2012

The emotional intelligence of general counsels in relation to lawyer leadership

Donna L. Wanser

Pepperdine University

Graduate School of Education and Psychology

THE EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE OF GENERAL COUNSELS IN RELATION TO LAWYER LEADERSHIP

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by

Donna L. Wanser

February, 2012

Vance Caesar, Ph.D. – Dissertation Chairperson

This dissertation, written by

Donna L. Wanser

under the guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Doctoral Committee:

Vance Caesar, Ph.D., Chairperson

Roland Smith, Ph.D.

Kent Rhodes, Ed.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Page

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

While I have been blessed by many family and friends that have encouraged me to follow my desire to pursue a doctorate degree, I want to especially thank my committee, Vance Caesar, Kent Rhodes and Roland Smith for believing in me and keeping me and this project on course. I want to thank my classmates for their support throughout the entire doctoral process. Peggy and Andrew Cherng, the founders of Panda Restaurant Group, Inc., were also a source of inspiration and were the guiding light behind my choosing advanced studies in Organizational Leadership. However, my daughter, Vanessa, has been the stronghold for my completion. She has listened to countless hours about leadership, adult learning application, and research methods, and has always been my biggest fan. Never once did she complain about the impact my aspiration of completing a doctorate program had on her. I hope I am able to give her as much moral support as she was to me as she continues her advanced studies. Last, I want to thank my mom and dad. While they may seem to say little about my academic endeavors, they never stop being my biggest cheerleaders.

VITA

Donna L. Wanser

Education

Doctorate of Education
Pepperdine University
Major in Organizational Leadership
Dissertation topic: The study of the emotional intelligence of general counsel to determine if they are prepared to lead the more right-brained millennial lawyer .

Juris Doctorate
Touro Law School
International Law Review. Licensed in New York, California and District of Columbia.

Master of Business Administration
Dowling College
Major in Finance

Thesis topic: Analysis of key factors for a successful European Union and a combined European monetary system.
Dean's List, Delta Mu Delta (Delta Pi Chapter)

Bachelor of Science
University of Maryland
Major in Business Administration. Dean's List

Publications and Speaking Engagements

Published Article
"The European Union Today-A New Beginning or the End." Northeast Decision Science Institute 1995 p.114-116.

National Retail Tenant Association

2001-2008 taught two courses annually of various real estate and legal subjects.

CREW

Speaker: "How to use emotional intelligence to be a more effective lawyer"

ACCA

Speaker: "Why emotional intelligence is important when dealing with millennial lawyers"

ALFA

Speaker: "How to manage outside counsel"

Experience

Vice President, Legal **Panda Restaurant Group, Inc., Rosemead, CA**	2000 - present
Morgan Lewis	2000
Reliance Development Group/ **LandAmerica Financial Group** **New York, NY**	1988 - 1999

ABSTRACT

Few studies have examined lawyer leaders. However, previous research has indicated that effective leaders tend to score high in emotional intelligence. This study investigated the emotional intelligence of general counsels and their beliefs about leadership of millennial lawyers. Emotional intelligence was assessed using the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i; Bar-On & Handley, 2003). Participants' total mean EQ-i score was nearly identical to that of a normative sample (Bar-On, 2004a) but the current sample scored significantly higher in positive impression, assertiveness, independence, and stress tolerance. In the current sample, males scored significantly higher than females in independence, empathy, adaptability, reality-testing, and flexibility. On average, respondents believed (but not strongly) that millennial lawyers learn differently than lawyers of previous generations and that emotional intelligence and a less managerial approach can enhance leadership of millennial lawyers. Nevertheless, a high percentage reported that their companies had not made specific plans to accommodate the learning differences of millennial lawyers. There was a significant negative correlation between respondents' belief that training in emotional intelligence would help them lead more effectively and both age and number of years practicing law. There was also a significant negative correlation between endorsement of the Socratic method of teaching law students and number of years practicing law (but not the respondent's age). Leadership coaching/training and number of direct reports both showed significant positive correlations with company plans to accommodate the learning differences of the millennial generation.

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of this study of the emotional intelligence of a group of general counsels (lawyers in leadership positions). The chapter discusses the background of the research problem, the study's purpose, the research problem, the research questions, the study's importance, assumptions, limitations, and definitions of terms.

