

## Emotional and Other Intelligences

Common wisdom suggests that intelligence, what is more clearly termed *academic* or *verbal* intelligence, should predict both emergence into positions of leadership (smart people are selected as leaders or figure out how to become leaders) and leadership effectiveness (smart people are better at determining strategy and solving complex problems). Although there is a positive relationship between verbal intelligence (as measured by traditional intelligence tests that often produce an intelligence quotient, or IQ, score), this relationship is not as strong as one might expect. A meta-analysis by Timothy Judge, Amy Colbert, and Remus Ilies (2004) suggests that the correlation between verbal intelligence and leadership is between only .21 and .27 (corrected for range restriction)—lower than common wisdom might suggest. Earlier reviews have found similar, somewhat disappointing relationships between intelligence and leadership emergence and perceptions of leadership effectiveness (Lord, DeVader, & Alliger, 1986). There are some important reasons why the relationship between intelligence and leadership is not stronger. First, intelligence may be relative. Leta Stetter Hollingworth (1926) found that if a leader's intelligence was much greater than that of followers, the followers did not identify with and support a leader. The social identity theory of leadership (Hogg, 2001) suggests that followers choose and support leaders who are more "prototypical" members of the group, clarifying the reason why followers might reject a leader with much greater intelligence than the typical group member has.

This research seems to support the notion that voters may not support candidates who appear "too intellectual," as if they are "out of touch" with the common citizen. This is often the case in the United States presidential elections where candidates such as John Kerry, Mitt Romney, and Barack Obama were labeled as being too intellectual and "professorial." This may shed light on the appeal of politicians who appear to be more like the common person—Lyndon B. Johnson, and George W. Bush, Eva Peron, and Sarah Palin, former Australian Prime Minister John Howard, and Cuba's Fidel Castro.

Second, situational factors may moderate the intelligence-leadership relation. In his cognitive resources theory, Fred Fiedler (2002) explains that in a crisis or under stressful circumstances, intelligence may actually be an inhibitor of leadership effectiveness because the intelligent leader wastes time trying to problem solve when quick action is needed. Instead, Fiedler argues, the experienced leader is more effective in crisis or stressful situation, calling on behavioral actions learned through experience and training (think of military or firefighting leaders who train specifically for taking quick actions during stressful "battleground" situations). According to cognitive resources theory, intelligent leaders may outperform experienced leaders when there is no immediate crisis and the intelligent leaders can engage in sometimes-lengthy problem analysis and development of solutions. As this suggests, highly intelligent leaders are only successful part of the time. In addition, in some situations, such as leading a sports team, effective leadership may rely more on specific athletic knowledge and skills than on verbal intelligence.

Finally, and importantly, verbal intelligence may not be a particularly strong predictor of leadership because other forms of intelligence may be more strongly implicated in leadership emergence and effectiveness. Specifically, social intelligence, or intelligence involving understanding people and social processes, may be more important to leadership than IQ. More recently, attention has been given to the role of emotional intelligence in leadership effectiveness. In addition, other forms of intelligence may be important for leadership to possess.

## Theories of Multiple Intelligences

The concept of multiple intelligences goes back as far as Edward L. Thorndike (1920) who proposed social intelligence as a type of intelligence distinct from verbal/academic intelligence. Thorndike characterized social intelligence as the ability to understand and manage people and to act wisely in human relations. Decades later, J. P. Guilford (1967) postulated that there were dozens of facets to intelligence in his structure of intellect model, which included 30 dimensions representing social intelligence. Guilford suggested that the ability to interpret facial and gestural expressions, the ability to perceive others' intentions, and skill in following a sequence of events in social interaction, were all separate components of social, or *behavioral*, intelligence. Guilford and his colleagues constructed measures of these multiple domains of intelligence, many of which were nonverbal in nature (to rule out the overlap with verbal intelligence), and some of which included elements of understanding emotions and feelings.

In the 1980s, Howard Gardner (1983) proposed his theory of multiple intelligences, which included intrapersonal (understanding one's own feelings, motivations, and interests) and interpersonal (understanding others and knowing social processes) forms of intelligence. Gardner (1995) himself has explored connections between these domains of intelligence and leadership. A key to Gardner's notion of effective leadership hinges on a leader's ability to communicate and connect with different constituents, using vision and storytelling to affect their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. One example of an effective leader of this sort is former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. In short, Gardner believes there are multiple forms of intelligence that are important for leadership effectiveness.

