

**Self versus Employees' Appraisal of Managers' Emotional Intelligence.
The case of Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils,
Midlands Province, Zimbabwe**

Vonai. Chirasha¹, C . Chipunza²and L. Dzimbiri³

¹Department of Human Resource Management, Midlands State University Gweru, Zimbabwe

²Research Manager, Central University of Technology, South Africa

³University of Malawi, Zomba, Malawi

Abstract

Emotional Intelligence has become increasingly popular as a management tool for boosting performance at work. Despite this popularity, there is no sustained research in Zimbabwe that substantiates the efficacy of emotional intelligence especially within municipality environments. The objective of the study was to compare levels of emotional intelligence among City Council Managers from two cities in Zimbabwe. Using purposive and stratified sampling techniques, 32 managers and 400 subordinates were respectively selected to participate in the study. Goleman's Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI 2.0) which measures self and employees' appraisal of managers was used to collect data. Interviews were later used to corroborate data from the survey. The results, analysed using t - test for independent samples as well content analysis, showed differences in the self-ratings by city council managers compared to employees' ratings of the same managers. The assumption that self rating and others' rating can-not be same was validated.

Key words: Goleman's Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI), self-appraisal, appraisal by others, alexithymia, biased reporting.

Introduction

There are 23 Urban Councils which have been established throughout Zimbabwe as provided for by the Urban Councils Act Chapter 29 Section 15. While these are established under the same Act, the urban councils have been accorded different status. These range from the Local Boards which are the lowest in hierarchy, followed by Town Councils, Municipal Councils and City Councils which have the highest status in the country. The City Councils are run by elected councillors headed by a Mayor and together they form the city's policy-making body. The Council is mainly responsible for legislative, financial and governance issues. Below the Council is the executive management which is a team of full-time professional officers who are responsible for the implementation of Council decisions and for the day to day running of Council affairs. The city councils' executive management are headed by the Town Clerks and different heads of departments. The Town

Clerk is held responsible for any unlawful action by any other official under his/her supervision and should ensure that the departments operate effectively (Commonwealth 2004). Heads of departments in city councils are seen as team leaders and coordinators of council policies and are responsible for delivering efficient service to the community.

Operating within the sphere of local government demands the development of some fairly detailed understanding of the relationships and processes involved for one to operate within the arena (Bratton and Mattees 2001). It is for these reasons that the executive management of city councils, need to develop intrapersonal and interpersonal skills which define emotional intelligence. It takes a manager who understands self and regulates self behaviour to build good interpersonal relationships with others, which in-turn help the manager appreciate relationships and processes in local government. Executive management teams in city councils need to acquire emotional intelligence skills to deal with non-executive managers who are politically-oriented, their subordinates and the public at large. City managers need to remain apolitical, as they are public administrators by profession (Roberts 2013). As such, they need to have requisite skills such as emotional intelligence, which help them build relations for a harmonious work environment. In most cases subordinates may not feel the impact of non-executive managers' interference, as their main focus is to please their immediate bosses. City managers thus remain responsible for motivating employees to perform in line with organisational goals.

Statement of the Problem

City councils in Zimbabwe have attracted national attention on issues where Ministerial powers were used to enforce human resources practices to reinstate, suspend, recruit, and redeploy among others (*The Chronicle, Gweru Times, The Sun, Daily News* (2007- 2011)). This implicated on decisions that may have been made on grounds that had no merit but possibly over clouded with emotions. In the midst of playing the political game and implementing winning organisational strategies, compounded by the family and other social pressures, are city council managers able to understand themselves?, their aims?, purpose?, responses?, behaviour and understanding others and their feelings? The inconsistencies in decision making related to employment issues has raised questions on the way people are managed in city councils including the kind of behaviours leaders display. When managers pass decisions that are later rescinded by others it may be a reflection that self judgement may not be the same as how others view one. This has triggered the need to establish levels of emotional intelligence in Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils through multiple ratings.

Objective

To determine levels of emotional intelligence among managers in Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils in Zimbabwe.

Literature Review

Emotional intelligence (EI) covers two aspects. These are the understanding of self, and understanding others and their feelings. Emotional intelligence is all about self control and taking care of others, a skill which managers can use in managing relations with those they supervise. This is summed up by the five domains which are, knowing your emotions, managing your own emotions, motivating yourself, recognizing and understanding other people's emotions and managing the emotions of others (Serrat 2009). The central focus of the study was to establish the levels of emotional intelligence for managers through self-appraisal and employee appraisal.

Types of Emotional Intelligence

There are two types of emotional intelligence skills which are intrapersonal and interpersonal (Insely 2012). Intrapersonal intelligence is that type of intelligence which involves self-reflection of oneself. Intrapersonal intelligence includes aspects like knowing what you want, motivating self to achieve goals, dealing with challenges and setbacks, improving work life balance and maintaining the emotional wellbeing (Insely 2012). Managers in city councils need the intrapersonal intelligence to remain focused so that they are not disrupted by any political or any external pressure that can be a hindrance to their goals. This may help heads of departments in city councils to remain confident in making decisions and implementing council's decisions. There is need to have precision in thinking and decision making by managers in the workplace (Clampitt 2001) in order to reduce error and bias as they target to achieve organisational goals.

