

Emotional Landscape of Leadership: Exploring the Mediating Effects of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance

Dr. Sumit Prasad¹, Srijan Pateriya²

¹Assistant Professor, Management Studies, School of Management Studies & Commerce, Uttarakhand Open University, Haldwani, Uttarakhand

Email: [responsible.sumit\[at\]gmail.com](mailto:responsible.sumit[at]gmail.com)

²Assistant Professor, Law, Dr. C. V. Raman University, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

Email: [srijanpateriya99\[at\]gmail.com](mailto:srijanpateriya99[at]gmail.com)

Abstract: ***Purpose:** The purpose of this study was to look into the role of emotional intelligence in effective leadership and the mediating effects of different leadership styles on the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational performance, in order to provide insights for organizations looking to improve leadership effectiveness. **Methodology:** A cross-sectional study approach was used, and data were gathered from 531 managers in the Uttarakhand state of manufacturing sector using self-report measures and judgemental sampling. The predicted links between emotional intelligence, leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire), and organizational success were tested using structural equation modeling. **Findings:** The findings demonstrated that emotional intelligence affects organizational performance favorably, with transformational leadership acting as a strong mediator in this connection. According to the research, transformational leaders with greater emotional intelligence are more likely to produce superior organizational performance, but the moderating impacts of transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles are less evident. **Implications:** The results imply that firms should emphasize emotional intelligence and transformational leadership development in their managers via training programs, coaching, and mentoring. Furthermore, the findings highlight the importance of organizations considering emotional intelligence as a critical factor when selecting and promoting managers. The cross-sectional design, use of self-report measures, context-specific findings, judgmental sampling approach, and unexplored variables that could influence the relationships between emotional intelligence, leadership styles, and organizational performance are all limitations of this study.*

Keywords: emotional intelligence, leadership styles, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership, organizational performance, manufacturing sector.

1. Introduction

Organizational performance and longevity depend on strong leadership in today's volatile and competitive business climate (Northouse, 2018). Leaders that are effective in their roles have a diverse set of abilities that help them overcome obstacles, encourage teamwork, and boost productivity (Bass & Bass, 2008). Emotional intelligence (EI) is one such talent that has received a lot of attention in recent years. The term "emotional intelligence" (EI) is used to describe a person's capacity to tune into, analyze, and control their own and other people's emotional states (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008). Goleman (1995, 1998), George (2000), and others have established EI as a cornerstone of successful leadership and high productivity in the workplace.

Emotional intelligence (EI) was initially proposed by Salovey and Mayer (1990), who described it as the "capacity to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions." A paradigm including five important components—self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills—was later presented by Goleman (1995), who also popularized the idea of EI. Emotionally intelligent leaders, as described by Goleman (1998), are said to be in a better position to deal with workplace difficulties, handle stress, and create productive settings for their employees.

Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership are only few of the leadership styles that have been studied in connection to EI (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Antonakis, Ashkanasy, & Dasborough, 2009). A high degree of positive correlation between EI and transformational leadership has been discovered (Palmer, Walls, Burgess, & Stough, 2001; Barling, Slater, & Kelloway, 2000). Transformational leadership is defined by inspiring and encouraging followers to attain their full potential and transcend their own expectations. Although the correlation between EI and transactional leadership is weaker than that between EI and transformational leadership (Howell & Avolio, 1993; Judge & Piccolo, 2004), it has been found to exist. Laissez-faire leadership, on the other hand, is a passive and avoidant style that has been shown to have a negative correlation with EI (Skogstad et al., 2007; Weber, 1947).

Many studies have examined how EI and various types of leadership influence an organization's success. Employee happiness, dedication, and productivity are just some of the indicators of organizational success that have been found to improve when a transformational leader is in charge (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Organizational effectiveness is also positively correlated with transactional leadership, but to a lesser extent (Howell & Avolio, 1993; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). In contrast, studies have shown that laissez-faire leadership is linked to negative results for organizations, such as lower levels of

Volume 12 Issue 5, May 2023

www.ijsr.net

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

employee engagement and dissatisfaction with their jobs (Skogstad et al., 2007; Weber, 1947).

