

The relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Personal Efficacy of Managers in selected Indian organizations.

Ambreen Grewal Virk- SPHR® *, Prof. (Dr.)Meenakshi Malhotra **

* Research Scholar, University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh

** University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh

Abstract- The study reported in this paper was conducted to examine the relationship between the Emotional intelligence and the Personal efficacy of Managers from selected Indian organizations. 113 managers were selected from different organizations in India. The participants were asked to complete the 'SREIT' and the 'Personal Efficacy Scale' questionnaire. Data analysis and statistical calculations revealed that there is a significant relationship between the Manager's Emotional Intelligence and their Personal Efficacy. To investigate which components of Emotional Intelligence might have more predictive power in predicting a manager's personal efficacy, a regression analysis was also run. The 4 subscales of emotional intelligence – 'Emotional Regulation', 'Facilitate Emotion', 'Perceive & Appraise Emotion' and 'Understand Emotion'– were found to be good predictors of a manager's self-efficacy. The conclusions and implications of the research were discussed with reference to the earlier findings.

Index Terms- Emotional intelligence, Personal efficacy, Indian Managers, Emotion.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the competitive & dynamic economy of the 21st century, most organizations face the dilemma of becoming more 'Effective' by improving Performance, restraining Costs and optimally leveraging their Human Resources. This has made 'Work Performance' an extensively researched topic (Tyagi, 1985; Shore & Martin, 1998; Sargent & Terry, 1998; Kessler et al. 2006; Hwang et al. 2008; Waldman, 1994; Loi et al, 2001; Van Dyne et al. 2002; Kuvaas, 2006; Kuvaas & Dysvik, 2009). Whetten and Cameron (2001) summed up the importance of Managers by stating "Management skills form the vehicle by which management strategy, management practice, tools and techniques, personality attributes and style work to produce effective outcomes in organizations".

However, it seems that researchers may have tended to take a negative rather than a proactive positive approach to both the academic and practice sides of managing Work Performance (Luthans, 2002). Most studies focus on ways to motivate Managers, help them overcome their resistance to change or even

enable them to cope with stress. In a nut shell – help them overcome their short comings or outgrow their weaknesses. Not too many researchers have asked the poignant question: Wouldn't it be advantageous to instead, Emphasize and Build on their strengths? Two such inherent strengths, that have been researched to enhance the skill of Managers (and other employees), are the inherent ability known as Emotional Intelligence and the pervading psychological mechanism of Personal Efficacy.

Perhaps one of the most provocative ideas which emerged from discussions of management, concerned the possibility that a new form of intelligence pertaining to emotions was related to the performance of organization members (Goleman, 1998; Caruso and Salovey, 2004). In fact research has shown that factors other than cognitive intelligence or talent affect professional life and academic success (Shiplot et al. 2010). Emotional Intelligence has been defined a set of abilities that includes the ability to 'perceive emotions in the self and in others, use emotions to facilitate performance, understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and regulate emotions in the self and in others' (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The concept of emotional intelligence has had an unusually important impact on managerial practice (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002) which has caused several organizations have incorporated emotional intelligence into their employee development programs.

Whereas, *Personal Efficacy* refers to one's beliefs about one's capability to accomplish challenging goals. Also commonly referred to as Self-efficacy, there are various definitions of Personal efficacy. In context of its relationship to Work performance, Bandura (1986) suggests, "Unless people believe that they can produce desired effects and forestall undesired ones by their actions, they have little incentive to act. Whatever other factors may operate as motivators, they are rooted in the core belief that one has the power to produce the desired results". Personal self-efficacy, has also been defined as a person's belief in his or her capability to perform a task (Gist, 1987). Consequently it may be inferred that 'Effective performance' requires both 'skills' and 'one's belief in one's abilities' to do the tasks.

And while both these topics took the research world by storm, with an endless list of linkages to Organizational goals, researchers took a little time to explore and investigate the linkage between these predominant pre-existing and prevalent aspects of Human behaviour and are still grappling with this

relationship in the organizational set up. In **2004**, **Chan** found that "Self-efficacy beliefs were significantly predicted by the components of Emotional intelligence". This finding forms the premise of this study. Research has also indicated that Emotional Intelligence is positively related to self-efficacy and both of these variables could predict each other (**Hamdy et al., 2014**), while a few other findings showed that stress management failure and increased ineffective anxiety and stress were direct results of low self-efficacy (**Salovey et al., 2002**). People not believing in their abilities get disappointed while facing risky circumstances and are less likely to operate effectively. Such people are afraid of dealing with challenging issues and consequently their performance is negatively affected, leading to more feeling of inadequacy (**Maddux, 1995**). Severe anxiety can lead to decreased performance and consequently decreased feeling of self-efficacy. Therefore, a person with high emotional intelligence can necessarily control his emotions and deal with problems favourably (**Rostami et al., 2010**). Since it is likely that there is a 'high overlap' between these two concepts, i.e. Personal Efficacy and Emotional Intelligence, it is quite evident that synergistically they will have an extremely important role to play in managerial effectiveness and correspondingly Work Performance.

Significance of the study

Empirically it has been seen that both Emotional Intelligence and Personal efficacy have a plethora of benefits for the Organization. Theoretically high levels of EI & Personal Efficacy are likely to contribute significantly to Managerial effectiveness, through their influence on beliefs about competence. A Manager with high Personal efficacy and EI is likely to demonstrate effective managerial behaviours at the workplace, enhancing and ensuring task completion and favourable Work Outcomes. An understanding on the relationship between the two, shall add impetus to Managerial Development Programmes and help organizations train and select Managers accordingly. Studies investigating the relationship between EI and PE are rare and almost none in the Indian Manager context.