Background of the Problem

Increasingly, people are influenced by modern technology, which provides instant access to information. Prensky (2001) has stated that members of the millennial generation "think and process information fundamentally differently from their predecessors" (p. 1). According to Pink (2006), the *information age* of the 20th century stressed knowledge, whereas the 21st century is an increasingly *conceptual age* that stresses creativity, innovation, and compassionate action. Therefore, the millennial generation will need leaders who show those traits.

Heavy in visuals, modern technology also has led to greater right-brain stimulation (Nurco & Lerner, 1999). Users of modern technology tend to multitask, quickly shift their attention, and engage in shorthand communication (Prensky, 2001). The Internet has also resulted in an explosion of social networking by electronic means. All of these trends affect lawyers, as they do individuals in other professions. Tyler (2007) comments, "The millennial generation brings new challenges to the workplace" (p. 40). Lawyer leaders must be prepared to meet these challenges.

Effective leaders tend to score high in emotional intelligence, as measured by the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i; Bar-On & Handley, 2003). They show empathy,

flexibility, and social awareness (Bar-On & Handley, 2003). As stated by Goleman (2005), “Emotional intelligence is a master aptitude, a capacity that profoundly affects all other abilities, either facilitating or interfering with them” (p. 80). According to Wong and Law (2002), the “emotional intelligence of followers affects job performance and job satisfaction,” and “the emotional intelligence of leaders affects their [followers’] satisfaction and extra-role behavior” (p. 243).

Burns (1978) stated that the best leaders engage in transformational leadership, in which “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p. 20). According to Bass (1990a), leaders influence, inspire, motivate, stimulate intellect, coach, and advise. Dare (2005) found that followers’ expectations of leaders include aspects of emotional intelligence. Followers expect leaders to have interpersonal skills, motivate others, be sensitive to others, and be flexible.

Goleman (1998a) reported a positive correlation between the effectiveness of business leaders and their emotional intelligence. In a study of 265 corporate executives, directors, managers, business owners, and consultants, Brown and Rollin (2004) found that emotional-intelligence skills such as having a vision, building relationships, and developing people correlated more highly with leadership success than did traditional business skills such as external/market orientation, financial acumen, and planning. Businesspeople have come to accept the importance of emotional intelligence in their leaders and now use analysis of emotional intelligence as part of their hiring process (Goleman, 1998a, 1998b). To prepare students to be more effective in the business world, business schools have incorporated components based on emotional intelligence into their curricula (Muir, 2007).

Although research has demonstrated a positive correlation between emotional intelligence and effective leadership, the emotional intelligence of lawyer leaders has received little study (Elliot, 2011). The practice of law tends to promote left-brain abilities (e.g., argumentation, deduction, and memorization of facts) rather than right-brain abilities such as emotional sensitivity and empathy (Bar-On & Handley, 2003; Pink, 2006). Hence, leaders of millennial lawyers may need to engage in more right-brain thinking (Orrell, 2008). Generally, lawyers manage cases and contracts. Serving as a leader requires social and emotional skills. Goleman (2000) notes, "Leaders can increase their capacity to lead by understanding which emotional intelligence competencies underlie the leadership styles they are lacking and work to develop them" (p. 90).

With an increasingly complicated global environment blending business, government, public policies, there will be a greater need for leadership in the legal profession. Most law schools do not include any leadership courses in their curricula (Polden, 2008). Moreover, law professors tend to use the Socratic method of instruction. Socratic style teaching was initiated by Socrates' desire to enhance knowledge for both the student and the teacher through dialogue to build self confidence (Bobbitt, 2008). Socratic teaching is still used in many educational curricula such as philosophy, mathematics and ethics. However, research indicates that it has had no significant benefit as a pedagogical tool for teaching critical thinking (Mertz, 2007). The most common use of Socratic teaching is in American Law Schools. Socratic teaching is a tradition in American law schools that dates back to the 19th century. Law schools generally have thus far have resisted the need to change that model (Rogers, 2007).

Plato, challenged by his mentor's confrontational style depicted in many of Plato's Dialogues raises the issues of the constricted teaching format of Socrates. Despite many of its constrictions in allowing people to include their own beliefs in the learning process, Socratic styled teaching is still preferred in American law schools (Sullivan, Colby, Wegner, Bond, & Shulman, 2007).