Robert J. Sternberg (1985) argued for a triarchic theory of intelligence, which includes *analytical* (closest to verbal/academic intelligence), *creative*, and *practical* (similar to social and emotional intelligences) forms of intelligence. Sternberg (2002) has argued that practical intelligence is particularly important for leaders to possess. Although there is disagreement about the structure of intelligence and its various forms, ranging from three types (Sternberg) to dozens of forms (Guilford), it is generally accepted that verbal/academic intelligence—what is measured by standard intelligence tests and IQ scores—only assesses a portion of the broad domain of intelligence.

## Emotional Intelligence and Leadership

The 1995 publication of Daniel Goleman's best-selling book, *Emotional Intelligence*, put a spotlight on a little-known area of research on the role of emotions in human thought and behavior (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). As a result, the term *emotional intelligence* became part of everyday language. Emotional intelligence is presented as an alternative form of intelligence, in direct contrast to verbal intelligence. Although verbal intelligence focuses on using language, reasoning, and problem solving, *emotional intelligence* refers to the ability to perceive, use, understand, and manage emotions.

There are actually two distinct approaches to emotional intelligence. The first, based on the original Peter Salovey and John D. Mayer (1990) conceptualization, is termed the *abilities model*. This model views emotional intelligence as composed of four sets of skills: (1) managing emotions to attain specific goals, (2) understanding emotions, (3) using emotions to facilitate thinking, and (4) perceiving and interpreting emotions accurately in oneself and others (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Early work by Salovey, Mayer, and their colleagues focused on substantiating emotional intelligence as a *true* form of intelligence in the same sense as verbal/academic intelligence (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999). The abilities model is assessed through performance-based tests, the most recent version of which is the *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test* (MSCEIT) (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002).

The second approach to emotional intelligence is termed the *mixed model* and includes elements of emotional skill/competence; related personality characteristics, such as empathy, self-esteem, optimism, stress

tolerance/hardiness; and elements of interpersonal skill, such as assertiveness. The mixed model is represented in the popular press (e.g., Goleman, 1995) and by measurement instruments and research by Reuven Bar-On (1997) and others (e.g., Boyatzis & McKee, 2006). Measurement of the mixed model of emotional intelligence is typically done through self-report instruments that are similar to traditional personality tests.

An alternative approach to emotional intelligence is to focus simply on the emotional skill components that underlie a portion of the broader construct of emotional intelligence. Rebecca J. Reichard and Ronald E. Riggio (2008) introduced an interactive, process model of leader and follower emotional interaction that is based on research in nonverbal and emotional communication skills dating back to Robert Rosenthal's (1979) emphasis on skill in nonverbal communication. Emotional skills have been assessed using both performance-based measures (e.g., measures of ability to "read" others' emotions) and self-report measures.

The concept of emotional intelligence brought renewed interest to the intelligence-leadership connection, particularly when Goleman (1995) argued that emotional intelligence was perhaps more important than was IQ. Goleman (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002) also claimed that as individuals rose up the leadership ranks, emotional intelligence becomes increasingly important. This makes sense to some extent because emotional abilities are important for leaders in using their emotions to inspire and motivate their followers. Indeed, emotional expressiveness and the ability to emotionally inspire are key components of charismatic and transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Riggio & Riggio, 2008). For instance, studies where a speaker's emotionally expressive behavior is manipulated demonstrate that more expressive speakers are rated as more charismatic and more attractive to potential followers (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Holladay & Coombs, 1993). Studies of the speeches of U.S. presidents have also shown that more charismatic presidents use more expressive forms of speech, including greater use of metaphors (Mio, Riggio, Levin, & Reese, 2005).

Although there are cultural differences in which leadership qualities appeal to followers, recent research by the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavioral Effectiveness (GLOBE) project (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004) suggests that a leader's ability to connect emotionally with followers, or a sort of charisma, seems to be valued in nearly all cultures and countries studied. This is also consistent with Bernard Bass's (1997) contention that transformational/charismatic leadership has universal appeal to followers and is effective across cultures, countries, and contexts. For more information on this topic, see Chapter 56, "Leadership Cultures."

Leadership plays a key role in influencing the emotional "climate" of groups of followers and of organizations more generally. Research suggests that a leader's expression of positive emotions is positively related to higher levels of follower motivation and performance and leads to greater commitment by followers to the group or organization (George, 2000). A leader's expression of negative emotions (e.g., anger, disappointment) can also draw attention to problems or issues, directly motivating followers to address or resolve them.