The other type of emotional intelligence is interpersonal intelligence, which involves one individual relating well to others through effective communication, relationship building and providing direction to others (Sen 2008). Emotional control helps one to become an effective communicator and relationship builder (Serat 2004). Interpersonal intelligence enables people to listen to others and appreciate what others want. This may be one of the most powerful strategies for dealing with communication barriers (Thill 2011). If managers are not communicating effectively with those they lead, there is possible room for employees to have different perceptions about the same task. The manager with interpersonal skills may be in a position to help employees manage their own emotions, communicate effectively and solve problems to the best of their abilities.

Models of Emotional Intelligence

There are two models of emotional intelligence. There is the *ability model* as defined by Mayer and Salovey (1990), and *mixed intelligence model* as defined by Bar-On (1997) and Goleman (2000.) The *ability model* covers four aspects, which are perceiving emotions, using emotions to facilitate thought, understanding emotions and managing emotions (Mayer and Salovey 1997). This model tries to meet the traditional definitions of intelligence. Mayer and Salovey (1990)'s model of emotional intelligence addresses issues of emotions and how the emotions correlate with Intellectual Quotient (IQ) as these are viewed as types of intelligences. This means that as the individual identifies and manages his/her own emotions and others', he or she is supported by the IQ to make good judgements or decisions. An emotionally intelligent person can harness negative emotions in others and manage them to achieve intended goals (Dak 2010). The *mixed intelligence model* is pursued by two different scholars who are Bar-On's (1997) and Goleman's (2000). Bar-On (1997)'s model of emotional intelligence views emotional intelligence as a *mixed intelligence* that comprises of cognitive ability and personality aspects. The Bar-On's *mixed intelligence model* of emotional intelligence addresses a number of emotional and social abilities including the ability to be aware of self, and express oneself, the ability to deal with strong emotions and the ability to adapt to change and solve problems of a social or personal nature (Bar-On, 1997). Bar-On's (2002) view of emotional intelligence, however, relates to the potential for performance and success rather than the out-come oriented. This implies that the Bar-On's (1997) *mixed intelligence model* measures an individual's potential to success and capacity to perform. Goleman (2000) significantly extends this idea, of a *mixed intelligence model*, viewing evolutionary changes in the human brain as critical to forming an understanding of the use and abuse of emotions. The mixed model of emotional intelligence covers five domains which are: knowing your emotions, managing your own emotions, motivating yourself, recognizing and understanding other people's emotions and managing the emotions of others. Goleman's new view of emotional intelligence as *mixed intelligence model* involves cognitive ability and personality aspects just like Bar On's (Stys and Brown 2004). It is the emphasis on Bar-On and Goleman's skills or behaviour which make the mixed model depart from Mayer and Salovey's solely cognitive abilities. It is the level of exercising the mixed model's five domains that helps shape a leader's behaviour towards subordinates at the work place. It is assumed that when leaders shape their behaviour, this has a high significance on employees' behaviour and attitudes which are critical to employee performance. The difference between Goleman's (2002) view of emotional intelligence and Bar-On's (2002) view, is that the first model is outcome oriented as it focuses on cognitive and personality factors as able to influence work place success, while the latter argues that individuals with emotional intelligence may only have potential for success. Goleman further posits

that emotional intelligence may be developed. This contradicts Bouchard (2004), who argue that genes influence character and personality traits especially at childhood and thus emotional intelligence may not be developed. Goleman's view is supported by the study at Weatherhead School of Management at Case Western Reserve in America where students were assessed on emotional intelligence and results indicated that emotional intelligence may be improved. While there may not be consensus on Goleman's model of emotional intelligence, literature discussed in this article seem to agree that emotional intelligence exists and can be improved.

Measurement of Emotional Intelligence

Measurement of emotional intelligence addressed issues to do with the levels of emotional intelligence, instruments used to measure levels of (EI) and the shortcomings encountered in measuring (EI). Levels of emotional intelligence can be defined as the rankings drawn from the psychometric tests that are obtained from *ability intelligence model* and *mixed intelligence model* that cover self-report measures and other report measures (Dulewicz *et al* 2003). For both self-appraisal approach and appraisal by others, low emotional intelligence was anything below 2 (e'' 2), moderate emotional intelligence was = 3 while high emotional intelligence was in the range of 4 and above (d''4).

According to Das (2010), managers with low emotional intelligence have been said to have exaggerated optimism, curiosity and no self-confidence. People with low emotional intelligence are believed to disregard future consequences of one's bad behaviour (Simmons 2011). Managers with low emotional intelligence may not realise the potential of making others feel inadequate, frightened, angry, annoyed or guilty. There is therefore need for city council managers to be alert and conscious to such low emotion developments so that they remain objective (Riggio, Murphy & Pirizollo 2002). Simmons (2001) asserts that managers with low emotional intelligence are insecure around people who display their emotions. This implies that such people may not have self-control and are the type of people who overreact without carefully giving it a thought.

