.018	0.885	77.08%	0.960
Result Oriented	37.5	20.8	41.7	3.042	1.160	0.784		
Motivation	16.7	41.7	41.7	3.333	3.333	0.868		
Change Catalyst	16.7	50.0	33.3	3.125	1.076	0.892		
Commitment	16.7	37.5	45.8	3.333	0.816	0.777		

For the attribute of self-awareness the results indicate that managers rated themselves high or very high with 33.3% in consciousness and transparency and 37.5% in adaptability. However managers rated themselves average and low in optimism with 50%. The Managers' overall measure of Emotional Self-Awareness (MESA) or the latent factor of the construct is calculated based on the main principal component (see Table 2 coefficients column) as:

$$\text{MESA} = 0.854 \times B1 + 0.650 \times B2 + 0.823 \times B3 + 0.858 \times B4 \quad (1)$$

The weights show that the four items that make up the construct of managers' emotional self-awareness contribute almost equally to the overall measure of managers' emotional self-awareness with item B2 ("Optimism", coefficient=0.681) contributing slightly less than the other three questionnaire items. An ordinary mean of the four items will be an appropriate overall measure of the construct of MESA. This latent variable makes use of 69.46% of the information contained in the four questionnaire items and is reliable with a Chronbach's Alpha of 0.846.

Under Emotional Intelligent Self-Management (MESM) managers scored themselves significantly high or very high on self-control and calmness with a 37.5%, and 29.2% for self-confidence. A number of managers felt that their confidence was on the average 50%. The Managers' overall measure of Emotional Self-Management or the latent factor of the construct (MESM) is calculated based on the main principal component (see Table 2 coefficients column) as:

$$\text{MESM} = 0.854 \times B1 + 0.650 \times B2 + 0.823 \times B3 + 0.858 \times B4 \quad (2)$$

The weights of the latent factor for MESM show that the three items that make up the construct of managers' emotional self-management contribute fairly equally to the overall measure of the construct (all coefficients above 0.868 and below 0.926). An ordinary mean of the four items will be an appropriate overall measure of the construct of MESM. This latent variable makes use of 81.78% of the information contained in its four questionnaire items and is reliable with a Chronbach's Alpha of 0.886).

The results for awareness of others indicated that managers rated themselves slightly high on service orientation and respect with 37.5%. However managers felt that there were more average on inspiration 54.2%, respect and empathy

with 41.67%. It is interesting to note that few managers indicated that they were low in all variables ranging from 20.8% in respect to 33.3% in empathy. The overall measure of Managers' Emotional Awareness of Others (MEAO) is calculated based on the main principal component of the construct as:

$$\text{MEAO} = 0.843 \times B8 + 0.852 \times B9 + 0.822 \times B10 + 0.845 \times B11 \quad (3)$$

The weights show that the four items that make up the construct of managers' emotional awareness of others contribute fairly equally to the overall measure of the construct (all coefficients above 0.866 and below 0.948). An ordinary mean of the four items will be an appropriate overall measure of the construct of MEAO. The latent variable of managers' emotional awareness of others makes use of 84.95% of the information contained in the four questionnaire items and is reliable with a Chronbach's Alpha of 0.939.

Managers rated themselves significantly high on all variables on managers' management of others. Managers believed that they were highly committed with 45.8%, result oriented and motivated (41.7%), initiative (37.5%), good team members who are able to resolve conflict (33.3%) and good at building relationship and developing others (29.2%). The overall measure of Managers' Emotional Management of Others (MEMO) is calculated based on the main principal component of the construct as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MEMO} = & 0.839 \times B12 + 0.845 \times B13 + 0.872 \times B14 + \\ & 0.821 \times B15 + 0.851 \times B16 + 0.865 \times B17 \\ & + 0.818 \times B18 + 0.828 \times B19 + 0.760 \times B20 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The weights show that the nine items that make up the construct MEMO contribute fairly equally to the overall measure of the construct (all coefficients range from 0.777 to below 0.957). An ordinary mean of the four items will be an appropriate overall measure of the construct of MEMO. The latent variable of managers' emotional awareness of others makes use of 77.08% of the information contained in the nine questionnaire items involved and is reliable (Chronbach's Alpha=0.960).

Overall self-rating indicated high scores in all ratings. With a self-report instrument it is likely that individuals find it easier to rate themselves on the positive side than the negative side.

