Journal of Science and Inclusive Development Vol. 6, No. 1, DOI:10.20372/jsid/2024-263

The effect of Genos emotional intelligence on project leader outcomes: A case of non-governmental organization project leadership in Wolaita Zone, South Ethiopia

Talemos Data and Zinare Mamo

Department of Leadership, Vision International University, California State, USA

Corresponding author e-mail: talemosdata@gmail.com

Received: 13 June 2023; Revised: 08 October 2023; Accepted: 27 March 2024

Abstract

In this study, the impact of Genos Emotional Intelligence dimensions on leadership outcomes was investigated in non-governmental organizations, Wolaita zone. Structured MLQ questionnaires for project leader outcome and Genos Inventory Concise scales for emotional intelligence were used to gather data from 167 project leaders at all levels from a randomly chosen samples in order to evaluate the model. With a statistically significant correlation between the Non-Governmental Organization leadership practices, genos emotional intelligence, and leadership outcome, this study supports a direct and indirect impact of the Genos emotional intelligence scales on the financial performance of organizations ($p < 0.05$). The findings of the regression analysis for seven subscales revealed a significant link ($p < 0.05$) between the NGO leadership aspects of extra effort, effectiveness, staff satisfaction, and emotionally intelligent behavior. Genos emotional subscales explained 16.4% of the variance in overall leadership outcome: 6.1%, 17.7%, and 19.1% of the variance in extra effort, the effectiveness of leadership, and employee satisfaction, respectively. The research suggested that as Genos emotional intelligence practices at all levels of leadership improve in the direction of more effective and transformational leadership, as explained by the spectrum of emotionally intelligent scales, there is an opportunity for positive change in leadership outcomes.

Keywords: Genos Emotional Intelligence, Leadership Outcome, Extra Effort, Leadership Effectiveness, Employee Satisfaction.

Introduction

Leadership is a key element in deciding whether an organization succeeds or fails. Projects implemented in non-governmental organizations (NGOs) fail, despite the use of sophisticated project management methods and tools that facilitate the task of the project manager. The researchers conducted various pieces of research that demonstrated the insufficiency of such tools and procedures to ensure exceptional performance (Northouse, 2023; Mersino, 2022; Zulu,

2015; Wisker and Poulis, 2014; Deborah et al., 2013; Mersino, 2013; Phil et al., 2012; Doug, 2011). The researcher vigorously supports the notion of using emotional intelligence (EI) at work while not discounting the essential parts of the standard project management body of knowledge (PMI, 2017), which are crucial to the project's success (Bukhari and Khanam, 2016; Northouse, 2015; Olannye, 2014; Goleman et al., 2013; Nixon et al., 2012; Mahlet, 2012; Khan et al., 2012; Goleman, 2011; Goleman, 2001).

Concern was expressed by Van Wart (2013) on the apparent paucity of research into the theory relating to nonprofit leadership and performance since 2001, notably in the domain of leadership styles and job-specific emotional intelligence behaviors, i.e., genos emotional intelligence. When a leader fails to comprehend as well as exhibit work-specific emotional intelligence behaviors and the full range leadership styles, the leadership becomes deadly, resulting in employee unhappiness, poor performance, and attrition. Further study on this issue was conducted, and other researchers corroborated it (Masa'deh, 2016; Cserhati and Szabo, 2014; Yang et al., 2014; Doug, 2011). Desalegn et al. (2008) argued that nonprofits' contributions to the national budget occasionally could reach up to 25%, but that the project area's understanding of the effects of work specific emotional intelligence, and their interactions with sociodemographic factors on nonprofit leaders' performance (in terms of extra effort, leadership effectiveness, and satisfaction) is lacking.

However, there some generic EI studies in Ethiopia by Mahlet (2020), Legesse (2018), Tadesse (2017) and Ayele (2015). With the help of general models that emphasize the triple project constraints of time, cost, and stakeholder satisfaction, Mahlet (2020) addresses EI of international organizations. There is, however, no published research that attempts to investigate the impact of typical, work-specific emotional intelligence behaviors on project outcomes of extra efforts, leadership effectiveness, and how satisfied leaders are in the regional organizations functioning at the grassroots level.

The Genos EI Inventory (concise), on the other hand, was created to gauge how frequently an individual believes he/she exhibits emotionally intelligent actions at work. In other words, the EI score reflects how frequently a person engages in a wide range of EI behaviors related to emotion identification (of oneself and others), emotion reasoning, and general emotion management (self, others, and emotional control). Additionally, no research has been done to determine which aspects of EI relevant to a certain workplace best predict leadership success and the research on Genos Emotional Intelligence dimensions has not yet fully developed.

Journal of Science and Inclusive Development Vol. 6, No. 1, DOI:10.20372/jsid/2024-263

Researchers around EI often differentiate between ability-based models of EI, trait-based and mixed-models of EI (Mayer et al., 2000; Petrides and Furnham, 2000). It is believed that ability-based models of EI represent a comparatively homogenous collection of emotionally relevant abilities that are typically seen as measurable by psychometric testing. The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer et al., 2000) is an illustration of an ability-based EI test. Mixed-models of EI are more heterogeneous in nature than ability-based models of EI and combine a number of individual difference variables, such as emotionally based competencies or abilities, personality, and motivation. Self-report and/or rater-report inventories are frequently used to measure mixed-models of emotional intelligence. Examples include the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI; Sala, 2002), the Schutte EI (Schutte et al., 1998), and the Bar-On EQ-i (Bar-On, 1997).