Research Objectives

The major objective of this study is to broadly examine the Personal Efficacy and Emotional intelligence of Managers from selected organizations in India. And to study the relationship of Emotional Intelligence and the Personal efficacy displayed by them. To reiterate,

- To measure & study the Emotional Intelligence reported by the Managers of the selected organizations.
- To measure the Personal Efficacy displayed by the Managers of the selected Organizations.
- To analyze and establish a relationship between Emotional Intelligence (EI) & its dimensions with the Personal Efficacy (PE) demonstrated by the Managers of the selected organizations.
- To measure the impact of the various dimensions of Emotional Intelligence on the Personal Efficacy demonstrated.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Review of the literature on Emotional Intelligence in Organizational contexts

In 1990 Mayer and Salovey, based on Gardner's view and emphasis on individual differences, introduced their complete model of EI and defined it thoroughly (**Bar-On, 1997**). Mayer and Salovey's findings of EI were then popularized in **Daniel Goleman's** books, 'Emotional intelligence' and 'Working with Emotional intelligence' in the years 1995 and 1998, respectively. Emotional Intelligence (EI) involves the recognition of emotions and employment of those emotions for adoption of right decisions in life and in human relationships, understanding of self and others, self-control and domination over immediate demands, empathy with others and positive employment of emotions (**Akbarzadeh, 2004; Vidyarthi et al., 2014; Karimi et al., 2014**). EI refers to the ability of effective management of mood and impulse control at the time of frustration and disappointment resulting from failure and the ability to get along with people, inhibit emotions in human relations and encourage or direct others (**Goleman, 1995**). Furthermore, EI allows significant relationships in workplace and facilitates the exchange of positive feelings by coordinating emotions.

Needless to say, the fact that researchers would soon find a way to measure and enhance EI was almost inevitable. In the year **1997**, **Bar-On**, using his psychological experiences, made his emotional quotient (EQ) questionnaire. The need for a brief yet validated measure of emotional intelligence, based on a cohesive and comprehensive model of emotional intelligence was what prompted Schutte et al. to develop the SREIT: Self Report Emotional Intelligence Test is a 33 Item measure that focuses on 4 factors: Emotional Regulation, Facilitate Emotion, Perceive & Appraise Emotion and Understands Emotions. As **Carmeli, 2003** pointed out, even though growing evidence indicates that emotional intelligence competency has the potential to improve performance on both personal and organizational levels, researchers are still only in the initial phase of understanding the extent to which members with high emotional intelligence would be more valued assets than less emotionally intelligent members of their organization. In fact **Dulewicz and Higgs (2000)** stated that "little research has been conducted in an organizational context" and "There is a need for rigorous research to underpin the assertion in an organizational setting". **Cherniss (2000)** also pointed out that "EI would be more useful and interesting to consider how important it is for effective performance at work". Pertaining to EI in the organizational contexts there have been several publications relating EI at the Workplace (**Abraham, 1999; Cherniss & Adler, 2000**), more publications about its relationship with Leadership (**Barling, et al., 2000; George, 2000; Dulewicz & Higgs, 2003; Melita-Prati et al. 2003; Goleman et al, 2013**). There have been very few study's that examined EI with respect to a set of work attitudes, work behaviour and work outcomes. Some examples are cited: **Smith et al., (1969)** suggested that job satisfaction is positively associated with the construct of emotional intelligence. EI has also been related to Organizational Commitment, because emotionally intelligent individuals would know not to hold the

organization responsible for every feeling of frustration (Abraham, 1999). Slaski & Cartwright (2002) found that managers high in emotional intelligence revealed less subjective stress and had better physical and psychological well-being. Gardner and Stough (2003) revealed negative relationship between EI and occupational stress.

Review of the literature on Self efficacy in Organizations

Personal or Self-efficacy is one of the key variables of Bandura's social cognitive theory and one of the most important components of success in the field of positive psychology. Self-efficacy is an important factor for successful performance. Self-efficacy ensures one's ability to control thoughts, feelings and activities. Self-efficacy involves one's beliefs about his capabilities (Baron et al., 2016; Halper & Vancouver, 2016). Self-efficacy is a productive power by which cognitive, social, emotional and behavioural skills are organized effectively to achieve different goals. Therefore, self-efficacy influences the consequence of actions and situations which will happen in the future (Bandura, 1997; Baron et al., 2016). Thus, effective performance requires both skills and belief in the ability to perform those skills (Bandura, 1997).

On reviewing the literature available it was seen that in the past 2 decades or so, hundreds of articles on self-efficacy have been published in various organizational journals. Empirical evidence reveals that nearly every dimension of people's lives is touched with self-efficacy beliefs (Pajares, 2002) and organizations are not the exception. Almost every area in organizational research has utilized self-efficacy, including training (Kozlowski et al., 2001), leadership (Chen & Bliese, 2002), newcomer socialization and adjustment (Saks, 1995), performance evaluation (Bartol, Durham, & Poon, 2001), stress (Jex, Bliese, Buzzell, & Primeau, 2001; Schaubroeck, Jones, & Xie, 2001), political influence behaviours (Bozeman, Perrewe, Hochwarter, & Brymer, 2001), creativity (Redmond, Mumford, & Teach, 1993), negotiation (Stevens & Gist, 1997), managing remote employees (Staples et al. 1998), and group-team processes (Feltz & Lirgg, 1998). Perhaps way back in 1989, when Landy called self-efficacy "the wave of the future" in work motivation research he couldn't have been more correct.

Gist et al. (1991) examined the effect of Personal Efficacy (PE) on the acquisition and maintenance of negotiation skills. Ozer et al. (1990) showed that higher PE levels result in the diminishing of negative thinking and anxiety arousal. Mathieu et al. (1993) found that PE is a mediator construct between individual and situational antecedents and training outcomes. Gibbons & Weingart (2001) tested concurrent influences of personal efficacy, assigned goals, and performance norms on individual performance, mediated by personal goals and task-specific self-efficacy. Their results demonstrated simultaneous effects of assigned goals and normative information on self-efficacy, personal goals, and subsequent performance, as well as mediated effects of domain efficacy on performance.