Cook (2006) [12] argues that individuals have challenges in rating themselves accurately, as some may overrate themselves while others may underrate themselves. Self-report measurements have been reported to be biased as they might depend on one's mood. This is supported by Stys and Brown (2004) [34] who allude to the vulnerability of self-report to social desirability motives which give a biased reporting.

According to Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (2000) [24] if the individual's self- concept is inaccurate, an individual may end up rating himself or herself on the self- concept not the true thoughts, behaviours and attitudes. Bradberry and Graves (2004) [9] conclude that self-rating tests can only minimise bias but cannot completely eliminate it.

7.3. Levels of Emotional Intelligence-Employee Appraisal

Table 3. Managers' Emotional Intelligence-Employee Rating.

Managers' Emotional Self Awareness (Employee Rating)	Low/Very Low%	Average %	High/Very High%	Mean	St Dev	Latent Factor (Principal Component) Coefficient	% of total variation	Reliability-Cronbach 'alpha
B1. In your own view is your manager able to identify own feelings?	42.0	34.7	23.4	2.80	1.00	0.854	64.09%	0.807
B2. Is your manager always hopeful that targets will be met in your department?	54.0	23.0	23.0	2.63	1.10	0.650		
B3. Is your manager adaptable to change?	48.2	26.6	25.2	2.73	1.09	0.823		
B4. Is your manager transparent in dealing with employee issues?	45.6	24.5	29.9	2.88	1.11	0.858		
Managers' Emotional Self-Management (Employee Rating)								
B5. Does your manager have self-confidence?	44.9	27.0	28.1	2.85	1.10	0.841	75.22%	0.834
B6. Is your manager able to control his/her moods	48.5	26.6	24.8	2.73	1.04	0.874		
B7. Does your boss remain calm under pressure?	51.1	25.5	23.4	2.71	1.06	0.887		
Managers' Emotional Awareness of others (Employee Rating)								
B8. In your opinion does your boss have strong understanding of others?	50.0	25.2	24.8	2.73	1.05	0.843	70.66%	0.858
B9. Is your manager able to inspire employees to do their work?	50.0	28.8	21.2	2.64	1.01	0.852		
B10. Does your manager provide support and necessary service?	48.9	27.0	24.1	2.72	1.05	0.822		
B11. Do you respect your manager?	44.6	20.1	35.4	3.04	1.26	0.845		
Managers' Emotional Management of others (Employee Rating)								
B12. Is your manager initiative of new ways of doing things in your department?	47.1	25.5	27.4	2.81	1.07	0.839	69.51%	0.945
B13. Is your boss able to deal with conflict effectively?	53.3	25.2	21.5	2.66	1.02	0.845		
B14. Does your manager make & maintain personal friendships among work associates?	47.4	30.7	21.9	2.73	1.06	0.872		
B15. Is your manager good at building and managing teams?	52.5	23.4	24.1	2.68	1.03	0.821		
B16. Is your boss able to recognise employees' weaknesses & develop them?	49.6	25.9	24.5	2.69	1.13	0.851		
B17. Is your manager result oriented?	49.3	25.2	25.5	2.76	1.08	0.865		
B18. Are you motivated to work for your boss?	48.5	24.1	27.4	2.79	1.10	0.818		
B19. Is your manager good at leading change in your department?	50.8	25.5	23.7	2.68	1.09	0.828		
B20. Does your manager have commitment for his work?	54.0	26.3	19.7	2.61	0.99	0.760		

For the construct of emotional self-awareness the results show that only 23.4% of the employee participants believe that their managers' ability to identify own feelings is above average (that is high or very high) with 34.7% believing it to be average. Managers who are low in identifying their feelings may not be able to link how emotions influence their behaviour. Failure to identify and link feelings to behaviour is exemplified by a manager who may shout to employees through-out the day. Boyatzis and Ratti (2009) [7] allude to the fact that managers who fail to identify their anger feelings may disrupt a number of activities in an organisation as the feeling of anger transmits across the organisation. Employees in turn may react to the manager's anger and this may affect motivation levels of employees.

