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ABSTRACT

A leader may try various approaches to lead and manage an organization that helps to formulate strategy, adopt the positive direction and motivation, and above all lead to subordinate wellbeing. In the current study, an attempt is made to study whether the Emotional Intelligence of the leaders lead to the subordinates wellbeing. The current study adopted survey method to test the hypotheses. Emotional intelligence was measured by a 24-item scale developed by Goleman's (1998). General wellbeing was measured by a 19-item scale developed by Dupuy (1970). The data were collected from a sample of 414 respondents from the petroleum industry. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 was used to assist both quantitative and qualitative data analysis and maintained the transparency and credibility of the research. The results revealed the significant correlation between the emotional intelligence of the leaders and subordinate wellbeing
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INTRODUCTION

Every human being is born with emotions. Emotions are a part and parcel of our lives and we are subjected to exhibit or express them under various circumstances and state of mind. It could be unique for emotional sensitivity, emotional memory, emotional processing and emotional learning ability. These four congenital components of emotions forms the core of one's Emotional intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 2007). The intensity and magnitude of emotions vary from person to person and the ability to express and implement the same in particular situations too. This emotional sensitivity and potential, inculcate the ability to learn emotional management skills by human being to cope up with different situations, which we call Emotional Intelligence (EI).

One can be impressed with a person in terms of his/her mental abilities; hence will perceive such an individual as someone who has the credibility of a leader (Lord, De Vader & Alliger, 1986; Atwater & Yammarino, 1993; Atwater, Dionne, Avolio, Camobreco & Lau, 1999). Perhaps this perception is the result of his/her ability to perform complex tasks (Humphrey, 1985; Humphrey, Sleeth, Kellet & Showalter, 2000), and it is also possible that one perceives someone as a leader because of their emotional abilities and ability to influence employees to follow them. EI has been hailed as a stamp of successful leaders since the term became popular around the 1990s. The statement “great leadership works through emotions” (Boyatzis, McKee, & Goleman, 2002, p.3) means leaders with high EI are truly effective. Mayer et al. (2004) study revealed that subordinates appreciate high EI in their leaders. Very importantly EI played a key role in being happy, healthy, and productive in personal and
professional life (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). Goleman and his co-authors, Boyatzis and McKee (2002), stated that successful leadership is based on effective use of emotion and their actions are also influential to subordinate wellbeing at great extent.

In a leader-subordinate relationship, EI of both the leaders, and the subordinate contributes to a positive relationship between them. It is a leader’s job to inculcate a sense of responsibility within each subordinate for the wellbeing of his/her team. Goleman and Boyatzis (2002) work has created great interest in EI in particular and drew a correlation between having high EI and being an effective leader. Additionally, research linked high EI with psychological wellbeing (Palmer, Donaldson & Stough, 2002; Lopes, Drewal, Kadis, Gail & Salovey, 2006). A number of researchers talk about qualities associated with leaders, such as intelligence, mental and physical robustness, fortitude, and vision, which are essential for leadership. Goleman (2016) strangely, disagrees on these opinions he believes that apart from the basic skills a high quality of training, sharp brains and great ideas, a leader can’t be a true leader, unless he possesses EI as a key attribute for outstanding performance. With the lack of EI, a leader won’t be a true leader. However, it identifies the role of leaders within the organization apparently beneficial to the subordinate wellbeing.

In today's contemporary world, one can experience the drastic change in the workplace. Individuals are being judged by a new yardstick, not just by his/her smartness, or by how well he/she has been trained and educated or knowledgeable, but in a true sense how an individual handles himself/herself along with others as well. The post-modern organizations today are compelled to deal with competition, consumer awareness, globalization, diversification, and professionalism (Cascio, 2001). A leader may try various approaches to lead and manage an organization that helps to formulate strategy, adopt the positive direction and motivation, and above all lead to subordinate wellbeing. The leader-subordinate relationship is usually regarded as one of the most common causes of anxiety in the organizational working (Landeweerd & Boumans, 1994; Tepper, 2000) and also, regarded as a critical element of the psychological atmosphere within an organization (James & James, 1989). The leader’s behavior is associated with self-confidence, subordinates and periodic feedback and can enhance the subordinate wellbeing on the work as well off the work.