However, it has been argued that self- and rater-report measures of EI may still be useful because they may be created to evaluate "typical performance" as opposed to "maximal performance" (Gignac, 2009a; Gignac et al., 2006). Maximal EI performance represents the highest level of EI ability that can be manifested by an individual at a particular time. In contrast, typical EI performance represents the level of EI behaviors an individual manifests on a regular basis (Gignac, 2009a). Given that common performance appraisal indicators are typical performance in nature, it could be argued that human resource departments are more interested in the assessment of typical performance. Therefore, it is important to distinguish between typical performance and maximal performance; e.g., supervisor ratings, annual sales, etc. (Sackett and Devore, 2001).

Thus, in this study, the researcher sought to ascertain how the typical (the regularity with which a person/leader exhibits a wide range of EI behaviours), not one-time maximal aspects (the highest level of EI aptitude that a person can display at a given time) of Genos emotional intelligence factors or subscales affect leadership outcomes (i.e., extra effort, leadership effectiveness, and satisfaction). Genos workplace-specific behaviours, unlike other studies that use an ability model, identify a unique predictor among the variables for local organizations operating at grassroots levels. Alternative EI models include personality dimensions and measure maximal performance in most cases, unlike the Genos EI, which measures typical and work-specific emotions.

Methodology

Conceptualization of Genos Emotional Intelligence Theory

There are several assertions on the importance of emotional intelligence or its beneficial effects on performance in both the commercial and scientific literatures (Baba al., 2023; Clear et al., 2023; Northouse, 2023; Bradberry, 2022; Gignac, 2010). Research showed a strong relationship between emotional intelligence and work performance (Clear et al., 2023; Bradberry, 2022; Shahhosseini et al., 2013).

However, in this piece of research work, Genos model of emotional intelligence theory, created by Gignac (2010) was selected and utilized as the theoretical framework to guide the investigation to test how the Genos EI which was created to assess how frequently someone exhibits emotionally intelligent actions across the seven domains in an organization. Other EI scales measure the Maximal (one time) EI performance that characterizes the highest level of EI ability that can be manifested by an individual at a particular time. In contrast, typical EI performance represents as signified by Genos EI measures the level of EI behaviors an individual manifests on a regular basis (Gignac, 2009a). The Genos Self-Report Inventory was created to assess how frequently someone exhibits emotionally intelligent actions across the seven domains (Emotional Self-Awareness, Emotional Expression, Emotional Awareness of Others, Emotional Reasoning, Emotional Self-Management, Emotional Management of Others, Emotional Self-Control). According to Emotional intelligence, according to Gignac (2010), is the capacity to consciously adapt to, shape, and choose surroundings. The following seven variables of individual variations are solely important to the presentation of EI skills under the Genos EI paradigm (Gignac, 2010):

Emotional Self-Awareness (ESA): This gauges how frequently a person consciously acknowledges their emotions at the office. It also shows how often a person is aware that their emotions might influence or inspire their actions and thoughts at work. Neither the negative nor the positive feelings are highlighted by the subscale. Instead, a balance of both positive and negative affect states is included in the subscale (Gignac, 2015; Gignac et al., 2014).

Emotional Expression (EE): Assesses the proportion of times a person uses acceptable emotional expression at work. In this context, appropriate denotes doing things in the proper manner, at the proper time, and with the appropriate audience. The subscale incorporates a balance of items relevant to positive and negative emotions, such as positive feedback and anger, for example. The subscale does not explicitly specify any method of emotional expression, as the appropriate

expression of an emotion may be verbal or non-verbal in nature (or a combination of the two) (Gignac, 2015; Gignac et al., 2014).

Emotional Awareness of Others (EAO): Assesses how frequently a person can recognize other people's feelings when they are in the workplace. The focus is on being conscious of other people's vocal and nonverbal displays of emotion. Also, there is a focus on comprehending the kind of emotions that may influence or drive people at work (Gignac, 2015; Gignac et al., 2014).

Emotional Reasoning (ER): It defines the regularity with which a person includes emotionally relevant information when making decisions or addressing problems at work. It should be highlighted that the subscale for emotional reasoning does not reflect a bias against reason. Instead, the subscale was created to assess a balanced method of problem-solving that takes into account both one's own and other people's emotions when making judgements at work. There is also an emphasis on the use of emotions for the successful engagement of others (Gignac, 2022; Gignac, 2021; Gignac, 2015; Gignac et al., 2014).

Emotional Self-Management (ESM): Evaluates how frequently a person is successful at managing their emotions at work. Although there is some attention on engaging in activities to maintain a pleasant emotional state while at work, there is a significant emphasis on the successful adjustment of negative emotional states at work. ESM frequently entails letting go of an emotional setback rather than wallowing in it or brooding over it (Gignac, 2022; Gignac, 2015; Gignac et al., 2014).

Emotional Management of Others (EMO): Indicates the degree to which a person skillfully handles the emotions of others at work. This subscale includes actions made to inspire coworkers or subordinates as well as examples of how to influence others' emotions for their own benefit at work. This entails making the workplace enjoyable for others or, more precisely, assisting someone in resolving a problem that is troubling them (Gignac, 2022; Gignac, 2015; Gignac et al., 2014).