Ability to recognize and understand others' emotions is also an important leadership skill. Effective leadership needs to be sensitive to others' emotional states and gauge the emotional climate of the group or organization. Theories of leadership, such as transformational leadership, and particularly the leader-member exchange model (LMX; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) are predicated on leaders developing high-quality relationships with followers. In high-quality leader-member relationships, a leader must be attuned to the feelings, emotions, and attitudes of followers and provide emotional support and motivating encouragement to them. Some limited evidence indicates that ability to read others' emotional expressions is related to effective leadership (Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005).

Effective leaders also understand their own emotions and understand emotional processes in general. David R. Caruso, John D. Mayer, and Peter Salovey (2002) state that it is important for leaders to recognize the relationships among emotions, determine the meaning that different emotions and feelings convey, and understand subtle emotional changes. This is consistent with the emphasis in personal leadership development

on possessing high levels of self-knowledge, including knowledge of one's own feelings, motivations, and values (Avolio, 2005).

Managing and regulating emotions is another critical aspect of emotional intelligence for leadership. Often, leaders are under great stress or pressure, and because followers' attention is drawn to a leader, a leader must stifle the display of negative emotional reactions such as fear or anxiety. Instead, leader need to create the impression that they are "cool, calm, and collected" even under pressure, and in many instances, need to be able to present a positive, optimistic face to followers (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). It is particularly important that leaders control their display of negative emotions. Consider the negative backlash that Soviet Union Premier Nikita Khrushchev encountered following his angry fist- and shoe-pounding outburst at the United Nations assemblies in 1960. Even inappropriate expression of positive emotions can be detrimental to a leader, as U.S. presidential hopeful Howard Dean found out when his exuberant scream at a campaign rally made him appear emotionally "out of control."

At the interpersonal level, leaders need to manage emotions such as anger and frustration at a follower's mistake or incompetence, particularly when the overt expression of the negative emotion will lead to deterioration in the follower's performance or in the quality of a leader-follower relationship. Leaders may have to display the opposite emotion than the one they are truly experiencing to keep followers motivated and confident following their mistake or failure (George, 2000).

Another component of the abilities model of emotional intelligence is using emotions to facilitate thinking. Evidence indicates that possession of positive moods facilitates creativity, whereas negative moods enhance critical thinking and reasoning—particularly important when a leader is dealing with a complex problem where an error can lead to great risk or failure (George, 2000). To be effective, leaders need to be emotionally intelligent to use emotions effectively. Positive emotions can be used to motivate and to build good interpersonal relationships, but negative emotions can also be used to enhance critical analyses, to appropriately reprimand followers when needed, and to remind a leader of the risks associated with poor decision making.

Although there is great interest and speculation about the role of emotional intelligence in effective leadership, relatively little good empirical research supports the claims of the popularizers of emotional intelligence. Several scholars have questioned both the validity of the emotional intelligence construct and its relationship to leader effectiveness (Murphy, 2006). Much of this criticism is directed at the mixed model because it mixes emotional competencies with traditional personality traits (e.g., optimism, empathy) and constructs such as assertiveness and resilience/stress tolerance). The concern is that it is not emotional intelligence per se that is leading to effective leadership, but possibly some other personality characteristics or traits. At best, the relationships between emotional intelligence measures and leadership effectiveness have been statistically significant, but small in magnitude (often smaller than the correlations between IQ and leadership). In summary, both verbal/academic intelligence and emotional intelligence seem to be important in determining effective leadership, but the magnitude of relationship between each type of intelligence and leadership is significant, but relatively small. This suggests that effective leaders possess multiple forms of intelligence—and forms of intelligence beyond verbal and emotional intelligence.

## **Social Intelligence and Leadership**

Although the existence of a social intelligence (i.e., intelligence that is associated with experience, rather than with formal education) seems obvious, there has been surprisingly little research in this area. Thorndike introduced the construct in 1920 and there were several early attempts to measure social intelligence (Moss, Hunt, Omwake, & Ronning, 1927). This early research was pretty much abandoned, however, because measures of social intelligence failed to show adequate discrimination (i.e., discriminant validity) from measures of verbal/academic intelligence. Yet, some level of overlap between measures of academic intelligence and

social intelligence would be expected given that both forms of intelligence involve higher-level cognitive processing. The line of research was later picked up by Guilford and colleagues and then reemerged in the 1980s with the theories of multiple intelligences as discussed earlier.

