THE RESEARCH NEXUS
ISSN: 3106-7867 | 3106-7859
Volume 2, Issue 4, 2025

BEYOND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL SELF-AWARENESS MODEL FOR PREDICTING LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Naureen Azad

Lecturer, Department of Applied Psychology, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan.

naureenazad0890@gmail.com

Keywords
Self-awareness, Social intelligence, Leadership behavior, Emotional intelligence, Cognitive intelligence, Multidimensional model.

Article History
Received: 10 October 2025
Accepted: 15 December 2025
Published: 31 December 2025

Corresponding Author: *
Naureen Azad

Abstract
This study redefines self-awareness in leadership through a triadic model integrating emotional, cognitive, and social intelligence. Using a novel correlational approach, data were collected from 72 manager-subordinate dyads across diverse organizations in Pakistan. Managers completed two self-assessments two weeks apart, while subordinates rated their leadership using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Regression analyses showed that only social intelligence significantly predicted leadership effectiveness. Emotional and cognitive intelligence, along with traditional and correlational self-awareness measures, were not significant predictors. Findings emphasize the cultural challenges of assessing self-awareness in high power-distance contexts and support the inclusion of social intelligence in leadership development and evaluation.

INTRODUCTION

Leaders hold significant influence over their followers, ranging from a single individual to a large group or even a national population. Historically, this power dynamic has occasionally led to destructive outcomes, particularly when leaders possess narcissistic tendencies or distorted self-perceptions (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). The lack of negative feedback, driven by fear of reprisal, can contribute to leaders' skewed self-assessment, making them perceive themselves as more competent or morally righteous than their followers do (Van Velsor, Ruderman, & Young, 1992). Such a lack of accurate self-awareness can hinder effective leadership (Wilson, O'Hare, & Shipper, 1990).

Self-awareness:

Previous studies have examined self-awareness and its role in leadership effectiveness (Atwater & Yammarino, 1992; Goleman, 1995), but issues with conceptualization and measurement have persisted (Edwards & Parry, 1993).

The current study aims to address these limitations by re-conceptualizing self-awareness beyond emotional intelligence (EI) to also include cognitive and social intelligence. This broader view is based on Locke's (2005) argument that self-awareness should encompass one's cognitive abilities, as these are crucial for leadership. The study also challenges previous methodological issues, such as the use of difference scores, by measuring self-awareness using consistency across two self-ratings spaced two weeks apart. Leadership effectiveness was assessed through the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which evaluates various leadership factors, including consideration and predictive accuracy (Stogdill, 1963). This research highlights the importance of extending self-awareness to include cognitive and social intelligence, reinforcing the need for a more

comprehensive approach to understanding leadership effectiveness (Locke, 2005; Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

Leadership:

Psychological research on leadership has evolved over time, beginning with Trait Theory in the early 20th century (Stogdill, 1948). This theory posits that leadership qualities are innate, with certain traits like intelligence, dominance, and extroversion distinguishing leaders from followers (Mann, 1959). However, the limitations of Trait Theory, including its failure to account for situational factors, were noted by Stogdill (1948) and others. Further research, such as Lord, DeVader, and Alliger's (1986) meta-analysis, found cognitive ability to be a significant predictor of leadership effectiveness. Despite this, Trait Theory was later criticized for its narrow focus, as it did not fully consider the dynamic nature of leadership roles (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Behavioral Theory emerged in response to these shortcomings, emphasizing that effective leadership results from behaviors rather than inherent traits (Stogdill, 1957; Blake & Mouton, 1964). Ohio State Leadership Studies identified two key leadership behaviors: "initiating structure" and "consideration" (Hemphill & Coons, 1957).

This perspective shifted leadership research from focusing on individual leaders to analyzing leadership as a dynamic process. Blake and Mouton (1964) proposed five leadership styles based on these behaviors, with the "team style" being most effective. The Situational and Contingency theories, proposed by Fiedler (1967), further emphasized the importance of context in leadership, highlighting the interaction between leadership style and situational variables. Leader-Member Exchange Theory (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975) also examined leader-follower relationships, emphasizing that leaders may adopt different styles depending on their employees' status in the organization. Ultimately, a comprehensive view of leadership integrates traits, behaviors, situational factors, and follower dynamics to better understand and improve leadership effectiveness (Atwater & Yammarino, 1992).

