



Delegation Effectiveness as the Function of Emotional Intelligence and Academic Intelligence

SubeDar Yadav*

* Assistant Professor, Dept. of Psychology, Nehru P.G. College, Lalitpur (U.P.)

ABSTRACT

The present study aim to study the effect of the interaction of Emotional intelligence and Academic intelligence upon the Delegation effectiveness of the executive officers and managers. The study was conducted on 300 managers and executive officers of various industrial setups. Multiple correlation was calculated to find out the effects of Emotional intelligence and Academic intelligence on Delegation effectiveness. The multiple R 0.75 shows that Delegation effectiveness is the function of the combined effect of Emotional intelligence and Academic intelligence.

INTRODUCTION

In 1920, E.L. Thorndike suggested his his frequently quoted division of intelligence into abstract, mechanical and social intelligence. Abstract intelligence was spoken of as ability to understand and manage ideas and abstractions, mechanical intelligence as ability to understand and manage ideas and abstractions, mechanical intelligence a ability to understand and manage the concrete objects of the physical environment and social intelligence as ability to understand and manage people (Thorndike and Stein, 1937).

Until 1980 there was no talk of emotional intelligence. In 1989, John Mayer and Peter Salovey first coined the term ‘emotional intelligence’ to describe a person’s ability to understand one’s own emotions, the emotions of others and act appropriately based on these emotions.

“Emotional intelligence refers to the capacity of recognizing our own feelings and those of others for motivating our self and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships” (Daniel Goleman, 1998).

Delegation is the instrument of responsibility and authority to another and the creation of accountability for performance. It is to be noted that delegation is not the process of abdication. The person who delegates does not divorce himself from the responsibility and authority which he entrusts.

The purpose of this study is to find out the interactive effect of emotional intelligence and academic intelligence on the delegation effectiveness of the industry managers and officers.

METHOD

The sample consisted of 300 managers and executive officers of various industrial setup. Their age ranging from 25 to 58 years, and length of service from 1 year to 30 years.

INSTRUMENTS

1. **Emotional intelligence scale**: by Subedar Yadav

The present scale is in two parts. In first part, there are 18 statements. 9 statements are related to be “ability to get along with people”, and other 9 statements are related to the ability to make personal decisions.

The second part of the scale consist of 18 statements – 11 positive and 7 negative. The proposed age range is from 20 to 60 years. Although, the scale can be use for any type for any type of educated worker, but it is specially designed for executive officers and managers. The maximum possible score gained by a respondent is 180 and minimum score is 36.

Reliability – test-retest reliability computed after a lapse of 2 month turned out to be 0.65.

Validity – the questionnaire was validated against Singh’s emotional maturity scale. The coefficient of correlation between the questionnaire and Singh’s emotional maturity scale for a group of 100 manager and executive officers was found to be 0.53

2. **Standard Progressive Matrices:** by Raven’s (1948)

The standard progressive matrices (sets A, B, C D & E) is a test of a person’s capacity at the time of the test to apprehend meaningless figure presented for his observation. The scale consist of 60 problems divided into 5 sets of 12 and all the 5 sets provide 5 opportunities for grasping the method and 5 progressive assessment of a person’s capacity for ‘intellectual’ activity.

Test – retest reliability for full scale is 0.93 and validity is 0.86

3. **Delegation Effectiveness Scale:** by DR. (SMT) Krishna Agarwal, 1998.

Delegation effectiveness scale is a measuring parameter for effectiveness of delegation of the respondent by knowing about his attitude towards delegation, delegation habits delegation pattern and his feeling about delegation activity. Test-retest reliability for the full scale is 0.75 and validity is 0.71.

RESULTS

Multiple Regression analysis was computed to see the relationship of critical variable (Delegation effectiveness) with the predictors (Emotional intelligence & Academic intelligence). The results are shown in table 1,2 & 3.

Table 1 here

Table 2 here

Table 3 here

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The partial 'r' was computed between Emotional-intelligence and Delegation effectiveness, keeping Academic intelligence as constant variable and 0.42 coefficient of correlation was found. This means that had all the 300 manager and executive officers, the same amount of academic intelligence then the correlation between emotional intelligence and delegation effectiveness would have been 0.42 instead of 0.44. There is a correlation between delegation effectiveness and emotional intelligence.