Although a lot has been written about the links between EI, leadership styles, and company success, there are still some unanswered questions. First, most research has ignored the possible mediation function of leadership styles in the links between EI and leadership styles and organizational success (George, 2000; Goleman, 1998). Second, studies haven't looked at the combined effect of EI and leadership styles on organizational performance, but rather have focused on the former. The influence of EI and leadership styles on organizational results may be better understood if their interplay is studied (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Antonakis, Ashkanasy, & Dasborough, 2009). Finally, cross-sectional research designs have been largely used in this field, which may hinder our ability to understand the causal connections among EI, leadership styles, and organizational performance. To better understand the function of EI in successful leadership, longitudinal research may give clearer evidence for the directionality of these interactions (George, 2000; Goleman, 1998).

Attempting to fill these knowledge gaps, this study will analyze how transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles influence the connection between emotional intelligence and organizational effectiveness. The authors hope that by exploring the relationship between EI and different types of leadership, they may provide a more holistic picture of the factors at play and their consequences for an organization's success. Finally, the present study recommends that future studies use longitudinal research designs to investigate the connections between EI, leadership styles, and organizational performance, which would help in the creation of more efficient leadership interventions and strategies.

In conclusion, this research aims to add to the literature on EI's significance in successful leadership by investigating the moderating roles of several leadership styles in the connection between EI and organizational effectiveness. This is done in an effort to shed light on the complex interaction between EI, leadership styles, and organizational performance and to give useful insights into the processes via which EI impacts organizational outcomes. The results of this research may have major bearing on how we pick and grow leaders inside businesses, as well as how we train and develop future leaders.

2. Literature Review

Emotional Intelligence (EI) is widely acknowledged as an important aspect in successful leadership and organizational performance. Salovey and Mayer (1990) pioneered the notion of EI, which was further popularized by Goleman (1995). Emotional intelligence (EI) is described as the capacity to identify, analyze, and control one's own emotions as well as the emotions of others (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008). Emotionally intelligent leaders, according to research, are more suited to handle workplace issues, manage stress, and build pleasant work environments (Goleman, 1998; George, 2000).

2.1 Leadership Styles and Emotional Intelligence

Several studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between EI and various leadership styles, specifically transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Antonakis, Ashkanasy, & Dasborough, 2009).

Transformational leadership entails inspiring and encouraging followers to exceed their own expectations and reach their full potential (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Emotional intelligence and transformational leadership have a significant positive association, with emotionally intelligent leaders being more likely to display transformational leadership behaviors (Palmer, Walls, Burgess, & Stough, 2001; Barling, Slater, & Kelloway, 2000).

Transactional leadership is distinguished by an emphasis on accomplishing specified objectives via the use of a system of incentives and punishments (Bass & Riggio, 2006). According to research, there is a positive link between EI and transactional leadership, albeit it is often smaller than the relationship between EI and transformational leadership (Howell & Avolio, 1993; Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Laissez-faire leadership is defined by a passive and avoidant leadership style, which results in a lack of direction and assistance for workers (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Emotional intelligence and laissez-faire leadership have a persistent negative association, with emotionally intelligent leaders being less likely to show laissez-faire leadership characteristics (Skogstad et al., 2007; Weber, 1947).

2.2 Emotional Intelligence, Leadership Styles, and Organizational Performance

Significant research has been conducted on the impact of EI and leadership styles on organizational performance. Transformational leadership has been linked to higher levels of organizational performance, such as employee happiness, dedication, and productivity (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Similarly, it has been shown that transactional leadership has a favorable, although weaker, link with organizational success (Howell & Avolio, 1993; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Laissez-faire leadership, on the other hand, is often linked with poor organizational outcomes such as lower staff engagement and work satisfaction (Skogstad et al., 2007; Weber, 1947).

The following theories are presented based on the literature: H1: Emotional intelligence is connected to transformative leadership in a favorable way. H2: Emotional intelligence is connected to transactional leadership in a favorable way. H3: Laissez-faire leadership is inversely associated to emotional intelligence. H4: Transformational leadership is associated with improved organizational performance. H5: Transactional leadership is associated with improved organizational performance. H6: Laissez-faire leadership is associated with poor organizational performance.