However, in today's hypercompetitive global world every human being is in search of skills that may help to create their schedule, behaviors, and relationship with others more meaningful and manageable, and also a well-organized workplace and personal life Earlier research has shown evidence that EI is correlated with health, happiness, life effectiveness, and performance desirability in workplaces (Bar-On, 2001; Johnson, Batey, & Holdsworth, 2009). Over the past decade, having effective EI, leadership behavior is not only the credible psychological constraint but also plays a significant role in the success or failure of the leader, especially, at the most senior levels (Goleman, 1995; Cherniss, 2004). Moreover, pro-social behaviors, parental affectionate relationship along with positive family and peer relations are the significant outcomes of positive EI (Mayer et al., 1999; Rice, 1999).

Based on the above discussion, the primary aim of the study was to investigate the role of EI of leaders on subordinate wellbeing. Especially, the current study aims to achieve the following objectives and hypothesis are formed

**OBJECTIVES**

1. To explore the effect of EI of the leaders on subordinate wellbeing.
2. To know the relationship between Paternalistic Leadership (PL) Style of the leaders and subordinate wellbeing.

**HYPOTHESIS**

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no relationship between EI of the leader and subordinate wellbeing.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is a positive relationship between EI of the leader and subordinate wellbeing.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Salovey and Mayer (1990) is regarded as the founder of thought on this topic and said to be coined and defined the term “Emotional Intelligence”. According to Salovey and Mayer (1990), EI comprises of the three categories of adaptive abilities: evaluation and expression of emotion, regulation of emotion and utilization of emotions in solving problems. In an early nineteenth century, the theorists began to research on the idea that there are certain abilities are present other than academic intelligence which can predict success in life. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso’s (2000) conceptualized EI as, perceiving, assimilating, understanding, and managing one’s emotions which are based on learned mechanism as one learns from emotional encounters just as one learns from cognitive encounters. Hence, EI is an ability to recognize and use emotion as a more effective communicator.

The impact of a single book “Emotional Intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ”, which was published in 1995 by ‘New York Times’ social science journalist Goleman, was strong enough to become a bestseller, including a Time Magazine cover feature (Gibbs, 1995). The book caught the public attention and brought EI to the forefront and widespread the term EI in the corporate as well as academics field. With the strong viewpoints, Goleman stated that EI is equivalent to IQ as a vital indicator to gauge one’s success of professional life. Goleman (1995, 1998) defined EI as the ability to aware of one’s emotions and handle those emotions in varying situations. He concluded that EI consists of different dimensions such as self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill.

The term emotions are not recent phenomena it has been discussed and scripted as early as in a long way since 1st century B. C. by the poet/philosopher Publius Syrus, ‘Rule your feelings lest your feelings rule you’ (Syrus c.100BC/1961 in Salovey and Mayer 1990/2004: 2). In today’s fast track world the scholars from all sphere associated with varied professions such as researchers, psychologist, teachers, trainers, counselors, consultants and professionals are involved in acquiring knowledge about EI skills and its working in daily life. In early twentieth century, Thorndike (1920) carried his research to conceptualized EI that further conceded by many researchers (Moss & Hunt, 1927; Gardner, 1983), and discussed the allied concept of social-intelligence or multiple-intelligence.

In the Indian context, the concept of EI is rooted in social, religious and traditional culture. In Indian culture individuals often treated as a virtue of Karma/Dharma. Fundamentally, Indian culture is based on the morality of caring nature which emphasizes contingent interpersonal obligation, family bonding, and contextual sensitivity. Traditionally, India has diverse systems of belief and practices owing to the multicultural nation that emphasized certain interdependent but interrelated concepts like stress and suffering. One cannot imagine a beautiful life, worth living, and meaningful without positive emotions. In Indian perspective, different researchers tried to conceptualize EI based on their cultural values.

WELLBEING

World Health Organization (WHO) (1998), defines wellbeing as, “Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity”. Wellbeing is a concept of how every individual feels about themselves and the environment in which they live and work. The term wellbeing is used to describe the social, economic, psychological, spiritual or medical state of an individual or group. A high level of wellbeing is associated with positive happening, whereas the low level of wellbeing is associated with negative happenings. Till today, there is no commonly agreed definition of wellbeing; in fact, wellbeing is subjected to its value and importance to the human being and society and important to differentiate the personal and social wellbeing. Furthermore, it is essential to highlight the wellbeing as an inner condition of an individual which considered as a benchmark of the quality of life and the result of the development of society and human being as a member of society.
Aristotle uniquely described wellbeing through his writing “Nicomachean Ethics” (1999), according to him, only a virtuous life considered to be happy life or eudaimonic life (eudaimonia is the Greek term for a good life). Aristotle’s virtuous approach towards the life was not disagreed by his many colleagues and suggested that feeling positive is enough for a happy life that is referred to as the hedonic approach to eudaimonia (cf., Waterman, 1993). The hedonic wellbeing describes happiness and its positive effects on an individual and apparently absence of negative effect (Kahneman et al., 1999). In contrast, the concept of eudaimonic wellbeing describes the happiness of life in terms of life fullest, or understand the capability of own strength (Ryan & Deci, 2001). The two fundamental values of hedonism and eudemonism are based on a distinct level of wellbeing expressing human nature and constitution of a good society. A sense of accomplishment and meaningful life are strong characteristics of eudaemonic wellbeing (Ryff, 1989; Ryan & Deci, 2001) along with the sound psychological condition.