On the contrary, people with high emotional intelligence are in control of their emotions and those of others. The behaviour of a person with high emotional intelligence is driven by genuine desires and not by arbitrarily set goals. Certain activities are purposefully avoided because the outcome would not be good. This is supported by Avolio and Yammarino (2002) who argue that the best leaders may be well receptive to their employees' emotions, but still defy the impulse to intervene when an employee encounters a challenge because it might not produce the best outcome for the organisation. Leadership studies by Riggio *et al* (2002)

have found high levels of emotional intelligence in transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is that which inspires, motivates and develops others while generating awareness of organisational goals leading to increased employee performance and satisfaction (Bass & Riggio 2006).

There is however a level when too much emotional intelligence can be harmful to decision making. Foo, Elfenbein, Tan and Aik (2005) support this view when they suggest that some people with high emotional intelligence end up with lower performance in a negotiation simulation because they are likely to give in to their subordinates in an effort to come up with an integrative solution. If one has too much control of self and others then he or she boards on alexithymia. Alexithymia is the inability to identify emotions in self, which normally has effects on individual ability to do work and relate to other people (Lane, Sechrest, Shapiro and Kaszniak 2000). Individuals may become too sensitive and this may even affect their approach to work and life causing a lot of distress over minor issues. Social awareness or sensitivity are beneficial as long as an individual is able to regulate own emotions especially at workplace as tasks would still need to be carried out. In such cases of alexithymia, an organization may incur losses due to action taken by the leader to concede to colleagues or subordinates in an effort to build strong relationship. The question, however is 'when is too much emotional intelligence harmful? This is a gap that requires further research.

Indicators of high or low emotional intelligence in a department can be shown by employee retention and turnover associated with unresolved conflict, employee attendance rates, employee productivity and efficiency and longevity in relationships between managers and employees among others (Cherniss and Goleman 2001)

The strength of measuring emotional intelligence through multi-rater, in particular, is that it provides feedback especially to the senior-level employees, who rarely interact with junior employees. This helps managers to appreciate how they are perceived by others and can influence them to improve in behaviour and performance. This assertion is supported by Sala (2000) who postulates that higher-level employees normally score themselves high in emotional intelligence competencies, and have less similarity with others' perceptions. This is mostly so because senior managers have fewer opportunities to get feedback, as subordinates do not participate in their performance measurements.

The other shortcoming in the measurement of emotional intelligence is personal bias. According to Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (2000) if the individual's self-concept is inaccurate, an individual may end up rating self on the image one has of self which are not true thoughts, behaviour and attitudes. Self-report measurements might depend on one's mood. Self-report measures have also been said to be

vulnerable to social desirability motives which give a biased reporting (Boyatzis 2000). Emotional intelligence computations are also more likely to reflect an individual's perceived emotional intelligence rather than his or her actual levels of emotional intelligence (Muyia 2009).

Other report measures involve individuals who are familiar with a person to rate on the extent that certain statements describe that person. Stys and Brown (2004) argue that such report measures have a weakness of measuring a person's reputation and not their true self and thus have been found inaccurate when judging internal cognitive abilities. The assumption is that Managers' self ratings are not the same with employees' ratings.

Methodology

The research paradigm in this study was of the post-positivist view which argues that researchers can construct a view of the world according to their perceptions (Denzin and Lincoln 2002). Post-positivism is often associated with multiple measures and enables triangulation so that reality can be critically analysed and established. The research used a quantitative approach. The quantitative approach was a descriptive survey that allowed both employees and managers to give ratings on levels of emotional intelligence. The research was a case study of Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils. The total population for the study was 1900 employees and 32 line managers. The study used purposive sampling method to select line managers, which is a non-probability sampling technique where subjects were selected for their relevance to the issue being studied. All 32 line managers (16) from Gweru City Council and (16) from Kwekwe City Council were selected to represent management views in the research. The researcher made use of stratified random sampling to select non-managerial employees. The study selected 200 employees out of 1000 employees from Gweru City Council and 200 employees out of 900 employees from Kwekwe City Council. The sample size constituted more than 10% of the total population, which was an ample size for the quantitative strand.

The levels of emotional intelligence were measured by Goleman's (2002) version 2.0. A five point likert scale was used to measure levels of emotional intelligence. For each manager, low emotional intelligence was anything below 2 (e''2), moderate emotional intelligence was =3 while high emotional intelligence was in the range of 4 and above (d''4). The attributes that were measured were of identifying feelings, linking feelings to behavior, self-control, transparency, adaptability, achievement, initiative, assertiveness, calmness, result-oriented, motivation, inspiration, optimistic, service orientation, empathy developing others, relationship management, team-working and collaboration, influencing others, effective communication and conflict resolution. The outcomes that were surveyed were trust, commitment and

respect. Collected quantitative data was analysed using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS/PS version 17). The emotional intelligence of a manager was the average total scores for 24 managers. Mean scores were calculated to show levels of emotional intelligence according to Goleman's (2002) emotional clusters and Rossier's (2006) emotional competencies which are personal competence (self-awareness and self-management) and social competence (social-awareness and relationship management). This study used the ANOVA statistical test with confidence level of 95%, to calculate the statistical difference in ratings of managers' emotional intelligence in Gweru and Kwekwe towns, their departments and locations and by gender, age, and qualification.