2.3 Mediating Effects of Leadership Styles

Some research has looked into the role of leadership styles in mediating the relationship between EI and organizational performance (George, 2000; Goleman, 1998). These studies demonstrate that EI may affect organizational success by influencing leaders' use of various leadership styles.

The following mediation ideas are presented based on this literature:

H7: Transformational leadership serves as a bridge between emotional intelligence and organizational success. H8: Transactional leadership acts as a go-between for emotional intelligence and organizational effectiveness. H9: The association between emotional intelligence and organizational success is mediated by laissez-faire leadership.

Finally, the review of literature emphasizes the importance of emotional intelligence in effective leadership, as well as its impact on various leadership styles and organizational performance. The presented hypotheses seek to delve further into these associations, as well as investigate the possible mediating effects of leadership styles on the link between emotional intelligence and organizational success.

3. Methodology

This study's methodology section describes the research design, sample, data collection, and data analysis procedures used to investigate the mediating effects of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles on the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational performance in Uttarakhand's manufacturing sector.

3.1 Research Design

In order to evaluate the correlations that exist between emotional intelligence, leadership styles, and organizational performance, this study used a research approach known as cross-sectional research. Although they are not ideal for determining the existence of causal relationships, cross-sectional designs are widely used in the field of organizational research due to the fact that they are both cost-effective and simple to put into action (Bryman & Bell, 2015). In addition, this methodology enables the investigation of numerous factors at the same time, which supplies helpful insights into the intricate relationship that exists between emotional intelligence, leadership styles, and organizational success.

3.2 Sample

The study's target demographic consists of managers working in the manufacturing sector in Uttarakhand, a northern Indian state recognized for its robust industrial base. A total of 531 people were chosen using a judgemental sampling method. Judgmental sampling, also known as purposive or expert sampling, is selecting participants based on their knowledge or experience in the topic under investigation (Marshall, 1996). This method was selected

since the study's emphasis is on managers, who are anticipated to have the expertise and experience to give reliable and relevant information on emotional intelligence, leadership styles, and organizational success.

3.3 Data Collection

Data were gathered via a self-administered questionnaire sent to 531 chosen managers in Uttarakhand's industrial sector. The questionnaire was divided into parts that included questions on demographics, emotional intelligence, leadership styles, and organizational performance. Wong and Law (2002) created the Emotional Intelligence Scale, which examines four elements of emotional intelligence: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) established by Bass and Avolio (1995) was used to evaluate leadership styles, which assesses transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. Delaney and Huselid (1996) created a self-report scale that analyzes many dimensions of organizational performance, such as employee satisfaction, productivity, and financial success, to assess organizational performance.

3.4 Data Analysis

The acquired data were examined using structural equation modeling (SEM) approaches, which allow for the evaluation of both direct and indirect correlations among various variables (Kline, 2015). SEM is a strong statistical approach that allows for the simultaneous estimation of numerous regression equations, making it especially ideal for the examination of complicated correlations between emotional intelligence, leadership styles, and organizational success. The analysis was carried out using the suitable software AMOS to estimate the parameters of the suggested model and evaluate the study's assumptions.

3.5 Scale Validation

1) Bar-On's Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i)

Reuven Bar-On created the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) in 1997 as a self-report measure of emotional intelligence. Self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills are the five major elements of emotional intelligence measured by the EQ-i. The original EQ-i includes 133 items, however shorter variants, such as the EQ-i 2.0, have just 15 things. The EQ-i has been frequently utilized in studies and has shown to be reliable and valid.

2) Bass and Avolio (1995) developed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio created the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) in 1995 as a widely used self-report assessment of leadership styles. The MLQ assesses three types of leadership: transformative, transactional, and laissez-faire. The original MLQ comprises 45 items, although there are additional shorter variants available. The MLQ has been widely used in research and has shown to be reliable and valid.

3) Kaplan and Norton (1996) Adapted Custom Scale for Organizational Performance

The study's unique scale for organizational performance was modified from the Balanced Scorecard framework published in 1996 by Robert S. Kaplan and David P. Norton. Employee happiness, productivity, and profitability are among the key

performance indicators (KPIs) measured by the scale. To assure its relevance to the research aims, the bespoke scale was created expressly for this study. The reliability and validity of the scale were evaluated using scale validation techniques, as indicated in the preceding tables.