Self-awareness and Leadership:

Self-awareness plays a crucial role in leadership, influencing both the motivation to lead and leadership effectiveness. Chan and Drasgow (2001) identified three types of individuals motivated to lead: those who view themselves as natural leaders, those driven by an agreeable disposition, and those motivated by a sense of social duty. All of these types exhibit self-awareness, suggesting that it is integral to leadership. Atwater and Yammarino's (1992) study showed that self-awareness affects leadership performance, with those who have a better understanding of their behavior exhibiting better outcomes. Similarly, Sosik and Megerian (1999) linked self-awareness to transformational leadership and managerial success.

However, previous research primarily relied on difference scores (self-ratings versus follower ratings), which have been criticized for issues like reliability and construct validity (Johns, 1981; Edwards, 1995). To address this, newer studies, including Church's (1997) research on high- versus average-performing managers, used more accurate measures of self-awareness, such as correlating self-ratings across time. These studies consistently found that self-aware leaders—those who accurately assess their behavior—perform better. This research suggests that self-awareness, particularly through social and emotional intelligence, is a key factor in effective leadership. The current study aims to refine the measurement of self-awareness, using multiple tools like the Fleishman Job Analysis Survey and Tromso Social Intelligence Scale, to better understand its relationship with leadership. Hypotheses proposed in the study suggest that higher self-awareness correlates with better leadership behaviors (Fleishman & Reilly, 1992; Silvera, Martinussen, & Dahl, 2001)

Hypotheses

H 1: There will be a positive correlation between managers' self-assessments of Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, and Emotional Intelligence, and their Leader Behavior scores.

H 2: Managers who demonstrate higher self-awareness scores (indicated by stronger correlations between their ratings at Time 1 and Time 2) will show more favorable Leader Behavior scores.

H 3: Managers with smaller differences between their self-ratings at Time 1 and Time 2 (indicating higher self-awareness) will exhibit better Leader Behavior scores.

Methodology

Participants and Sampling

The study involved 72 manager-subordinate dyads recruited from various private and public sector organizations across Pakistan. Participants were recruited using a combination of in-person visits, emails, and phone calls. Eligibility criteria required that each manager-subordinate pair be in a verifiable supervisory relationship to ensure meaningful assessment of leadership behaviors. Participants were informed of the study's purpose and confidentiality protections, and informed consent was obtained in accordance with the ethical standards of HSA University (Approval ID: [HSAU/PSY-2024/017). To encourage participation, managers received a small incentive (PKR 500) and were entered into a draw for a weekend holiday package at Mangla Resort. A preliminary power analysis, assuming a medium effect size ($f^2 = 0.15$) and a significance level of 0.05, indicated that a minimum of 67 dyads would be needed to achieve a power of 0.80 for detecting 10% variance in leadership behavior via multiple regression.

Instruments

Cognitive Abilities:

Cognitive abilities were assessed using an adapted version of the Fleishman Job Analysis Survey (Fleishman & Reilly, 1992), comprising 21 items measuring perceptual, reasoning, memory, and psychomotor skills. Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = describes me very poorly, 7 = describes me extremely well). The scale showed high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .84 at Time 1 and .83 at Time 2).

Social Intelligence:

The Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale (Silvera, Martinussen, & Dahl, 2001) measured three facets: Social Skills, Social Awareness, and Social Information Processing. Each subscale included seven items, with some reverse-coded. Cronbach's alpha ranged from .71 to .77 across time points. Scores were averaged to compute overall and facet-specific means.

Emotional Intelligence:

Emotional intelligence was measured using the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS; Wong & Law, 2002). This 16-item scale assesses Self-Emotion Appraisal (SEA), Others' Emotion Appraisal (OEA), Use of Emotion (UOE), and Regulation of Emotion (ROE). Internal consistency was satisfactory across most subscales (e.g., SEA: .72-.83; ROE: .62 at Time 1, .87 at Time 2).