Emotional Self-Control (ESC): Signifies the relative frequency with which some individual controls their strong emotions appropriately in the workplace. A significant emphasis is put on the ability to maintain attention or concentration on the work at hand in the face of emotional difficulty. Though similar to emotional self-management, emotional self-control places a greater emphasis on the behavioural show of restraint over strong, reactive emotions at work, including rage or joy. Emotional Self-Management is more proactive in this regard, whereas

Emotional Self-Control is more reactive (Gignac, 2015; Gignac et al., 2014; Gignac, 2010; Gignac, 2009).

Genos Total EI: The Total EI score (reported only in the Genos EI Recruit report) is based on an equally weighted composite of the seven Genos EI dimensions defined above. As a result, the Total EI score reflects how frequently a person engages in a wide range of EI behaviours related to the detection of emotions (of the self and others), the reasoning with emotions, and the general management of emotions (self, others, and emotional control according to Gignac (2010).

Conceptualization of Leadership Outcome

The effectiveness of a leader's leadership is judged by how frequently they believe it inspires their followers to put in extra effort (include getting others to do more than they expected to, heightening others to desire to succeed, and increasing others willingness to try harder), how effective raters perceive their leadership (includes effective in meeting others' job related needs, effective in representing their group to higher authority, effective in meeting organizational requirements and lead a group that is effective) to be at interacting at different levels of the organization, and how satisfied (using methods of leadership that are satisfying and working with others in a satisfactory way) raters are with their leadership methods of working with others. Moreover, it is measured by how satisfied employees are with their leader's methods of working with others. literatures (Baba al., 2023; Clear et al., 2023; Northouse, 2023; Bradberry, 2022; Gignac, 2021; Gignac, 2010; Gignac and Ekermans, 2010; Avolio, 1995). This piece of research work hypothesized that the Seven Genos Emotional Intelligence dimensions have no significant effect (Ho) on three leadership outcome dimensions in Wolaita zone NGOs leadership.

Research sample and data collection

The total population under study is 1100. NGO leaders are managing 80 projects in the Wolaita zone of SNNPR-Ethiopia. Sample size was estimated using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) formula for calculating sample size.

Journal of Science and Inclusive Development Vol. 6, No. 1, DOI:10.20372/jsid/2024-263

$$n = \frac{\chi^2 Np\,(1-p)}{e^2\,(N-1) + \chi^2\,p(1-p)}$$

n = Sample size

N = Population size

e = Accepted sampling error

χ^2 = Chi-square of degree of freedom 1 and confidence 95% = 3.841

p = Proportion of population (if unknown, 0.5)

$$n = \frac{1.96^2 * 1100 * 0.5(1-0.5)}{(0.05)^2 * (1100-1) + 1.96^2 * 0.5\,(1-0.5)} \qquad n = \frac{3.841 * 1100 * 0.5 * 0.5}{0.0025(1099) + 3.841 * 0.5 * 0.5}$$

$$n = 284.92$$

The questionnaire was distributed to 285 participants where the proportion of leaders from each NGO category was calculated using the following formula.

$$n = \left[\frac{p}{m}\right] * N$$

Where, n = Sample leaders from each NGO Category to be surveyed,

P = Number of leaders in a similar NGO category

m = Total number of Leaders in Wolaita NGOs

N = Total number of samples calculated (as given above).

Accordingly, 25 leaders from Integrated agriculture NGOs, 79 leaders from Women and child affairs NGOs, 47 leaders from health sector NGOs, 25 leaders from Education NGOs, 20 leaders from Agriculture only NGOs, 29 leaders from Agriculture and Livelihood NGOs, 29 leaders from Water, Mining and Energy NGOs, 25 leaders from Social Works NGOs, 4 leaders from Trade and Industry NGOs, and 3 leaders from Youth and Sports NGOs were administered with the questionnaire. Response rate was 60%. Out of the 170-questionnaire returned, 3 were incomplete. As a result, the researcher removed 3 questionnaires from the analysis. The useable data was therefore, based on 167 returned questionnaires. In their study of survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research, Baruch and Holtom (2008) analyzed 1,607 studies that were published in 17 refereed academic journals between the year 2000 and 2005 and covered more than 100,000 organizations and 400,000 individual respondents. They found the response rate for studies that used data collected from individuals to be 52.7% with a standard

deviation of 20.4, and the response rate for studies that used data collected from organizations to be 35.7% with a standard deviation of 18.8. The average return rate for management and behavioral science research is between 32% and 50% (Baruch and Holtom, 2008; Cycyota and Harrison, 2006). The benchmark suggested by Baruch and Holtom (2008) was 35-40% for organization or 50% at the individual level. These authors also disclosed that any deviation from this level must be explained. Moreover, Pallant (2013) quoting Stevens (1996) recommend that 'for social science research, about 15 participants per predictor are needed for a reliable equation'. Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) give a formula for calculating sample size requirements, considering the number of independent variables that you wish to use: $N > 50 + 8m$ (where m = number of independent variables). Based on this information, the number of cases in my research work with full response for transformational, transactional, laissez-faire and emotional intelligence was 82 satisfying the formula. The actual sample size employed in this study was 167, far greater than the expected normally distributed sample size of 30.

