The purpose of this study was to examine whether self-awareness of managers (defined as agreement between self and other leadership ratings) would moderate relationships between (a) aspects of emotional intelligence and transformational leadership behavior, and (b) transformational leadership behavior and managerial performance. Multisource data were collected from 63 managers (who responded about their emotional intelligence and transformational leadership behavior), 192 subordinates (who rated their manager’s transformational leadership behavior and performance outcomes), and 63 superiors of focal managers (who rated managerial performance). Results indicated that correlations between emotional intelligence aspects, leader behavior, and performance varied as a function of self-awareness of managers. The practical implications of these findings are discussed.
may underlie a manager’s exhibition of transformational leadership (see Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978), which involves a strong emotional relationship between the leader and follower. Several reviews (e.g., Bass, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1997) and meta-analyses (Gaspar, 1992; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Patterson, Fuller, Kester, & Stringer, 1995) have identified transformational leadership as a particularly powerful source of effective leadership in a variety of organizational contexts.

Several writers (e.g., Bennis, 1989; Megerian & Sosik, 1996) have argued that one aspect of EQ, self-awareness, is integral to transformational leadership effectiveness. Prior studies (Atwater & Yammarino, 1992; Yammarino & Atwater, 1997) indicate that managers who are highly self-aware compare their leadership behaviors against the information they receive from others (e.g., followers) about their behaviors. Atwater and Yammarino (1992) found that the extent to which U.S. Naval Academy students are self-aware (i.e., in agreement with others concerning leadership perceptions) moderates relationships between transformational leadership and performance. Two key questions, however, are (a) what aspects of EQ differentiate those leaders who are in agreement with others concerning their transformational leadership qualities from those who are not in agreement, and (b) how do nonmilitary leaders who are in agreement with others regarding their transformational leadership qualities differ in terms of performance from those who are not in agreement? Given that the quality of leader choices and development has long-term effects on organizations (Gatewood & Field, 1994), answers to these questions may provide managers with important selection criteria and performance assessment guidelines necessary in all organizations. This study addresses these issues by examining relationships between aspects of EQ as predictors of transformational leadership, and transformational leadership and managerial performance for managers who underestimate, overestimate, and are in agreement with subordinates regarding their transformational behaviors.

The present study extends prior work in three ways. First, it examines relationships between aspects of EQ, self-other agreement on transformational leadership, and managerial performance that have been conceptualized but not yet empirically investigated. Second, the present study is conducted in a nonmilitary (i.e., business) environment. Atwater and Yammarino (1992) explored self-other agreement on transformational leadership in a military setting. The present study’s examination of this issue using a nonmilitary sample is essential for potentially extending the generalizability of Atwater and Yammarino’s (1992) results to business contexts. Third, Atwater and Yammarino (1992) used self-other rating agreement as a proxy measure of

**THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT**

Atwater and Yammarino’s (1997) model of self-other rating agreement provided the theoretical framework for the present study. Briefly, the authors proposed that individual and personality characteristics (e.g., aspects of EQ) influence self-other rating comparisons (e.g., perception of transformational leadership), which in turn influence performance outcomes (e.g., managerial performance). While results of several studies (e.g., Atwater & Yammarino, 1992; Atwater, Rousch, & Fischthal, 1995) have supported this model’s general line of reasoning, prior research has ignored the role of leader EQ in self-other rating comparisons of transformational leadership behavior.

Goleman’s (1995) review of the EQ literature (e.g., Greenspan, 1989; Mayer, DiPaolo, & Salovey, 1990; Mayer & Salovey, 1995; Salovey, Hsee, & Mayer, 1993; Salovey & Mayer, 1990) identified self-awareness, emotional management, self-motivation, empathy, and relationship management as key aspects of EQ. Self-awareness, one’s ability to self-observe, results from dispositional attributes such as purpose-in-life (PIL) (Frankl, 1992), private self-consciousness (attention to one’s inner thoughts and feelings), and public self-consciousness (general awareness of the self as a social object; Fenigstein et al., 1975). Emotional management involves self-monitoring, in other words, the regulation of expressive behavior guided by situational cues to social appropriateness (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Snyder, 1974). Self-motivation stems from optimism and the belief that one has the ability to influence events and consequences in his or her life (Paulhus, 1983). Empathy is the ability to recognize and respond to changes in the emotional states of others through sensitivity, social self-confidence, and even-temperedness (Hogan, 1969; Salovey & Sluyter, 1997). Relationship management refers to a predisposition toward effectively handling interpersonal relationships (Salovey & Sluyter, 1997).