Mood Assessment:

Mood was measured using the Brief Mood Introspection Scale (BMIS; Mayer & Gaschke, 1988). This 16-item adjective checklist assesses eight mood states. Due to poor reliability in this sample (Cronbach's alpha = .22 at Time 2), mood data were analyzed cautiously and excluded from primary analyses. Future studies may consider a more robust instrument.

Leadership Behavior:

Leader behavior was assessed using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII (LBDQ-XII; Stogdill, 1963), which includes 12 leadership dimensions such as Consideration, Integration, and Predictive Accuracy. Subordinates rated each item on a 5-point Likert scale. Internal consistency across subscales ranged from .79 to .90, indicating strong reliability.

Procedure

Each manager completed two self-assessment surveys (Time 1 and Time 2) spaced two weeks apart. A unique anonymous code, first two letters of their mother's name and last four digits of their phone number was used to match responses while preserving confidentiality. The two-week interval was selected based on previous leadership studies aiming to

capture short-term consistency without memory contamination. Managers received pre-labeled envelopes for each time point and were instructed to complete and return the surveys by mail. A reminder was sent near the second deadline to promote compliance. Concurrently, each manager provided a sealed "Employee" envelope to a subordinate, who completed the LBDQ based on their manager's behavior. All materials included detailed instructions, consent forms, and were ethically approved. To minimize organizational bias, participants were drawn from diverse industries (e.g., healthcare, finance, education, technology). However, managers distributed surveys to subordinates themselves, a limitation noted due to the potential for social desirability bias, though confidentiality was assured.

Data Analysis

Self-awareness was calculated using both correlational and difference score approaches. Mean ratings and inter correlations between Time 1 and Time 2 scores were computed for cognitive, emotional, and social intelligence. Regression analyses assessed predictive validity on leadership behavior. Mood scores were excluded from final regressions due to low reliability. This multimethod, multi-informant design provided a robust foundation to explore the multidimensional construct of self-awareness in leadership across real-world settings.

Results

This study presents descriptive statistics for the scales used, followed by analyses examining intelligence variables as predictors of Leader Behavior. Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 explore the relationships between Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence, self-awareness, and Leader Behavior, highlighting positive associations between these variables and effective leadership

Descriptive Statistics

Table1: Descriptive Statistics for Self-Ratings on Cognitive, Social and Emotional Ability Factors

Variables	Manager Self-Report Time 1 (M)	SD (Time 1)	Manager Self-Report Time 2 (M)	SD (Time 2)	Mean Difference Scores	Mean Correlations Between T1 and T2
Cognitive Abilities	5.19	0.53	5.21	0.51	0.19	0.59
Social Info Processing	4.96	0.67	5.01	0.65	0.35	0.47
Social Skills	4.87	0.84	4.93	0.74	0.35	0.70
Social Awareness	4.81	0.76	4.81	0.81	0.37	0.48
Self-Emotion Appraisal	5.44	0.66	5.50	0.79	0.32	0.46
Others Emotion Appraisal	5.04	0.77	5.12	0.84	0.42	0.47
Use of Emotion	5.50	0.98	5.50	0.93	0.34	0.48
Regulation of Emotion	5.10	0.95	5.10	1.03	0.40	0.31

In the analysis of descriptive statistics, Cognitive Abilities (M = 5.21) and Use of Emotion (M = 5.50) consistently exhibited the highest mean scores across both Time 1 and Time 2, while Social Awareness recorded the lowest mean scores (M = 4.81) at both time points. Regulation of Emotion demonstrated the highest standard deviations at Time 1 (SD = 0.95) and Time 2 (SD = 1.03), indicating greater variability. In terms of correlations, Social Skills had the largest mean correlation (r = 0.70), whereas Regulation of Emotion showed the smallest correlation (r = 0.31). The largest mean difference was observed in Others' Emotion Appraisal (0.42), reflecting notable change over time.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for LBDQ Factors