There has not been an overarching or “defining” theory of social intelligence as there has been with emotional intelligence. Instead, research has focused on specific aspects or components of social intelligence. For example, some early approaches focused on social insight or social perception as key elements of social intelligence (Chapin, 1942), whereas others (Ford & Tisak, 1983) argued that empathy was a key to social intelligence, although there is obvious overlap between empathy and emotional intelligence. Herbert A. Marlowe Jr. took a broader approach to social intelligence, defining it as the “ability to understand the feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of persons, including oneself, in interpersonal situations and to act appropriately on that understanding” (1986, p. 52).

Sternberg (1985; Wagner & Sternberg, 1986) suggested that a key component of social intelligence (or what Sternberg calls *practical intelligence*) is tacit knowledge—knowledge about the social environment that is never explicitly taught and may never even be verbalized. Sternberg has suggested that there is a tacit knowledge for leaders and for all types of occupations, and that the tacit knowledge required to be a successful leader in one sector or type of organization may be very different than the required tacit knowledge for successful leadership in another sector.

For example, the tacit knowledge to be a successful political leader involves understanding the political machinations of the legislative body; recognizing how to manage, influence, and be appropriately responsive to constituents; and knowing the general leadership/management strategies of how to get things done. Although executive leaders may need to possess some common elements of tacit knowledge for leadership, the tacit knowledge to lead effectively in the for-profit, not-for-profit, and the governmental sectors would be quite different and distinct.

More recent approaches to social intelligence have focused on the more general social abilities that allow a leader to be socially intelligent. For example, Stephen J. Zaccaro (2002) argues that social intelligence for leaders consists of a sort of social perceptiveness—an ability to perceive the requirements of a particular organizational situation or problem and to select the appropriate behavioral response and organizational strategy. This requires a high degree of what Zaccaro terms *behavioral flexibility*, which is a leader's ability to quickly vary actions in response to the dynamic, changing social situation. Socially intelligent leaders adapt, whereas leaders lacking social intelligence simply rely on executing the same, well-learned strategy regardless of the situation.

This type of social intelligence can be independent of general intelligence or a leaders’ experience. For example, even very bright, experienced leaders can fail because they lack the requisite social perceptiveness and either fail to adequately read or misread the requirements of the social situation. A failure of social intelligence might also occur if leaders don't fully understand how their actions will be perceived and acted on by followers and other constituents. Political agendas often fail because a leader either doesn't understand the process of how to push the agenda, or doesn't anticipate the reactions of opponents or of constituents.

Another approach to social intelligence is part of a broader emotional and social skills model proposed by Riggio and colleagues (Riggio & Carney, 2003). This model focuses on three very basic sets of social-communication skills that are key skill components of social intelligence: social expressiveness, social sensitivity, and social control. *Social expressiveness* is skill in verbal communication (i.e., being articulate; ability to convey ideas) and ability to engage others in social interaction. It is related to, but distinct from extraversion. *Social sensitivity* refers to listening skill and ability to interpret the subtleties of others’ communications, ability to read and interpret social situations (similar to social perceptiveness), and knowledge of social norms, roles, and processes (similar to tacit knowledge). *Social control* is ability to play various social roles—a sophisticated social

role-playing skill that is important in impression management (similar to behavioral flexibility/adaptability). Research with this model suggests that social expressiveness and social control are quite strongly related to both leader emergence and effectiveness and are critical in leader impression management and in appearing honest and authentic.

Theory and research have suggested that social intelligence is related to leadership effectiveness and that the importance of social intelligence increases as one moves up the organizational hierarchy to higher and higher leadership positions. For example, in one study, social intelligence of frontline supervisors did not predict either the performance of leaders or how satisfied supervisees were with them. However, there was a much stronger relationship between the measure of social intelligence and both leadership performance and follower satisfaction with the higher-level leadership (Riggio, Riggio, Salinas, & Cole, 2003). Zaccaro (2002) argues that the complexity of a leadership situation increases as one moves up the chain of command and the magnitude of the problems, and the difficulties in both decision making and decision implementation, increase, requiring the greater reliance on social intelligence to be effective.

Although the popularity of the much newer construct of emotional intelligence has fueled a great deal of research in the past dozen or so years, there has been very little research on social intelligence more generally, and in particular, on social intelligence and leadership. As mentioned, part of the problem is a lack of an overarching theory for social intelligence and few comprehensive and agreed-upon measures of social intelligence. Both emotional and social intelligence are complex, multifaceted, and difficult to assess.