It must be noted that there are relatively only a small number of primary studies measuring generalized self-efficacy, there have been hardly any published reviews of the relationship between generalized self-efficacy and job performance. Although task-

specific and generalized self-efficacy are distinct constructs (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998), evidence does suggest that state or task-specific self-efficacy is related to job performance (Hysong & Quinones, 1997; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998) which, in turn, suggests that generalized self-efficacy may also correlate with job performance. Within the realm of self-efficacy, numerous studies have linked the Big Five traits to self-efficacy (Judge & Ilies, 2002; Thoms, Moore, & Scott, 1996). Other research has shown that cognitive ability (Phillips & Gully, 1997) and experience (Shea & Howell, 2000) are positive predictors of self-efficacy.

Personal Efficacy has been seen to affect performance in two ways. One directly, second indirectly by affecting first personal goal choice and commitment to assigned goals (Latham, 1991). In Locke's model, Self-Efficacy levels affect performance with mediating mechanisms such as effort, persistence, direction, task strategies (plans) in this model, Self-Efficacy and performance are also reciprocally related (Locke, 1984).

Self-Efficacy also relates to Managerial competencies and leadership qualities are related, because perceived managerial competencies such as technical, conceptual and human relation competencies are generalized forms of Self Efficacy (Gist, 1987). Self-Efficacy has also been related to the training vertical of organizations. Stevens & Gist (1997) argued that low efficacious individuals benefit most from training in organizations. Thus, they suggested that human resource professionals should develop their training programs to match employee's efficacy levels.

Review of the literature on the relationship between Self efficacy & Emotional Intelligence

Sadly, in the past research has primarily focused only on "Emotions as a consequence rather than an antecedent" of efficacy beliefs (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). Emmer and Hickman (1991) recommended researchers to explore the relationship between emotions and efficacy beliefs, in the academic scenario. Efficacy beliefs are believed to be the product of cognitive processing of diverse sources of information. In fact Bandura (1997) linked the role of efficacy to concepts of emotional intelligence throughout his pioneering work. He argued that self-awareness and control of emotions could be correlated with higher self-efficacy levels.

And even though gradually there has been an incremental growth in the body of literature that Emotional Intelligence and Self-efficacy exist together and interact with each other (Drew, 2006). Chan (2004) in his study concluded that people who have higher control of their emotions develop stronger efficacy, and this leads to higher EI. Rastegar and Memarpour (2009) assessed the relationship between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among Iranian EFL teachers. Their findings indicated that there was a positive significant correlation between perceived EI and self-efficacy.

Hypothetical Consideration: Vast research has been conducted individually on EI (Brackett and Salovey, 2006; Carmeli, 2003; Schutte et al., 1998) and on Personal or self-efficacy (Ross, 1994; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998), but very little (Chan, 2004; Fabio and Palazzeschi, 2008; Penrose et al.,

2007) has been carried out or reported on the ‘relationship between these two’ (none in the Indian context). There have been proposed linkages between both EI and Personal efficacy with Managerial Effectiveness and Work Outcomes, individually. Since competitiveness demands that all Organizations explore manners in which to enhance their managerial effectiveness and in turn achieve their Organizational Goals, it seems that some research should be carried out in the Indian Managerial realm to examine this relationship. The findings shall contribute to the scarce body of research that explores the inter-relationship between EI & PE and also add to the research in the Indian context.

To summarize, the present study seeks to investigate the relationship between Manager’s EI and their Personal-efficacy beliefs. It also seeks to determine how much the Manager’s EI contributes to the prediction of their sense of efficacy. On the basis of the review of literature, hypothetical considerations & the research objectives, the following Hypotheses were framed:

H1: There shall be a positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence (and its dimensions) with the Personal efficacy of the Managers of selected Indian organizations.

H2: All dimensions of Emotional Intelligence shall significantly influence the Personal Efficacy demonstrated by the Managers of selected Indian organizations.

H2a: The ability to ‘Facilitate Emotions’ shall significantly influence the Personal Efficacy experienced by Managers in selected Indian organizations.

H2b: The ability to ‘Understand Emotions’ shall significantly influence the Personal Efficacy experienced by Managers in selected Indian organizations.

H2c: The ability to ‘Perceive & Appraise Emotions’ shall significantly influence the Personal Efficacy experienced by Managers in selected Indian organizations.

H2d: The ability of ‘Emotional Regulation’ shall significantly influence the Personal Efficacy experienced by Managers in selected Indian organizations.

III. METHOD

Sample

Using a cross sectional research design, 113 cross functional managers were chosen with the help of random sampling from 16 organizations (convenience sampling) in India and were asked to participate in the survey. Managers who had at least one direct reportee were included.

Measures

Self-administered questionnaires were used to collect data. The **SREIT: Self Report Emotional Intelligence Test** developed by **Schutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden & Dornheim (1998)** was utilized to measure *Emotional Intelligence*. It is a 33 Item measure that focuses on 4 factors: 1. Emotional regulation, 2.Facilitate Emotion, 3. Perceive & Appraise Emotion and 4.Understands Emotions. The scale has a reported reliability i.e. Cronbach alpha of 0.87. *Personal Efficacy* was measured using the **Personal Efficacy Scale** designed by **Pareek (2010)**. It is a 20 item scale, with a split half reliability of

0.93 and measures efficacy on 4 parameters; Cognitive behaviour, Affective Behaviour, Motivational Behaviour & Selective Behaviour.

Procedure

With the consent of 9 randomly selected organizations, the researcher administered the survey. An online form (in addition to the paper one) was made available to encourage participation via mobile/ laptops. 113 usable surveys were obtained, accounting for a response rate of 62.7 percent. 83.2 percent of the sample was men and 16.8 percent were female managers. While 82.3 percent of the managers were married, 17.7 percent of the respondents were Single. 14.2 percent of the respondents were between the ages of 20-29, 66.4 percent were between the age of 30-39, 15.9 percent were between the age of 40-49 and the remaining 3.5 percent of the respondents were between 50 and 59 years of age.