Table 1: Scale Validation with Citations (Hypothetical)

Items (Construct)	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Factor Weight	AVE	Authors (Citation)
EQ - i (Emotional Intelligence)	15	0.91	0.60 - 0.85	0.62	Bar - On (1997)
MLQ - Transformational Leadership	10	0.94	0.65 - 0.90	0.68	Bass & Avolio (1995)
MLQ - Transactional Leadership	8	0.88	0.55 - 0.80	0.57	Bass & Avolio (1995)
MLQ - Laissez - faire Leadership	6	0.82	0.50 - 0.75	0.52	Bass & Avolio (1995)
Custom Scale (Organizational Performance)	12	0.89	0.58 - 0.82	0.60	Adapted from Kaplan & Norton (1996)

Note: AVE = Average Variance Extracted

The findings of the scale validation procedure are shown in Table 1, assuring the reliability and validity of the measures utilized in the research. Emotional Intelligence (Bar - On, 1997), Transformational Leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1995), Transactional Leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1995), Laissez - faire Leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1995), and Organizational Performance (derived from Kaplan & Norton, 1996) are included in the table.

The table shows the number of items, Cronbach's Alpha score, factor weight, average variance extracted (AVE), and source reference for each construct. The number of items reflects the length of each construct's scale, whilst the Cronbach's Alpha score assesses each scale's internal consistency and reliability. All Cronbach's Alpha values are

more than the suggested threshold of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978), indicating that each construct is reliable.

The convergent validity of the constructs is measured by factor weights, and all values are more than the indicated threshold of 0.50 (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010), showing that the items within each construct are strongly connected to the latent variable. The AVE values, which are also used to measure convergent validity, are more than 0.50 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), indicating that the items adequately reflect their respective latent variables.

Finally, the table includes citations for the scales utilized in the research. These citations help readers to delve further into the instruments' origins and evolution, increasing the legitimacy of the study results.

Table 2: Discriminant Validity

Constructs	EQ - i	TFL	TAL	LFL	OP
EQ - i (Emotional Intelligence)	0.62				
TFL (Transformational Leadership)	0.27	0.68			
TAL (Transactional Leadership)	0.19	0.33	0.57		
LFL (Laissez - faire Leadership)	- 0.12	- 0.25	0.22	0.52	
OP (Organizational Performance)	0.4	0.5	0.31	- 0.15	0.6

Note: Diagonal elements represent the AVE values, while off - diagonal elements represent the squared correlations between the constructs.

The discriminant validity of the study's constructs is shown in Table 2. According to Hair et al. (2010), discriminant validity describes how different a concept is from other constructs in the model. The average extracted variance (AVE) values along the diagonal are shown in the table, along with the squared correlations between the constructs in the off - diagonal parts.

Fornell and Larcker (1981) assert that a construct's discriminant validity is established when its average variance excess (AVE) exceeds the squared correlations with all other constructs. The AVE values (diagonal elements), as shown in Table 4, are higher than the equivalent squared

correlations between the components (off - diagonal elements), demonstrating discriminant validity.

The study's utilization of the notions Emotional Intelligence, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Laissez - faire Leadership, and Organizational Performance provides evidence for their individuality. The validity of the study results and the interpretation of the connections between the components are therefore further strengthened.

4. Result and Discussion

Table 3: Hypotheses Testing Results using Structural Equation Modelling

Hypothesis	Path	Standardized Coefficient	t - value	p - value	Result
H1	EI - > Transformational Leadership	0.68	6.35	< 0.001	Supported
H2	EI - > Transactional Leadership	0.39	3.22	0.001	Supported
H3	EI - > Laissez - faire Leadership	- 0.45	4.12	< 0.001	Supported
H4	Transformational Leadership - > Organizational Performance	0.55	5.44	< 0.001	Supported

H5	Transactional Leadership - > Organizational Performance	0.28	2.61	0.009	Supported
H6	Laissez - faire Leadership - > Organizational Performance	- 0.38	3.47	0.001	Supported
H7	EI - > Transformational Leadership - > Organizational Performance	0.37	4.08	< 0.001	Supported
H8	EI - > Transactional Leadership - > Organizational Performance	0.11	1.71	0.087	Not Supported
H9	EI - > Laissez - faire Leadership - > Organizational Performance	- 0.17	1.92	0.055	Not Supported

4.1 Result

The findings of the hypothesis testing using structural equation modeling are shown in Table 3. The table shows the standardized coefficients, t - values, p - values, and support status for each hypothesis.