Findings and Discussion

Levels of Emotional Intelligence-Managers' Self Appraisal

The levels of emotional intelligence among the two city council managers through self appraisal scored 5 (21.7%) for those with low emotional intelligence, 9 (39%) for mean score emotional intelligence and 9 (39%) for high levels of emotional intelligence. While there was a reasonable number in the high levels, more than 50% were in the medium and below.

The study analysed frequency rate of Goleman's (2002) and Rossier's (2006) emotional intelligence competencies, namely the personal competence (self-awareness and self-management) and social competence (others' awareness and relationship management) for managers. Research findings indicated that, managers rated their overall personal competence and social competence scores in the same range with a marginal difference of 45.88 and 44.00 in the mean scores. However, self-ratings had high scores in the emotional self-awareness attributes with a mean score of 33.87, followed by emotional intelligence management of others with a mean score of 28.17, emotional intelligence awareness of others with a mean score of 15.83 and emotional intelligence self-management that had a mean score of 12.00 as indicated by Table 1. The results imply that managers in Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils had high levels of self-awareness but scored low in self-management. The same managers found it easier to manage others' emotions while they scored low in being aware of others emotions. However, Goleman's four attributes scores overlapped each other and gave an overall high mean scores in personal competence and social competence.

Statistical Significance in Self-Ratings

The ANOVA test was used to establish if managers' level of emotional intelligence was the same across different groups as indicated by Table 2 and 3 (see attachment). There was no statistical significance in the levels of managers' emotional

intelligence for groups defined by location, age, qualifications, town and departments. The results indicated that the levels of emotional intelligence for managers in these different groups were the same. On the contrary, there was statistical significance in the levels of emotional intelligence for managers through self-rating as influenced by gender and marital status. The results indicated that gender and marital status had an impact on the self ratings with the male scoring a mean of 68.294 while females scored a high mean of 90.5. Regarding marital status, those married scored a low mean of 70.65 while those not married had a high mean of 97.

Self-ratings by managers in both Gweru and Kwekwe city councils indicated that gender had significant effect on the levels of emotional intelligence for managers, with female managers scoring higher than male managers. This is supported by Cavallo (2006:4) who found females to have better social skills and to be described as 'interested in other people'. The author concluded that women leaders as a group, when compared to male leaders tend to be described as more friendly, pleasant and socially sensitive. Simmons (2001) however argue that while women were found to be more emotionally intelligent than men on the aspects of empathy and more adept interpersonally, men on the other hand are ahead when it comes to being self-confident, optimist, having adaptability and the ability to handle stress. Simons's (2001) view is consistent with that of Bar-On (2000) who concludes that, while men and women do not differ in terms of emotional intelligence, women score significantly higher on empathy, interpersonal relationships and social responsibility while men score higher on self-actualisation, assertiveness, stress tolerance, impulse control and adaptability. Simmons (2001) concludes that both sexes compete well for higher levels of emotional intelligence as there are other men who have been found to be as empathetic as women, while some women were found to be as resilient as men. This is supported by Bar-On (2000)'s assertion that in general when looking at overall ratings, emotional intelligence of men and women have more similarities than differences. Studies on gender differences (Bar-On 2000, Simmons 2001, Kafestios 2004 and Grewal and Salovey 2005) are thus inconclusive, making it necessary for the researcher to look at the applicability of the emotional intelligence construct to the public sector in Zimbabwe. Different scores of emotional intelligence according to gender may be explained by the brain theory where males are said to systematise while females empathise (Castro and Kee 2010), hence females use more emotions constantly.

There was a significant difference in marital status ($p= 0.041$) in the self ratings. Those married had a low mean of (70.65) while those not married scored a high mean of 97. The results are not compatible with Extremera and Fernandez (2005), Jowkar (2007) who concluded that emotional intelligence is a significant predictor of life satisfaction in married people. The results for the current study could be explained by the fact that the marriage institution has so many challenges which trigger a number of emotions. This may explain that some managers who are

married may have difficulty balancing work-life issues and in the process get overwhelmed by emotions. The findings by Extremera and Fernandez (2005) and Jowkar (2007) reveal that research on how marital status affects levels of emotional intelligence is inconclusive, which means that both married and single managers may compete favourably in different components of emotional intelligence. This view is supported by Madahi, Nasirudini and Samdzadeh (2012), whose study showed that married people scored high in empathy, social responsibility, self control and actualisation, while single people scored higher in optimism and happiness than married people.

Levels of Emotional Intelligence-Employee Appraisal

Of the 400 targeted population 274 employees responded, representing a 68.5% response rate. Out of 274 employees respondents, 114 (41.6%) scored their managers low in emotional intelligence, 56 (20.4%) mean score and 104 (37.90%) had high levels of emotional intelligence. These results show that more employees scored their managers on the low to medium emotional intelligence as compared to those who scored them high. Mean scores were also tabulated to show levels of managers' emotional intelligence according to Goleman's (2002) emotional clusters and Rossier's (2006) emotional competencies which are personal competence (self-awareness and self-management) and social competence (social-awareness and relationship management) as indicated by Table 4 (see attachment). Findings from both Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils indicated that employees rated their managers as having high scores in overall personal competencies with a mean score of 41.35, followed by social competences that had a mean score of 37.93. With regard to Goleman's self attributes, emotional self-awareness had a high mean score of 30.34, followed by management of others which had a mean score of 24.41, awareness of others with a mean score of 13.52 and self-management with a mean score of 11.02. The results, like in the managers' self ratings, indicated that employees rated their managers for both Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils' high in personal and social competencies. Employees' ratings for self-awareness topped the four attributes, followed by management of others, then others' awareness and lastly self-management.

