

Emotional intelligence, moral reasoning and transformational leadership

Niroshaan Sivanathan

School of Business, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada

G. Cynthia Fekken

Department of Psychology, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada

Keywords

Moral responsibility, Intelligence, Leadership, Effectiveness

Abstract

Using university residence staff as our leaders of interest, we explored the association of emotional intelligence and moral reasoning to leadership style and effectiveness. A total of 58 residence staff completed questionnaires assessing their emotional intelligence and moral reasoning. Subordinates ($n=232$) rated the residence staff's leadership behaviours and effectiveness. Residence staff's supervisors ($n=12$) also provided similar effectiveness ratings. Analysis showed that leaders who reported higher levels of emotional intelligence were perceived by their followers as higher in transformational leadership and more effective. Interestingly, having high emotional intelligence was not related to supervisor's ratings of effectiveness. Supervisors associated greater job effectiveness with higher moral reasoning. Theoretical implications and practical applications of these findings are discussed.

Received: November 2001
Accepted: January 2001

This article could not have been completed without the support and guidance of Nick Turner. The authors also wish to extend their appreciation to Julian Barling for his helpful comments. They would also like to thank Nancy Tatham, Tom Sharp and Richard Young for their help with data collection.



Leadership & Organization
Development Journal
23/4 [2002] 198-204

© MCB UP Limited
[ISSN 0143-7739]
[DOI 10.1108/0143773021042906 1]

Transformational leadership has emerged as one of the most widely researched leadership paradigms in organizational psychology.

Transformational leadership is the leader's ability to motivate followers to achieve beyond what was originally thought possible. Bass (1985) proposed four factors that were characteristic of transformational leadership, commonly referred to as the "four I's":

- 1 idealized influence (i.e. followers idealize and emulate the behaviours of their trusted leader);
- 2 inspirational motivation (i.e. followers are motivated by attainment of a common goal);
- 3 intellectual stimulation (i.e. followers are encouraged to break away from old ways of thinking and are encouraged to question their values, beliefs and expectations); and
- 4 individualized consideration (i.e. followers' needs are addressed both individually and equitably) (Bass and Avolio, 1997).

Transformational leaders can be contrasted with two other types of leaders.

Transactional leaders are thought to have an exchange based relationship with their followers. Although transactional leadership is known to be moderately effective when practised well (Bass, 1998), such a reinforcement based leader-follower relationship has been empirically shown to be less effective than transformational leadership. The absence of leadership characterizes *laissez-faire* leaders (Bass and Avolio, 1997) who are found to be less effective than transformational leaders.

Transformational leadership has consistently shown advantageous effects on a range of individual and organizational outcomes (Bass, 1998). For example, Barling *et al.* (1996) found that subordinates' organizational commitment was positively correlated with the transformational leadership behaviours of their supervisors.

Kelloway and Barling (1993) have also shown the strongest predictor of loyalty to one's union is the degree to which shop stewards practised transformational leadership. In addition, a positive relationship has also been found between transformational leadership and subordinate motivation (Masi and Cooke, 2000). Perhaps most compelling is the accumulating evidence showing transformational leadership to be positively associated with bottom line business performance (Barling *et al.*, 1996; Howell and Avolio, 1993). In sum, the empirical literature shows that transformational leadership is positively associated with leader effectiveness (Bass, 1998).

Because of the positive organizational outcomes associated with transformational leadership, researchers are exploring factors that predict transformational leadership behaviours (Rost, 1991). Such factors will contribute to the theoretical elaboration of transformational leadership theory and have potential for improving leader training and selection. Two variables showing much promise are emotional intelligence (Sosik and Megerian, 1999; Barling *et al.*, 2000) and cognitive moral reasoning (Atwater *et al.*, 1998, 1999; Turner *et al.*, in press).

Emotional intelligence has been defined as: An array of personal, emotional, and social abilities and skills that determines how well the individual functions in his or her given environment (Bar-On, 1997, p. 1).