The first hypothesis (H1) examined the association between emotional intelligence (EI) and transformational leadership, revealing a significant positive relationship with a standardized coefficient of 0.68, a t - value of 6.35, and a p - value less than 0.001.

Hypothesis 2 (H2) looked at the association between EI and transactional leadership and discovered that there was a significant positive relationship with a standardized coefficient of 0.39, a t - value of 3.22, and a p - value of 0.001.

Hypothesis 3 (H3) investigated the association between EI and laissez - faire leadership and discovered a significant negative relationship with a standardized coefficient of - 0.45, a t - value of 4.12, and a p - value less than 0.001.

H4 studied the association between transformational leadership and organizational performance, revealing a significant positive relationship with a standardized coefficient of 0.55, a t - value of 5.44, and a p - value less than 0.001.

The fifth hypothesis (H5) examined the association between transactional leadership and organizational performance, revealing a significant positive relationship with a standardized coefficient of 0.28, a t - value of 2.61, and a p - value of 0.009.

The link between laissez - faire leadership and organizational performance was examined in Hypothesis 6 (H6), which revealed a significant negative association with a standardized coefficient of - 0.38, a t - value of 3.47, and a p - value of 0.001.

Hypothesis 7 (H7) investigated the role of transformative leadership in moderating the link between EI and organizational success. The findings supported the hypothesis by indicating a significant mediating impact with a standardized coefficient of 0.37, a t - value of 4.08, and a p - value less than 0.001.

Hypothesis 8 (H8) investigated the role of transactional leadership in moderating the connection between EI and organizational success. The findings revealed a non - significant mediating effect with a standardized coefficient of 0.11, a t - value of 1.71, and a p - value of 0.087, indicating that the hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 9 (H9) investigated the role of laissez - faire leadership in moderating the link between EI and organizational success. The findings showed that the hypothesis was not supported, with a standardized coefficient of - 0.17, a t - value of 1.92, and a p - value of 0.055.

4.2 Discussion

The goal of this research was to look at the link between emotional intelligence (EI), leadership styles, and organizational performance, as well as to see whether different leadership styles may act as a mediator between EI and organizational performance. The structural equation modeling (SEM) and hypothesis testing findings gave important insights into these linkages.

H1 hypothesized a link between emotional intelligence and transformative leadership. This hypothesis was validated by the data, which showed that leaders with greater levels of EI were more likely to engage in transformational leadership behaviors (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bar - On, 1997). This is consistent with previous studies demonstrating the significance of EI in the development and performance of transformative leaders (George, 2000; Goleman, 1998). This association might be explained by emotionally intelligent leaders being better at understanding and regulating their own emotions, as well as empathizing with and influencing the emotions of others (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008). Transformational leaders inspire and encourage their followers through building a shared vision, fostering trust, and giving personalized assistance (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

According to H2, there is a favorable association between EI and transactional leadership. The findings confirmed this theory in part, indicating that emotionally intelligent leaders exhibit transactional leadership practices to some level. This conclusion is consistent with prior study, which found a favorable, although weaker, relationship between EI and transactional leadership vs transformational leadership (Palmer, Walls, Burgess, & Stough, 2001). This may be due to the fact that transactional leadership, which is based on contingent rewards and corrective actions (Bass & Riggio, 2006), still necessitates some level of emotional understanding and adaptability in order to effectively engage with and manage followers' expectations and reactions (Goleman, 1998).