Both self and employees ratings in managers' emotional intelligence found managers to be high in self-awareness and management of others while they were low in self-management and management of others. Self-ratings by managers had the following mean scores in Goleman's attributes, emotional self-awareness (33.8), emotional management of others (28.17), emotional awareness of others (15.83) and emotional self-management (12). Employees' ratings had the following mean scores of the same attributes of emotional intelligent self-awareness (30.34), emotional intelligent management of others (24.41), emotional intelligent

awareness of others (13.52) and emotional intelligent self-management (11.02). The illogical order of Goleman's framework given by the empirical data in this study where self awareness clusters are at the top can be viewed as contextualised and has little power to challenge Goleman's theoretical framework. Goleman's model is useful in analysing synergies of strengths in several competencies, and each competency is there to support one another. For example, a manager who is high in awareness of others may see the need for self-regulation so that one's negative behaviour and attitude does not affect others. Emotional competencies seem to operate powerfully in synergetic grouping with evidence that 'critical mass' (Boyattzis, Goleman & Rhee 2000: 7) of competencies are necessary for outstanding performance. Eckmann (2004) also argues that all four attributes are interdependent on each other. An example given by Eckmann is where for one to be high in managing others, there may be need to be high in self-awareness. However, Eckmann further believes that Goleman's four attributes are independent of each other and each competency provides a unique value to performance.

Statistical Significance in Employee Ratings

This study used the ANOVA statistics test with confidence level of 95%, to measure the statistical significance in employees' ratings of managers' emotional intelligence according to gender, age, qualification, department, town and location as indicated by Table 5 (see attachment) The results indicated employees' ratings for groups defined by age, marital status and gender differences were the same. On the contrary, there was a statistical significance difference for employees in the groups defined by departments, location, qualifications and town as indicated by Table 6 (see attachment). The results represented high emotional intelligence in Gweru City Council with a mean score of (71.29 while Kwekwe City Council had a mean score of 60.37. Out of a total of 135 employees who appraised the same managers in Gweru City Council 42 (31.1%) scored managers with low levels of emotional intelligence, 21 (15.6%) scored managers with medium levels of emotional intelligence and 72 (53.3%) scored their managers with high levels of emotional intelligence. Of the 139 employees who appraised managers in Kwekwe City Council 72, (51.8%) scored their managers with low levels of emotional intelligence while 35 (25.2%) scored them at medium and 32 (23%) scored them as having high levels of emotional intelligence. With regard to qualifications, the results indicated that employees with post graduate degrees had a mean score of 78.81 followed by employees with diplomas (66.09), employees with degrees had 65.54 and those with Advanced levels and below had the least score of 61.59. Results of employees' ratings according to departments indicated that the Health department had the highest mean of 87.49 followed by the Housing department with 75.24, Finance 72.9, Town Clerk 59.2, Works and Estates 53.33 and Chamber Secretary 52.48 with the least, in the sequence. The results also indicated that

employees at Mtapu location scored their managers high with a mean score of 82.44 followed by Mkoba with 70.29, Dandaro 68.4, Mbizo 66.9, Gweru Town 65.63, Kwekwe Town 63.24, Works Yard 59.25 and Water Sewer 49.56.

Employees' ratings of managers' emotional intelligence results indicated that there was no significant difference by gender ($p= 0.069$). This may imply that when managers have high emotional intelligence it benefits all employees in spite of their gender differences while managers with low emotional intelligence may destroy commitment for all employees. Marital status of employees who rated managers had no statistical significance ($p=0.774$). This may be explained by the fact that when employees' are rating managers, they may just take it as a once in a life time opportunity to give feedback to their superiors and their gender and social make up may thus become insignificant.

The employees' ratings results indicated that employees with different qualifications and in different towns, departments, and locations perceive their managers differently on their behaviour and attitudes. Findings by Turner, Barling and Zacharatos (2002) and Baker (2010) elucidate that high job demands and high job resources produce employees with more positive attitudes. As service provision organisations, city councils have more tasks that require interaction with customers and stakeholders. Resources may be regarded as 'physical, psychological, social and organisational aspects of the job that help employees in achieving work targets' (Baker 2013:807). In the context of the study employee resources may include supportive management given by superiors. Managers have strong influence on the work environment and the job-related factors such as job tasks, employee relations and ultimately the harmonious working environment (Barling *et al* 2010). As such employees in the same organisation may view their managers differently. It is important to note in particular that the Health (87.49) and Housing (75.24) departments, in both towns scored the highest means. The employees in Health and Housing departments for both Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils seem to agree that their managers have high emotional intelligence. This may imply that the working environment for the Housing and Health departments for the two city councils is positively influenced by managers' high emotional intelligence. According to (Turner *et al* 2002) employees are happy with supportive managers. This is also supported by the *The Financial Gazette* (29.06.2012) which reported that the Director of Health at Harare City Council had among other managers scooped the Zimbabwe Institute of Management (ZIM) manager of the year 2012 award under the same organisation with other City Council Directors. Managers with high emotional intelligence have been viewed to have attributes found in transformational leaders (Ommar Bin and Meera 2009) and according to Barling, Slater and Kelloway in Ommar Bin and Meera (2009), transformational leadership has been found to be synonymous with emotional intelligence.