In their popular books, Goleman (1995) and Stein and Book (2000) have argued that those leaders with greater emotional intelligence will be more effective leaders. We argue that this relationship could be driven by the conceptual overlap between the four aspects of transformational leadership behaviours relying heavily on the leader's personal, emotional and social skills (Bass and Avolio, 1994) and the personal, social and emotional abilities that make up emotional intelligence. Indeed, positive relationships between emotional intelligence and transformational

The research register for this journal is available at
<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/researchregisters>



The current issue and full text archive of this journal is available at
<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/0143-7739.htm>

leadership have been demonstrated in recent studies (Barling *et al.*, 2000; Palmer *et al.*, 2001). One study found managers in a plant to show greater idealized influence, inspirational motivation and individualized consideration with increased levels of emotional intelligence (Barling *et al.*, 2000). Another study found management students with greater emotional intelligence to report greater scores in inspirational motivation and individualized consideration components of transformational leadership (Palmer *et al.*, 2000).

Moral reasoning is thought to be one's conceptual and analytical ability to frame socio-moral problems using one's standards and values in order to judge the proper course of action (Rest, 1979). Recently, moral reasoning has garnered interest among organizational researchers because of renewed emphasis on ethical leadership (Howell and Avolio, 1992; Kanungo and Mendonca, 1996). The data do indeed support the argument that transformational leadership should be empirically related to moral reasoning because of shared emphases on making good judgments about moral or value related issues. In a study using managers in one Canadian and two British organizations, Turner *et al.* (in press) showed that transformational leadership behaviours were positively associated with levels of moral reasoning. Another study found that moral reasoning moderated leaders' style of punishment (contingent versus non-contingent) and leader effectiveness (Atwater *et al.*, 1998). A related study found that cadets displaying higher moral reasoning were judged as being more effective as leaders (Atwater *et al.*, 1999).

Thus, emotional intelligence and moral reasoning are conceptually and empirically linked to transformational leadership behaviours. Examination of both simultaneously is timely and allows assessment of the relative contributions of each to leadership style. In the present study, we examine this research question using residence dons as leaders. Residence dons are student leaders appointed by universities to serve as a resource for academic and personal matters that are of concern to students living in residences. In addition to their main effects, we test the hypothesis that emotional intelligence and moral reasoning will interact in their effect on transformational leadership. Perhaps leaders who are high in emotional intelligence are especially able to determine which social variables are relevant to socio-moral dilemmas. Finally, consistent with existing literature, we hypothesize that

transformational leadership will be positively related to leader effectiveness.

Method

Participants

Three distinct groups of volunteers participated in this study:

- 1 residence dons from all the residences of a mid-sized Ontario university;
- 2 the residence supervisors (i.e. dons' immediate supervisors); and
- 3 residents from the various residences.

Of the 75 residence dons invited to participate in the study, 58 dons participated (30 women, 28 men). Mean age of women was 22.43 years (SD = 1.52) with a range of 20-29 years. Mean age of men was 22.81 years (SD = 1.36) with range of 21-26 years.

Of the 13 residence supervisors invited to participate in the study, 12 supervisors volunteered (eight women, four men). No other demographic information was collected from the supervisors.

The residents of the participating dons were volunteers selected through the method of convenience. Four students per residence don were sampled, resulting in 232 resident participants (127 women, 105 men). The mean age of women was 19.01 years (SD = 0.89); mean age of men was 19.14 years (SD = 1.34).

Materials

We used four questionnaires in this study. The first scale used was the emotional quotient inventory (EQi) (Bar-On, 1997), a 133-item self-measure of one's level of emotional intelligence. Items are answered using a five-point Likert scale where 1 indicates "very seldom or not true of me" and 5 indicates "very often true of me". Although the EQi is made up of five composite scales, i.e.:

- 1 intrapersonal;
- 2 interpersonal;
- 3 adaptability;
- 4 stress management; and
- 5 general mood;

only the total emotional intelligence score was used. This score is standardized to a mean of 100 with a standard deviation of 15. The EQi technical manual (Bar-On, 1997) summarizes psychometric evidence derived from many studies conducted in diverse work settings. The EQi has shown good reliability with internal consistencies ranging from 0.69 to 0.86 and one month test-retest stabilities ranging from 0.78 to 0.92. In addition, the technical manual presents evidence to support the construct

validity of the EQi. In particular, the EQi total score is correlated with conceptually relevant personality variables, appropriately uncorrelated with conventional intelligence test scores and predictive of work outcomes including job performance.