The relationship between emotional and social intelligence is also unclear. Some scholars see them as quite distinct forms of intelligence. Other researchers believe that emotional intelligence is a particular subset of the broader construct of social intelligence, but these two types of intelligence have received the most research attention from leadership scholars. From the theories of multiple intelligences, however, we see a broad array of proposed types of intelligence. Two additional forms of intelligence that have been proposed are sociopolitical intelligence and cultural intelligence. These have particular relevance to our understanding of leadership, and these much newer constructs will be briefly discussed.

## **Sociopolitical Intelligence and Leadership**

Theories of multiple intelligences, and the popularity of emotional intelligence, have led scholars to suggest forms of intelligence beyond IQ, and intelligences that don't seem to fit neatly into the social or emotional categories. One such approach is what has been termed *sociopolitical intelligence*, which emphasizes that human beings are social animals, existing in dominance hierarchies, engaging in self-serving actions to try to get ahead—to survive, and to thrive.

Joyce and Robert Hogan (2002), using an evolutionary framework, suggest that humans, as social animals, try to get along with others and try to get ahead, and that people vary in their abilities to either get along or get ahead. A core element of sociopolitical intelligence is managing one's reputation (an individual's actions and accomplishments over time) because the only way that others know us is by our reputation. Social skills are critical to managing one's reputation, and individuals gain status and acceptance through reputation. "Leaders are, almost by definition, the well-liked, high status people in a group" (Hogan & Hogan, 2002, p. 78).

A key component of sociopolitical intelligence is generalized role-taking ability, similar to the role-playing skill, social control, discussed earlier. Other elements of sociopolitical intelligence, important for leadership, are accurately reading interpersonal cues, accurately communicating intended meanings, and conveying an air of trustworthiness. The measurement of sociopolitical intelligence uses a methodology similar to the assessment of personality, and the Hogans offer some evidence for the validity of their measurement instrument.

Sociopolitical intelligence, like all forms of intelligence, is viewed as a set of skills or competencies, and these are independent of the character or ethicality of the person possessing them. That means that highly intelligent

individuals, regardless of the type of intelligence, can be good, ethical leaders, or flawed and “evil.” Hogan and Hogan (2002) emphasize that sociopolitical intelligence can interact with negative elements of personality, such as narcissism, or other forms of psychopathology (paranoia, psychopathy, and personality disorders). As a result, there are highly sociopolitically intelligent leaders who are flawed psychologically, and represent “flawed public figures.” They cite U.S. presidents Lyndon B. Johnson as possessing sociopolitical intelligence but being a narcissist, Richard Nixon as paranoid, and Bill Clinton as histrionic (Hogan & Hogan, 2002, pp. 85–86).

In his characterization of the leadership of Mao Zedong, James MacGregor Burns depicts a leader high in sociopolitical intelligence. “Mao was brilliantly successful not merely because of his skills as propagandist and organizer but because he was far more attuned than were his rivals to the *needs* of the ‘agrarian masses.’ ... He studied the peasants in a conscious effort to analyze their discontent and their revolutionary potential” (1978, p. 235).

A closely related form of sociopolitical intelligence has been termed *Machiavellian intelligence* and is rooted in evolutionary psychology and social science (Byrne & Whiten, 1988; see also Chapter 86, “Connective Leadership”). This theory suggests that human intelligence developed as a result of the need to influence and manipulate others in social groups and emphasizes the importance of this form of intelligence to social success, competitiveness, and the ability to “come out on top.”

## **Cultural Intelligence and Leadership**

In our increasingly global and diverse world, individuals must interact with people of different nationalities, cultures, and socioeconomic levels. Leaders, in particular, represent culturally diverse constituents and must deal with leaders from nations and organizations in other parts of the world. As a result, there has been a great deal of interest in the concept of cultural intelligence.

Lynn R. Offermann and Ly U. Phan define cultural intelligence as “the ability to function effectively in a diverse context where the assumptions, values, and traditions of one's upbringing are not uniformly shared with those with whom one needs to work” (2002, p. 188). P. Christopher Earley, Soon Ang, and Joo-Seng Tan (2006) define cultural intelligence as “a person's capability for successful adaptation to new cultural settings, that is, for unfamiliar settings attributable to cultural context,” and emphasize that cultural intelligence is not just knowing about other cultures but also being able to adapt one's behavior to fit into the different culture. As these definitions suggest, cultural intelligence is a specific form of social intelligence, and one that moves beyond understanding one's own culture and context to an ability to cross cultures and situations.