H3 postulated a negative link between emotional intelligence and laissez - faire leadership. This prediction was validated by the data, which showed that greater levels of EI were related with a lower chance of participating in laissez - faire leadership practices. Previous study has shown a negative link between EI and passive or avoidant leadership styles (Antonakis, Ashkanasy, & Dasborough, 2009). Emotionally intelligent leaders are more aware of their own and others' emotional signals, which may reduce

their proclivity to shirk responsibility, withhold counsel, or fail to offer feedback, all of which are traits of laissez - faire leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

H4-H6 investigated the connections between each of the leadership types and organizational success. The findings corroborated H4, showing that transformative leadership improved organizational performance. This conclusion is consistent with a large body of research identifying transformational leadership as a significant driver of organizational performance in a variety of circumstances (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Transformational leaders have been shown to increase staff enthusiasm, commitment, and satisfaction, which leads to greater performance and innovation (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

H5 was also supported by the data, which indicated that transactional leadership had a favorable, although lesser, influence on organizational performance when compared to transformational leadership. Prior research has demonstrated transactional leadership to be beneficial in some circumstances, especially where duties are regular and clear expectations and objectives can be established (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Howell & Avolio, 1993).

H6 hypothesized a link between laissez - faire leadership and poor organizational performance. This hypothesis was validated by the findings, which showed that laissez - faire leadership was inversely related with organizational performance. This conclusion is consistent with earlier research that has shown that laissez - faire leadership has a negative impact on employee motivation, job satisfaction, and organizational outcomes (Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, & Hetland, 2007; Weber, 1947). The passive and avoidant actions of laissez - faire leaders often result in a lack of direction and assistance, resulting in poorer levels of staff engagement and overall performance (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Finally, H7, H8, and H9 investigated the role of leadership styles in moderating the association between EI and organizational success. The findings demonstrated that transformational leadership partially moderated this association, implying that the favorable effect of EI on organizational performance is explained in part by emotionally intelligent leaders' enhanced proclivity to undertake transformational leadership activities. This study lends credence to the idea that developing EI might improve leaders' capacity to successfully apply transformational leadership methods, hence boosting organizational success (George, 2000; Goleman, 1998).

The mediating impacts of transactional and laissez - faire leadership, on the other hand, were not found to be significant. This means that, although EI may be associated with various leadership styles, they play no meaningful role in understanding the association between EI and organizational success. These results emphasize the significance of emphasizing the development of transformational leadership behaviors as a fundamental strategy of utilizing EI to enhance organizational outcomes.

Finally, this study sheds light on the connections between EI, leadership styles, and organizational performance. The findings show that EI is associated to transformational and transactional leadership, but not to laissez - faire leadership. In addition, transformational leadership emerged as an important mediator in the link between EI and organizational success. These results highlight the need of developing EI and transformational leadership characteristics in organizational leaders in order to improve overall performance and success.

5. Managerial Implications

The study's results have numerous key management implications for firms in Uttarakhand and elsewhere in the industrial sector. To begin, the findings highlight the significance of emotional intelligence in successful leadership (Wong & Law, 2002). As a result, firms should emphasize the development of emotional intelligence in their managers, adopting training programs aimed at increasing emotional intelligence and teaching transformational leadership concepts (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Organizations can help managers become more self - aware, manage emotions more effectively, improve social awareness, and build stronger relationships within their teams by investing in emotional intelligence workshops, coaching, mentoring, and other development opportunities (Goleman, 1998; Palmer et al., 2001).

Second, the findings emphasize the relevance of leadership styles, namely transformational leadership, in moderating the association between emotional intelligence and organizational success (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). As a result, while hiring and promoting managers, businesses should take emotional intelligence into account (Goleman, 1995; Barling et al., 2000). Organizations may guarantee that they are choosing individuals who are more suited to adjust their leadership style to the demands of their team and company, resulting in increased organizational performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993).

6. Conclusion

Finally, this study has provided important insights into the role of emotional intelligence in effective leadership, as well as the mediating effects of various leadership styles, particularly transformational leadership, on the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational performance. According to the results, transformational leaders with greater emotional intelligence are more likely to produce superior organizational performance, whereas the moderating impacts of transactional and laissez - faire leadership styles are less noticeable. These findings add to the existing literature on emotional intelligence and leadership by providing a more complete understanding of the complex interplay between these variables and filling research gaps identified in previous studies.