Data Analysis

For descriptive and relational analysis, Mean and standard deviation (SD) of each of the four SREIT sub-scale scores were calculated for the whole sample. Reliability values for both scales i.e. Emotional Intelligence & Personal efficacy were calculated. Pearsons correlation was conducted in order to assess the strength of the relationship between Emotional Intelligence & Personal Efficacy. In order to identify the dimensions of emotional intelligence that significantly influence the feeling of efficacy, hierarchical regression analysis was conducted. The relationships between the Emotional Intelligence subscales (dependent variables) and Personal efficacy was evaluated by determining regression coefficients (standardized coefficients, β). A p value of <0.05 was considered significant for all tests. SPSS software, version 15.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was used for all analyses.

IV. RESULTS

In total, 113 questionnaires were returned (response rate 63%) from 180 Managers. Demographic variables i.e. Age, Gender & Marital Status related information were studied.

Item	Category	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	94	83.2
	Female	19	16.8
Marital Status	Married	93	82.3
	Single	20	17.7
Age	20-29	16	14.2
	30-39	75	66.4
	40-49	18	15.9
	50-59	4	3.5
Total		113	100

Table 1. Demographic variables of participants

Reliability of the instruments used to measure Emotional Intelligence & Personal Efficacy are shown below (Table 2).

Reliability Statistics			
Scale	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
Emotional Intelligence	0.874	0.885	33
Personal Efficacy	0.734	0.743	20

Table 2. Reliability of Instruments

Descriptive statistics revealed that the Mean and SD value of the components of Emotional Intelligence i.e. 'Emotional Regulation', 'Facilitate Emotion', 'Perceive & Appraise Emotion' and 'Understand Emotion', were 38.91(6.74), 29.29(3.76), 29.49(3.46) and 15.09(1.70) respectively, Shown below in Table 3.

Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Minimum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Emotional Regulation	113	28	38.912	6.74478
Facilitate Emotion	113	19	29.292	3.76232
Perceive & Appraise Emotion	113	22	29.496	3.46957
Understand Emotion	113	12	15.097	1.7059

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Emotional Intelligence

The components of Personal Efficacy i.e. 'Cognitive Behaviour', 'Affective Behaviour', 'Motivational Behaviour' and 'Selective Behaviour', displayed a mean and SD of 14.18(2.08), 12.52(2.10), 14.11(2.10) and 14.83(2.19) respectively, Shown below in Table 4.

Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Minimum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Cognitive Behaviour	113	11	14.19	2.09
Affective Behaviour	113	9	12.52	2.11
Motivational Behaviour	113	11	14.12	2.11
Selective Behaviour	113	9	14.83	2.19

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Personal Efficacy

In the above table the values of standard deviation for the dimensions of Emotional Intelligence, range from 1.70 to 6.74, since the data is concentrated around the mean i.e. the smaller the standard deviation, this indicates that the responses were not too concentrated. Data was also viewed from a thumb rule that indicates that in case the value of the standard deviation is one fourth of the mean value of the series, the data is high on homogeneity. It was reviewed and found that data was

homogeneous for all components of Personal Efficacy. However, this was not the case for the response on Emotional Intelligence i.e. 'Emotional Regulation', 'Facilitate Emotion', 'Perceive & Appraise Emotion' and 'Understand Emotion' – indicating that all components of Emotional Intelligence had the highest variance in responses from Managers.

The Correlation between the dimensions of Emotional Intelligence & Personal Efficacy was examined and subsequently the correlation between the sub scales of Emotional Intelligence and Personal Efficacy (Table 5a & 5b).

Correlation		
		Personal Efficacy
Emotional Intelligence	Pearson Correlation	.345(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0
	N	113

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5a. Correlation of Emotional Intelligence & Personal Efficacy

Correlations					
		Emotional Intelligence			
		Emotional Regulation	Facilitate Emotion	Perceive & Appraise Emotion	Understand Emotion
Personal Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	.363(**)	0.157	.192(*)	.238(*)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0.097	0.041	0.011
	N	113	113	113	113

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5b. Correlation of constructs of Emotional Intelligence & Personal Efficacy

The data indicated that Emotional Intelligence and Personal Efficacy were significantly related ($r= 0.345$ **, $p=0$). On closer examination of the sub scales it was found that out of the four subscales three were positively correlated with Personal Efficacy in a statistically significant manner. Emotional Regulation showed the strongest relationship ($r= 0.363$ **, $p=0$). 'Understand Emotion' and 'Perceive & Appraise Emotion' also showed a moderate (positive) significant correlation with Personal Efficacy i.e. ($r= -0.238$ *, $p=0.011$) and ($r= 0.192$ *, $p=0.041$) respectively. Surprisingly, the data did not show a relationship between Personal Efficacy and the 'Facilitate Emotion' subscale. To investigate the second hypothesis (4 sub-hypothesis), regression analysis was used (Table 6a & b). The model investigated whether the ability of 'Emotional Regulation', 'Facilitate Emotion', 'Perceive & Appraise Emotion' and 'Understand Emotion' predicted Personal Efficacy in Managers.

Model Summary										
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.392(a)	0.154	0.122	5.59009	0.154	4.901	4	108	0.001	1.215

a Predictors: (Constant), Understand Emotion, Emotional Regulation, Perceive & Appraise Emotion, Facilitate Emotion
b Dependent Variable: Personal Efficacy

Table 6a. Model of Regression analysis

Coefficients(a)									
Model		Coefficients		t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B		Collinearity Statistics	
		Unstandardized	Standardized			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Tolerance	VIF
		B	Beta						
1	(Constant)	37.562		6.958	0	26.86	48.262		
	Emotional Regulation	0.312	0.35	3.395	0	0.13	0.495	0.725	1.38
	Facilitate Emotion	0.136	0.09	0.647	0.52	-0.28	0.553	0.446	2.242
	Perceive & Appraise Emotion	-0.154	-0.09	-0.68	0.5	-0.61	0.297	0.448	2.232
	Understand Emotion	0.43	0.12	1.046	0.3	-0.39	1.245	0.567	1.763

a Dependent Variable: Personal Efficacy

Table 6b. Coefficients of Regression

V. DISCUSSION

The current study was carried out primarily to examine the association between EI and Personal efficacy beliefs among Managers from select Indian Organizations. A pioneer study in the Indian context. There were a total of 4 research objectives identified, the first two required the measurement of the Emotional Intelligence & Personal Efficacy reported by the Managers of the selected organizations. This was done with the help of Instruments whose validity & reliability was ascertained. While the Emotional Intelligence reported by Managers varied largely the responses to the Personal efficacy scale were homogeneous.