This method enhances critical thinking but does not develop emotional intelligence (Sullivan et al. 2007). Legal education discourages the development of compassion and empathy (Guinier, Fine, & Balin, 1997). Noting that data indicate lawyers are "psychologically and behaviorally more challenged in achieving results" (Muir, 2007, para. 9) than in most professions , Muir (2007) considers it problematic that lawyers receive little training in emotional intelligence either at school or on the job.

Hay Group researchers conducted a qualitative study of leadership characteristics of 33 lawyers in leadership positions at law firm (as cited in "Case for Lawyers," 2005). They found that the best leaders were less directive, employing a flexible, situation-specific approach. Snyder, head of Hay Group's Leadership Development Practice in New York, stated, "The best partners were far less likely than their peers to be pacesetters or directive—perfectionists who set unattainable goals, micromanage, and have a hard time letting go of tasks that would be better handled by associates" (as quoted in "Case for Lawyers," 2005, para. 7). The study found that a directive style was the dominant style of lawyer leadership, and the lawyer leaders generally perceive a directive style as effective leadership in critical, high-risk situations.

Recognizing lawyers' lack of social and emotional skills, Brand, dean of the University of San Francisco School of Law, noted that society needs lawyers who can

empathize, can persuade, and “have the courage to do the right thing” (as quoted in Slater, 2008, para. 6). The Caliper Profile assesses personality traits, career potential, and employment motivation. Using the Caliper Profile, Richard (2005) studied over 1,000 lawyers in senior management positions. The study found that the more successful lawyer leaders scored significantly higher than their colleagues on emotional-intelligence traits such as empathy and ego drive (the need to persuade others to agree with them).

According to Daicoff (1997), lawyers typically are dominating, competitive, and defensive and convey a sense of superiority. Richardson (2007) has stated that lawyers often have trouble trusting, collaborating, and following others. Using the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator, which assesses personality type, Stephens (n.d.) found that most lawyers fall into the category of thinkers/judgers. Individuals in that category fill an estimated 62% of management positions. Lawyers tend to manage, rather than lead, people; the tend for focus on rhetoric and legal maxims rather than being in the people business (American Bar Association, 1992). Bennis (2009) describes a manager as “one who administers, relies on control, has a short-range view, and asks how and when versus a leader, who innovates, inspires trust, has a long-range perspective, and asks what and why” (p. 143).

A study of law students found then when asked to weigh a set of values from the client’s perspective, they ranked expertise highest and weighted the client’s best interest third out of five choices (Gerdy, 2008). Empathy and compassion are not considered a priority to most lawyers; they view the practice of law in a factual dimension void of emotions (Barkai & Fine, 1982).

Lawyer leaders who are not emotionally intelligent may not be able to effectively lead millennial lawyers. Profession socialization experiences that foster empathy and compassion can facilitate increased emotional intelligence skills (Burack, Irby, Carline, Root, & Larson, 1999). Fortunately, according to a longitudinal study of the Weatherhead MBA program where emotional intelligence improved by 50% at the end of a seven year period (Boyatzis, Cowan, & Kolb, 1995) and Goleman (2005), emotional intelligence can be. However, more research is needed to assess lawyers' emotional intelligence, determine the factors that influence it, and ascertain how to increase it.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to measure the emotional intelligence of general counsels in leadership positions to determine what, if any, emotional-intelligence skills they need to learn to optimize their leadership of millennial lawyers. The assessment instrument was the EQ-i, designed by Bar-On (2004a). The EQ-i can be used to determine an employee's emotional health. It comprises five subscales: (a) Intrapersonal (self-awareness and self-expression), (b) Interpersonal (social awareness and interaction), (c) Stress Management (emotional management and control), (d) Adaptability (change management), and (e) General Mood (self-motivation). As defined by Bar-On (2004a), emotional intelligence consists of 15 subsets: self-regard, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, independence, self-actualization, empathy, social responsibility, interpersonal relationships, stress tolerance, impulse control, reality-testing, flexibility, problem-solving, optimism, and happiness.