Variables	M (Mean)	SD (Standard Deviation)
Representation	4.04	0.65
Reconciliation	3.88	0.66
Tolerance of Uncertainty	3.49	0.56
Persuasion	3.86	0.56
Structure	3.98	0.48
Tolerance of Freedom	3.82	0.67
Role Assumption	3.92	0.66
Consideration	3.73	0.53
Production Emphasis	3.66	0.70
Predictive Accuracy	3.80	0.48
Integration	3.82	0.56
Superior Orientation	3.77	0.54

Descriptive statistics for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) Form XII showed high mean scores across its twelve subscales (Table 2). On a 1-5 Likert scale, the highest means were for Representation (M = 4.04), Structure, and Role Assumption, while Tolerance of Uncertainty had the lowest (M = 3.49). Production Emphasis displayed the highest standard deviation (SD = 0.70), and Structure and Predictive Accuracy had the lowest (SD = 0.48).

Scores from the Brief Mood Introspection Scale (BMIS) were analyzed to assess potential mood differences between Time 1 and Time 2. A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted, revealing no significant mood variation [$F(1, 71) = .61$, $p = 0.436$], ensuring that mood fluctuations did not impact the Self-Awareness variables, allowing for continued analysis without contamination from mood variance.

Table 3

Correlations between the Overall Scores for Cognitive, Social and Emotional Abilities.

	1	2	3
1.Cognitive Grand Mean	-	.344**	.511**
2.Social Grand Mean		-	.487**
3.Emotional Grand Mean			-

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

Hypothesis 1 proposed a positive relationship between self-ratings of Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, and Emotional Intelligence and Leader Behaviour. Before exploring self-awareness in leadership, it was crucial to establish whether self-rated competence in these abilities predicted Leader Behaviour. Multiple regression analyses were conducted, regressing Leader Behaviour scores onto Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, and Emotional Intelligence scores from Time 1 and Time 2. A correlation matrix (Table 3) was examined to assess multi-collinearity among predictor variables. Medium-sized correlations between the grand mean scores indicated an acceptable level of collinearity, confirming that the variables could be used in regression analyses.

THE RESEARCH NEXUS
ISSN: 3106-7867 | 3106-7859
Volume 2, Issue 4, 2025

Table 4

Results of Multiple Regressions for Time 1 and Time 2 Overall Ability Scores as Predictors of Overall Leadership Effectiveness.

Coefficients			
Predictor	B	B	p-levela
Constant	2.384		.000
Time1 Overall Cognitive	.002	.002	.985
Time1Overall Social	.187	.292	.022
Time1 Overall Emotional	.097	.161	.241
R2		.151	
F		4.038	.011
Δ R2		.114	
Predictor	2.334		
Time2 Overall Cognitive	.092	.128	.334
Time2 Overall Social	.187	.269	.049
Time2 Overall Emotional	.016	.029	.846
R2		.124	
F		3.22	.028
Δ R2		.086	

Table 4 presents the results of two regression analyses with Leader Behavior scores as the dependent variable. The first regression used self-rated scores on Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, and Emotional Intelligence at Time 1 as independent variables, while the second regression used scores at Time 2. Social Intelligence and Emotional Intelligence scores were calculated by forming a grand mean from the sub-scale scores. The first regression revealed that these variables explained 11% of the variance in Leader Behavior, with Social Intelligence showing a significant beta weight, indicating it was the primary predictor. In the second regression, which used scores from Time 2, 8% of the variance in Leader Behavior was explained, and once again, Social Intelligence was the only variable with a significant beta weight, suggesting its consistent role in predicting Leader Behavior across both time points.

Table 5

Results of Multiple Regressions for Overall Ability Scores as Predictors of Overall Leadership Performance

Coefficients			
Predictor	B	B	P-level[a]
Constant	2.29		
Overall Cognitive	.048	.067	.614
Overall Social	.201	.290	.028
Overall Emotional	.054	.091	.542
R2		.142	
F		3.75	.015
Δ R2		.104	

[a] N = 72.