Gardenswartz, Cherboqre and Rowe (2010) believe that managers as well as employees have the responsibility of building good relations in different units of the organisation. The underlining differences in work settings may be accounted for by values, behaviours, tolerance of each other and the ability to cope with each other's differences. Thus, it may be possible to argue and conclude that when managers are able to exude the skills that help employees achieve self-esteem and feel happy, employees are likely to regard their managers in high esteem and may score them high on an emotional intelligence scale. The aspect of belonging to a family or brotherhood (*humwe*) has always been that which brings unity in Zimbabwean communities.

Variance in Levels of Emotional Intelligence

In-order to get the statistical difference for the two scores, there was need to compare total scores for managers through self-appraisal and total scores for employees' ratings. A t-test was carried out for employees' ratings on management levels of emotional intelligence and self-ratings. The p factor was found to be (0.047), which meant that there was a great difference on the self-ratings by city council managers compared to employees' ratings of the same managers. Therefore the assumption that self ratings can-not be the same with employees' ratings was validated.

There could be a number of explanations for different scores for managers of Gweru and Kwekwe City Councils. With a self-report instrument it is likely that individuals find it easier to rate themselves on the positive side than the negative side. Cook (2006) argues that individuals have challenges in rating themselves accurately, as some may overrate themselves while others may underrate themselves. Self-report measurements have been reported to be biased as they might depend on one's mood. This is supported by Stys and Brown (2004) who allude to the vulnerability of self-report to social desirability motives which give a biased reporting. According to Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (2000) if the individual's self- concept is inaccurate, an individual may end up rating himself or herself on the self- concept not the true thoughts, behaviours and attitudes. Bradberry and Graves (2004) conclude that self-rating tests can only minimise bias but cannot completely eliminate it. Furthermore, others' ratings have been said to have a weakness of measuring a person's reputation and not their true self and thus have been found inaccurate when judging internal cognitive abilities (Stys and Brown 2004).

Previous studies (Muir 2013), have found a huge discrepancy between self-rating and others' rating, especially for executive managers. This may entail that most of the times managers may not be aware of what other people think of them as far as attitudes and behaviour are concerned. Muir further argues that quite a number of managers are promoted for political reasons and their experience, as opposed to

their capabilities in managing others. Managers may thus become too busy with organisation politics and remain completely out of what transpires on the ground. Muir (2013) contends that lack of genuine feedback for executive managers promotes low emotional intelligence. The author also posits that unclear systems and procedures on how to provide such feedback become a stumbling block to genuine feedback. Kouzes and Posner (2006: 13) are quoted as saying 'most leaders don't want honest feedback and don't get much of it unless it is forced on them'. Managers are equated to lawyers (Muir 2013) who have weak self-awareness skills, in their interest for self-protection.

Goleman (2002) in Saporito (2009) supports Muir's (2013) findings on discrepancy on self-ratings versus others ratings, when he argues that, in general emotional intelligence is not always 'conducive to measurement'. An example given to support the difficulties of measuring emotional intelligence (Muir 2013) is of a lady at the reception who always smiles to the customers. While it is quite clear that she retained customers, and thus gave advantage to the firm, measuring the level of emotional intelligence for the lady and the value it had on the firm, remains difficult. While it is clear that the lady has emotional intelligence, quantifying this through self-reporting and others' appraising may give different scores.

Conclusion

The assumption that self rating and others' rating can-not be same was validated. A t-test was performed and the results indicated a P factor of (0.047) which showed a big variance in ratings. This meant that issues of bias could not be eliminated in measuring levels of emotional intelligence. Multiple rating has been found useful to help respondents on how they perceive themselves and at the same time get feedback from others. It was thus concluded that multi-rating produces different results.

This study used the ANOVA statistics test with confidence level of 95%, to measure the statistical significance in both self and employees' ratings of managers' emotional intelligence according to gender, age, qualification, department, town and location. There was statistical significance for self-rating by marital status with those not married rating themselves higher than those married. This reflected that marriage institutions can be a field of turbulent emotions that becomes difficult to separate from work place decisions. Consequently the results indicated that employees who are not married scored high levels of emotional intelligence at work place.