Some argue that cultural intelligence is particularly important for workplace leadership (although the same case can be made for political and other types of leadership): “The responsibility for maximizing the value of a diverse workforce disproportionately falls on those who seek to lead. Leaders are, and will be, increasingly called upon to be the champions of diversity, the models of skillful cross-cultural behavior, and the mediators of cross-cultural conflict. More and more, successful leadership will become synonymous with culturally intelligent leadership” (Offermann & Phan, 2002, p. 189).

Cultural intelligence is particularly important for political leaders who have to appeal to their own, often diverse, constituents, as well as work and be effective internationally. Many world leaders today spend a great deal of time learning about and studying cultures so they can avoid costly cultural blunders.

It has been argued that cultural intelligence involves understanding both others and other cultures, but also understanding oneself and how one's own culture affects a leader's perception and worldview. Research evidence suggests that experiences living in other cultures and countries is critically important in the development of cultural intelligence, as one develops a more “global mindset” (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2002). Culturally intelligent individuals, who possess a global mind-set, view persons from other backgrounds as equals, are open to ideas from other countries and cultures, are excited by interacting with persons from other

cultures, and are sensitive to cultural differences, but do not become self-conscious because of those differences.

Mahatma Gandhi is a good case study in the development of cultural (and social) intelligence. Born in India, Gandhi attended London University to receive a law degree. Much of this time was spent learning to adapt to British culture. He later moved to South Africa to begin his law career and had to adapt to a somewhat different culture. Many years later, a much more “culturally intelligent” Gandhi was able to garner support for his cause from people around the world because of his ability to understand and appeal to people from different cultural backgrounds.

Cultural intelligence, like all forms of intelligence, needs to be developed. This is particularly true with cultural intelligence because of humans’ tendencies to avoid, and sometimes fear, the unfamiliar. Nearly all experts in cultural competence/intelligence argue that there is no substitute for direct experience with different cultures and peoples for developing this form of intelligence. In a study of effective international business leaders, G. M. Spreitzer, M. W. McCall Jr., and J. D. Mahoney (1997) identified specific cultural competencies that are important for culturally intelligent leadership. These include being open to opportunities to learn, sensitivity to cultural differences, flexible, insightful, open to criticism and feedback, and able to bring out the best in all people.

## **Summary and Future Directions**

It takes intelligence to be a leader, but the question is which kinds of intelligence are most important for effective leadership? The short answer is multiple forms of intelligence. Although IQ only accounts for a small, but significant, amount of the variance in effective leadership, in combination with other forms of intelligence, particularly those in the social and emotional domains, multiple intelligence likely explains a great deal of effective leadership.

Nearly every leadership scholar or expert will emphasize the importance of “people skills” for leadership effectiveness, but it is difficult to determine exactly what constitutes “people skills.” Academic and verbal intelligence are linked to a leader's ability to make plans, make decisions, and convey meaning to followers. However, the ability to inspire and motivate followers, to connect with them, to persuade, and to develop them involve the nonacademic forms of intelligence, particularly emotional and social intelligence. To lead successfully in organizations and in a global and diverse environment, sociopolitical and cultural intelligences are also important. So, the conclusion is clear that multiple forms of intelligence are required for effective leadership.

Although research has investigated the relationships between specific forms of intelligence (academic, emotional, social, sociopolitical) and effective leadership, there have been virtually no studies that have used multiple forms of intelligence to predict leadership. One problem is the difficulty of obtaining measures of different kinds of intelligence on the same leaders. IQ measures are typically lengthy and involve solving problems (e.g., mathematics, logic), reading comprehension, and recalling facts and figures. As mentioned in the discussion of emotional intelligence, the better assessments of EI are performance-based measures associated with the abilities model. These are also time-consuming and costly to administer. Moreover, there are no agreed-upon measures of social intelligence, and like verbal and emotional intelligences, the best measures are performance-based. This lack of research means that there are unanswered questions about the relationships among different forms of intelligence and their individual and combined impact on leadership.

In addition, there is a great deal of overlap (i.e., shared variance) among the measures of different types of intelligence. That is because all types of intelligence use common, basic information processing skills (what intelligence researchers refer to as *g*, or *general intelligence*). One investigation of measures of academic and social intelligence demonstrated that there was considerable overlap between the two constructs, as well as significant correlations between measures of emotional skill and academic intelligence, although each did appear



as a distinct construct (Riggio, Messamer, & Throckmorton, 1991). Unfortunately, this study did not explore how these forms of intelligence related to leadership. There is a need for additional research investigating how multiple forms of intelligence, individually and collectively, affect leadership.