Table 5 presents the regression results where Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, and Emotional Intelligence scores predict employee-rated Leader Behaviors. These variables explained 10% of the variance in Leader Behavior, with Social Intelligence being the strongest and only significant predictor. Cognitive Abilities and Emotional

Intelligence had non-significant beta weights, highlighting Social Intelligence's primary role.

Table 6

Multiple Regression using Age, Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence and Emotional Intelligence to Predict Leader Behavior

	Coefficients		
Variable	B	B	p-level[a]
Constant	1.16		.005
Age	.009	.256	.040
Overall Cognitive	.124.	.171	.220
Overall Social	.243	.352	.009
Overall Emotional	-.013	-.021	.885
R2		.195	
F		4.051	.005
Δ R2		.147	

[a] N = 72

An ancillary multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine whether manager age mediated Leader Behavior prediction, as shown in Table 6. The results indicated that the independent variables explained 14% of the variance in Leader Behavior, with both Age and Social Intelligence providing significant incremental predictions.

Table 7

Correlations between Self-Awareness Scores Represented by Correlations and Leadership Factors

Leadership Factors	Cognitive Self-Awareness	Social Self-Awareness	Emotional Self-Awareness
Representation	.010	.159	.110
Reconciliation	.113	.011	-.096
Tolerance of Uncertainty	-.052	.175	-.174
Persuasion	.133	.048	.102
Structure	.085	.029	-.042
Tolerance of Freedom	.009	.119	-.072
Role Assumption	.148	-.166	.032
Consideration	-.019	.030	-.062
Production Emphasis	-.025	-.156	.064
Predictive Accuracy	.145	.068	-.162
Integration	-.078	-.001	-.136
Superior Orientation	-.010	-.077	.063

In table 7, Correlations between managers' self-ratings of Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, and Emotional Intelligence at Time 1 and Time 2 were used to measure Self-Awareness. Bivariate correlations between these Self-Awareness scores and Leader Behavior factors in the LBDQ revealed no significant relationships.

Table 8

Correlations between the Overall Correlation-based Scores for Cognitive, Social and Emotional Abilities.

	1	2	3
1.Cognitive Self-Awareness	-	.125	.131
2.Social Self-Awareness		-	.174
3.Emotional Self-Awareness			-

In table 8, To further test Hypothesis 2, which predicted that higher correlational Self-Awareness scores for Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, and Emotional Intelligence would be positively linked to Leader Behavior, a multiple regression model was created. Prior to regression, correlations between predictor variables were examined for multi-collinearity. The correlation matrix in Table 8 showed small correlations, indicating minimal collinearity among the predictor variables.

Table 9

Regression of Overall Leadership Score on the Correlation based Self-Awareness Scores.

Coefficients			
Predictor	B	B	p-level[a]
Constant	3.771		.000
Cognitive	.102	.065	.596
Social	.048	.028	.820
Emotion	-.079	-.056	.649
R2		.007	
F		.16	.920
Δ R2		-.037	

[a] N = 72.

Table 9 presents the results of a linear multiple regression, using correlational Self-Awareness scores for Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, and Emotional Intelligence as independent variables, with Leader Behavior scores as the dependent variable. The results contradicted Hypothesis 2, showing no statistically significant prediction of Leader Behavior from these Self-Awareness scores.

Table 10

Correlations between Difference Score Self-Awareness Measures and Leadership Factors

Self-Awareness Measures Represented by Difference Scores								
	Cognitive Abilities	Social Information Processing	Social Skills	Social Awareness	Self-Emotion Appraisal	Others Emotion Appraisal	Use of Emotion	Regulation of Emotion
Representation	-.095	-.059	.195	.026	-.057	.150	-.113	.229
Reconciliation	-.204	.011	-.076	.074	-.120	-.028	-.029	.040
Tolerance of Uncertainty	-.119	.014	.153	.036	-.053	.141	-.095	.051
Persuasion	-.039	-.039	.023	.063	.097	.164	.002	.191
Structure	-.143	-.040	.119	.085	-.152	.023	-.052	.027
Tolerance of Freedom	.045	.056	.085	-.043	-.038	.160	.009	-.001
Role Assumption	-.044	-.031	.064	.025	-.060	.014	-.151	.125
Consideration	-.062	-.118	.137	-.047	-.200	.127	-.159	.069