The majority of the participants believe that their managers are always not hopeful that targets will be met in their departments (41.2% low) with only 23% rating their optimism high or very high. Contrary to Stern, Hyman and Martin (2004) [22] who articulate that an individual with self-awareness skill is able to identify feelings, link feelings to behaviour, optimistic and result oriented, managers in Gweru and Kwekwe city councils were scored low on identifying feelings and optimism. 48.2% of the respondents view their managers' adaptability to change as low or very low and 26.6% as average with only 25.2% rating it high or very high. Only 29.9% of the participants rate their managers highly or very highly in terms of transparency in dealing with employee issues with 45.6% rating them very low or low. 24% view their transparency when dealing with employee issues average.

The Managers' overall measure of Emotional Self-Awareness or the latent factor of the construct (MESA) is calculated based on the main principal component (see Table 9 last column) as:

$$\text{MESA} = 0.854 \times B1 + 0.650 \times B2 + 0.823 \times B3 + 0.858 \times B4 \quad (5)$$

The weights show that the four items that make up the construct of managers' emotional self-awareness contribute almost equally to the overall measure of managers' emotional self-awareness with item B2 ("Is your manager always hopeful that targets will be met in your department?", coefficient=0.650) contributing slightly less than the other three questionnaire items. An ordinary mean of the four items will be an appropriate overall measure of the construct of MESA. This latent variable makes use of 64.09% of the information contained in the four questionnaire items and is reliable with a Chronbach's Alpha of 0.807. It is important to note that measurements for self-rating were almost the same. This indicate that employees in Gweru and Kwekwe city councils had the same perceptions with the managers on managers' emotional self-awareness. The least coefficient for self-rating (0.681) was almost close to the least coefficient of employees' rating (0.650) on managers' emotional self-awareness.

The table shows that 28.1% of the participants rate their managements' self-confidence high or very high with 44.9% rating it very low or low. The rest (27%) viewed their

managements' confidence as average. The majority of the participants (48.5%) believe that their managements' ability to control their moods is low or very low with only 24.8% rating them high or very high. Managements' calmness under pressure was rated low or very low by 51.1% of the respondents with 23.4% rating them high or very high. Slightly above a quarter of the participants believe that their managements' calmness was average. Managers in Gweru and Kwekwe city councils were found low in reading their emotions and controlling them. Maybe this explains the tempers that were picked and recorded by the media in Zimbabwe, the cliques and divisions among employees as indicated by the strategic plans documents for the two city councils. (Strategic Plans 2008-2012) [19]. When employees are divided at the workplace it provides fertile ground for conflict and in the process management may find it difficult to get collaboration, teamwork, as there may be a lot of distrust, stress, anger and fear among other workplace problems (Mathews 2006) [22].

The Managers' overall measure of Emotional Self-Management or the latent factor of the construct (MESM) is calculated based on the main principal component of the construct as:

$$\text{MESM} = 0.841 \times B5 + 0.874 \times B6 + 0.887 \times B7 \quad (6)$$

The weights of the latent factor for MESM show that the three items that make up the construct of managers' emotional self-management contribute fairly equally to the overall measure of the construct (all coefficients above 0.840 and below 0.890). This again indicate that employees had high regard of managers' ability to manage themselves. An ordinary mean of the four items will be an appropriate overall measure of the construct of MESM. This latent variable makes use of 75.22% of the information contained in its four questionnaire items and is reliable with a Chronbach's Alpha of 0.834.

As shown in the table, majority of the participants (50% low/very low) believe that their managers do not have a strong understanding of others. Only 24.8% of them rate their bosses understanding of others high/very high, with 25.2% rating it as average. Half of the respondents (50%) view their managers' ability to inspire employees to be low or very low and only 21.2% rate it to be high or very high. Slightly below half (48.9%) of the participants do not believe that their managers provide support and necessary service with 24.1% believing that they do. However 35.4% claim to respect their managers with 20.1% claiming that they moderately do so. 44.6% claim that they do not respect their managers. Managers in Gweru and Kwekwe city councils were found not to exhibit service-oriented behaviour and most employees found it difficult to respect them. In such an environment, managers may find it difficult to influence employees and this may have a bearing on performance. However a number of employees claimed that they still respect their managers' in spite of low scores in emotional awareness of others. Alexander (2007) [1] articulates that some employees believe that their managers assume no bad intentions with their bad

behaviour and may be easily unaware of their actions.