Instrumentation (Measurement)

Genos EI inventory- concise version was used to measure the seven subscales. This is intended to gauge how frequently a person thinks they exhibit emotionally intelligent behaviors at work (Gignac, 2010). Genos EI which measures the typical performances (frequency of work specific emotional behaviors excluding personality) as compared to the maximal performance (one time result at a certain point of time) measured by other EI models is used in this research. Concise version has seven subscales include Emotional Self-Awareness, Emotional Expression, Emotional Awareness of Others, Emotional Reasoning, Emotional Self-Management, Emotional Management of Others and Emotional Self-Control. In this research, participants rated their level of agreement to statements in the questionnaire using 5-point Likert-type response options where 1 represents Almost Never, 2 represents rarely, 3 represents sometimes, 4 represents often and 5 represents Almost Always. The researcher tested reliability to check if Wolaita zone NGO practices align with the standard reliability already tested by scale developers Cronbach's alpha value for Genos Total EI scale scores were associated with very high levels of internal consistency reliability (i.e., > 0.90) and mean subscale reliabilities were all above 0.70, ranging from 0.763 to 0.813. Two-week test-retest reliability also indicated a scale score of 0.78 (Schutte et al., 1998).

Journal of Science and Inclusive Development Vol. 6, No. 1, DOI:10.20372/jsid/2024-263

Leadership Outcome Instrument

The researcher employed the MLQ-5X, a tool created by Avolio and Bass (2004 and 1995), to assess the leadership outcome in NGOs in the Wolaita zone. The nine items that make up the MLQ instrument for this component measure the following three outcome categories: (a) Extra Efforts, (b) Perceived leadership Effectiveness and (c) Satisfaction). The Extra Effort score has a scale with a range of 1-5, calculated using the average of Questions and from the MLQ questionnaire. Leadership Effectiveness (EFF) score has a scale with a range of 1-5, calculated using the average of Questions and Leadership Satisfaction (SAT) score has a scale with a range of 1-5, calculated using the average of Questions. A project manager with lower ratings will have lower levels of each leadership outcome component. The higher scores denote a project manager who has greater leadership outcome behavioral leadership qualities. The researcher tested reliability to check of Wolaita zone NGO practices line up with the standard reliability already tested by scale developers. The test revealed that Cronbach's Alpha for all variables fell within accepted range. Estimates of internal consistency according to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire technical report by Bass and Avolio (2010) were above 0.70 for all scales except for active management-by-exception (0.64). Estimates of internal consistency according of 31 item EI scale of the data was 0.820, Cronbach's Alpha for 7 items was 0.820. Sub scale reliability Emotional Reasoning (0.779), Emotional Self-Awareness (0.813), Emotional Self-Management (0.760), Emotional Expression (.800), Emotional Awareness of Others (0.796), Emotional Management of Others (0.772), Emotional Self Control (0.783), respectively.

Table 1. Psychometric Properties of Variables (Descriptive Statistics)

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
Emotional Reasoning	167	14.42	2.487	0.779
Emotional Self-Awareness	167	13.25	1.786	0.813
Emotional Self-Management	167	14.56	2.721	0.760
Emotional Expression	167	19.69	3.311	0.800
Emotional Awareness of Others	167	16.85	2.514	0.796
Emotional Management of Others	167	14.69	2.673	0.772
Emotional Self Control	167	13.68	2.427	0.783
EI Total Score	167	107.14	12.440	0.820

Source: Computed from Own Survey

Data analysis methods

Quantitative, cross-sectional research data was collected with the help of trained enumerators. All the assumptions, including the rule for multicollinearity, were satisfied, and the researcher proceeded with analysis as this assumption was not violated. The two values, Tolerance and VIF were not a concern (result is displayed in Table 2 below). A total of 167 properly filled-in questionnaires were coded, inputted into the computer, cleaned, and analyzed using IBM SPSS 24, followed by interpretation. Multiple Regression analysis was used to estimate the relationship between a set of variables in the study, i.e., to look if there's a correlation between a dependent variable (that's the variable or outcome you want to measure or predict) and any number of independent variables (factors that may have an impact on the dependent variable). Regression analysis estimates how a given variable or a set of independent variables might impact the dependent variable to detect trends and patterns (Cohen, et al., 2013; Cohen, 1988).

Table 2. Multicollinearity Diagnostics

	ER	ESA	ESM	EE	EAO	EMO	ESC
Tolerance	0.57	0.84	0.44	0.7	0.75	0.55	0.63
VIF	1.76	1.19	2.28	1.44	1.33	1.81	1.6

Source: Computed from Own Survey

Results and discussion

Regarding the direction of the relationship between the emotional intelligence variables and leadership outcome variables, the result in Table 3 shows that genos emotional intelligence dimensions have a positive relationship with leadership outcome variables in NGOs in the Wolaita zone to perform as expected. This indicates that as one variable increases, the other variables also increase, and vice versa. This means that a lack of practice of the genos emotional intelligence behaviors that measure the frequency with which these variables are applied in work relations will negatively affect the outcomes of extra effort, leadership effectiveness, and employee satisfaction.

The other key thing to consider in the correlation output is the size of the value of the correlation coefficient. In practice, this can range from –1.00 to 1.00. This value will indicate the strength of the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables. A correlation of 0 indicates no relationship at all, a correlation of 1.0 indicates a perfect positive correlation, and a value of –1.0 indicates a perfect negative

Journal of Science and Inclusive Development Vol. 6, No. 1, DOI:10.20372/jsid/2024-263

correlation. The convention states that a correlation coefficient of r between r = 0.10 to 0.29 is thought to represent a weak or small association; a correlation coefficient of r between r = 0.30 to 0.49 is considered a moderate correlation; and a correlation coefficient of r between r = 0.50 or larger is thought to represent a strong or large correlation.