Production Emphasis	.056	.031	-.003	.010	-.024	.052	-.082	-.027
Predictive Accuracy	.061	-.028	.077	.063	.035	.093	-.045	.130
Integration	-.034	.060	.223	-.021	-.016	.112	-.072	.121
Superior Orientation	-.033	.160	.201	.073	-.106	.065	.008	.050

Table 10 represent in this study, difference scores were used for two main reasons: to explore whether these scores for Self-Awareness would be associated with Leader Behavior and to compare them with methods used in prior research. The difference scores were calculated by subtracting self-ratings on Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, and Emotional Intelligence at Time 1 from those at Time 2 and taking the absolute value. These scores reflect the instability of rated abilities in managers. Hypothesis 3 suggested that higher difference scores would be negatively related to Leader Behavior. However, as shown in Table 10, no significant relationship was found between the difference scores for Self-Awareness and the Leader Behavior factors in the LBDQ.

Table 11

Correlations between the Overall Difference Scores for Cognitive, Social and Emotional Abilities.

Cognitive Scores		Social Scores	Emotional Scores
Cognitive Self-Awareness	1	.389**	.375**
Social Self-Awareness		1	.104
Emotional Self- Awareness			1

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

A linear multiple regression analysis was performed, regressing Leader Behavior on the difference scores for Self-Awareness in Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, and Emotional Intelligence. The correlation matrix in Table 11 revealed small correlations between these variables, indicating minimal collinearity among the predictors before conducting the regression analysis.

Table 12

Multiple Regression Using Cognitive, Social and Emotional Difference Scores to Predict Overall Leadership

	Coefficients		
Variable	B	B	p-levela
Constant	3.784		.000
Cognitive Difference Scores	.309	.161	.249
Social Difference Scores	.132	.077	.552
Emotion Difference Scores	-.204	-.114	.378
R2		.039	
F		.919	.436
Δ R2		-.003	

[a] N = 72.

To test Hypothesis 3, a regression analysis was conducted with Cognitive Abilities, Social Intelligence, and Emotional Intelligence as independent variables and employee-rated Leader Behavior as the dependent variable. As shown in Table 12, the results were inconsistent with Hypothesis 3, revealing that manager Self-Awareness did not predict Leader Behavior, with beta weights indicating no influence on employee perceptions.

Discussion

This study sought to refine the understanding of self-awareness in leadership by expanding its conceptual scope beyond emotional intelligence to include cognitive and social dimensions, and by testing new methodological approaches to its measurement. The results offer both affirmation and challenges to existing models, shedding light on which elements of self-awareness are most salient in predicting leadership effectiveness.

Hypothesis 1: Self-Ratings and Leader Behavior

Findings supported the first hypothesis, indicating that managers who rated themselves higher in cognitive, emotional, and especially social intelligence were evaluated more positively by their subordinates on leadership behavior. Among these, social intelligence consistently emerged as the strongest predictor. This result aligns with leadership theories that emphasize interpersonal sensitivity and relational dynamics, such as Blake and Mouton's concern for people and Stogdill's construct of consideration. It suggests that leaders' capacity to navigate social situations and understand interpersonal cues may play a more critical role in shaping subordinate perceptions than traditionally emphasized cognitive or emotional traits.

The inclusion of manager age in regression analyses further improved predictive power, indicating that maturity may enhance leadership perception, possibly by fostering experience-based judgment and relationship management. This insight is particularly valuable for organizations seeking to identify and train leadership potential based on a broader developmental lens.

Hypothesis 2: Correlational Self-Awareness and Leader Behavior

Contrary to expectations, the correlational method of assessing self-awareness comparing Time 1 and Time 2 self-ratings did not significantly predict leader behavior. This suggests that internal consistency in self-perceptions over time may not directly translate into observable leadership outcomes. One possible explanation is that individuals may maintain stable self-views without these views aligning with actual interpersonal behavior. Alternatively, the measurement interval (two weeks) may have been too short to capture meaningful variation or consistency in behavior.