In the current study, EQ-i scores of surveyed lawyer leaders were compared to EQ-i normative scores (Bar-On, 2004a). A demographics/leadership survey created for

this study included questions about leadership beliefs on leadership and the need for emotionally intelligent leaders of the millennial lawyer. The study examined the extent to which emotional intelligence differed based on age, gender, industry, number of years working as a lawyer, size of the lawyer's staff, whether the lawyer had received leadership training or coaching, and the lawyer's beliefs regarding how best to lead millennial lawyers.

Problem Statement

To effectively lead millennial lawyers, general counsels (lawyers in leadership positions) need emotional intelligence. Millennial lawyers differ from lawyers of earlier generations in significant ways. The traditional view that lawyers can concentrate solely on left-brain skills will not adequately serve lawyers of the 21st century. Previous data indicate that lawyers tend to have inadequate emotional intelligence for effective leadership. However, emotional intelligence in lawyers has received little attention.

Research Questions

This study focused on the following research questions:

1. To what extent do the current sample's mean EQ-i scores differ from those of the EQ-i normative sample?
2. Are the mean responses to particular EQ-i survey statements related to the respondent's age and/or gender?
3. What do participants' responses to questions about leadership indicate about their view of leadership of millennial lawyers?
4. Are participants' responses to questions about leadership related to their demographic characteristics?

Importance of the Study

Leaders of millennial lawyers need emotional intelligence. Yet, there has been little research on lawyer leadership or the emotional intelligence of lawyers. Thus, the current study helps to fill a gap in the literature. The study focused on general counsels because they are typically in leadership positions. Surveying them for emotional intelligence provided baseline data on a core group of lawyer leaders. The study's findings indicated a gap between the current leadership skills of lawyers and the skills needed to lead millennial lawyers (whether in-house or outside). Closing the gap will require that lawyer leaders adopt a more transformational leadership style by means of increased emotional intelligence. This study will increase awareness of the need for right-brain skills among lawyers in leadership positions.

Assumptions

This study entails several underlying assumptions. First, the general counsels who participated in this study were representative of lawyer leaders. Second, the participants' answers were honest and sufficiently accurate. Third, lawyers whose scores indicate more emotional intelligence are better prepared to lead millennial lawyers. Fourth, the researcher assumed particular workplace needs of millennial lawyers based on previous research.

Limitations

This study also involved several limitations. Although Participants were randomly selected they came from a selected pool of general counsels registered in the Southern California, San Diego, or Sacramento chapters of the Association of Corporate Counsel (ACC) and currently serving in a leadership position were invited to participate. Lawyers

in other locations, in other types of leadership positions, or not in leadership positions were excluded from the study. Therefore, this study tested only a select sector of lawyer leaders. As more millennial lawyers enter the workforce, new workforce data may indicate different needs.

The EQ-i, used in this study, relies on self-report. Bar-On (2004a) cautions that psychopathic behaviors can lead to invalid EQ-i results and that narcissistic behaviors can skew results. However, Bar-On (2004b) states that the EQ-i has a built-in correction factor that adjusts the scale scores based on the [tendencies] toward exaggerated positive or negative responding. This factor detects test sabotaging and increases the instrument's accuracy by reducing the distorting effects of social response bias. Cronback alpha was used to examine the internal consistency of the EQ-i to determine its reliability. The average internal consistency coefficient of .76 indicates very good reliability (Bar-On, 2004b).

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions specify the meaning of important terms as used in this dissertation.

Emotional intelligence: "an array of noncognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures" (Bar-On, 2004a, p. 14).

General counsel: a member of the Southern California, San Diego, or Sacramento chapters of the ACC whose position title is General Counsel, Associate General Counsel, Deputy General Counsel, or Assistant General Counsel.

Lawyer leader: a general counsel or other lawyer in a leadership position.

Millennial lawyer: a Canadian or U.S. lawyer born in the late 1970s or early 1980s and therefore a member of the millennial generation, also called "Generation Y" (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Sweeney 2005).

Normative sample: Bar-On's (2004a) EQ-i sample represents 3,831 North Americans, 48.8 males, 51.2 females, 79% Caucasian, 50% with high school and some college (only 9% have advanced degrees), and 72.5% between the age of 20-49.