Accordingly Extra Effort dimension of leadership outcome and the seven factors of genos emotional intelligence have all indicated a value between r = 0.005 to 0.209 suggesting quite a small relationship between the two variables. Since genos EI measures the frequency with which the emotional intelligence variables are practiced in the organization, the result indicates that there is poor practice requiring improvement in all seven dimensions of the genos emotional intelligence to improve leadership performances. The value for leadership effectiveness ranges from r = 0.069 to 0.165 suggesting that these have weak relationship (ER, ESA, ESM, EE, ESC) and some have medium relationship from r = 0.318 to 0.319 (EAO and EMO). Like leadership effectiveness, the value for satisfaction ranges from small (0.072 to 0.160) to medium relationship (r = 0.325 to 0.341). Since leadership rated the existing emotional intelligence practice (frequency) in work relationship as affecting three dimensions of leadership effectiveness in this study, the practice is small to moderate far below expected and the dimensions genos emotional intelligence behaviors need to be improved.

Table 3. Correlations between total Genos Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Outcome

Variables	ER	ESA	ESM	EE	EAO	EMO	ESC	EE	EFF	SAT
ER	1									
ESA	0.299**	1								
ESM	0.609**	0.253**	1							
EE	0.328**	0.310**	0.389**	1						
EAO	0.381**	0.210**	0.410**	0.331**	1					
EMO	0.380**	0.306**	0.585**	0.495**	0.359**	1				
ESC	0.482**	0.230**	0.558**	0.309**	0.380**	0.431**	1			
EE	0.024	0.005	0.035	0.141	0.209**	0.080	0.052	1		
EFF	0.086	0.083	0.069	0.319**	0.165*	/**	0.043	0.512**	1	
SAT	0.152	0.160*	0.072	0.341**	0.106	0.325**	0.083	0.397**	0.724**	1

**. P < 0.01 level (2-tailed), *. P < 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Total NGO leadership outcome

This is the regression equation for total outcome and genos emotional intelligence sub scales of (study variables): $Y= a + b_1 x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 + b_4x_4 + b_5x_5 + b_6x_6 + b_7x_7$ where, Y represents total leadership outcome and ''a", the constant, b_1 to b_7 coefficients of the independent variables and x_1 to x_7 the independent variables (Emotional Reasoning, Emotional Self Awareness, Emotional Self-Management, Emotional Expression, Emotional Awareness of Others, Emotional Management of Others, and Emotional Self Control respectively). Thus, the equation for total leadership outcome is $Y = 6.939 + 0.038x_1 + 0.0259x_2 + 0.142x_3 + 0.129x_4 + 0.073x_5 + 0.179x_6 + 0.042x_7$.

The result (Table 4) reveals that the seven Genos emotional intelligence components were joint predictors of leadership performance ($F (7, 159) = 4.468$; $R^2 = 0.164$; $P < 0.0005$). The predictor variables jointly explained 16.4% of the variance in leadership outcome, while the remaining 83.6% could be because of extraneous variables.

Table 4. Model Summary[b]

				Std. Error	Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.405[a]	0.164	0.128	1.61303	0.164	4.468	7	159	0.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Self Control, Emotional Self-Awareness, Emotional Expression, Emotional Awareness of Others, Emotional Reasoning, Emotional Management of Others, Emotional Self-Management

b. Dependent Variable: Leadership Outcome

Examining the strong impact of Genos emotional intelligence i.e., not generic, but work specific emotional intelligence factors on leadership outcomes was the goal of this study. The findings showed that there are positive correlations between the leadership outcome and the genos emotional intelligence sub-dimensions. The model gives good account of dependent variable of leadership outcome dimensions. The seven sub scales accounts for R = 0.164 of variance in total leadership outcome.

This finding aligns with other pieces of research. Dudzinski (2022) revealed a significant positive link between EI and performance or outcome. According to Mahlet (2020), emotional intelligence is essential to project management because it integrates the technical and soft skills

Journal of Science and Inclusive Development Vol. 6, No. 1, DOI:10.20372/jsid/2024-263

required for projects. According to Bradberry et al. (2022), emotional intelligence is the single best predictor of professional performance and the most potent driver of driving leadership and high personal standards. According to the same author, 90% of top achievers at work who have been researched have high levels of emotional intelligence. Other researchers also showed that there was a correlation between emotional intelligence and job performance (Stein, 2023; Mubashir et al., 2023; Mersino, 2022; Northouse, 2021; Waterbury, 2016; Gignac, 2015; Schutte and Loi, 2014; Schutte et al., 2013). The effect of emotional intelligence on leadership in local government administration, and the relationship between emotional intelligence scores and leadership results were found to be significantly positive (Olannye, 2014). According to Northhouse (2021) and Gignac (2015), the process of leadership appears to be influenced by emotional intelligence. This study offers more evidence that NGO leaders who exhibit the seven sub-elements of Genos emotional intelligence behaviors at work have a beneficial influence on workers' extra effort, perceptions of their leadership effectiveness, and employee satisfaction.