Mayer and Salovey (1995) argued that EQ is based on the assumptions that individuals should forgo short-term benefits for long-term benefits, strive for proindividual and prosocial emotions, and treat individuals as unique human beings. These underlying assumptions of EQ have been
theoretically linked to transformational leadership behavior (Bass, 1990; Bennis, 1989; Megerian & Sosik, 1996). In developing followers to higher levels of personal and professional development, transformational leaders display four behaviors: (a) idealized influence (charisma), demonstrating high standards of conduct, self-sacrifice, determination, and far-sightedness; (b) inspirational motivation, providing meaning and challenge to follower work through prosocial collective action; (c) intellectual stimulation, promoting innovation and creativity by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways; and (d) individualized consideration, developing followers through individuation and mentoring. In addition, charisma may be attributed to leaders by followers (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Leaders who possess aspects of EQ are likely to exhibit transformational behaviors for several reasons. First, to the extent that a leader is self-aware, he or she may demonstrate determination, farsightedness, and strong convictions in his or her beliefs (Bennis, 1989). A leader who possesses the emotional management aspect of EQ considers the needs of others over his or her personal needs (Goleman, 1995). Self-awareness, self-sacrifice, and self-control are required for self-other rating agreement (Yammarino & Atwater, 1997) and idealized influence behaviors and attributions (Bass, 1998). Second, given that self-awareness is a function of PIL (Frankl, 1992), a leader who is self-aware may possess a greater than average sense of purpose and meaning. A leader who possesses the emotional management aspect of EQ uses emotionally expressive language and non-verbal cues associated with transformational/charismatic leaders (Salovey et al., 1993). By providing followers with purpose and meaning, delivered in an emotionally expressive manner, leaders may inspirationally motivate followers to perform beyond expectations (Shamir, 1991). Third, emotional management and relationship management may promote positive affect in followers, resulting in broader levels of thinking and enhanced capacity for self-learning (Greenspan, 1989). Indeed, a good mood may facilitate a leader’s intellectually stimulating behaviors aimed at solving old problems in nontraditional ways. Fourth, empathy may be required for transformational leaders who display individually considerate behaviors to foster individuation, mentoring, and development of followers (Bass, 1998).

In terms of self-other rating comparisons of transformational leadership behaviors, individuals may be categorized as (a) overestimators, those who produce self-ratings that are significantly higher than other ratings on dimensions of interest; (b) underestimators, those who produce self-ratings that are significantly lower than other ratings on dimensions of interest; and (c) those...
in agreement, who produce ratings similar to other ratings on dimensions of interest (Ashford, 1989; Atwater & Yammarino, 1992).

ASPECTS OF EQ AND RATINGS OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Several aspects of EQ have been identified by Atwater and Yammarino (1997) as individual and personality characteristics associated with individuals whose self-other ratings are in agreement. For example, in agreement individuals are likely to possess internal locus of control, interpersonal orientation, and high levels of private self-consciousness, PIL, and self-esteem (Atwater & Yammarino, 1997). Internal locus of control parallels the self-motivation aspect of EQ (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Both concepts involve personal efficacy, the belief that one can heavily influence events and consequences in his or her life (Paulhus, 1983). Personal efficacy is a key attribute of transformational leaders (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Ross & Offerman, 1997). Followers are unlikely to become attracted to or motivated by a leader who does not believe that he or she can “make things happen.”

Interpersonal orientation parallels the relationship management aspect of EQ. Both concepts involve paying greater attention to interpersonal, as opposed to technical, dimensions when interacting with others (Goleman, 1995). Such an interpersonal orientation may be required for transformational leaders to develop followers into self-leaders, inspire followers to put the group’s interest ahead of self-interests, and get followers to change their goals, aspirations, and ways of thinking.

Private self-consciousness and PIL are dispositional attributes which promote the development of the self-awareness aspect of EQ (Goleman, 1995). Self-aware individuals possess high levels of inner-directed thought (i.e., private self-consciousness) and PIL (Fenigstein et al., 1975; Frankl, 1992; Goleman, 1995). Both innerdirectedness and PIL have been associated with transformational leadership (Burns, 1978; Levit, 1992; Zaleznik, 1974).

Mayer and Geher (1996) found that individuals who were in agreement with their peers and group members were more empathetic than individuals who were not in agreement. Moreover, Burns (1978) argued that “self-esteem and evolution of a sense of human empathy work in harmony to bring out a potential for leadership” (p. 95). Self-esteem is positively correlated with the empathy aspect of EQ (Goleman, 1995) which includes structural components of social self-confidence, sensitivity, and even-temperedness (Hogan, 1969; Johnson, Cheek, & Smither, 1983). Prior research (e.g., Bass, 1990; Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994; Megerian & Sosik, 1996; Yukl, 1994)
has linked these dispositional attributes to transformational leadership. Based on these arguments, we predict the following:

_Hypothesis 1a:_ Self-awareness (as measured by private self-consciousness and PIL), self-motivation (as measured by personal efficacy), relationship management (as measured by interpersonal control), and empathy (as measured by social self-confidence, even-temperedness, and sensitivity) will be positively related to transformational leadership for those managers who are in agreement.

Atwater and Yammarino (1997) also identified two aspects of EQ as individual and personality characteristics associated with overestimators. Specifically, they argued that overestimators are likely to possess high levels of public self-consciousness and score high on self-monitoring. Public self-consciousness parallels the outer-directedness component of self-awareness (Goleman, 1995). Both concepts involve a general awareness of the self as a social object that has an effect on others (Fenigstein et al., 1975). Given that self-monitoring involves regulation of expressive behavior guided by situational cues to social appropriateness (Snyder, 1974), self-monitoring parallels the emotional management aspect of EQ (Goleman, 1995). Individuals who possess high levels of self-monitoring are associated with inflated self-ratings (Tunnell, 1980).