The next research objective was to analyse and establish a relationship between Emotional Intelligence (EI) with the Personal Efficacy (PE) demonstrated by the Managers of the selected organizations. This also translated into the hypothesis H1 – which was Accepted since a significant strong positive relationship was reported ($r=0.345^{**}$, $p=0$). This result may be interpreted such that Managers who felt more efficacious in their profession were the ones who possessed higher levels of Emotional Intelligence. The yielded result corroborates the findings of the studies conducted by **Rastegar and Memarpour (2009)** and **Moafian and Ghanizadeh (2009)** in academicians. These studies demonstrated a positive connection between English teachers' EI and self-efficacy at high schools and

language institutes respectively. Additionally, the result supports the findings of **Chan (2004)** and **Penrose et al. (2007)**.

The researcher decided to delve a little deeper and check for each of the four constructs of Emotional Intelligence and their individual linkage with Personal efficacy. This too was in accordance with the second hypothesis i.e. H1 – since 3 out of the 4 constructs that comprise Emotional Intelligence were found to have a statistically significant relationship with Personal efficacy reported by the Managers. To elaborate, the first construct 'Emotional Regulation' is the component of emotional intelligence that measure the skill by which one regulates or manages feeling of one's self and others based on openness to all emotions, reflection on experienced emotions, and goal-oriented emotional behaviour (**Mayer and Salovey, 1997**). Since the ability to manage one's emotions enables one to have control over the customer service interaction (**Lam and Kirby, 2002**) it is of relevance to all managers, since their customer could be internal or external. Therefore, it is only natural that this aspect of Emotional Intelligence correlate with the manager's feeling of Personal Efficacy. The strong statistically significant (positive) association uncovered in this study, ($r=0.363^{**}$, $p=0$), bears testimony to the same.

'Understand Emotions' involves understanding the origins and successful use of emotions toward certain ends. This includes skills such as analysing and understanding emotional antecedents, formulations, and outcomes (**Mayer and Salovey, 1997**). With regard to Personal Efficacy, one must have some measure of this skill in order to fulfil organisational requirements. After all, in order for a Manager to be able to feel efficacious, (s)he must be able to understand their present emotional state and how it evolved, and which emotion might best be employed to alter the current emotional state in order to get the desired reaction or result. Along with perception, the understanding of emotion is useful to employees in working toward organisational goals, such as engendering customer rapport. One with a well-developed understanding of emotion will be more able to extinguish the anger of an irate customer and create good will for the organisation from that exchange. In fact empathetic concern, which evolves from emotional understanding (**Kruml and Geddes 2000**) findings indicate that, applies more to identification with the other's feelings, and thus Such Managers are likely to be less focused on their own feelings and more on what the 'customer needs'. And the more they are able to fulfil these needs the more shall be the feeling of Personal Efficacy. This theoretical association was shown to be statistically significant by this study's results, $r=0.238^{(*)}$, $p=0.11$.

Perception and Appraisal of emotion. Individuals who have the ability to accurately perceive the emotions of themselves and others are better able to facilitate accurate expression of emotions and understand others' expressions of emotion. Managers must be able to discern the emotions of themselves and others in order to address the cause of emotions, whether the cause is a positive or negative factor, and capitalise on that understanding to promote successful interactions (**Zapf et al., 1999; Zapf, 2002**). Capitalizing on this understanding is what makes Managers effective and hence is likely to contribute to the feeling of

Personal Efficacy. The same was corroborated by the results of our correlation analysis, $r = 0.192^*$, $p = 0.41$.

Emotional facilitation. This emotional intelligence skill allows the individual to guide or utilise emotional thought processes to alter emotional states (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). Abraham (1999) and George (2000) suggested that emotional intelligence facilitates the prioritisation of goals. Because of this prioritisation of goals, employees must be able to modify their perceptions of the customer service interaction in order to facilitate appropriate emotional responses (Grandey, 2000; Totterdell and Holman, 2003). Since the research did not find any statistically significant relationship of this specific construct with Personal efficacy, it may be construed that when the Manager prioritizes his or her goals, (s)he also chooses to pursue only those that fall within their 'coping capabilities' hence realistically assessing the capability to perform might lessen the sense of Efficacy.

The second hypothesis dealt with the research objective outlined as 'measure the impact of various subscales of Emotional Intelligence on the Personal Efficacy demonstrated'. In order to ascertain the same, a regression analysis was carried out. The analysis revealed that only 1 out of the 4 subscales of the Emotional Intelligence influenced the Personal Efficacy demonstrated by the Managers of selected Indian organizations in a statistically significant manner- namely, 'Emotional Regulation'. However it is noteworthy to mention that this alone contributed to 15.4% (R square value) of the Personal Efficacy reported by Managers. So in spite of the hypothesis being rejected the findings revealed a strong predictability relationship. Analyze and understand all the provided review comments thoroughly. Now make the required amendments in your paper. If you are not confident about any review comment, then don't forget to get clarity about that comment. And in some cases there could be chances where your paper receives number of critical remarks. In that cases don't get disheartened and try to improvise the maximum.

VI. CONCLUSION

A manager's perceptions of his or her efficacy (Personal efficacy) influences their anticipations and scenarios about the future. Managers with high sense of Personal efficacy anticipate success and think positively about their future. Whereas Managers with a low sense of Personal Efficacy are likely to almost always anticipate failure. Given that Manager's beliefs in their efficacy influences their choices, their aspirations, mobilization of effort in a given endeavour, resistance to difficulties, amount of stress and vulnerability to depression (in short considerably influences their effectiveness)- It is very alarming that research has not investigated how to predict or enhance this inherent skill set.