The overall measure of managers' emotional awareness of others (MEAO) is calculated based on the main principal component of the construct as:

$$\text{MEAO} = 0.843 \times B8 + 0.852 \times B9 + 0.822 \times B10 + 0.845 \times B11 \quad (7)$$

The weights show that the four items that make up the construct of managers' emotional self-management contribute fairly equally to the overall measure of the construct (all coefficients above 0.820 and below 0.855). While they were mixed feelings among employees on managers' ability to be aware of others' emotions, overall the coefficient indicate that employees rated their managers high. An ordinary mean of the four items will be an appropriate overall measure of the construct of MEAO. The latent variable of managers' emotional awareness of others makes use of 70.66% of the information contained in the four questionnaire items and is reliable with a Chronbach's Alpha of 0.858

The results show that 47.1% of the participants are of the opinion that their managers' initiative of new ways of doing things in their department was very low or low. This percentage is higher than the 27.4% who believe that their manager's initiative is high or very high. More than half of the participants doubt their managements' ability to deal with conflict with 53.3% rating them as low or very low. Only 21.5% believe that their managers can deal with conflict effectively. Research has shown that failure to deal with conflict may be counterproductive (Sen 2008) [30]. Bottled up emotions need to be released and if not given an outlet, may find another way to escape (Serrat, 2004) [31], which may damage work relations. About 47.3% of the participants think that their manager's ability to make and maintain

personal friendship with workmates in the workplace is low or very low. Managers who are not able to build and manage good relations with employees were found to negatively affect employee morale, increase absenteeism and reduce productivity (Matthews 2006) [22]. Only 21.9% rank their managers high or very high in this regard whereas 30.7% believe that they are average. The majority of the participants (52.5%) rated their managers' team building capabilities low or very low as compared with 24.1% who rated them high or very high. Only 24.5% of the respondents rate their managers' ability to recognize employees' weakness and develop them high or very high. However 49.6% rate their ability to recognize and develop employees low or very low. As indicated in table 12, 49.3% of the respondents are of the opinion that their managers are not result oriented and 25.5% rate them high or very high whereas 25.2% rank as average. Looking at the results presented in table 12, 48.5% of the respondents seem not to be motivated by their managers (very low/low) with only 27.4% acknowledging that their managers motivate them (high/very high). More than 50% of the respondents believe that their managers' are unable to lead change in their respective departments and 25.5% rate them average with only 23.7% rating them high or very high. The majority of the respondents 54% claim not to be committed to their work with only 19.7% claiming to be highly or very highly committed. Managers in Gweru and Kwekwe city councils were found to have challenges in surrounding themselves with employees who are committed. Emotional intelligence managers are able to attract and retain great colleagues and investors (Bliss 2011) [6]. The overall measure of Managers' Emotional Management of Others (MEMO) is calculated based on the main principal component of the construct as:

$$\text{MEMO} = 0.839 \times B12 + 0.845 \times B13 + 0.872 \times B14 + 0.821 \times B15 + 0.851 \times B16 + 0.865 \times B17 + 0.818 \times B18 + 0.828 \times B19 + 0.760 \times B20 \quad (8)$$

The weights show that the nine items that make up the construct MEMO contribute fairly equally to the overall measure of the construct (all coefficients range from 0.760 to below 0.875) which is relatively high just like in the self-rating. An ordinary mean of the four items will be an appropriate overall measure of the construct of MEMO. The latent variable of managers' emotional awareness of others makes use of 69.51% of the information contained in the nine questionnaire items involved and is reliable with a Chronbach's Alpha of 0.945.

7.4. Managers' Self-Rating Versus Employee Rating

There could be a number of explanations for different scores for managers of Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils. Managers scored themselves relatively high or very high in most constructs of emotional intelligence ranging from 29.17% to 45.83%, while employees rated a few managers high or very high in all constructs with scores not lower than 19.7% and not more than 29.9%. However it is important to note that on the overall both self-rating and employees' rating had high coefficients ranging from 0.650 to 0.948. This

findings refutes Cook (2006) [12] who argues that individuals have challenges in rating themselves accurately, as some may overrate themselves while others may underrate themselves. In this study while employees had mixed feelings about their managers on different attributes the overall ratings indicate that self-rating can be accurate. Managers' self-rating scored the least in optimism with 12.50%, empathy 25% and inspiration 26.83% while employees scored them the least in conflict management with 21.5%, inspiration 21.2% and relationship building 21.9%. With a self-report instrument it is likely that individuals find it easier to rate themselves on the positive side than the negative side. Self-report measurements have been reported to be biased as they might depend on one's mood. Bradberry and Graves (2004) [9] conclude that self-rating tests can only minimise bias but cannot completely eliminate it. However it is interesting to note that self-reporting and employees' rating in Gweru and Kwekwe city councils had similar scores.