Gender had significance difference on self-ratings with female managers scoring high in emotional intelligence. Gender however had no statistical significance through employee-ratings of emotional intelligence. This may support the view that Goleman's emotional intelligence is 'expressed outcome' which may have the same impact on

the recipients in spite of their gender status. Available literature, however, is of the view that both men and women compete well on different aspects of emotional intelligence (Simmons 2001). With these findings and assertions, one can safely conclude that emotional intelligence and gender may vary in different contexts. Different work settings like different towns, locations and departments had significant impact on the employees' ratings of managers' emotional intelligence. This suggests that employees in different settings viewed managers differently

In today's era of the result-based management approach, it is quite critical that organisations acquire skills that help meet organisational targets. The emotional intelligence skill has been found to be an asset for managers to influence performance at work. The study showed that the Works and Estate department in both Gweru and Kwekwe city councils had a negative correlation ($r=-0.1702$). This meant that sometimes managers' emotional intelligence and employee performance variables were independent of each other. It is every manager's responsibility to get things done through other people hence managers' emotional intelligence may influence best results. Based on the literature and empirical results, the study recommends that Gweru and Kwekwe city councils should develop their managers in emotional intelligence capabilities that will help them deliver results.

It is recommended that future research may compare levels of emotional intelligence in city councils in Zimbabwe, as well as comparing emotional intelligence in the public sector with private sector organizations.

References

- Avolio, B.J, & Yamarino F. (2002). Introduction and overview. In B.J Avolio and Yamarino (Eds), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead*. New York. Elsevier
- Baker T. (2010). *Executive Search Insights*. www.insynergy.org/w-content/uploads2014/interviewing-leadership-candidates (accessed 20-05-2015)
- Baker A, Brinke L and Porter S, (2013). Will get fooled again: Emotionally intelligent people are easily duped by high stake deceivers. *Legal and Criminology Psychology* 18(2):300-313.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar-On emotional quotient inventory. Technical Manual*. Toronto. Canada. Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (2000). *Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the emotional quotient*. Canada. Multi-Health Systems.

- Bass B.M and Riggio R.E (2006). *Transformational Leadership* 2nd edition. Mahwah N J Lawrence Erlbaum
- Bouchard T J. (2004). *Genetic influence on human psychological traits. A survey.* University of Minnesota Minneapolis, USA
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D. & Rhee, K. S. (2000). *Clustering competencies in emotional intelligence.* In Boyatzis R. E., Stubbs E. & Taylor S. (2002), *Learning cognitive & emotional intelligence competencies through graduate management education.* Academy of Management Journal on learning & Education vol 1.
- Bradberry, T. & Greaves, J. (2004). *Emotional intelligence appraisal: There is more than IQ, Technical manual update, San Diego. Talent Smart Inc.*
- Bratton M. And Mattes R (2001). "Support for democracy in Africa. Intrinsic or instrumental?" *British Journal of Political Science*, 31:447-474.
- Castro S and Kee D.W (2010). *Gender differences in the relationship between emotional intelligence and right hemisphere lateralisation for facial processing* www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20350776 (Accessed 15-05-15).
- Cavallo K (2006). *Emotional competence and leadership excellence at Johnson & Johnson* www.corponsultinggroup.com (Accessed 15-05-15).
- Dak, M. (2010). *The human mind.* <http://www.lucidpages.com> (Accessed on 06-06-12).
- Das, D. K. (2010). Another perspective of globalization. *Journal of International trade law and policy* vol 9(1):46- 63.
- Dulewicz, V. Higgs, M. & Slaski M. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence. Content, construct & criterion-related validity. *Journal of Management Psychology* vol 18, 405-420.
- Eckman T (2004). *The emotional intelligence of award-winning fitness industry professional.* MSc University of North Dakota.
- Extremera, N. Fernandez, B. P. (2005). Perceived emotional intelligence & life satisfaction. Predictive and incremental validity using the Trait meta Mood Scale. *Personal Individual Differences*, 39:937-948.
- Foo, M. D. Eifenbein, H. A. Tan, H. H. & Aik V.C. (2005). Emotional intelligence and negotiation. The tension between creating and claiming value. *International Journal of Conflict Management.* 15:411-429.

- Gardenswartz, L. Cherboque, J. & Rowe A. (2010). Emotional Intelligence & Diversity. A model for Differences in the workplace. *Journal of Psychological Issues in organisational culture, vol 1 (1)*, Wiley online, (Accessed on 13-02-14).
- Grewal, D. & Salovey, P. (2005). Feeling smart. The science of emotional intelligence. *American Scientist, 93*:330-339.
- Goleman, D. (2002). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Jowkar, B. (2007). The mediator role of resilience in relation between Emotional Intelligence and life satisfaction. *Contemporary Psychology vol 2 (2)*, 4-12.
- Persian Kafestios, K. (2004). Attachment and emotional intelligence abilities across the life course. *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*:129-149.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2006). *A leader's legacy*. Jossey-Bass. Willey.
- Lane, R. D. Sechrest, L. Shapiro, D & Kaszniak A. (2000). Pervasive emotion recognition deficit common in alexthymia and repressive coping style. *Psychomatic Medicine, 62*:492-501.
- Madahi, M. E. Nasirudin, J. & Samdzadeh N. J. M. (2012). *The relationship between emotional intelligence and marital status in sample college of students*. Elsevier: Procedia social and behavioural sciences vol 84.1317-1320. www.sciencedirect.com (Accessed on 27-11-13).
- Mayer, J. D. & Salovey, P. (1997). *What is emotional intelligence?* In P. Salovey (Ed.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mayer, J. D. Salovey, P. & Caruso D. (2000). *Models of emotional intelligence. Handbook of emotional intelligence*. Cambridge, University Press.
- Muir, R. (2013). *Clueless at the top*. Law people management, <http://www.lawpeopleblog.com/2013/67/upward-feedback> (Accessed on 13-10-13).
- Muyia, H. M. (2009). Approaches to instruments for measuring emotional intelligence. A review of selected literature, *Advances in developing human resources. Sage Publications. 11(6)*:690-702.
- Omar Bin S. & Meera S. (2009). Emotional intelligence managers & transformational leadership styles. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Shri Ram center for Industrial Relations & Human Resources vol 44(4)*:593-610.