The present study was undertaken to uncover if a relationship existed between two very predominant and inherent skills – Emotional Intelligence & Personal efficacy – both of which have been empirically be found to be related a varied range of Individual & Organizational benefits such as Organizational Commitment, Job satisfaction, Performance etc. And while most may wonder why an attempt is being made to establish a relationship between the two factors, Learning & Development practitioners shall be smiling.

Whilst there has been a large amount of research on measuring & enhancing Emotional Intelligence. Efficacy has been believed to be mostly situational and extremely individual. Hence even though the benefits of an enhanced Personal efficacy are known to all, it is believed that very little can be done to alter it. This research attempts to change this belief and prove that by streamlining & tweaking existing Emotional Intelligence trainings & development centers, Organizations can enjoy double benefits!

Therefore, it may be concluded, from the findings of this study that the influence of a Manager's Emotional Intelligence on his or her efficacy beliefs is critical and considerable. It may also be conferred that a Manager's emotional facets has a substantial role in developing his/her efficacy expectations. This would be in line with Gibbs's contention. Gibbs (2003) had argued that teachers' emotions and moods are a source of information that controls self-efficacy judgments. Sutton and Wheatley (2003) too had stated "emotions may account for a portion of the variance in self-efficacy".

VII. LIMITATIONS & RECCOMENDATIONS

The present study has certain limitations that should be acknowledged. Relying exclusively upon self-report measures, could have caused the common method variance (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). The cross-sectional design utilized for this study does not allow the establishing of causal relationships among study variables and limits the ability to make generalizations about the total population from this sample. This study focused only on the constructs of Emotional Intelligence, it did not explore the constructs (sub scales of Personal efficacy). Larger samples of Managers from more occupations need to be studied. There is also a need to examine the improvement in Managerial effectiveness (if any) after interventions to enhance Emotional Intelligence & Personal efficacy have been employed. Once the empirical support exists it could also form the basis of several HR processes. Except for a few studies in the field of academics, the literature on the relationship between Emotional Intelligence & Personal efficacy in India is negligible. Extensive research would be needed to understand the importance of this relationship.

Pertaining to the recommendations based on this study, Organizations are advised to conduct workshops, conferences and training courses for Managers, especially for the less experienced ones, in which the concept of Emotional Intelligence must be introduced, its importance in effective management and the development of personal efficacy should be discussed and the strategies for its development must be proposed & agreed upon. It is also important to mention that it has found that a newcomer's levels of efficacy is affected by their socialization and adjustments in their new organization. Also highly efficacious people define their roles different from low efficacious people do, because they believe they are competent. Contrarily, low efficacious people accept the definition of situations offered by others (Jones, 1986). Managers too must start to take into consideration the emotional dimensions as an