Another consideration is methodological. While correlational self-awareness offers a novel alternative to difference scores, it may lack sensitivity in detecting nuanced changes in behavior or in capturing externally observable traits. This finding raises questions about whether self-awareness as a construct is best assessed through self-report at all, or whether multi-source feedback tools might offer greater ecological validity.

Hypothesis 3: Difference Scores and Leader Behavior

Similarly, the difference score method measuring the magnitude of change between two self-assessments also failed to significantly predict leader behavior. Although widely criticized in the literature for low reliability and conceptual ambiguity, the difference score method remains prevalent. Our results further support criticisms of this approach and suggest that simple difference calculations may be insufficient to capture the complex, contextual nature of self-awareness.

One possible explanation is the potential inflation or deflation in self-ratings due to social desirability, particularly since managers were aware that subordinates would also be rating their leadership. While confidentiality was ensured, subconscious self-presentation biases may still have influenced the data.

Synthesis and Implications

Taken together, these results suggest that self-awareness when operationalized as cognitive or emotional self-appraisal over time may not independently predict leadership effectiveness. However, social intelligence, as a stable self-perceived trait, demonstrates consistent predictive value. This finding calls for a rethinking of self-awareness measures in leadership research and supports the integration of social cognition as a core component.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

The study contributes to the growing discourse on multidimensional leadership competencies by emphasizing the primacy of social intelligence.

Practically, organizations should consider incorporating social intelligence assessments into leadership development programs and selection systems. Theoretically, these findings challenge the sufficiency of existing self-awareness frameworks that over-rely on emotional intelligence paradigms.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Despite its contributions, the study faced limitations. The low reliability of the Brief Mood Introspection Scale at Time 2 compromised its utility, and the two-week interval may not have captured meaningful behavioral shifts. Additionally, managers selecting the employees who evaluated them introduces a risk of rater bias. Future research should explore longer intervals, use objective behavioral indicators, and employ truly anonymous 360-degree feedback mechanisms.

In summary, while this study did not validate new self-awareness measurement approaches, it did reaffirm the centrality of social intelligence in leadership. Future work should continue to refine measurement strategies and explore how self-awareness, in its many forms, interacts with personality, context, and leadership style to influence organizational outcomes.

Conclusion

This study demonstrated that self-awareness when expanded to include emotional, cognitive, and especially social intelligence has a partial association with leadership effectiveness. While social intelligence emerged as a consistent predictor of positive leader behavior, neither emotional nor cognitive intelligence significantly influenced leadership ratings. Moreover, alternative measures of self-awareness based on score correlations and difference scores did not yield statistically meaningful associations with subordinate perceptions. These results highlight the potential limitations of conventional self-assessment tools and suggest that current methods may not adequately capture the complexity of self-awareness in real-world leadership settings. Practical implications point toward prioritizing social intelligence in recruitment and training frameworks, while future research should adopt more refined sampling strategies, increase assessment frequency, and explore mediating or moderating factors. In conclusion, this research contributes a fresh perspective to the evolving discourse on leadership and offers actionable insights into the assessment and development of leadership competencies.

REFERENCES

Atwater, L. E., & Yammarino, F. J. (1992). Does self-other agreement on leadership perceptions moderate the validity of leadership and performance predictions? Personnel Psychology, 45, 141-164.

B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Congruence of self and others 'leadership ratings of naval officers for understanding successful performance. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 40(4), 437-454.

Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S. (1964) The Managerial Grid, Houston TX.: Gulf. Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S. (1978) The New Managerial Grid, Houston TX.: Gulf.

Church, A. H. (1997). Managerial Self-Awareness in High-Performing Individuals in Organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(2) 281-292.

Cashman, J., Dansereau, F., Jr., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1976). Organizational understructure and leadership: A longitudinal investigation of the managerial role-making process. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15, 278-296.

Chan, K., & Drasgow, F. (2001). "Toward a Theory of Individual Differences and Leadership: Understanding the Motivation to Lead", Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(3), 481-498.