When influencing and motivating followers, transformational leaders often employ self-presentation tactics facilitated by self-monitoring ability (Bass, 1998; Bennis, 1989; Gardner & Avolio, 1998). In their interactions with followers, transformational leaders provide a social stimulus for the motivation of collective action by followers (Shamir, 1991). Given that public self-consciousness has to do with seeing oneself as a social object that has an effect on others, public self-consciousness may be required for the construction of charismatic images by transformational leaders. Individuals who possess high levels of public self-consciousness are also associated with inflated self-ratings (Atwater & Yammarino, 1997). With these points in mind, the above arguments suggest the following:

_Hypothesis 1b:_ Self-awareness (as measured by public self-consciousness) and emotional management (as measured by self-monitoring) will be positively related to transformational leadership for those managers who are overestimators.

Yammarino and Atwater (1997) argued that underestimators misdiagnose their strengths and weaknesses, may be overly modest, have emotional highs and low, and display low self-worth. Misdiagnosis of strengths and
weaknesses is inconsistent with both the self-awareness aspect of EQ and the generally stable self-schemata associated with transformational leaders (Bennis, 1989; Shamir, 1991). Acute modesty and low self-worth are also inconsistent with personal efficacy common to both the self-motivation aspect of EQ and the confidence and dominance associated with transformational leaders (Ross & Offerman, 1997). Emotional instability is inconsistent with even-temperedness found in the structure of empathy (Hogan, 1969; Johnson et al., 1983) and associated with transformational leaders (Bass, 1998). As such, we expected aspects of EQ to be unrelated to transformational leadership ratings of underestimators. Thus,

_Hypothesis 1c:_ Self-awareness (as measured by private self-consciousness, public self-consciousness, and PIL), emotional management (as measured by self-monitoring), self-motivation (as measured by personal efficacy), relationship management (as measured by interpersonal control), and empathy (as measured by social self-confidence, even-temperedness, and sensitivity) will be unrelated to transformational leadership for those managers who are underestimators.

**RATINGS OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGERIAL PERFORMANCE**

Yammarino and Atwater (1997) argued that those managers who are in agreement are the best performers. In fact, Atwater and Yammarino (1992) found that correlations between transformational leadership behavior and performance were highest for leaders who were in agreement with reports of others. However, Atwater et al. (1995) found underestimators to be rated highest by their followers. According to Yammarino and Atwater, underestimators are associated with mixed performance results and it is difficult to predict performance outcomes resulting from underestimation. In contrast, overestimators are associated with poor performance. Overestimators may ignore negative or critical information necessary for self-development, and do not see the need for their behavior to change (Atwater & Yammarino, 1997). Based on this work, we propose the following hypotheses and research question:

_Hypothesis 2a:_ Transformational leader behavior will be positively related to performance for those managers who are in agreement.

_Hypothesis 2b:_ Transformational leader behavior will be negatively related to performance for those managers who are overestimators.

_Research Question 1:_ What is the relationship between transformational leader behavior and performance for those managers who are underestimators?
METHOD

SAMPLE AND PROCEDURES

Ninety-eight managers and 294 subordinates in a business unit of a large U.S.-based information services and technology (IT) firm were surveyed. Data were collected through self-administered questionnaires, which were mailed to participants via company mail, anonymously completed by participants, and returned directly to the researchers. Accompanying each questionnaire package were cover letters from the host organization’s vice president and managing business partner and the researchers, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Reminder notices were sent to participants via electronic mail 8 weeks after the questionnaires were distributed.

A total of 255 useable questionnaires were obtained for a response rate of 65%. Of this total, 192 were subordinates (who responded about their supervisor’s transformational leadership qualities and performance outcomes) and 63 were managers (who responded about their personal characteristics and transformational leadership qualities). This data was used to assess EQ predictor/leader behavior and leader behavior/performance relationships. Three subordinates rated each manager. Six months later, each manager was rated on performance effectiveness by his or her superior. This data was used to assess leader behavior/performance relationships. Managers ranged in age from 32 to 63, with the average age being 46. They had worked, on average, 5 years in their current position and had a range of job tenure of 1 to 31 years. Of these managers, 80% had at least a bachelor’s degree, 85% were male, and the vast majority (98%) were white.

MEASURES

Predictors. Nine measures of EQ considered relevant to predicting transformational leadership were obtained for each self-rater. These measures included three measures of self-awareness (private self-consciousness, public self-consciousness, and PIL), one measure of emotional management (self-monitoring), one measure of self-motivation (personal efficacy), one measure of relationship management (interpersonal control), and three measures of empathy (social self-confidence, even-temperedness, and sensitivity). The inclusion of these EQ measures was based on past leadership research (e.g., Bass, 1990; Hogan et al., 1994; Megerian & Sosik, 1996).

Private self-consciousness was measured using Fenigstein and colleagues’ (1975) 10-item Private Self-Consciousness scale (e.g., ‘I’m
constantly examining my motives,” (α = .71). Public self-consciousness was measured using Fenigstein and colleagues’ seven-item Public Self-Consciousness scale (e.g., “I’m usually aware of my appearance,” (α = .76). Both the private and public self-consciousness scale items were rated on a scale of 0 (extremely uncharacteristic) to 4 (extremely characteristic).

PIL was measured using Crumbaugh’s (1968) 20-item Purpose-In-Life test based on the work of Frankl (1992). For example, a sample item reads, “I have discovered . . .” with the respondent choosing among a scale of 1 (no mission or purpose in life) to 7 (clear-cut goals and a satisfying life purpose; α = .84). Managers rated themselves on these items using a 7-point scale unique to each item (see Crumbaugh, 1968).