METHODOLOGY

RESEARCH DESIGN

Data was collected through the Web-based survey, as well as through the hard copy. The Web-based survey link (https://goo.gl/forms/eTf6eGDuskM3HXCK2) was created in ‘Google’ and the link was emailed to all respondents with a brief description of the research background and purpose of the study. A total of 414 responses were gathered to report on their leader's EI and self-administered general wellbeing scale. The respondents were between assistant-manager and chief-manager levels.

EI scale (Goleman, 1998) was used to measure EI of the leaders. It consisted of twenty-five items to be responded on a five-point Likert scaling, varying from ‘1= rarely’ to ‘5= always’. The scale measured five aspects of EI: self-awareness, self-regulation, self-motivation, empathy, and social-skills. General wellbeing schedule (Dupuy, 1970) was used to measure subordinate wellbeing. The scale consisted nineteen items with six sub-scales: anxiety, depressed-mood, general-health, positive-wellbeing, self-control, and vitality. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 20 was used to analyze the raw scores for the current study.

RESEARCH MODEL SHOWING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EI AND G WB

![Figure 1](image)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2: Correlation Between Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI_S-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_S-R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_S-M</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI_S-S</td>
<td>0.7**</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>0.86*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_A</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_DM</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_GH</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_SC</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td>0.8**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_V</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.7**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB_T</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.8**</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=414, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001
The correlation results (Table 2) show that EI is significantly and positively related to its sub-dimensions and also to general wellbeing and its sub-dimensions. The reliability analysis (Cronbach’s alpha) (table 3) shows acceptable level for the scales, EI and GWB.

Table 3: Reliability analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Wellbeing</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

The analysis of first equation of the multiple regressions (Table 3) showed that the EI predicts 16% of total general wellbeing of the composite sample. The EI significantly contributed to general wellbeing
in the composite sample. This proved that EI of the leaders contributes to subordinate wellbeing. This means that overall EI contributes in creating subordinate wellbeing. The analysis of fourth regressions equation showed that of the dimension of self-awareness of EI significantly contributed in explaining subordinate wellbeing in the composite sample. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

$H_{01}$: There will be a positive relationship between EI of the leader and subordinate wellbeing.

**Table 4: Multiple Regression with General Wellbeing as Predictor Variable, Emotional Intelligence as Criterion Variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>General Wellbeing_Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>$t$-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>8.94***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$ =0.16***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>$t$-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>4.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regulation</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Motivation</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Skills</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$ =0.19***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=414, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

The research results strongly support the EI of leaders its Impact on subordinate wellbeing, suggesting that the subordinate wellbeing is taken care in the petroleum organization.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

Future researchers should conduct a wider study to explore EI of the leaders in the petroleum organization and how it impacts on subordinate wellbeing in a varied manner. The potential researchers should conduct a wider study on subordinate wellbeing in the petroleum organization in a varied manner. Fundamentally, general wellbeing scale self-reporting surveys are the most effective method of capturing the subjective nature of the leader-subordinate relationships and subordinate wellbeing. It would not be sensible to employ alternative sources such as leaders to evaluate these constructs, as they are generally subjective, and based on individual experiences. In the current study, subordinates evaluate their own wellbeing keeping their leaders/bosses in mind. In future research the scholars should consider leaders themselves to evaluate their own wellbeing as well as subordinate wellbeing.

**LIMITATIONS**

In the current study, EI scale used was of Goleman (1998) and the general wellbeing scale used was of Dupuy (1970), which was age old. The new scale of EI and general wellbeing required the permission of the respected authors, which was time-consuming to obtain the permission and also costly. Hence, those new scales were not a part of current research. The respondents were from one organization of petroleum industry. Hence, there was the lack of diversity in the sample group. Respondents were restricted to subordinates category. The leaders’ category was not a part of the research. Subordinates were restricted to the job group of assistant manager to chief manager grades, which consist of lower and middle management. Thus the findings obtained in this study did not represent top management leadership. An electronic survey prevented some respondent from participating due to outdated or incorrect email addresses.
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