Transformational leader: a leader who motivates and inspires; is empathic and self-aware; understands the needs of her or his followers; can adapt his or her leadership style to the situation; and makes limited use of coercive, authoritative, or laissez-faire leadership styles.

Summary

Effective leaders tend to score high in emotional intelligence, as measured by the EQ-i (Bar-On & Handley, 2003). They demonstrate empathy, flexibility, and social awareness (Bar-On & Handley, 2003).

Lawyers receive little training in emotional intelligence either at school or on the job (Muir, 2007; Sullivan et al. 2007). In general, they may have inadequate emotional intelligence to be effective leaders (Daicoff, 1997; Muir, 2007; Richardson, 2007; Stephens, n.d.). Having grown up in the Internet age, millennial lawyers bring new skills and ways of thinking to the workplace (Pink, 2006; Prensky, 2001; Tyler, 2007). To effectively lead millennial lawyers, general counsels and other lawyers in leadership positions must have emotional-intelligence skills. These skills can be developed (Goleman, 2005).

However, the emotional intelligence of lawyer leaders has received little study. To help fill the gap in the literature, the current study focused on the emotional intelligence of a group of general counsels. EQ-i scores of surveyed lawyer leaders were compared to EQ-i normative scores (Bar-On, 2004a). The study examined possible associations between emotional intelligence and each of the following: age, gender, industry, number of years working as a lawyer, beliefs regarding how best to lead millennial lawyers, size of the lawyer's staff, and whether the lawyer had received leadership training or coaching. The findings should prove useful in efforts to increase lawyers' emotional intelligence.

CHAPTER 2: Review of Literature

This chapter reviews the literature most relevant to the current study. It discusses the concept of emotional intelligence, the assessment of emotional intelligence, a possible association between gender and emotional intelligence, and the importance of emotional intelligence. The chapter also discusses the definition of leadership, different styles of leadership, emotional intelligence in relation to leadership, the characteristics of the millennial generation, and lawyer leaders.

Concept of Emotional Intelligence

In 1920 Thorndike formally introduced the concept of social intelligence, which he defined as the "ability to understand others and to act or behave wisely in relation to others" (p. 228). Similarly, Gardner (1993) recognized the importance of interpersonal intelligence (the ability to recognize others' needs, goals, and motivations) and intrapersonal intelligence (the ability to recognize one's own feelings and motivations).

Salovey and Mayer (1990) developed the first model of emotional intelligence, which they defined as "the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions" (p. 189). They divided emotional intelligence into three domains: (a) appraisal and expression of emotion in oneself and others (the ability to accurately perceive one's own emotions, read others' facial and body language, and respond with empathy; (b) regulation of emotion in oneself and others (based on past experiences, the ability to regulate moods and avoid negative moods); and (c) use of emotional intelligence to solve problems (the ability to be more flexible in planning, think creatively, and be highly motivated to achieve one's goals). In contrast, Goleman (1995)

divided emotional intelligence into five domains: “knowing one’s emotions, managing emotions, motivating oneself, recognizing emotions in others and handling relationships” (p. 43).

Mayer and Salovey (1997) further developed their model, incorporating particular emotional abilities and adding the concept of feelings. The result was a model consisting of four branches. The first branch comprises perception, appraisal, and expression of emotion. It includes the ability to (a) identify emotion in one’s physical states, feelings, and thoughts; (b) identify emotions in other people, designs, artwork, etc., through language, sound, appearance, and behavior; (c) express emotions accurately and express needs related to those feelings; and (d) discriminate between accurate and inaccurate, or honest and dishonest, expressions of feeling (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, pp. 10–11).

The second branch is emotional facilitation of thinking. This branch involves the following: (a) emotions prioritize thinking by directing attention to important information; (b) emotions are sufficiently vivid and available that they can be generated as aids to judgment and memory; (c) mood swings change the individual’s perspective from optimistic to pessimistic, encouraging consideration of multiple points of view; and (d) emotional states differentially encourage specific problem-solving approaches, as when happiness facilitates inductive reasoning and creativity (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, pp. 10–11).