Self-monitoring was measured using Snyder’s (1974) Self-Monitoring scale (e.g., “I would probably make a good actor,” Kuder-Richardson 20 reliability coefficient = .72). Managers rated themselves on the 25 self-monitoring items using a dichotomous true or false scale.

Personal efficacy was measured using a 10-item scale developed by Paulhus (1983; e.g., “When I make plans I am almost certain to make them work,” α = .66). Interpersonal control also was measured using a 10-item scale developed by Paulhus (e.g., “I find it easy to play an important part in most group situations,” α = .61). Both the personal efficacy and interpersonal control scale items were rated on a scale of 1 (disagree) to 7 (agree).

Social self-confidence was measured using a 3-item scale adapted from Hogan (1969; e.g., “I like to talk before groups of people,” α = .71). Even-temperedness was measured using a 5-item scale developed by Johnson and colleagues (1983) based on Hogan’s previous work (e.g., “I am usually calm and not easily upset,” α = .78). Sensitivity was measured using a 5-item scale developed by Johnson and colleagues also based on Hogan’s work (e.g., “I have seen some things so sad that I almost felt like crying,” α = .71). The social self-confidence, even-temperedness, and sensitivity scale items were rated on a scale of 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

Leadership behavior. Two forms of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ–Form 5X; Bass & Avolio, 1997) were used to assess the transformational leadership behavior of the managers. Previous versions of the MLQ have been criticized for their failure to empirically generate the factor structure proposed by Bass and Avolio (1994) to underlie transformational leadership (e.g., Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Yukl, 1994). However, the MLQ-5X has been shown to be a psychometrically sound instrument (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1997; Bass, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1997). Managers completed the self-rating form of the MLQ-5X, and three subordinates of each
The manager completed the other-rating form. The questionnaires used in the present study contained 20 items that measured transformational leadership. Items on all forms were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always).

Transformational leadership is comprised of five components: inspirational motivation, idealized influence-behaviors, idealized influence-attributes, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1997). Four items measure each component. Sample items from each subscale (other form) include the following: (a) Inspirational Motivation, “Articulates a compelling vision of the future”; (b) Idealized Influence–Behaviors, “Talks about their most important values and beliefs”; (c) Idealized Influence–Attributes, “Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her”; (d) Intellectual Stimulation, “Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate”; and (e) Individualized Consideration, “Spends time teaching and coaching.”

Because of high intercorrelations (ranging from .70 to .85) among the subscales, we followed prior research (e.g., Atwater & Yammarino, 1992; Dubinsky, Yammarino, & Jolson, 1995) and considered transformational leadership as one 20-item scale. Scores (self-report $\alpha = .80$ and rater $\alpha = .94$) were computed by averaging participants’ responses to the 20 items composing the five subscales. Scores for subordinates reporting to each leader were averaged (i.e., aggregated) into one subordinate rating for each leader.

To evaluate the appropriateness of aggregation of scores for focal leaders, two tests were performed. First, $r_{wg}$ within-group agreement indexes (James, Demaree, & Wolfe, 1984) were run for each group (i.e., focal leader) on each of the transformational leadership dimension scales. Results indicated that the following percentages of groups had $r_{wg}$ index scores of greater than .7: for inspirational motivation, 98%; for idealized influence-behaviors, 95%; for idealized influence-attributes, 97%; and for both intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration, 100%. In addition, for each transformational leadership dimension, a one-way ANOVA was employed to compare within-group variance and between-group variance. ANOVA results indicated highly significant between-group variance. Results of Levene’s (1960) test indicated that for idealized influence-behavior ($1.90, p < .005$), idealized influence-attributes ($2.31, p < .001$), inspirational motivation ($2.71, p < .001$), intellectual stimulation ($2.58, p < .001$), and individualized consideration ($2.38, p < .001$) within-group variances were homogeneous while variances across groups were significantly different. Based on the Levene tests and the $r_{wg}$ index scores, it was concluded that aggregation was appropriate.
Outcome measures. Four outcome measures considered to be consequences of transformational leadership were obtained for each self-rater (i.e., focal leader). These measures included performance effectiveness as rated by the focal leaders’ superiors and subordinates, and extra effort and satisfaction of subordinates. The inclusion of these outcome measures was based on past leadership research (e.g., Bass, 1990, 1998; Yukl, 1994).

Performance data were collected 6 months subsequent to administration of the questionnaires. This information was provided by the various superiors of the focal leaders and was made available to the researchers in composite scores. Superiors evaluated respective focal leaders on 14 dimensions of managerial practices (Yukl, 1994) on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all effective) to 7 (extremely effective). The evaluation assesses 14 managerial practices such as motivating and inspiring, planning and organizing, and problem solving (see Yukl, 1994). An average score of the 14 dimensions of managerial practices for each focal leader was computed, summarized on a form, and provided by the host organization’s vice president and managing business partner to the researchers.

In addition, leader performance effectiveness was assessed from the perspective of the subordinates. Effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction were measured using scales from the MLQ-5X (other form). Effectiveness was measured using a 4-item scale (e.g., “Is effective in meeting organizational requirements,” α = .83). Extra effort was measured using a 3-item scale (e.g., “Gets me to do more than I expected to do,” α = .87). Satisfaction was measured using a 2-item scale (e.g., “Works with me in a satisfactory way;” α = .88). Subordinates rated effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction scale items on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always). Scores for subordinates reporting to each leader were averaged (i.e., aggregated) into one subordinate rating for each leader.