Cronbach, L. J., & Furby, L. (1970). How we should measure —change‖—or should we? Psychological Bulletin, 74(1), 68-80.

Edwards, J. R. & Parry, M. E. (1993). On the use of polynomial regression equations as an alternative to difference scores in organizational research. Academy of Management Journal, 36(6), 1577-1613.

Edwards, J. R. (1995). Alternatives to Difference Scores as Dependent Variables in the Study of Congruence in Organizational Research. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 64(3), 307-324.

Edwards, J. R. (2001). Ten Difference Score Myths. Organizational Research Methods, 4(3), 265-287.

Esser, J., K. (1998). Alive and Well after 25 Years: A Review of Groupthink Research. Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 73(2), 116-141.

Fenigstein, A. (1974). Self-consciousness, self-awareness and rejection. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas.

Fleishman, E.A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. Personnel Psychology, 37, 1-6.

Fleishman, E. A. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill and A. E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behaviour: Its description and measurement. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957 (b).

Fleishman, E. A. & Reilly, M. E. (1992). Administrator's guide F-JAS: Fleishman Job Analysis Survey. Palo, Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam.

Johns, G. (1981). Difference score measures of organizational behavior variables: A critique.

Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 27(3), 443-463.

Halpin, A.W., & Winer, B.J. (1957). A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Businness Research, Ohio State University.

Hazucha, J. F., Bentile, S. A., & Schneider, R. J. (1992). The impact of self-development. Paper presented at seventh annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Montreal, Canada.

Hemphill, J. K., & Coons., A. E. (1957). Development of the leader behaviour description questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill and A. E. Coons (Eds.), Leader behaviour: Its description and measurement. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L. (1952). Some recent findings in human relations research, In E. Swanson, T. Newcombe and E. Hartley (eds), Readings in social psychology, NY: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

Kirkpatrick, S. A. & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do Traits Matter? The Executive, 5(2), 48- 60.

Locke, E. A. (2005). Why emotional intelligence is an invalid concept. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26, 425-431.

Lord, R.G., DeVader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986) A Meta-analysis of the Relation Between Personality Traits and Leadership Perceptions: An Application of Validity Generalization Procedures, ‖ Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3), 402-410.

Mann, R. D. (1959) ‗A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups ', Psychological Bulletin 66(4): 241-70

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Meta-analysis of the relationship between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions and performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 380-399.

Rosenthal, S., A. & Pittinsky, T., L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. The Leadership Quarterly. 17(6), 617-633.

Sadler, P. (1997) Leadership, London: Kogan Page.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9(3), 185-211

Silvera, D., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. (2001). The Tromso social intelligence scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 42, 313 – 319

Sosik, J. J., & Megerian, L. E (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance. Group Organization Management, 24, 367-390.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948) _Personal factors associated with leadership. A survey of the literature. Journal of Psychology 25: 35-71.

Stogdill, R.M., Goode, O.S., & Day, D.R. (1962). New leader behavior description subscales. Journal of Psychology, 54, 259-269.

Stogdill, R.M. (1963). Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire—Form XII. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Stogdill, M, & Coons, A. (1957). Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Research Monograph no 88, Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research Ohio State University.

Tekleab, A., G., Sims, H., P., Seokhwa, Y., Tesluk, P. E., & Cox, J. (2008). Are we on the Same Page? Effects of Self-Awareness of Empowering and Transformational Leadership.Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14(3) 185-201.

Van Velsor, E., Ruderman, M., & Young, D. (1992). Enhancing self-objectivity and performance on the job: The role of upward feedback. Paper presented at the Society for Industrial &Organizational Psychology, Sl. Louis, Missouri.

Wilson, C. L., O 'Hare, D. & Shipper, F. (1990). Task cycle theory: The processes of influence. In Clark, K. E., & Clark, M. B. (Eds.), Measures of leadership. Wes Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Wong, C., & Law, K. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. The Leadership Quarterly, 13, 243 – 274.

Wright, P. (1996) Managerial Leadership, London: Routledge.