Extra Effort Dimension of Leadership Outcome

This is the regression equation for Extra Effort dimension of leadership outcome and the genos emotional intelligence sub scales of (study variables): $Y = a + b_1 x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 + b_4x_4 + b_5x_5 + b_6x_6 + b_7x_7$ where, Y represents Extra Effort dimension of the leadership outcome and ‘’a”, the constant, b_1 to b_7 coefficients of the independent variables and x_1 to x_7 the independent variables (Emotional Reasoning, Emotional Self Awareness, Emotional Self-Management, Emotional Expression, Emotional Awareness of Others, Emotional Management of Others, and Emotional Self Control, respectively). Thus, the equation for extra effort dimension of leadership outcome $Y= 2.605 + 0.012x_1 + 0.019x_2 + 0.016x_3 + 0.023x_4 + 0.058x_5 + 0.004x_6 + 0.001x_7$.

The analysis has indicated that the seven subcomponents of emotional intelligence account for 6.1% ($R^2 = 0.061$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.019$, $F (7, 159) = 5.374$, $P < 0.183$] variance in the Extra Effort subcomponent of leadership outcome (Table 5). To evaluate the role of each explanatory factor on the dependent variable, the standardized beta coefficient is used. These coefficients demonstrate how much a change in the explanatory explains a change in the dependent variable. A high value of the independent variables' standardized beta coefficient denotes that they have a higher impact on the response variables. Emotional Awareness of Others ($\beta = 0.222$; $t = 2.508$; $P < 0.05$) was significantly independent predictor of extra effort dimension of leadership outcome (Table 6). This implies that it has positive significant effect on followers and their

performance. Other dimensions of genos emotional intelligence variables have a positive but statistically insignificant effect on followers and their performance as perceived by the leadership of the organization under study, implying poor practice of these in the organization.

Table 5: Emotional Intelligence Sub Scales and Extra Effort Model Summary[b]

				Std. Error	Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.246[a]	0.061	0.019	0.64839	0.061	1.465	7	159	0.183

a. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Self Control, Emotional Self Awareness, Emotional Expression, Emotional Awareness of Others, Emotional Reasoning, Emotional Management of Others, Emotional Self-Management

b. Dependent Variable: Extra Effort

Table 6: Emotional Intelligence Sub Scales and Extra Effort Coefficients [a]

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2.605	0.490		5.317	0.000
Emotional Reasoning	0.012	0.027	0.047	0.465	0.643
Emotional Self-Awareness	0.019	0.031	0.051	0.610	0.543
Emotional Self-Management	0.016	0.028	0.067	0.580	0.563
Emotional Expression	0.023	0.018	0.119	1.290	0.199
Emotional Awareness of Others	0.058	0.023	0.222	2.508	0.013
Emotional Management of Others	0.004	0.025	0.016	0.157	0.876
Emotional Self Control	0.001	0.026	0.004	0.044	0.965

a. Dependent Variable: Extra Effort

Perceived Leadership Effectiveness of Leadership Outcome

This is the regression equation for Leadership Effectiveness dimension of leadership outcome and the genos emotional intelligence sub scales of (study variables): $Y = a + b_1 x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 + b_4x_4 + b_5x_5 + b_6x_6 + b_7x_7$ where, Y represents Leadership Effectiveness dimension of the leadership outcome and ‘’a”, the constant, b_1 to b_7 coefficients of the independent variables and x_1 to x_7 the independent variables (Emotional Reasoning, Emotional Self Awareness, Emotional Self-Management, Emotional Expression, Emotional Awareness of Others, Emotional Management of Others, and Emotional Self Control, respectively). Thus, the equation for extra

Journal of Science and Inclusive Development Vol. 6, No. 1, DOI:10.20372/jsid/2024-263

effort dimension of leadership outcome $Y = 2.36 + 0.10x_1 + 0.17x_2 + 0.05x_3 + 0.047x_4 + 0.022x_5 + 0.081x_6 + 0.026x_7$.

The seven subcomponents of genos emotional intelligence account for 17.7% [$R^2 = 0.177$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.141$, $F (7, 159) = 4.900$, $P < 0.000$] variance in the perceived leadership effectiveness dimension of leadership outcome (Table 7). Emotional Management of Others ($\beta = 0.334$; $t = 2.3454$; $P < 0.05$) is the best independent predictor of perceived leadership effectiveness dimension of leadership outcome followed by Emotional Expression ($\beta = .240$; $t= 2.785$; $P < 0.05$) (Table 8). This indicated that the variable has a positive significant effect on followers and their performance. Other dimensions of genos emotional intelligence are positively correlated, but statistically insignificant predictors of perceived leadership effectiveness. In the study the sampled leadership was asked to rate the existing genos EI practices and the effects these have on the leadership outcome dimensions. The low values indicate the presence of weak practices the practice in the organization requiring improvements.