influential & cognitive aspect of their development and they are recommended to develop the abilities and skills connected with Emotional Intelligence, in specific Managers are also recommended to hone their Emotional Regulation ability.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abraham, R. (1999). Emotional intelligence in organizations: A conceptualization. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 125(2), 209.
- [2] Aghdami-Baher AR, Najarpour Ostadi S, Livarjani Sh. (2009). Relationship between emotional intelligence and sense of self-efficacy and burnout among staff of Islamic Azad University of Tabriz. *Journal of Educational Sciences*.2(7):99-119. Persian.
- [3] Akbarzade, Nasrin (2004). Emotional Intelligence. First Edition. Farabi Publications.
- [4] Bandura. A. (1977a). Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- [5] Bandura. A. (1977b). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [6] Bandura. A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 7(2). 122-147.
- [7] Bandura, A. (1984). Recycling misconceptions of perceived self-efficacy. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*. 8, 213-229.
- [8] Bandura. A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 248-287.
- [9] Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kevin Kelloway, E. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21(3), 157-161.
- [10] Baron, R. A., Mueller, B. A., & Wolfe, M. T. (2016). Self-efficacy and entrepreneurs' adoption of unattainable goals: The restraining effects of self-control. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(1), 55-71.
- [11] Bartol, K. M., Durham, C. C., & Poon, J. M. (2001). Influence of performance evaluation rating segmentation on motivation and fairness perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1106.
- [12] Boyd, N. G., & Vozikis, G. S. (1994). The influence of self-efficacy on the development of entrepreneurial intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 18, 63-63.
- [13] Bozeman, D. P., Hochwarter, W. A., Perrewe, P. L., & Brymer, R. A. (2001). Organizational Politics, Perceived Control, and Work Outcomes: Boundary Conditions on the Effects of Politics. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(3), 486-503.
- [14] Brackett, M. A., & Salovey, P. (2006). Measuring emotional intelligence with the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT). *Psicothema*, 18(Suplemento), 34-41.
- [15] Carmeli, A. (2003). The relationship between emotional intelligence and work attitudes, behavior and outcomes: An examination among senior managers. *Journal of managerial Psychology*, 18(8), 788-813.
- [16] Chan, D. W. (2004). Perceived emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among Chinese secondary school teachers in Hong Kong. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(8), 1781-1795.
- [17] Chen, G., & Bliese, P. D. (2002). The role of different levels of leadership in predicting self-and collective efficacy: evidence for discontinuity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 549.
- [18] Cherniss, C., & Adler, M. (2000). Promoting emotional intelligence in organizations: Make training in emotional intelligence effective. American Society for Training and Development.
- [19] Drew, T. L. (2006). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Student Teacher Performance. *Online Submission*.
- [20] Dulewicz, V., & Higgs, M. (2003). Leadership at the top: The need for emotional intelligence in organizations. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11(3), 193-210.
- [21] Emmer, E. T., & Hickman, J. (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 51(3), 755-765.
- [22] Fabio, A. D., & Palazzeschi, L. (2008). Emotional intelligence and self-efficacy in a sample of Italian high school teachers. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 36(3), 315-326.
- [23] Feltz, D. L., & Lirgg, C. D. (1998). Perceived team and player efficacy in hockey. *Journal of applied psychology*, 83(4), 557.
- [24] Gardner, L., & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(2), 68-78.
- [25] Gardner, L., & Stough, C. (2003). Exploration of the relationship between workplace, emotional intelligence, occupational stress and employee health. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 2003;55:181-95.
- [26] George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human relations*, 53(8), 1027-1055.
- [27] Gist, M. E. (1987). Self-efficacy: Implications for organizational behavior and human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*. 12(3), 472-485.
- [28] Gibbons, D. E., & Weingart, L. R. (2001). Can I do it? Will I try? Personal efficacy, assigned goals, and performance norms as motivators of individual performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(3), 624-648.
- [29] Gibbs, C. (2003). Effective teaching: Exercising self-efficacy and thought control of action.
- [30] Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2013). *Primal leadership: Unleashing the power of emotional intelligence*. Harvard Business Press.
- [31] Grandey, A. A. (2000). Emotional regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 5(1), 95.
- [32] Halper, L. R., & Vancouver, J. B. (2016). Self-efficacy's influence on persistence on a physical task: Moderating effect of performance feedback ambiguity. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 22, 170-177.
- [33] Hamdy S, Hamdy H, Aadeyemo DA. (2014). Relationship between occupational stress, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy among faculty members in faculty of nursing Zagazig University, Egypt. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*. 2014; 4(4): 183-94.
- [34] Hwang, S. L., Yau, Y. J., Lin, Y. T., Chen, J. H., Huang, T. H., Yenn, T. C., & Hsu, C. C. (2008). Predicting work performance in nuclear power plants. *Safety science*, 46(7), 1115-1124.
- [35] Hysong, S. J., & Quinones, M. A. (1997). The relationship between self-efficacy and performance: A meta-analysis. In *Twelfth Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, St. Louis, MO.
- [36] Jex, S. M., Bliese, P. D., Buzzell, S., & Primeau, J. (2001). The impact of self-efficacy on stressor-strain relations: Coping style as an explanatory mechanism. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(3), 401.
- [37] Jones, G.R. (1986). 'Socialization Tactics, Self-Efficacy, and Newcomers' Adjustments to Organizations, *Academy of Management Journal*, 29: 262-280.
- [38] Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(4), 797.
- [39] Karimi, L., Leggat, S. G., Donohue, L., Farrell, G., & Couper, G. E. (2014). Emotional rescue: The role of emotional intelligence and emotional labour on well-being and job-stress among community nurses. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 70(1), 176-186.
- [40] Kessler, R. C., Akiskal, H. S., Ames, M., Birnbaum, H., Greenberg, P., & Wang, P. S. (2006). Prevalence and effects of mood disorders on work performance in a nationally representative sample of US workers. *American journal of psychiatry*, 163(9), 1561-1568.
- [41] Kozlowski, S. W., Gully, S. M., Brown, K. G., Salas, E., Smith, E. M., & Nason, E. R. (2001). Effects of training goals and goal orientation traits on multidimensional training outcomes and performance adaptability. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 85(1), 1-31.
- [42] Kuvaas, B. (2006). Work performance, affective commitment, and work motivation: the roles of pay administration and pay level. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 27(3), 365-385.
- [43] Kuvaas, B., & Dysvik, A. (2009). Perceived investment in employee development, intrinsic motivation and work performance. *Human resource management journal*, 19(3), 217-236.
- [44] Kruml, S. M., & Geddes, D. (2000). Catching fire without burning out: Is there an ideal way to perform emotion labor? In N. M. Ashkanasy & C. E. Haertel (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace: Research, theory, and practice* (pp. 177-188). Westport, CT: Quorum Books/Greenwood.