The study's organizational implications show that boosting managers' emotional intelligence and encouraging transformational leadership are essential steps toward improving leadership effectiveness and achieving organizational success. Organizations may guarantee that

their managers are well - equipped to adjust their leadership styles to the demands of their teams and organizations by emphasizing the development of emotional intelligence in their managers and implementing it into their selection and promotion procedures.

7. Theoretical Contributions

This study adds to the existing body of knowledge on emotional intelligence and leadership by investigating the mediating effects of different leadership styles, specifically transformational, transactional, and laissez - faire leadership, on the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational performance. This method fills research gaps in prior studies by providing a more thorough understanding of the complex relationship between emotional intelligence, leadership styles, and organizational success (Antonakis et al., 2009).

Furthermore, by focusing on managers in the Uttarakhand manufacturing sector, this study broadens the applicability of previous findings on the relationship between emotional intelligence, leadership styles, and organizational performance in a new context. This is especially relevant given the rising acknowledgment of the importance of emotional intelligence and effective leadership in driving organizational performance across a variety of industries and sectors (Mayer et al., 2008; Northouse, 2018).

8. Limitations

This study has several limitations that must be taken into account. First, the cross - sectional design makes it difficult to establish causal relationships between variables (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Second, self - report measures are susceptible to biases such as social desirability and common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Thirdly, the context - specific findings in the Uttarakhand manufacturing sector may restrict the applicability of the results to other sectors and locations. Fourthly, the judgmental sampling method may have introduced selection bias and restricted the generalizability of the results (Marshall, 1996). Unexplored variables, such as organizational culture or individual distinctions, may also impact the association between emotional intelligence and organizational performance. Future research could resolve these limitations and investigate the complex interplay between emotional intelligence, leadership styles, and organizational performance in greater depth.

References

- [1] Antonakis, J., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dasborough, M. T. (2009). Does leadership need emotional intelligence? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20 (2), 247 - 261.
- [2] Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- [3] George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53 (8), 1027 - 1055.
- [4] Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- [5] Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated - business - unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (6), 891 - 902.
- [6] Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta - analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (5), 755 - 768.
- [7] Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta - analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7 (3), 385 - 425.
- [8] Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, 63 (6), 503 - 517.
- [9] Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22 (1), 5 - 10.
- [10] Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez - faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12 (1), 80 - 92.
- [11] Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- [12] Antonakis, J., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dasborough, M. T. (2009). Does leadership need emotional intelligence? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20 (2), 247 - 261.
- [13] Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- [14] Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- [15] Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21 (3), 157 - 161.
- [16] George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53 (8), 1027 - 1055.
- [17] Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- [18] Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- [19] Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated - business - unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (6), 891 - 902.
- [20] Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta - analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (5), 755 - 768.
- [21] Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta - analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7 (3), 385 - 425.

- [22] Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, 63 (6), 503 - 517.
- [23] Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- [24] Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22 (1), 5 - 10.
- [25] Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9 (3), 185 - 211.
- [26] Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez - faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12 (1), 80 - 92.
- [27] Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- [28] Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- [29] Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2015). *Business Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [30] Delaney, J. T., & Huselid, M. A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39 (4), 949 - 969.
- [31] Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. New York, NY Guilford Press.
- [32] Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice*, 13 (6), 522 - 526.
- [33] Wong, C. - S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13 (3), 243 - 274.
- [34] Bar - On, R. (1997). *The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ - i): A test of emotional intelligence*. Toronto, Canada: Multi - Health Systems.
- [35] Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- [36] Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39 - 50.
- [37] Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- [38] Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- [39] Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw - Hill.
- [40] Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- [41] Bar - On, R. (1997). *The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ - i): A test of emotional intelligence*. Toronto, Canada: Multi - Health Systems.
- [42] Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- [43] Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39 - 50.
- [44] Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- [45] Antonakis, J., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dasborough, M. T. (2009). Does leadership need emotional intelligence? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20 (2), 247 - 261.
- [46] Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21 (3), 157 - 161.
- [47] Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- [48] Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- [49] Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- [50] Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated - business - unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (6), 891 - 902.
- [51] Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta - analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (5), 755 - 768.
- [52] Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, 63 (6), 503 - 517.
- [53] Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- [54] Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22 (1), 5 - 10.
- [55] Wong, C. - S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13 (3), 243 - 274.