The third branch entails understanding and analyzing emotions—that is, employing emotional knowledge. It includes the ability to (a) label emotions and recognize relations among the words and among the emotions, such as the relation between liking and loving; (b) interpret the meaning of emotions with regard to

relationships, such as the sadness that often accompanies a loss; (c) understand complex feelings, such as simultaneous feelings of love and hate or emotional blends such as awe (a combination of fear and surprise); and (d) recognize emotional transitions, such as from anger to satisfaction or shame (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, pp. 10–11).

The fourth branch is reflective regulation of emotion to promote emotional and intellectual growth. It includes the ability to (a) stay open to feelings, whether pleasant or unpleasant; (b) reflectively engage or detach from an emotion, depending on its judged usefulness or informativeness; (c) reflectively monitor emotions in relation to oneself and others (e.g., recognize how clear, typical, influential, or reasonable they are); and (d) manage emotion in oneself and others by moderating negative emotions and enhancing pleasant ones, without repressing or exaggerating the information they may convey (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, pp. 10–11).

Assessment of Emotional Intelligence

Mayer, DiPaolo, and Salovey (1990) performed the first empirical assessment of emotional intelligence. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2000) later developed the Multifactor Emotional Intelligences Scale, which they modified into the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT). The MSCEIT includes social competencies.

There are two other widely used measures of emotional intelligence: the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI; Goleman, 2005), which is outcome-oriented, and the EQ-i (Bar-On, 2004a), which is process-oriented. Bar-On (2004a) defines emotional intelligence as “an array of noncognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that

influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures" (p. 14).

This study employed the EQ-i (Bar-On, 2004a). A self-report instrument that measures emotional and social intelligence, the EQ-i is based on 19 years of research by Bar-On (2000). It has been tested in over 10,000 studies on over 85,000 individuals worldwide. The EQ-i is the first validated and most widely used measure of emotional intelligence. A mean score of around 100 on each of the composite scales indicates average emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 2000). Improving individual subscale scores typically improves overall score (Bar-On, 2004b). However, Bar-On (2004b) cautions that an individual who obtains a high score on the EQ-i is not necessarily emotionally intelligent or emotionally and socially healthy; pathological conditions are associated with extremely high scores.

The EQ-i:133 for Canadian and U.S. respondents was developed from a normative database of approximately 4,000 Canadian and US participants (Bar-On, 2004b). Overall scores do not significantly differ based on gender, however, individual subscale scores did vary based on gender (Bar-On, 2004b). Females seem to have stronger interpersonal skills, self-awareness, and empathy. Males seem to be stronger in intrapersonal skills, adaptability, stress management, self-regard, independence, problem solving, flexible and optimism. Older individuals tend to score higher, suggesting that emotional and social intelligence increase with age (Bar-On, 2004a). For an interpretive guideline of EQ-i scale scores, see Appendix A.

The EQ-i:133 consists of 133 five-point response scale whose answers range from 1 (*very seldom* or *not true of me*) to 5 (*very often true of me* or *true of me*). The

instrument is intended for individuals at least 16 years old. It is written at a sixth-grade reading level and, on average, takes 40 minutes to complete (Bar-On, 2004a). The EQ-i:125 is a shortened version that omits the eight negative-impression-scale questions and is intended primarily for the corporate sector (Bar-On, 2004a). Although it is assumed that the EQ-i:125 meets the standards of the EQ-i:133, it has not been independently validated (Bar-On, 2004b).

The EQ-i has five EQ composite scales that assess general areas of strengths and weaknesses and a total of 15 subscale components that provide a general indication of coping abilities and present functioning. The Intrapersonal Self-Awareness and Self-Expression scale comprises five subscales: Self-Regard (accurately perceiving, understanding, and accepting oneself), Emotional Self-Awareness (being aware of and understanding one's emotions), Assertiveness (effectively and constructively expressing one's emotions and oneself), Independence (being self-reliant and free of emotional dependency on others), and Self-Actualization (striving to achieve personal goals and actualize one's potential).