The second scale used was the defining issues test – short form (DIT) (Rest, 1990). This is a self-report measure comprised of three moral dilemmas to which the respondent is asked to make a morally challenging decision. Reasons for the decision are scored according to Kohlberg's stages of moral development. Test-retest reliabilities of the DIT are generally in the high 0.70 and 0.80s, and Cronbach's alpha also in the high 0.70s (Rest, 1990). Along with face validity, the DIT has shown significant group differences in criterion group validity and correlations around 0.60 and 0.70 with other measures of moral reasoning in convergent/divergent validity tests (Rest, 1990).

The third scale used was the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ-5X) (Bass and Avolio, 1995), a 36-item measure of leadership style assessing transformational, transactional and *laissez-faire* leadership behaviours. The rater form of this questionnaire was used to assess leadership behaviours of dons by their residents. Items are answered using a five-point Likert scale where 0 indicates "not at all" and 4 indicates "frequently, if not always". Given that the MLQ-5X was designed for an organizational setting, some items were modified by adding a parenthetical comment linking it to the residence context and identifying the don as the focal leader when completing the items. Each don was given a mean score across the four resident raters for each of the transformational, transactional and *laissez-faire* scales. Bass and Avolio (1997) showed reliabilities of the subscales to be greater than 0.77. The scales were also shown to be internally consistent in test-retest measures. The MLQ-5X manual also presents evidence for predictive validity on various organizational outcomes.

Finally, to minimize the effect of monomethod bias, two external criterion measures were collected to evaluate the effectiveness of each don. Resident ratings of don effectiveness were based on the sum of six items extracted from a larger appraisal form completed each autumn by residents as part of an exercise by the university to evaluate the residence system. In addition, ratings of don effectiveness were collected from the 12 immediate supervisors who completed the same six items.

Procedure

Most dons responded to the emotional quotient inventory and the defining issues test at a biannual training session of all dons; others were approached individually. Dons mailed the completed questionnaires directly via campus mail to the second author. Supervisor ratings of don effectiveness were completed by supervisors at one of their weekly meetings and were also mailed via campus mail to the second author.

Residents of the dons were approached randomly in their residence and asked to fill out the MLQ-5X using their residence don as the target leader. The mean score across each leadership dimension was calculated by summing the score of each dimension across the raters per don and dividing by the number of raters per don. This resulted in an aggregated leadership score per don.

Missing data for the EQi were dealt with by prorating the available data for each don with a set criterion of 95 per cent response rate. DIT's with any missing data were discarded from the analysis. Missing data for the MLQ were dealt with by prorating each leadership style scale with a set criterion of 90 per cent response rate.

Results

The means, standard deviations and range for the emotional intelligence, moral reasoning, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, *laissez-faire* leadership, supervisor ratings and resident ratings presented in Table I are comparable to sample means reported in the literature (Bar-On, 1997; Dawda and Hart, 2000, Rest, 1990; Bass and Avolio, 1995).

The internal consistencies were also calculated for total scores on the EQi, DIT, MLQ-5X and the supervisor rating scales. Following the suggestion by Gregory (2000), a Cronbach's alpha of 0.70 was set as the criterion for minimum internal consistency. The EQi revealed an alpha coefficient of 0.80, indicating good reliability (Gregory, 2000). The Cronbach's alpha for the DIT was 0.44. This is much lower than the reliability reported by the test manual (Rest, 1990). Following the procedure described in the test manual, coefficient alpha was estimated for all 36 items on the MLQ-5X, resulting in an alpha coefficient of 0.87. The reliability of the supervisor ratings also revealed strong reliability with an alpha coefficient of 0.88. Because the researchers were not furnished with the raw data from the original appraisal survey, the resident ratings of don

Table I
Descriptive statistics for key variables

Scale	Cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Range
Emotional intelligence	58	97.76	11.40	60.30 - 126.31
Moral reasoning	55	40.54	16.96	6.67 - 83.33
Transformational leadership	58	2.47	0.50	1.08 - 3.44
Transactional leadership	58	1.82	0.23	1.25 - 2.35
Laissez-faire leadership	58	0.98	1.07	0.13 - 2.19
Supervisor rating	58	4.10	0.60	2.67 - 5.00
Resident rating	57	4.12	0.35	2.75 - 4.61

effectiveness did not lend itself to an internal consistency analysis.