With similarity in rating, the researcher concludes that high or lack of emotional intelligence affect the people who

surround the rated person more. Goleman's emotional intelligence is expressed which is more of outcome oriented hence employees perception of managers explained employees' receiving end of managers' behaviour and attitude. If one has high levels of emotional intelligence it may imply that one is able to identify emotions that affect him/her and manage them while at the same time identify others emotions and manage them. This help create a conducive environment as managers in this case would influence behaviour of those they lead positively. On the contrary lack of emotional intelligence by managers may be harmful to the employees. While managers scored themselves high in most attributes in this study they should equally reflect on employee ratings where they were scored low like conflict management, inspiration and relationship building.

Previous studies (Muir 2013) [25], have found a huge discrepancy between self-rating and others' rating, especially for executive managers. This may entail that most of the times managers may not be aware of what other people think of them as far as attitudes and behaviour are concerned. Muir further argues that quite a number of managers are promoted for political reasons and their experience, as opposed to their capabilities in managing employees. Managers may thus become too busy with organisation politics and remain completely out of what transpires on the ground. (Muir 2013) [25] contends that lack of genuine feedback for executive managers promotes low emotional intelligence. The author also posits that unclear systems and procedures on how to provide such feedback become a stumbling block to genuine feedback. Kouzes and Posner (2006: 13) [20] are quoted as saying 'most leaders don't want honest feedback and don't get much of it unless it is forced on them'. Managers are equated to lawyers (Muir 2013) [25] who have weak self-awareness skills, in their interest for self-protection. On the contrary middle managers in Gweru and Kwekwe city councils seemed to be more close to the employees they were managing hence there was no discrepancy on the ratings.

8. Conclusion

The instrument that measured Goleman's emotional intelligence through self-rating was reliable with Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients ranging from emotional self-awareness 0.846, emotional self-management 0.886, emotional awareness of others 0.939 and emotional intelligence management of others 0.960. The instrument used by employees to rate managers was also reliable with the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients ranging from emotional intelligence self-awareness 0.807, emotional intelligence self-management 0.834, emotional intelligence awareness of others 0.858 and emotional intelligence management of others 0.945. Using feedback from employees managers in both Gweru and Kwekwe city councils may need to keep getting feedback from peers and subordinates so that they keep improving their attitude and behaviour. Emotional intelligence matters more when it affects the people surrounding you hence managers in Gweru and Kwekwe city

councils should take employee ratings seriously. On the other hand self-rating and employee ratings were found to be similar thus refuting the hypothesis that self-rating and others' rating can-not be same. Multiple rating has been found useful to help respondents on how they perceive themselves and at the same time get feedback from others.

References

- [1] Alexander (2007), *How to deal with a bad boss*. <http://www.positivesharing.com>
- [2] Avolio, B. J, & Yamarino F. (2002). Introduction and overview. In B. J Avolio and Yamarino (Eds), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead*. New York. Elsevier
- [3] Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar-On emotional quotient inventory. Technical Manual*. Toronto. Canada. Multi-Health Systems.
- [4] Bar-On, R. (2002). *Bar-On emotional quotient inventory. Technical Manual*. Toronto. Canada. Multi-Health Systems.
- [5] Bass B. M and Riggio R. E (2006). *Transformational Leadership* 2 edition. Mahwah N J Lawrance Erlbaum.
- [6] Bliss, S. E. (2011). *The effect of emotional intelligence on a modern organisational leader's ability to make effective decisions*, Bellevue University.
- [7] Boyatzis, R. E. (2000). *Developing emotional intelligence*. In Cherniss C. And Goleman D. (Eds), *The emotional intelligent workplace. How to select for, measure and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups and organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [8] Boyatzis, R. E. & Ratti, F. (2009). Emotional, social and cognitive intelligence competencies distinguishing effective Italian managers and leaders in a private company and co-operatives. *Journal of Management Development*. Vol 28 (9) 821-838.
- [9] Bradberry, T. & Greaves, J. (2004). Emotional intelligence appraisal: There is more than IQ, *Technical manual update*, San Diego. Talent Smart Inc.
- [10] Bratton M. And Mattes R (2001). "Support for democracy in Africa. Intrinsic or instrumental?" *British Journal of Political Science* (vol 31) 447-474.
- [11] Cherniss C. & Goleman D (2001). *The emotional intelligent workplace*. 1st Edition. Josey-Bass.
- [12] Cook, C. R. (2006). *Effects of emotional intelligence on principals' leadership performance*. PhD Thesis, Montana State University.
- [13] Commonwealth Report 2004.
- [14] Dak, M. (2010). *The human mind*. <http://www.lucidpages.com> (Accessed on 06-06-12).
- [15] Das, D. K. (2010). Another perspective of globalization. *Journal of International trade law and policy* vol 9 (1) 46- 63.
- [16] Dulewicz, V. Higgs, M. & Slaski M. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence. Content, construct & criterion-related validity. *Journal of Management Psychology* vol 18, 405-420.