The scale of Interpersonal Social Awareness and Interpersonal Relationships consists of three subscales: Empathy (being aware of and understanding how others feel), Social Responsibility (identifying with one's social group and cooperating with others), and Interpersonal Relationships (establishing mutually satisfying relationships and relating well with others). The scale of Stress Management and Emotional Management and Regulation comprises two subscales: Stress Tolerance (effectively and constructively managing emotions) and Impulse Control (effectively and constructively controlling emotions). The Adaptability and Change Management scale consists of three subscales:

Reality-Testing (objectively validating one's feelings and thinking with external reality), Flexibility (adapting and adjusting one's feelings and thinking to new situations), and Problem-Solving (effectively solving problems of a personal and interpersonal nature). The General Mood and Self-Motivation scale comprises two subscales: Optimism (being positive and looking at the bright side of life) and Happiness (feeling content with oneself, others, and life in general).

Gender and Emotional Intelligence

Findings are mixed as to whether men and women tend to differ in their degree of emotional intelligence. In a study of managers, Mandell and Pherwani (2003) found that women scored higher than men in emotional intelligence. Jausovec and Jausovec (2005) examined EEG correlates of emotional intelligence in 28 Missouri undergraduates and found no significant difference between males and females. In a large-sample study by Craig et al. (2009), females scored higher than males on empathy and on overall emotional intelligence but lower on self-concept.

Importance of Emotional Intelligence

Goleman (1995) estimates that IQ contributes about 20% to an individual's success, whereas emotional and social skills contribute about 80%. Several studies have found that the impact of social and emotional intelligence is as powerful as that of technical skills for career success (Goleman, 1998b). Emotional intelligence has been associated with positive work outcomes and affects attitudes at work (Lopes, Grewal, Kadis, Gall, & Salovey, 2006). As will be discussed in a later section, emotional intelligence also contributes to leadership ability.

Definition of Leadership

People define leadership in different ways (Stogdill, 1974). However, it is generally agreed that leaders inspire and motivate others to "achieve a common goal" (Northouse, 2007, p. 3). According to Bennis (2009), "Leadership evolves around vision, ideas, direction, and has more to do with inspiring people as to direction and goals than with day-to-day implementation" (p. 132). As expressed by Covey (2004), "Leadership is communicating to people their worth and potential so clearly that they are inspired to see it in themselves" (p. 639). Leaders inspire trust and foster talent (Covey, 2004). Effective leaders are self-confident, motivated to lead and influence others; they are willing to take responsibility and take charge (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). They adapt to the developmental level of their followers (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993).

Leadership contrasts with management. Whereas leadership is about people, management is about tasks. Leaders have followers and focus on effectiveness; managers have projects and focus on efficiency (Bennis, 2009). As expressed by Kotter (1999) "The fundamental purpose of management is to keep the current system functioning, and the fundamental purpose of leadership is to produce change" (p. 11). In an attempt to bridge the gap between leadership and management, Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, and Fleishman (2000) have offered a leadership model that includes technical skills (proficiency in a specific activity or type of work), human skills (knowledge of, and ability to work with, people), and conceptual skills (ability to work with ideas and concepts).

Styles of Leadership

Mumford, Zaccaro, and Lewin (as cited in Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939), whose

research is used by the U.S. Army, posited three leadership styles: authoritarian (autocratic), participative (democratic), and delegative (giving free reign). According to Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002), a leader may alternate between six leadership styles: visionary, affinitive, coaching, democratic, pacesetting, and commanding. This section will discuss the following leadership styles: authoritarian, technocratic, transactional, servant, charismatic, and transformational.

Authoritarian leadership. Authoritarian leaders exert control; they want others to seek their approval rather than take initiative. They give little or no positive feedback and tend to take over when they think a task can be done better. Lewin et al. (1939) showed that authoritarian leadership is less effective than either participative or delegative leadership. Followers of participative leaders were less productive than followers of authoritarian leaders but made contributions of much higher quality. Goleman et al. (2002) found that habitually coercing people has a negative effect on the work environment. Effective leadership is not the same thing as power or authority (Riverstone, 2004).

Technocratic leadership. Pitcher (1999) has referred to "intense, determined, uncompromising, hardheaded, cerebral and analytical" executives as "technocrats" (p. 32). In a study of executives, she found that technocratic executives believed they were effective leaders, but their employees disagreed. Employees did not trust technocratic leaders due to their lack of empathy and their inability to cultivate personal relationships.