As can be seen from Table II, transformational leadership is positively correlated to emotional intelligence and resident ratings of don effectiveness, whereas transactional leadership is negatively correlated with moral reasoning and positively correlated with supervisor ratings of don effectiveness. Correlated data suggested none of the variables were so highly intercorrelated as to preclude performing a regression analysis.

Regression analysis

The influence of emotional intelligence and moral reasoning on transformational leadership was examined using multiple regression. First, following the directions outlined by Aiken and West (1991), the data for each of these two variables were centered. In particular, the mean scores were subtracted from each observation; consistent with Aiken and West (1991), standard deviations were not adjusted. Entered simultaneously, emotional intelligence and moral reasoning accounted for 17 per cent ($R^2 = 0.17$, $SE = 0.44$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.14$) of the variance in transformational leadership, $F(2, 52) = 5.42$, $p < 0.01$. A significant beta weight ($t = 3.2$, $p < 0.002$) was associated with emotional intelligence. Next, an interaction term, calculated by multiplying centered scores for emotional intelligence and moral reasoning, was entered into the equation.

Although the overall regression equation remained significant ($F(3,51) = 3.56$, $p < 0.02$), the interaction term did not achieve a significant beta weight.

Discussion

The purpose of the current study was to enhance our understanding of transformational leadership by evaluating its associations with emotional intelligence, moral reasoning and leader effectiveness. Analysis revealed that followers' evaluations of leaders' transformational behaviours were positively related to leaders' self-reports of emotional intelligence and resident ratings on leadership effectiveness. Transformational leadership was not related to either self-reports of moral reasoning or supervisor ratings of don effectiveness. There was no evidence that high levels of both emotional intelligence and moral reasoning interacted to influence transformational leadership beyond the additive effects. Nonetheless, our multi-source data demonstrated a set of predicted associations between transformational leadership and theoretically meaningful variables.

As hypothesized, leaders reporting greater emotional intelligence were perceived by the residents to display greater transformational behaviours. In addition, they were perceived to be more effective. These findings replicate

Table II
Intercorrelations of emotional intelligence, moral reasoning and leadership variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Emotional intelligence	–	.17	.40**	–.03	–.23	.07	.30*
2. Moral reasoning		–	.04	–.37**	.19	.29*	.02
3. Transformational leadership			–	.13	–.39**	.13	.60**
4. Transactional leadership				–	–.01	–.28*	–.03
5. Laissez-faire leadership					–	–.14	–.22
6. Supervisor rating						–	.16
7. Resident rating							–

Notes: Decimals omitted
* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

earlier work by Barling *et al.* (2000) and Palmer *et al.* (2000) and supports Goleman (1995) and Stein and Book's (2000) contention that effective leaders are socially adept.

Contrary to the hypothesis, leaders displaying greater moral reasoning were not found to display greater transformational leadership behaviours. A likely explanation is the low Cronbach's alpha for the DIT. The test of Cronbach's alpha is sensitive to both variance and number of items. In the current study, consider that the total number of items being analyzed was three. Thus, the low Cronbach's alpha could likely be a function of the number of items (Cortina, 1993).

Furthermore, consider that the sample population analyzed was homogeneous. The dons were a restricted sample in terms of age and education. This is especially a problem given the evidence that age and education account for 52 per cent of total variance in DIT (as cited by Bernardi, 1994). For instance, a similar study using the DIT short version on a homogeneous sample found a comparable Cronbach's alpha of 0.35 (Bernardi, 1994). Attempting to compare the current study's Cronbach's alpha of 0.44 to that of the Cronbach's alpha reported in the test manual would be an unfair comparison (Cooper and Richardson, 1986). Thus, we argue the low Cronbach's alpha is a result of range restriction found in a homogenous sample along with the use of the short version of the DIT. However, given the empirical evidence supporting use of the DIT in the literature, we decided to use this measure. Nevertheless, future research employing the longer version of the DIT or the newer versions of the DIT is needed to address more thoroughly the relationship between transformational leadership and moral reasoning.

Another avenue for exploring further the relationship between transformational leadership and moral reasoning may be to look at the factor structure of the MLQ-5X. Although the original theory suggests that the MLQ-5X is based on a nine correlated-factor model (Bass and Avolio, 1997), other empirical studies show evidence of a six correlated-factor model (Avolio *et al.*, 1999) and a three correlated-factor model (Den Hartog *et al.*, 1999).