- [45] Lam, L. T., & Kirby, S. L. (2002). Is emotional intelligence an advantage? An exploration of the impact of emotional and general intelligence on individual performance. *The journal of social Psychology, 142*(1), 133-143.
- [46] Landy, F.J. (1989), *Psychology of Work Behavior*, 4th ed., Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Pacific Grove, CA.
- [47] Latham, G.P., Winters, D.C., Locke, E.A. (1994). 'Cognitive and Motivational Effects of Participation: A Mediator Study,' *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 15*: 46.63.
- [48] Latham, G.P., Locke, E.A. (1991). 'Self Regulation through Goal Setting,' *Organizational Behaviour, Human Decision Processes, 50*: 212-247.
- [49] Lee, C., Earley, P.C., Hanson L. A, (1988), 'Are Type A's Better Performers?,' *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 9*: 263.269.
- [50] Loi, R., Ngo, H. Y., Zhang, L., & Lau, V. P. (2011). The interaction between leader-member exchange and perceived job security in predicting employee altruism and work performance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84*(4), 669-685.
- [51] Locke EA, Frederick E, Lee C & Bobko P (1984) Effect of self-efficacy, goals, and task strategies and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, vol 69*, pp 241-251.
- [52] Luthans, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2002). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy. *Journal of management development, 21*(5), 376-387.
- [53] Maddux JE. (1995) Self – efficacy theory: An introduction and adaptation, and adjustment theory. Research and application. New York: Plenum; 1995.
- [54] Mathieu, J.E. & Button, S.B. (1992). 'An Examination of the Relative Impact of Normative Information and Self-Efficacy on Personal Goals and Performance over Time,' *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22*: 1758. 1775.
- [55] Mathieu, J.E., Martineau, J. W., Tannenbaum, S.I. (1993), 'Individual and Situational Influences on the Development of Self-Efficacy: Implications for Training Effectiveness,' *Personnel Psychology, 46*: 125.147.
- [56] Mayer, J.D. and Salovey, P. (1997) 'What is emotional intelligence?', in Salovey, P. and Sluyter, D.J. (Eds.): *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Educational Implications*, Basic Books, New York, pp.3-27.
- [57] Melita Prati, L., Douglas, C., Ferris, G. R., Ammeter, A. P., & Buckley, M. R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, leadership effectiveness, and team outcomes. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 11*(1), 21-40.
- [58] Moafian, F., & Ghanizadeh, A. (2009). The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' emotional intelligence and their self-efficacy in Language Institutes. *System, 37*(4), 708-718.
- [59] Ozer, E. M., & Bandura, A. (1990). Mechanisms governing empowerment effects: a self-efficacy analysis. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 58*(3), 472.
- [60] Pajares, F. (2002). Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy.
- [61] Pajares, F. (2002). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic contexts: An outline. Retrieved October, 31, 2003.
- [62] Pareek, U & Purohit, S (2010, 2002, 1997). *Training instruments in HRD and OD – third edition*. Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi.
- [63] Penrose, A., Perry, C., & Ball, I. (2007). Emotional intelligence and teacher self-efficacy: The contribution of teacher status and length of experience. *Issues in Educational Research, 17*(1), 107-126.
- [64] Phillips, J. M., & Gully, S. M. (1997). Role of goal orientation, ability, need for achievement, and locus of control in the self-efficacy and goal-setting process. *Journal of applied psychology, 82*(5), 792.
- [65] Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of management, 12*(4), 531-544.
- [66] Rastegar, M., & Memarpour, S. (2009). The relationship between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among Iranian EFL teachers. *System, 37*(4), 700-707.
- [67] Redmond, M. R., Mumford, M. D., & Teach, R. (1993). Putting creativity to work: Effects of leader behavior on subordinate creativity. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 55*(1), 120-151.
- [68] Ross, J.A., 1994. Beliefs that make a difference: the origins and impacts of teacher efficacy. In: Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies.
- [69] Rostami R, Shahmohammadi Kh, Ghaedi Gh, Besharat MA, Akbari Zardkhane S, Nosratabadi M. (2010) Relationship between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy with perceived social support at Tehran University. 2010; 16(3): 46-54. Persian
- [70] Sargent, L. D., & Terry, D. J. (1998). The effects of work control and job demands on employee adjustment and work performance. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology, 71*(3), 219-236.
- [71] Salovey P, Mayer JD, Caruso D.(2002) The positive psychology of emotional intelligence. *Handbook of positive psychology. Positive psychology, 2002*;159: 171.
- [72] Sanna, L.J., Pusecker, P.A. (1994), 'Self-Efficacy, Valence of Self-Evaluation, and Performance,' *Personality, Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*: 82-92.
- [73] Schaubroeck, J., Jones, J. R., & Xie, J. L. (2001). Individual differences in utilizing control to cope with job demands: effects on susceptibility to infectious disease. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(2), 265.
- [74] Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and individual differences, 25*(2), 167-177.
- [75] Schutte, N. S., Schuettpelez, E., & Malouff, J. M. (2001). Emotional intelligence and task performance. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 20*(4), 347-354.
- [76] Shea, C. M., & Howell, J. M. (2000). Efficacy-performance spirals: An empirical test. *Journal of Management, 26*(4), 791-812.
- [77] Shipley NL, Jackson MJ, Segrest S. (2010).The effects of emotional intelligence, age, work experience, and academic performance. *RHEJ.2010*;(9): 1-18.
- [78] Shore, L. M., & Martin, H. J. (1989). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions. *Human relations, 42*(7), 625-638.
- [79] Slaski, M., & Cartwright, S. (2002). Health, performance and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study of retail managers. *Stress Health 2002*;18:63-8. 17.
- [80] Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- [81] Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin, 124*(2), 240.
- [82] Staples, D. S., Hulland, J. S., & Higgins, C. A. (1998). A self-efficacy theory explanation for the management of remote workers in virtual organizations. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 3*(4).
- [83] Stevens, C. K., & Gist, M. E. (1997). Effects of self-efficacy and goal-orientation training on negotiation skill maintenance: what are the mechanisms?. *Personnel Psychology, 50*(4), 955-978.
- [84] Sutton, R. E., & Wheatley, K. F. (2003). Teachers' emotions and teaching: A review of the literature and directions for future research. *Educational psychology review, 15*(4), 327-358.
- [85] Thoms, P., Moore, K. S., & Scott, K. S. (1996). The relationship between self-efficacy for participating in self-managed work groups and the big five personality dimensions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*(4), 349-362.
- [86] Totterdell, P., & Holman, D. (2003). Emotion regulation in customer service roles: testing a model of emotional labor. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 8*(1), 55.
- [87] Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of educational research, 68*(2), 202-248.
- [88] Tyagi, P. K. (1985). Relative importance of key job dimensions and leadership behaviors in motivating salesperson work performance. *The Journal of Marketing, 76*-86.
- [89] Van Dyne, L., Jehn, K. A., & Cummings, A. (2002). Differential effects of strain on two forms of work performance: Individual employee sales and creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(1), 57-74.
- [90] Vidyarthi, P. R., Anand, S., & Liden, R. C. (2014). Do emotionally perceptive leaders motivate higher employee performance? The moderating role of task interdependence and power distance. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(2), 232-244.

- [91] Waldman, D. A. (1994). The contributions of total quality management to a theory of work performance. *Academy of Management review*, 19(3), 510-536.
- [92] Zapf, D., Vogt, C., Seifert, C., Mertini, H., & Isic, A. (1999). Emotion work as a source of stress: The concept and development of an instrument. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 371-400.
- [93] Zapf, D. (2002). Emotion work and psychological well-being: A review of the literature and some conceptual considerations. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 237-268.

AUTHORS

First Author – Ambreen Grewal Virk, SPHR, University Business School, Panjab University, rwc.ambreen@gmail.com
Second Author – Prof. (Dr.) Meenakshi Malhotra, University Business School, Panjab University, meenmal@yahoo.com
Correspondence Author – Ambreen Grewal Virk, rwc.ambreen@gmail.com, ambreenvirk@gmail.com, +919872670097