To evaluate the appropriateness of aggregation of scores for focal leaders, two tests were performed. First, r_wg within-group agreement indexes (James et al., 1984) were run for each group (i.e., focal leader) on each of the leader outcome measures rated by subordinates. Results indicated that the following percentages of groups had r_wg index scores of greater than .7: for effectiveness, 95%; for extra effort, 92%; and for satisfaction, 91%. In addition, for each leader outcome measure rated by subordinates, a one-way ANOVA was employed to compare within-group variance and between-group variance. ANOVA results indicated highly significant between-group variance. Results of Levene’s (1960) test indicated that for effectiveness (3.17, p < .001), extra effort (2.86, p < .001), and satisfaction (4.47, p < .001) within-group variances were homogeneous while variances across groups were
significantly different. Based on the Levene tests and the $r_{wg}$ index scores, it was concluded that aggregation was appropriate.

Category of agreement. We followed a procedure developed by Atwater and Yammarino (1992) in which self-raters are categorized into one of three agreement groups relative to the ratings of subordinates. The difference between the self and subordinate ratings of transformational leadership was computed and then each focal leader’s difference score was compared to the mean difference score. Specifically, leaders whose difference scores were one-half standard deviation or more above the mean difference were categorized as overestimators. Leaders whose difference scores were one-half standard deviation or more below the mean difference were categorized as underestimators. When leaders’ difference scores were within one-half standard deviation of the mean difference, those leaders were categorized as being in agreement.

RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, and intercorrelations for the predictor, leadership, and performance variables for the overall sample are presented in Table 1. Means and standard deviations for these variables in self versus other agreement groups are presented in Table 2.

Several significant mean differences using Tukey’s HSD test are shown in Table 2. First, both the mean public self-consciousness and PIL scores for overestimators were significantly greater than those for underestimators. Second, subordinate ratings of transformational leadership for underestimators were significantly greater than those in agreement, which in turn were significantly greater than those for overestimators. Moreover, self-ratings of transformational leadership for both overestimators and those in agreement were significantly greater than those for underestimators. These results are similar to those in Atwater and Yammarino (1992), and suggest that differences in the category assignments resulted from both self- and other (subordinate) evaluations. Third, each of the effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction mean scores for overestimators was significantly lower than those for both underestimators and those in agreement.

The significant correlations in Table 3 illustrate the ways in which agreement between self- and other ratings affect correlations between EQ predictors and leadership ratings. For those in agreement, four of the seven proposed EQ predictors (PIL, personal efficacy, interpersonal control, social (text continues on p. 382)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Private self-consciousness</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public self-consciousness</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Purpose-in-life</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-monitoring</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal efficacy</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interpersonal control</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social self-confidence</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Even-temperredness</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sensitivity</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TFL (self-rating)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TFL (other-rating)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Performance appraisal</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(superior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Effectiveness (subordinate)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Extra effort (subordinate)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>—-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Satisfaction (subordinate)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>—-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: n = 63 managers. TFL = transformational leadership; NA = not applicable. Significant correlations (p < .05) are italicized.
TABLE 2
Means and Standard Deviations for EQ Predictor,
Transformational Leadership, and Performance Variables
in Self Versus Other Agreement Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overall subratings (n = 63)</th>
<th>(a) Agreement (n = 29)</th>
<th>(b) Underestimator (n = 16)</th>
<th>(c) Overestimator (n = 18)</th>
<th>Significant Mean Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private self-consciousness</td>
<td>1.35 (.73)</td>
<td>1.26 (.75)</td>
<td>1.45 (.73)</td>
<td>1.41 (.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public self-consciousness</td>
<td>2.37 (.66)</td>
<td>2.36 (.65)</td>
<td>2.12 (.48)</td>
<td>2.61 (.73)</td>
<td>b &lt; c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose-in-life</td>
<td>11.86 (.53)</td>
<td>11.84 (.51)</td>
<td>11.47 (.61)</td>
<td>12.29 (.42)</td>
<td>b &lt; c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>11.16 (4.35)</td>
<td>10.79 (4.07)</td>
<td>12.13 (3.79)</td>
<td>10.89 (5.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal efficacy</td>
<td>5.79 (.52)</td>
<td>5.70 (.44)</td>
<td>5.74 (.55)</td>
<td>5.96 (.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal control</td>
<td>5.65 (.51)</td>
<td>5.75 (.52)</td>
<td>5.48 (.48)</td>
<td>5.64 (.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self-confidence</td>
<td>3.13 (.60)</td>
<td>3.14 (.66)</td>
<td>3.04 (.62)</td>
<td>3.20 (.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even-temperedness</td>
<td>2.84 (.70)</td>
<td>2.93 (.79)</td>
<td>2.58 (.47)</td>
<td>2.92 (.68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>2.31 (.64)</td>
<td>2.32 (.61)</td>
<td>2.36 (.58)</td>
<td>2.27 (.75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>2.96 (.43)</td>
<td>3.01 (.31)</td>
<td>3.36 (.18)</td>
<td>2.53 (.37)</td>
<td>c &lt; a &lt; b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ratings</td>
<td>3.24 (.36)</td>
<td>3.30 (.35)</td>
<td>2.97 (.33)</td>
<td>3.38 (.25)</td>
<td>b &lt; a, b &lt; c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal (rated by superior)</td>
<td>5.19 (1.01)</td>
<td>5.03 (1.05)</td>
<td>5.06 (1.12)</td>
<td>5.56 (.78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness (rated by subordinate)</td>
<td>3.14 (.55)</td>
<td>3.23 (.60)</td>
<td>3.42 (.28)</td>
<td>2.75 (.45)</td>
<td>c &lt; b, c &lt; a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra effort (rated by subordinate)</td>
<td>2.93 (.63)</td>
<td>3.03 (.68)</td>
<td>3.20 (.32)</td>
<td>2.50 (.54)</td>
<td>c &lt; b, c &lt; a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (rated by subordinate)</td>
<td>3.14 (.69)</td>
<td>3.29 (.68)</td>
<td>3.52 (.33)</td>
<td>2.56 (.57)</td>
<td>c &lt; b, c &lt; a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: EQ = emotional intelligence.