From a practical standpoint, however, there is a general consensus that multiple forms of intelligence play a part in effective leadership. Political officials, business executives, officers and members of community and nonprofit organizations—all types of leadership—use multiple forms of intelligence, both to attain positions of leadership and to be effective in them. Labeling these constructs *intelligences* (rather than simply calling them *skills* or *competencies*) is not without controversy. Purists argue that emotional and social intelligences (and certainly sociopolitical and cultural intelligences) are not *true* forms of intelligence.

The label of *intelligence* carries with it certain assumptions. First, intelligence is presumed to have both a genetic/hereditary component and an environmental component that involves acquiring mental skills and abilities through learning and experience. For academic intelligence, both heredity and environment contribute, with heredity being perceived as more important. This may be similar for emotional intelligence, with the ability to use emotions being strongly influenced by heredity, but shaped by the environment. With social intelligence, and certainly with sociopolitical and cultural intelligences, development of these may be more heavily weighted toward the environment, although heredity still makes substantial contributions.

Conversely, there are advantages to looking at these constructs through the lens of intelligences. These are inherited and learned competencies that are akin to traditional notions of intelligence. They are not merely personality, temperament, or attitudes and values, but actual abilities that help people be more effective in social situations—to be able to communicate with others, connect with them, influence their behavior, play social roles effectively, and understand the complexities of human interaction. Given that these are also components of effective leadership, the continued exploration of the relationship between multiple forms of intelligence and leadership just makes sense.

—Ronald E. Riggio

---

## References and Further Readings

- Ashforth, B. E. and Humphrey, R. H. *Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity*. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 18 no. (1) pp. 88–115. (1993).
- Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance: Made/born*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Awamleh, R. and Gardner, W. L. *Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance*. *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 10 no. (3) pp. 345–373. (1999).
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory: Technical manual*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bass, B. M. *Does the transactional/transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?* *American Psychologist*, vol. 52 pp. 130–139. (1997).
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership (2nd ed.)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Boyatzis, R. E., & McKee, A. (2006). *Resonant leadership: Renewing yourself and connecting with others through mindfulness, hope and compassion*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Byrne, R. W., ed. , & Whiten, A. (Eds.). (1988). *Machiavellian intelligence: Social expertise and the evolution of*

*intellect in monkeys, apes, and humans*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Caruso, D. R., Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (2002). *Emotional intelligence and emotional leadership*. In R. E. Riggio, ed. , S. E. Murphy, ed. , & F. J. Pirozzolo (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. pp. 55–74). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chapin, F. S. *Preliminary standardization of a social insight scale*. *American Sociological Review*, vol. 7 pp. 214–225. (1942).

Earley, P. C., Ang, S., & Tan, J. (2006). *CQ: Developing cultural intelligence at work*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fiedler, F. E. (2002). *The curious role of cognitive resources in leadership*. In R. E. Riggio, ed. , S. E. Murphy, ed. , & F. J. Pirozzolo (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. pp. 91–104). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ford, M. and Tisak, M. S. *A further search for social intelligence*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 75 pp. 197–206. (1983).

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York: Basic Books.

George, J. M. *Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence*. *Human Relations*, vol. 53 pp. 1027–1055. (2000).

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. E., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Graen, G. B. and Uhl-Bien, M. *Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level, multi-domain perspective*. *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 6 pp. 219–247. (1995).

Guilford, J. P. (1967). *The nature of human intelligence*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gupta, A. K. and Govindarajan, V. *Cultivating a global mindset*. *Academy of Management Executive*, vol. 16 pp. 116–126. (2002).

Hogan, J., & Hogan, R. (2002). *Leadership and sociopolitical intelligence*. In R. E. Riggio, ed. , S. E. Murphy, ed. , & F. J. Pirozzolo (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. pp. 75–88). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hogg, M. A. *A social identity theory of leadership*. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, vol. 5 no. (3) pp. 184–200. (2001).

Holladay, S. J. and Coombs, W. T. *Communicating visions: An exploration of the role of delivery in the creation of leader charisma*. *Management Communication Quarterly*, vol. 6 pp. 405–427. (1993).

Hollingworth, L. S. (1926). *Gifted children*. New York: Macmillan.