This study was able to replicate the findings in the literature of transformational leaders being rated as more effective by their followers (as cited by Bass, 1998); however, the present study had no evidence of dons exhibiting transformational behaviours as being rated as more effective leaders by their supervisors. Perhaps the explanation is methodological. The residents rated only

their own don on effectiveness whereas the supervisors were rating a minimum of four dons each. Supervisors might have ranked each don relative to the effectiveness of their comparison group. This is a common methodological issue in organizational research – usually supervisor ratings are collected for multiple subjects from a single supervisor.

An alternate explanation is that residents and supervisors are sensitive to different aspects of the don's role when rating effectiveness. The differential correlations between ratings of effectiveness and dons' self-reported emotional intelligence and moral reasoning suggests that, for residents, an effective don is socially skilled and for supervisors, an effective don is able to reason about complex moral issues that might arise in residences. Other research supports the argument that effectiveness ratings vary as a function of rater-ratee relationship (Hojbjerg and Choi, 2000). Future research might employ a 360 degree feedback program that would allow a comprehensive assessment of the leader when exploring this issue.

We also suggest that the current findings may contribute to developing practical applications. First, Stein and Book (2000) have claimed from the review of the work by Bar-On that a person's emotional intelligence is trainable, whereas Dukerich *et al.* (1990) have shown moral development to be trainable in group settings. Leadership research likewise supports the view that transformational leadership is trainable (Barling *et al.*, 1996; McElroy and Stark, 1992; Micha *et al.*, 1992). Thus, given the empirical link that we have found between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership as well as moral reasoning and transactional leadership, further research might explore the indirect effects of emotional intelligence and moral reasoning on the trainability of transformational leadership. Perhaps simultaneous training of emotional intelligence and moral reasoning might have positive outcomes in organizational training and development of their leaders.

There are some limitations to the study that need to be addressed. Although the study exhausted close to the maximum number of dons available at the university for the study, the sample size remains small. However, we were able to replicate significant links between the variables found in the past literature. Another limitation is the issue of external validity. It could be argued that the residence dons' leadership is not generalizable to other types of leaders, such as industrial leaders. Perhaps industrial leaders operate in a more structured setting

and hence exhibit categorically different leadership. Nonetheless, leadership ratings of dons on the MLQ-5X showed the expected variability as seen in the normative data (Bass and Avolio, 1997). Moreover, given developmental studies showing transformational leadership may begin to develop during adolescence (Zacharatos *et al.*, 2001), using dons to measure transformational leadership in young adults only helps further our understanding of leadership in various contexts. The present study provides support for future researchers who might wish to extend the present research to examine emotional intelligence and moral reasoning simultaneously in industrial settings.

Although it would be intuitive to presume that high emotional intelligence increases one's transformational leadership behaviours, or that one's higher level of moral reasoning decreases the amount of transactional leadership behaviours, it is important to note that the current study does not lend itself to causal inferences. For instance, it is plausible for one to argue that the nature of the job requiring greater transformational behaviours might in the process increase one's emotional intelligence. Similarly, it could be argued that resorting to less transactional leadership behaviours on the job, the individual finds oneself in an environment that helps boost the level of moral reasoning.

Although we cannot make causal links between the variables studied, the present study is important to the leadership literature for two reasons. It is the first study to look simultaneously at the constructs of emotional intelligence and moral reasoning with respect to Bass's (1985) transformational leadership paradigm. Second, it was able to replicate the links found between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership as seen in the literature. Although it was not able to replicate the link found between moral reasoning and transformational leadership in the literature (Turner *et al.*, in press), there was a link found between moral reasoning and transactional leadership. Finally, given the multi-source nature of the data in the current study, it provides a strong starting point for further analysis of the causal nature of the variables studied and, furthermore, for modeling the pathway between the predictor variables, leadership behaviours and leadership effectiveness. Such research will shed light onto the developmental nature of transformational leadership as well as provide practical implications for leadership training programs.