a. Means and standard deviations for all focal leaders.
b. Means and standard deviations for leaders whose self-ratings were within ½ standard deviation of averaged subordinate ratings.
c. Means and standard deviations for leaders whose self-ratings were ½ standard deviation below averaged subordinate ratings.
d. Means and standard deviations for leaders whose self-ratings were ½ standard deviation above averaged subordinate ratings.
e. Means are significantly different using Tukey’s HSD test, p < .05.
TABLE 3
Correlations Between EQ Predictors and Transformational Leadership for Leaders in Self Versus Other Agreement Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Overall Subratingsa (n = 63)</th>
<th>Subordinate Ratings</th>
<th>Self-Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Agreementb (n = 29)</td>
<td>Underestimatore (n = 16)</td>
<td>Overestimator (n = 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private self-consciousness</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public self-consciousness</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose-in-life</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal efficacy</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal control</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self-confidence</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even-tempereness</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: EQ = emotional intelligence.

a. Averaged ratings of leadership for all focal leaders.
b. Averaged ratings of leadership for leaders whose self-ratings were within ½ standard deviation of averaged other ratings.
c. Averaged ratings of leadership for leaders whose self-ratings were ½ standard deviation below averaged other ratings.
d. Averaged ratings of leadership for leaders whose self-ratings were ½ standard deviation above averaged other ratings.

*p < .10. **p < .05. ***p < .01.
self-confidence) were significantly related to both subordinate and self-ratings of transactional leadership. However, even-temperedness was negatively related to self-ratings of transformational leadership for those in agreement. Thus, Hypothesis 1a received partial support.

Hypothesis 1b, which predicted that both public self-consciousness and self-monitoring would be positively related to ratings of transformational leadership for overestimators, was not supported. In fact, Table 3 indicates negative trends (albeit non-significant correlations, \( p < .19 \)) for these relationships for both subordinate and self-ratings.

Hypothesis 1c, which predicted that EQ predictors of leadership would be unrelated to ratings of transformational leadership for underestimators, was supported for all measures of EQ except social self-confidence and PIL. Social self-confidence was significantly and positively related to both subordinate and self-ratings of transformational leadership for underestimators. PIL was significantly and positively related to self-ratings of transformational leadership for underestimators.

### TABLE 4

Correlations Between Performance Variables and Transformational Leadership for Leaders in Self Versus Other Agreement Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Subordinate Ratings of Transformational Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Subratings(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(superior)</td>
<td>–.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(subordinate)</td>
<td>.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(subordinate)</td>
<td>.77***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(subordinate)</td>
<td>.75***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Subordinate ratings of leadership for all focal leaders.
b. Subordinate ratings of leadership for leaders whose self-ratings were within ½ standard deviation of averaged subordinate ratings.
c. Subordinate ratings of leadership for leaders whose self-ratings were ½ standard deviation below averaged subordinate ratings.
d. Subordinate ratings of leadership for leaders whose self-ratings were ½ standard deviation above averaged subordinate ratings.

\*\( p < .10 \), \**\( p < .05 \), \***\( p < .01 \).
With respect to the correlations between the performance variables and leadership ratings presented in Table 4, Hypothesis 2a is fully supported. Specifically, for those in agreement, significant positive relationships between subordinate ratings of transformational leadership and each performance outcome measure occur. Hypothesis 2b was not supported. While subordinate ratings of overestimators’ transformational leadership and superior performance appraisal ratings were not related, positive relationships between subordinate ratings of transformational leadership and subordinate ratings of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness did occur. For underestimators, significant positive relationships between subordinate ratings of transformational leadership and subordinate ratings of extra effort and satisfaction occur. However, a significant negative relationship between subordinate ratings of transformational leadership and performance appraisal (rated by superior) occurs for underestimators.