A partial $r_{13,2}$ of 0.0057 was found as against 0.11. Had all the managers and Executive officers of the same level of emotional intelligence, then the correlation between Delegation effectiveness and Academic intelligence would have been 0.0057 instead of 0.11. It must be clear that the emotional intelligence has an important influence on Delegation effectiveness and Academic intelligence. Without the presence of Emotional intelligence, Academic intelligence is unable to make any impact on delegation effectiveness.

The partial $r_{23,1}$ of 0.21 was found as against 0.24. This means that had all the 300 managers and executive officers the same amount of Delegation effectiveness then the correlation between Emotional intelligence and Academic intelligence would have been 0.21 instead of 0.24. There is a difference between the two correlations. It therefore means that Delegation effectiveness effects the relation between Emotional intelligence and Academic intelligence.

Correlation coefficient of determination between Delegation effectiveness and Emotional intelligence is 19.36%. Hence, 19% of variance in Delegation effectiveness is associated with, determined by or accounted for, by variance of Emotional intelligence. The coefficient of determination between Delegation effectiveness and Academic intelligence is 1.21%. Therefore 1% variance in Delegation effectiveness is determined by variance in Academic intelligence. Again, the coefficient of determination between Emotional intelligence and Academic

intelligence is 5.76%. Hence, 5% variance in Emotional intelligence is accounted for by variance in Academic intelligence.

The computation of multiple regression equation was also done with the help of the partial regression coefficient.

$b_{12,3}$ was found to be 0.58 and $b_{13,2}$ was 0.0065. Hence the regression equation comes to be –

$$\bar{X}_1 = 0.58X_2 + 0.0065X_3 + A$$

This shows that every unit increase in X_2 (Emotional intelligence) will make 0.58 increase in X_1 (Delegated effectiveness) and every unit increase in X_3 (Academic intelligence) will make 0.0065 increase in X_1 (Delegated effectiveness).

The coefficient of multiple (R) is 0.75. Which indicates that the Delegation effectiveness is the function of the combined effect of Emotional intelligence and Academic intelligence.

REFERENCES

- Yadav S.D. (2000).** Emotional intelligence scale (EIS).
- Agarwal, K. (1998).** Delegation effectiveness scale. National Psychology Corporation, Agra-2
- Goleman, D. (1998).** Working with Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990).** Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185-211.
- Garrett, H.E. (1973).** Statistics in Psychology. Vakils, Feffers & Simons Private Ltd.
- Raven, J.C., Court, J.H., & Raven, J. (1948).** Standard progressive matrices (SPM) scale. London: h.k. Lewis & Co. Ltd.
- Thorndike, R.L., & Stein, S. (1937).** An evaluation of the attempts to measure Social Intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 34, 275-284.

TABLE 1

Table showing means, S.D's. coefficient correlation, Partial r, partial S.D's.

	1. Delegation Effectiveness	2. Emotional Intelligence	3. Academic Intelligence
M	101.23	138.98	48.10
σ	1.96	1.47	1.58
r	$r_{12} = 0.44$	$r_{13} = 0.11$	$r_{23} = 0.24$
Partial r	$r_{12.3} = 0.42$	$r_{13.2} = 0.0057$	$r_{23.1} = 0.21$
Partial σ	$\sigma_{1.23} = 1.75$	$\sigma_{2.13} = 1.29$	$\sigma_{3.12} = 1.53$

TABLE 2

Table Showing the coefficient of Determination (r^2).

($r^2 \times 100$, 1= Delegation effectiveness, 2= Emotional intelligence, 3= Academic intelligence).

$r_{12}^2 = 0.44 = (0.44)^2 \times 100 = 19.36\%$
$r_{13}^2 = 0.11 = (0.11)^2 \times 100 = 1.21\%$
$r_{23}^2 = 0.24 = (0.24)^2 \times 100 = 5.76\%$

TABLE 3

Table showing the Beta Coefficients, Multiple regression equation and Multiple R.

$b_{12.3} = r_{12.3} \frac{\sigma_{1.23}}{\sigma_{2.13}} = 0.42 \frac{1.75}{1.29} = 0.58$
$b_{13.2} = r_{13.2} \frac{\sigma_{1.23}}{\sigma_{3.12}} = 0.0057 \frac{1.75}{1.53} = 0.0065$
Multiple Regression Equation
$\bar{X}_1 = 0.58 X_2 + 0.0065 X_3 + A(\text{Constant})$
Multiple R = 0.75