Table 7: Emotional Intelligence Sub Scales and Leadership Effectiveness Model Summary[b]

					Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.421[a]	0.177	0.141	0.59977	0.177	4.900	7	159	0.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Self Control, Emotional Self Awareness, Emotional Expression, Emotional Awareness of Others, Emotional Reasoning, Emotional Management of Others, Emotional Self-Management b. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

Table 8. Emotional Intelligence Sub Scales and Leadership Effectiveness Coefficients [a]

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2.360	0.453		5.208	0.000
Emotional Reasoning	0.010	0.025	0.038	0.394	0.694
Emotional Self-Awareness	0.017	0.028	0.047	0.596	0.552
Emotional Self-Management	0.050	0.026	0.212	1.952	0.053
Emotional Expression	0.047	0.017	0.240	2.785	0.006
Emotional Awareness of Others	0.022	0.021	0.084	1.016	0.311
Emotional Management of Others	0.081	0.023	0.334	3.454	0.001
Emotional Self Control	0.026	0.024	0.097	1.063	0.289

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

Employee Satisfaction of Leadership Outcome

This is the regression equation for employee satisfaction dimension of leadership outcome and the genos emotional intelligence sub scales of (study variables): $Y = a + b1\ x1 + b2x2 + b3x3 + b4x4 + b5x5 + b6x6 + b7x7$ where, Y represents Extra Effort dimension of the leadership outcome and ‘’a”, the constant, b1 to b7 coefficients of the independent variables and x1 to x7 the independent variables (Emotional Reasoning, Emotional Self Awareness, Emotional Self-Management, Emotional Expression, Emotional Awareness of Others, Emotional Management of Others, and Emotional Self Control, respectively). Thus, the equation for extra effort dimension of leadership outcome $Y = 2.605 + 0.012x1 + 0.019x2 + 0.016x3 + 0.023x4 + 0.058x5 + 0.004x6 + 0.001x7$.

Also, the same seven EI components explained 19.1% [$R^2 = 0.191$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.156$, $F(7, 159) = 5.374$, $p < 0.000$] of variance in employee satisfaction dimension of leadership outcome (Table 9). Emotional Management of Others ($\beta = 0.327$; $t = 3.408$; $P < 0.05$) is the largest independent predictor of Employee Satisfaction dimension of leadership outcome followed by Emotional Self-Management ($\beta = 0.269$; $t = 2.505$; $P < 0.05$), followed by Emotional Expression ($\beta = 0.254$; $t = 2.975$; $P < 0.05$). Emotional Self-Management has a significant effect on this dimension. Emotional Self-Awareness ($\beta = 0.026$; $t = 0.330$; $P < 0.05$), Emotional Reasoning ($\beta = 0.041$; $t = 1.399$; $P < 0.05$), have positive effect but statistically insignificant on Employee Satisfaction dimension of leadership outcome. Emotional Awareness of Others ($\beta = -0.023$; $t = -0.280$; $P > 0.05$) has also positive effects, but not significant effect on Employee Satisfaction dimension of leadership outcome (Table 10). Findings from Mahlet (2020) and Coetzer (2014) supports satisfaction can be attributed to emotional intelligence though her study focuses on generic emotional intelligence. This researcher assessed the effect of emotional intelligence on leadership Performance in local government administration and concluded that emotional intelligence scales were positively correlated and had huge predictive effect on leadership outcome. Northouse (2023) and Shahhosseini et al. (2013) also came up with similar finding in the study made about the relationship between transactional, transformational leadership styles, emotional intelligence and job performance.

Journal of Science and Inclusive Development Vol. 6, No. 1, DOI:10.20372/jsid/2024-263

Table 9: Emotional Intelligence Sub Scales and Employee Satisfaction Model Summary[b]

					Change Statistics				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.437[a]	0.191	0.156	0.70328	0.191	5.374	7	159	0.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Self Control, Emotional Self Awareness, Emotional Expression, Emotional Awareness of Others, Emotional Reasoning, Emotional Management of Others, Emotional Self-Management b. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Table 10. Emotional Intelligence Sub Scales and Employee Satisfaction Coefficients

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	1.974	0.531		3.714	0.000
Emotional Reasoning	0.041	0.029	0.132	1.399	0.164
Emotional Self-Awareness	0.011	0.033	0.026	0.330	0.742
Emotional Self-Management	0.076	0.030	0.269	2.505	0.013
Emotional Expression	0.059	0.020	0.254	2.975	0.003
Emotional Awareness of Others	0.007	0.025	0.023	0.280	0.780
Emotional Management of Others	0.094	0.027	0.327	3.408	0.001
Emotional Self Control	0.015	0.028	0.047	0.522	0.602

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Conclusion

In this study, the practice and effect of the Genos emotional intelligence dimensions on the outcome of leadership at all levels in the NGOs in Wolaita Zone were examined. EI is an important trait in the workplace, as emotions are an integral part of workplace activities at all levels of leadership. There was a significant association between organisational performance, or leadership outcome characteristics, and emotional intelligence. Total emotional intelligence, as well as the seven sub-dimensions, had a positive effect on leadership outcomes. From the regression results, all of the genos emotional intelligence dimensions were positively correlated with extra effort, perceived leadership effectiveness, and employee satisfaction, but most were statistically insignificant, though statistical insignificance doesn't mean there is no practical significance. The role played by genos emotional dimensions indicates that much of the variances ranging from 80.9% to 93.9% are explained by other extraneous variables that require further

investigation. As far as the existing genos EI practice is concerned, the results indicated a small to average relationship that needs improvements at NGO practices in the study area. Leadership needs training in the skills of the genos emotional elements. Genos EI has been practiced in American and European contexts with much higher results, but low in the current study. Further investigation is required by comparing the results with other established emotional intelligence measures such as ability models, which define EI as a conceptually related set of mental abilities to do with emotions such as the ability to perceive and understand one's own emotions; trait models, which define EI as an array of socio-emotional traits such as assertiveness; and competency models, which comprise a set of emotional competencies defined as learned capabilities based on EI (e.g., influence, that is, wielding effective tactics for persuasion). Generally, it is concluded that workplace genos emotional intelligence dimensions are useful for the best performance (leadership outcome) of NGO leadership in the study area.