To test for significant differences between the parallel correlations presented in Tables 3 and 4, the correlations were transformed from $r$ to $Z$, and then tested for significant differences (Myers & Well, 1991). Results revealed that the correlation between leader public self-consciousness and subordinate ratings of transformational leadership for managers in agreement ($r = .33$) was significantly different ($p < .05$) than that for overestimators ($r = -.37$). Similarly, the correlation between leader self-monitoring and subordinate ratings of transformational leadership for those in agreement ($r = .29$) was significantly different ($p < .05$) than that for overestimators ($r = -.43$). In addition, the correlation between leader social self-confidence and subordinate ratings of transformational leadership for overestimators ($r = -.18$) was significantly different ($p < .05$) than correlations for those in agreement ($r = .45$) and for underestimators ($r = .63$). Moreover, the correlation between leader sensitivity and subordinate ratings of transformational leadership for those in agreement ($r = .25$) was significantly different ($p < .05$) than that for overestimators ($r = -.57$). Finally, the correlation between superior performance appraisal ratings and subordinate ratings of transformational leadership for underestimators ($r = -.62$) was significantly different ($p < .05$) than correlations for those in agreement ($r = .39$) and for overestimators ($r = .16$). There were no other significant differences between independent correlations.

**DISCUSSION**

The results of this study lead to several conclusions. First, correlations between EQ predictors of leadership and leadership behavior differed based on categorizations of self-awareness (defined as self-other agreement) of
focal leaders. For those leaders categorized as self-aware, subordinate ratings of transformational leadership behavior were positively related to PIL, personal efficacy, interpersonal control, and social self-confidence. For those leaders categorized as underestimators, subordinate ratings of transformational leadership behavior were positively related to social self-confidence. For those leaders categorized as overestimators, subordinate ratings of transformational leadership behavior were negatively related to sensitivity. This pattern of results provides empirical support for theoretical considerations of EQ (e.g., Cooper, 1997; Goleman, 1995; Salovey & Sluyter, 1997) which propose that self-awareness is the foundation upon which other aspects of EQ are based. Results of the present study suggest that self-awareness may provide individuals with greater perceived control over interpersonal events and consequences in their life. This pattern of results also supports prior research (e.g., Bass, 1985; Hogan et al., 1994; Megearian & Sosik, 1996) that suggests that transformational leaders who are self-aware possess high levels of self-confidence and self-efficacy, and provide orientation for followers. These results suggest that the association of transformational leadership and possession of these aspects of EQ may depend upon being realistic about how one is seen by one’s followers.

The pattern of EQ predictor/leader behavior relationships is noteworthy. The presence of significant positive relationships between subordinate ratings of transformational leadership behavior and PIL, personal efficacy, and interpersonal control emerged in the presence of leader self-awareness. Mayer and Geher (1996) noted that the self-awareness aspect of EQ allows individuals to connect emotions, thoughts, and actions. Results of the present study suggest that self-awareness may support a leader’s translation of purpose and meaning in life into invigorating challenges for followers. Such translation of thoughts into actions may enhance ratings of transformational leadership by followers. In addition, self-awareness may help leaders to better “hear” the emotional implications of their own thoughts and the feelings of others (Mayer & Geher, 1996). Such an emotional understanding of one’s own and others’ feelings is a central aspect of the motivational mechanism of transformational leadership (Bass, 1998; Ross & Offerman, 1997; Shamir, 1991) and promotes a sense of personal control and efficacy (Salovey & Sluyter, 1997). Thus, it is possible that self-awareness may support a leader’s ability to translate interpersonal control and personal efficacy into ratings of transformational leadership by followers.

Second, correlations between subordinate ratings of transformational leadership and performance outcomes differed based upon categorizations of focal leaders. For those leaders categorized as self-aware, ratings of focal leader performance by both superiors (in terms of managerial
effectiveness) and subordinates (in terms of effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction) were positively related to subordinate ratings of transformational leadership behavior. These results parallel similar findings reported in Atwater and Yammarino (1992), who measured performance in terms of performance evaluation, recommended early promotion, and recent promotion recommendations. These results suggest that transformational leaders who are in agreement with their subordinates regarding their transformational leadership behavior may be perceived in a positive light by both their superiors and subordinates.

With respect to leaders categorized as overestimators, study findings were not in the direction anticipated. While superior appraisals of focal leader performance were unrelated to subordinate ratings of transformational leadership, subordinate ratings of focal leader performance were positively related to subordinate ratings of transformational leadership behavior. A potential explanation for this pattern of results concerns common method variance, given that both transformational leadership and performance outcomes (extra effort, satisfaction, effectiveness) were rated by subordinates. Future research should explore these relationships using independent data sources.

An interesting finding concerned leaders categorized as underestimators. For these leaders, superior appraisals of focal leader performance were negatively related to subordinate ratings of transformational leadership. Yet, subordinate ratings of focal leader performance in terms of extra effort and satisfaction were positively related to subordinate ratings of transformational leadership. These mixed results provide support for Yammarino and Atwater (1997) who argued that underestimators may not be perceived as effective performers, yet may be pleasant to be around. This may be due to the fact that effectiveness represents a performance outcome, while both extra effort and satisfaction represent leader influences on follower motivation and emotional states (Bass, 1985).