- [17] Foo, M. D. Eifenbein, H. A. Tan, H. H. & Aik V. C. (2005). Emotional intelligence and negotiation. The tension between creating and claiming value. *International Journal of Conflict Management*. Vol 15, 411-429.
- [18] Goleman, D. (2002). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- [19] Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils Strategic Plans (2008-2012).
- [20] Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2006). *A leader's legacy*. Jossey-Bass. Willey.
- [21] Lane, R. D. Sechrest, L. Shapiro, D & Kaszniak A. (2000). Pervasive emotion recognition deficit common in alexithymia and repressive coping style. *Psychosomatic Medicine* vol 62, 492-501.
- [22] Mathews, B. (2006). Promoting emotional literacy, equity & interest in K53 science lessons for 11-14 year olds, the improving Science & Educational Development project. *International Journal of Science Education* vol 26, 3: 281-308.
- [23] Mayer, J. D. & Salovey, P. (1997). *What is emotional intelligence?* In P. Salovey (Ed.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence*. New York: Basic Books.
- [24] Mayer, J. D. Salovey, P. & Caruso D. (2000). *Models of emotional intelligence*. *Handbook of emotional intelligence*. Cambridge, University Press.
- [25] Muir, R. (2013). *Clueless at the top*. *Law people management*, <http://www.lawpeopleblog.com/2013/67/upward-feedback> (Accessed on 13-10-13).
- [26] Muyia, H. M. (2009). Approaches to instruments for measuring emotional intelligence. A review of selected literature, *Advances in developing human resources*. *Sage Publications*. Vol 11 (6) 690-702.
- [27] Sala, F. (2002). *Emotional competence inventory*. Technical manual. Philadelphia, PA: Mc Clelland Center for Research, hay group.
- [28] Sala, F. (2002). *Its lonely at the top: Executive's emotional intelligence self (mis) perceptions*. *Consortium for research on emotional intelligence in organizations*. www.eiconsortium.org. (Accessed on 30-09-14).
- [29] Saporito, A. (2009). Exploring the dimensions of the non-profit leader. *Journal of Philadelphia social innovations*. <http://www.philasocialinnovations.org/site/index>, (Accessed on 23-11-13).
- [30] Sen, S. (2008). Interpersonal skills through emotional intelligence. A psychological perspective. The Iefai University. *Journal of Soft Skills* vol 2: 25-30.
- [31] Serrat, O. (2009). *Understanding and developing emotional intelligence*. *Knowledge Solutions*. www.scribd.com/doc/510458/Human-Resource-Mgt (Accessed on 27-10-12).
- [32] Simonns, K. (2001). *Executive update: Emotional intelligence, What smart managers should know*. *The centre for association leadership*. <http://www.asacentre.org/Resources/articledetail>.
- [33] Stern, R., Hyman, L., Martin, C. E. (2004). The importance of self-awareness for school councillors. *Journal of Psychology* vol 7 477-489.
- [34] Stys, Y. & Brown, S. I. (2004). A review of emotional intelligence literature and its implications for corrections. *Research Branch Correctional Service of Canada*.
- [35] Riggio, R. E., Murphy, S. E. & Pirozollo, F. J. (Eds). (2002). *Multiple intelligence and leadership*. Mahwah, N J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [36] Roberts, R. D., Burrus J., Betancourt A. C., Holtzman S., Libbrecht N., Mac Cann C., Matthews G., Minsky J., Naemi B. & Schulze R., (2013). in press. Multimedia assessment of emotional abilities. Development and validation. *Educational Testing Service Research Report*. No. RR-13. Princeton N. J. Educational testing service.