Acknowledgments

I want to thank Vision International University for "Opening Education Possibility" and my advisor, Zinare Mamo (Ph.D.), for his intellectual support while I was writing this paper.

Funding

This research work did not access any external funding, but Vision University provided discounted courses and research fees.

Conflicts of Interest

The author asserts to have no competing interests in relation to this research work.

Data Availability

The corresponding author can provide the data that were utilized to support the study's conclusions upon request.

References

Avolio BJ, Bass BM. 2004. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and Sampler Set (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Avolio BJ, Bass BM, Jung DI. 1995. MLQ multifactor leadership questionnaire: Technical report. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Baba MM, Krishan C, Al-Harthy FN 2023. Emotional intelligence for leadership effectiveness: Management Opportunities and Challenges During Times of Crisis. Apple Academic Press.

Bar-On R. 1997. Emotional Quotient Inventory: Technical manual. Multi-Health Systems. Toronto.

Bradberry T, Graver J, Lenaioni PM. 2022. Emotional Intelligence 2.0. TalentSmart; San Diego, CA, USA.

Bukhari SR, Khanam SJ. 2016. Trait emotional intelligence as a predictor of academic performance in university students. Pak J Psychol. 47(2): 33-45.

Coetzer WC. 2014. The relationship between EI and job satisfaction amongst WESTCOL FET lecturers. Master's thesis). University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, Gauteng, South Africa.

Cohen J, Cohen P, West S, Aiken L. 2013. Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York, NY: Routledge

Cohen JW. 1988. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cserhati G, Szabo L. 2014. The relationship between success criteria and success factors in organizational event projects. Intl J Proj Manag. 32, 613-624.

Gignac GE. 2021. Genos emotional intelligence inventory technical manual (2nd Edition). Genos. Suite 1c. 207 Young Street, Sydney, Waterloo, NSW 2017, Australia.

Gignac GE. 2015. Seven-factor model of emotional intelligence as measured by Genos EI. Eur J Psychol Assess. 26, 309-316.

Gignac GE. 2010. Genos emotional intelligence inventory technical manual (2nd Edition). Genos. Suite 1c. 207 Young Street, Sydney, Waterloo, NSW 2017, Australia.

Gignac GE, Ekermans G. 2010. Group differences in EI within a sample of black and white South Africans. Pers Individ Differ. 49: 639-644.

Goleman D. 2011. Working with emotional intelligence. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Goleman D. 2001. Emotional intelligence: Issues in paradigm building. In: the emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups and organizations. New York: Jossey Bass

Khan AA, Saleem M, Tahir MA, Nadeem M. 2012. Emotional intelligence and self-esteem as predictors of academic success among higher education students: A survey conducted at the Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan. J Educ Res. 15(1): 56-66.

Mahlet Hagos. 2020. Effect of emotional intelligence on project success: In the Case of GIZ Ethiopia.

Masa'deh R. 2016. The role of emotional intelligence in enhancing organizational effectiveness: The case of information technology managers in Jordan. Int J Commun Netw Syst. Sci. 9, 234-249.

Mayer JD, Salovey P, Caruso DR. 2000. The Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso emotional intelligence Test: Technical manual. Multi-Health Systems. Toronto.

Mersino AC. 2022. Emotional intelligence for project managers: The people skills you need to achieve outstanding results. Printed in the United States of America. 1601 Broadway, New York.

Nixon P, Harrington M, Parker D. 2012. Leadership performance is significant to project success or failure: A critical analysis. Int J Product Perform Manag. 61(2): 204–216.

Northouse PG. 2021. Leadership: Theory and practice (9th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Olannye AP. 2014. An assessment of the effect of emotional intelligence on leadership performance in local government administration. J Emerg Trends Econ Manag Sci. 5(1): 44-55.

Palmer BR, Stough C. 2006. The Genos emotional intelligence assessment scale: Technical manual. Australia: Genos Pty Ltd.

Sala F. 2002. Emotional competence Inventory (ECI) Technical Manual. Hay Group. McClelland Centre for Research and Innovation. www.eiconsortium.org

Schutte NS, Malouff JM, Simunek M, McKenley J, Hollander S. 2002. Characteristic emotional intelligence and emotional well-being. Cogn Emot. 16: 769-785.

Schutte NS, Natasha L. 2014. Connections between emotional intelligence and workplace flourishing. Pers Individ Differ. 66: 134–139.

Schutte N, Malouff MJ, Thorsteinsson E. 2013. Increasing emotional intelligence through training: Current status and future directions. Int J Emot Educ. 5. 56-72.

Shahhosseini MS, Abu DI, Ismi A. 2013. Relationship between transactional, transformational leadership styles, emotional intelligence and job performance. Researchers World- Int. Refereed Soc Sci J. 4(1): 15-24.

Stein SJ. 2023. Emotional intelligence for Dummies. John Wiley and Sons. Canada.

Yang LR, Huang CF, Hsu TJ. 2014. Knowledge leadership to improve project and organizational performance. Intl J Proj Manag. 32: 40-35.