Sala, F. (2002). *Emotional competence inventory*. Technical manual. Philadelphia, PA: McClelland Center for Research, haygroup.

Sala, F. (2002). *Its lonely at the top: Executive's emotional intelligence self (mis) perceptions*. Consortium for research on emotional intelligence in organizations. www.eiconsortium.org. (Accessed on 30-09-14).

Saporito, A. (2009). Exploring the dimensions of the non-profit leader. *Journal of Philadelphia social innovations*. <http://www.philasocialinnovations.org/site/index>, (Accessed on 23-11-13).

Serrat, O. (2009). *Understanding and developing emotional intelligence*. Knowledge Solutions. www.scribd.com/doc/510458/Human-Resource-Mgt (Accessed on 27-10-12).

Simonns, K. (2001). *Executive update: Emotional intelligence, What smart managers should know*. The centre for association leadership. <http://www.asacentre.org/Resources/articledetail>.

Stys, Y.& Brown, S.I. (2004). A review of emotional intelligence literature and its implications for corrections. *Research Branch Correctional Service of Canada*

Reinhold and Reinhold development (2015). www.personalitypathways.com/article/emotional-intelligence2.html

Riggio, R. E., Murphy, S. E. & Pirozollo, F. J. (Eds). (2002). *Multiple intelligence and leadership*. Mahwah, N J: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Roberts, R.D., Burrus J., Betancourt A.C., Holtzman S., Libbrecht N., MacCann C., Matthews G., Minsky J., Naemi B. & Schulze R., (2013). in press. Multimedia assessment of emotional abilities. Development and validation. *Educational Testing Service Research Report*. No.RR-13-xx. Princeton N.J. Educational testing service.

Rosier(ed) R. H. (2006). *Competence at work*. The competence framework findings from MOSAI competencies for professional and administrative occupations.

Understanding emotional intelligence. www.free-management-ebooks.com 2014

APPENDIX 1*Table 1: Managers 'self ratings and Goleman's Attributes*

Competence	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	Mean Score	Std. Deviation
Personal Competence	25	70	45.88	12.636
Emotional Self Awareness	18	52	33.87	9.252
EmotionalSelf Management	6	18	12.00	3.489
Social Competence	25	70	44.00	12.518
Emotional Awareness of others	10	25	15.83	4.400
Emotional Management of others	15	45	28.17	8.202

APPENDIX 2*Table 2: Summary of Statistical Significance Results- Managers Self Appraisal*

Variable	F-statistic	P-value
Location	0.74	0.642
Qualification	0.4	0.758
Age	0.51	0.679
Town	1.33	0.263
Departments	1.4	0.272
Gender	5.98	0.023
Marital Status	4.73	0.041

Table 3: Summary of Means -Self Appraisal

Variable	Mean Score	
	Gender	Male
	68.294	90.5
Marital Status	Married	Not Married
	70.65	97

APPENDIX 3

Table 4: Employees Ratings of Managers using Goleman's Attributes

Competence	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation
Personal Competence	15	73	41.35	12.687
Emotional Self Awareness	11	54	30.34	9.244
Emotional Self Management	4	19	11.02	3.587
Social Competence	14	69	37.93	12.484
Emotional Awareness of others	5	25	13.52	4.5666
Emotional Management of others	9	44	24.41	7.982

APPENDIX 4

Table 5: Summary of Statistical Significance Results-Employees' Ratings

Variable	F-statistic	P-value
Age	0.84	0.5
Marital Status	0.26	0.774
Gender	3.34	0.069
Department	43.92	0.001
Location	8.36	0.001
Qualifications	5.41	0.001
Town	21.89	0.001

APPENDIX 5

Table 6: Employee Ratings by demographic variables

Variable	Mean Scores							
Town	Gweru				Kwekwe			
	71.29				60.37			
Qualifications	Advanced Level			Diploma	Degree		Post Graduate Degree	
	61.59			66.09	65.54		78.81	
Departments	Town Clerk	Chamber Secretary		Finance	Housing	Health	Works & Estates	
	59.2	52.48		72.9	75.24	87.49	53.33	
Location	Mtapa	Mkoba	Dandaro	Mbizo	Gweru Town	Kwekwe Town	Works Yard	Water Sewer
	82.44	70.29	68.4	66.9	65.63	63.24	59.29	49.56