References

- Aiken, L.S. and West, S.G. (1991), *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Atwater, L.E., Dionne, S.D., Avolio, B., Cambreco, J.F. and Lau, A.W. (1999), "A longitudinal study of the leadership development process: individual differences predicting leader effectiveness", *Human Relations*, Vol. 52, pp. 1543-62.
- Atwater, L.E., Dionne, S.D., Camobreco, J.F., Avolio, B.J. and Lau, A. (1998), "Individual attributes and leadership style: predicting the use of punishment and its effects", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 19, pp. 559-76.
- Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M. and Jung, D.I. (1999), "Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 72, pp. 441-62.
- Barling, J., Slater, F. and Kelloway, E.K. (2000), "Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: an exploratory study", *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, Vol. 21, pp. 157-61.
- Barling, J., Weber, T. and Kelloway, E.K. (1996), "Effects of transformational leadership training and attitudinal and fiscal outcomes. A field experiment", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81, pp. 827-32.
- Bar-On, R. (1997), *BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory Technical Manual*, Multi-Health Systems, Toronto.
- Bass, B.M. (1985), *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, Free Press, New York, NY.
- Bass, B.M. (1998), *Transformational Leadership: Industrial, Military, and Educational Impact*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1994), *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1995), *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Research: Permission Set*, Mind Garden, Palo Alto, CA.
- Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1997), *Full Range Leadership Development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*, Mind Garden, Palo Alto, CA.
- Bernardi, R.A. (1994), "Validating research results when Cronbach's alpha is below .70: a methodological procedure", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 54, pp. 766-75.
- Cooper, W.H. and Richardson, A.J. (1986), "Unfair comparisons", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71, pp. 179-84.
- Cortina, J.M. (1993), "What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, pp. 98-104.

- Dawda, D. and Hart, S.D. (2000), "Assessing emotional intelligence: reliability and validity of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) in university students", *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 28, pp. 797-812.
- Den Hartog, D.N., vanMuijen, J.J. and Koopman, P.L. (1997), "Transactional versus transformational leadership: an analysis of the MLQ", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 70, pp. 19-34.
- Dukerich, J.M., Nichols, M.L., Elm, D.R. and Vollrath, D.A. (1990), "Moral reasoning in groups: leaders make a difference", *Human Relations*, Vol. 43, pp. 473-93.
- Goleman, D. (1995), *Emotional Intelligence*, Bantam Books, New York, NY.
- Gregory, J.R. (2000), *Psychological Testing: History, Principles, and Applications*, Allyn and Bacon, Toronto.
- Hoijberg, R. and Choi, J. (2000), "Which leadership roles matter to whom? An examination of rater effects on perception of effectiveness", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 11, pp. 341-64.
- Howell, J.M., and Avolio, B.J. (1992), "The ethics of charismatic leadership: submission or liberation?", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 6, pp. 43-54.
- Howell, J.M. and 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*, Vol. 78, pp. 891-902.
- Kanungo, R.N. and Mendonca, M. (1996), *Ethical Dimensions of Leadership*, Sage, London.
- Kelloway, E.K. and Barling, J. (1993), "Members' participation in local union activities: measurement, prediction, and replication", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, pp. 22-279.
- McElroy, J.C. and Stark, E. (1992), "A thematic approach to leadership training", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol. 4, pp. 241-53.
- Masi, R.J. and Cooke, R.A. (2000), "Effects of transformational leadership on subordinate motivation, empowering norms, and organizational productivity", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 8, pp. 16-47.
- Micha, P., Ori, L. and Gluskinos, U.M. (1992), "The Israeli defense forces: an example of transformational leadership", *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 13, pp. 3-8.
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, M. and Stough, C. (2001), "Emotional intelligence and effective leadership", *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 22, pp. 5-10.
- Rest, J.R. (1979), *Development in Judging Moral Issues*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Rest, J.R. (1990), *DIT Manual*, 3rd ed., Center for the Study of Ethical Development, Minnesota, MN.
- Rost, J.C. (1991), *Leadership for the Twenty-first Century*, Greenwood, New York, NY.
- Sosik, J.J. and Megerian, L.F. (1999), "Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance: the role of self-other agreement on transformational leadership perceptions", *Group and Organizational Management*, Vol. 24, pp. 367-90.
- Stein, S.J. and Book, H.E. (2000), *The EQ Edge: Emotional Intelligence and Your Success*, Stoddart Publishing, Toronto.
- Turner, N., Barling, J., Epitropaki, O., Butcher, V. and Miller, C. (in press), "Moral reasoning and transformational leadership", *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Zacharatos, A., Barling, J. and Kelloway, E.K. (2001), "Development and effects of transformational leadership in adolescents", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 11, pp. 211-26.