An examination of the means for EQ predictors, transformational leadership, and performance variables shown in Table 2 sheds some light on the mixed results concerning performance of underestimators. Specifically, the mean self-rating transformational leadership score for underestimators (2.97) was significantly lower than that for self-aware leaders (3.30) and overestimators (3.38). However, the mean subordinate rating transformational leadership score for underestimators (3.36) was significantly greater than that for self-aware leaders (3.01), which in turn was significantly greater than that for overestimators (2.53). This pattern of results is consistent with both Van Velsor, Taylor and Leslie (1992) and Atwater et al. (1995) who found those leaders who rated themselves lowest were rated highest by followers. As noted by Atwater and Yammarino (1997), underestimation
“appears to reflect modesty and is not accompanied by lower performance” (p. 163). In fact, results summarized in Table 2 indicate that the mean subordinate ratings of focal leader performance for underestimators were significantly greater than those for overestimators. Thus, from the perspective of subordinates, underestimators may be perceived as performing as well as self-aware leaders and better than overestimators. Yet, the trend of mean performance appraisal scores shown in Table 2 suggests that superiors of focal leaders favor overestimators (mean = 5.56), rather than underestimators (mean = 5.06).

One possible explanation for the lack of congruency between superior and subordinate ratings of performance for underestimators concerns public self-consciousness. An inspection of Table 2 reveals that overestimators possess significantly higher levels of public self-consciousness than underestimators. Public self-consciousness involves individuals “worrying about others’ opinions and the impression they are making on others” (Atwater & Yammarino, 1997, p. 137). Public self-consciousness may be directed toward maintaining behaviors consistent with established norms in order to make favorable impressions on key individuals (e.g., supervisors). Such a focus may leave little room for paying attention to the concerns of subordinates (Schneider, 1983). In fact, interviews with three senior executives in the host organization revealed that managers who “play the game,” according to established norms, are looked upon favorably by superiors in performance evaluations and promotion considerations. However, those interviews also revealed that “fast-track” candidates and the “darlings of senior management” are often seen as self-serving, duplicitous, and uncaring by their subordinates. Thus, public self-consciousness may be useful for managers who wish to maximize their performance appraisal ratings by superiors. At the same time, possession of public self-consciousness does not guarantee high ratings of transformational leadership and effectiveness by one’s subordinates.

Results of the present study suggest implications for managers. For example, with increased use of 360-degree feedback assessment comes a need to understand what dispositional attributes and leadership behaviors are associated with managerial effectiveness. Study results indicate that managers who maintain self-awareness (self-other rating agreement) possess more aspects of EQ and are rated as more effective by both superiors and subordinates than those who are not self-aware. Thus, aspects of EQ identified in the present study as being associated with self-aware leadership (PIL, personal efficacy, interpersonal control, social self-confidence) may provide human resource managers with selection criteria for identifying potentially effective management candidates.
In addition, given the encouraging results concerning self-awareness as a key aspect of both EQ and effective performance, organizations should promote training programs regarding aspects of EQ (especially self-awareness), transformational leadership, and performance. Such training programs can address issues relevant to the human resource function including enhancement of capacity of team members to learn shared leadership skills on the job (Cooper, 1997), provide new sets of emotion-based skills to improve self-learning (Greenspan, 1989), develop leaders as mentors and transformers of organizational culture (Harrison, 1997), and assess and develop emotional competencies of organizational members (Salovey & Sluyter, 1997).

A related practical implication concerns the finding that correlations between EQ aspects, leader behavior, and performance varied as a function of self-other agreement. As such, leadership trainers and consultants may consider using self-other agreement categories (i.e., in agreement, overestimator, underestimator) to deliver EQ aspect and performance feedback to participants or clients. Moreover, trainers and consultants may consider modifying 360-degree feedback instruments and reports to reflect categories of self-other agreement.

This study has some limitations that may impede the generalizability of the findings. These include the unique context of the field study (bureaucratic IT firm), a small homogeneous sample (n = 63 primarily white male managers from an individualistic culture), and a cross-sectional research design which precludes any cause-and-effect managerial prescriptions from being made. Despite these limitations, the present study makes several noteworthy contributions. First, the results, based upon a nonmilitary sample, corroborate those found in Atwater and Yammarino’s (1992) research using a military sample. Second, this study helps to refine the leadership literature by explaining influences of several aspects of EQ on leader effectiveness. As House, Shane, and Herold (1996) and Schneider (1983) have suggested, “different kinds of behavior in different kinds of situations may be expected from different kinds of people” (House et al., 1996, pp. 212-213). This study has provided some evidence that all transformational leaders may not be equally effective.

Third, the present study raises an important issue concerning the appropriateness of self-other rating agreement as a surrogate measure for self-awareness. Specifically, self-awareness is a psychological state which enables an individual to incorporate information from self-other comparisons into self-evaluations and behavior. According to Fenigstein and colleagues (1975), self-awareness is a function of the dispositional attributes of private and public self-consciousness. If self-other rating agreement is a surrogate measure of self-awareness, it is logical to expect that those leaders categorized as self-aware (i.e., in agreement) would be associated with the
highest levels of private and public self-consciousness. This logical expectation was not confirmed with the present study’s data. Future research should examine the appropriateness of self-other rating agreement as a surrogate measure of self-awareness, paying particular attention to dispositional attributes which underlie the self-awareness construct.

Fourth, this study raises many interesting questions regarding effects of interactions between self-awareness, aspects of EQ, and leadership behaviors on performance evaluation, 360-degree feedback information, manager training and development, and cascading effects of leadership throughout the organization. For example, why are underestimators associated with equivocal results or “mixed reviews,” concerning performance evaluations by superiors and subordinates? Accordingly, the present study provides a foundation for future research to explore the role of leader self-awareness (self-other rating agreement) in moderating relationships between various leadership dispositional attributes and behaviors and managerial performance.
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