House, R. J., ed. , Hanges, P. J., ed. , Javidan, M., ed. , Dorfman, P. W., ed. , & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Judge, T. A., Colbert, A. E., and Ilies, R. *Intelligence and leadership: A quantitative review and test of*

*theoretical propositions. Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 89 no. (3) pp. 542–552. (2004).

Lord, R. G., DeVader, C. L., and Alliger, G. M. *A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 71 pp. 402–410. (1986).

Marlowe, H. A., Jr. *Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 78 pp. 52–58. (1986).

Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., and Salovey, P. *Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. Intelligence*, vol. 27 pp. 267–298. (1999).

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). *What is emotional intelligence?* In P. Salovey, ed. & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators* (pp. pp. 3–31). New York: Basic Books.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.

Mio, J. S., Riggio, R. E., Levin, S., and Reese, R. *Presidential leadership and charisma: The effects of metaphor. The Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 16 no. (2) pp. 287–294. (2005).

Moss, F. A., Hunt, T., Omwake, K. T., & Ronning, M. M. (1927). *Social intelligence test*. Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Murphy, K. R. (Ed.). (2006). *Critique of emotional intelligence: What are the problems, and how can they be fixed?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nye, J. S., Jr. (2008). *The power to lead*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Offermann, L. R., & Phan, L. U. (2002). *Culturally intelligent leadership for a diverse world*. In R. E. Riggio, ed. , S. E. Murphy, ed. , & F. J. Pirozzolo (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. pp. 187–214). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Reichard, R. J., & Riggio, R. E. (2008). *An interactive, process model of emotions and leadership*. In N. M. Ashkanasy, ed. & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Research companion to emotions in organizations* (pp. pp. 512–527). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Riggio, R. E., & Carney, D. O. (2003). *Manual for the Social Skills Inventory (2nd ed.)*. Redwood City, CA: MindGarden.

Riggio, R. E., Messamer, J., and Throckmorton, B. *Social and academic intelligence: Conceptually distinct but overlapping constructs. Personality and Individual Differences*, vol. 12 no. (7) pp. 695–702. (1991).

Riggio, R. E., & Riggio, H. R. (2008). *Social psychology and charismatic leadership*. In D. R. Forsyth, ed. , C. Hoyt, ed. , & G. Goethals (Eds.), *Leadership at the crossroads: Social psychology and leadership* (pp. pp. 30–44). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Riggio, R. E., Riggio, H. R., Salinas, C., and Cole, E. J. *The role of social and emotional communication skills in leader emergence and effectiveness. Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, vol. 7 no. (2) pp. 83–103. (2003).

Rosenthal, R. (Ed.). (1979). *Skill in nonverbal communication*. Boston: Oelgeschlager, Gunn, & Hain.

Rubin, R. S., Munz, D. C., and Bommer, W. H. *Leading from within: The effects of emotion recognition and*

personality on transformational leadership behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 48 pp. 845–858. (2005).

Salovey, P. and Mayer, J. D. *Emotional intelligence. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, vol. 9 pp. 185–211. (1990).

Spreitzer, G. M., McCall, M. W., Jr., and Mahoney, J. D. *Early identification of international executive potential. Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 82 pp. 6–29. (1997).

Sternberg, R. J. (1985). *Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (2002). *Successful intelligence: A new approach to leadership*. In R. E. Riggio, ed. , S. E. Murphy, ed. , & F. J. Pirozzolo (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. pp. 9–28). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Thorndike, E. L. *Intelligence and its uses. Harper's Magazine*, vol. 140 pp. 227–235. (1920).

Thorndike, R. L. *Factor analysis of social and abstract intelligence. Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 27 pp. 231–233. (1936).

Wagner, R. K., & Sternberg, R. J. (1986). *Tacit knowledge and intelligence in the everyday world*. In R. J. Sternberg, ed. & R. K. Wagner (Eds.), *Practical intelligence* (pp. pp. 51–83). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Zaccaro, S. J. (2002). *Organizational leadership and social intelligence*. In R. E. Riggio, ed. , S. E. Murphy, ed. , & F. J. Pirozzolo (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. pp. 29–54). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

---

**Entry Citation:**

Riggio, Ronald E. "Emotional and Other Intelligences." *Political and Civic Leadership*. Ed. Richard A. Couto. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2010. 997-1005. *SAGE Reference Online*. Web. 30 Jan. 2012.



© SAGE Publications, Inc.

Brought to you by: SAGE