Transactional leadership. According to Burns (1978), transactional leaders clearly define tasks and concisely explain how they want the tasks to be executed. Followers carry out the tasks in return for a defined reward, be it material or

psychological. The leader checks that the job is being done. As expressed by Kuhnert and Lewis (1987), “Transactional leaders engage their followers in a relationship of mutual dependence in which the contributions of both sides are acknowledged and rewarded” (p. 649).

Dienesch and Liden (1986) believe that the exchange is not always even. Similarly, Graen, Linden, and Hoel (1982) distinguish between high-quality and low-quality exchange relationships. High-quality relationships have an emotional component; they are based on a personal bond between leader and follower. Low-quality relationships lack emotional involvement and are based on business considerations such as pay and work hours.

Bass (1990b) believes that transactional leadership promotes mediocrity because it restrains creativity. Conger and Kanungo (1998) warn that leaders who focus solely on rules and processes can stifle ideas and ways of thinking that are new to them. Burns (1978) notes that transactional leaders can include intangibles such as respect and trust among exchangeable values in order to make an exchange more meaningful, but such intangibles involve no concrete rewards and are therefore difficult to evaluate, including in terms of their effect on performance.

Howell and Avolio (1993) defined transactional leadership as a series of exchanges and bargains between leaders and followers. In this model, followers are not motivated to do anything beyond what their leaders specify. According to Bass and Avolio (1995), transactional leadership can include the following: (a) contingent reward (the leader contracts an exchange of rewards and rewards good performance upon completion of a task), (b) active management by exception (the leader watches for

deviations from rules and standards and takes corrective action), (c) passive management by exception (the leader intervenes only if standards are not met), and (d) laissez-faire (the leader abdicates responsibility and avoids making decisions).

According to Bass (1990b), modern transactional leaders focus on "initiating and organizing work," "accomplishing the tasks at hand," "showing consideration for employees," and "satisfying the self-interests of those who do good work" (p. 20). Modern transactional leadership is similar to "performance-based management" in that the leader does not take a subordinate's individual strengths into account (Bass, 1990a). Transactional leadership works best for followers whose work style is similar to that of their leader and who are motivated by rewards (Bass, 1990b). Bass (1985) and Burns (1978) believe that a transactional style is best used in a negotiatory or contractual situation.

Servant leadership. A servant leader "puts other people's needs, aspirations, and interests above their own" (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 13). Servant leaders exhibit vision, inspire trust, and motivate followers to achieve their full potential (Greenleaf, 1977).

Charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders are visionaries; through inspiration and communication, they inspire others to achieve goals (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). According to Conger and Kanungo (1998), they lead by means of four steps. First, they articulate a vision that their followers can enthusiastically share. According to Senge (1990), "A shared vision is a vision that many people are truly committed to, because it reflects their own personal vision" (p. 192). Second, charismatic leaders state their performance expectations and express confidence in their subordinates, thereby increasing their subordinates' self-esteem and self-confidence (Conger, as cited in

Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Third, charismatic leaders articulate and model their values. Fourth, they reinforce innovative actions and behaviors. Recent study of leaders by Choi (2006) found that there are three core components of charismatic leadership, envisioning, empowerment and empathy. Charismatic leaders stimulate their followers' need for achievement, affiliation and power.

Transformational leadership. Some researchers consider servant leadership and charismatic leadership to be types of transformational leadership (Shamir et al. 1993). Indeed, the concept of transformational leadership (Burns, 1978) was inspired by House's (1977) theory of charismatic leadership. According to Burns (1978), transformational leaders appeal to their subordinates' higher ideals and encourage creative solutions (Burns, 1978).

Bass and Avolio (as cited in Felfe, Tartler, & Leipmann, 2004) have noted that transformational leaders provide the following: (a) charisma/idealized influence (they provide vision and a sense of mission, instill pride, and gain respect and trust); (b) inspirational motivation (they communicate high expectations, use symbols to focus efforts, and express important purposes in simple ways); (c) intellectual stimulation (they promote intelligence, rationality, and careful problem-solving; and (d) individualized consideration (they give personal attention, treat each employee individually, coach, and advise).

Promoting feelings of self-worth in followers improves their performance (Dansereau et al. 1995). Transformational leaders support their employees' intellectual and emotional needs (Northouse, 2007). Alston (2009) states, "Transformational leaders improve followers' accomplishments and success by influencing their values and needs,

motivating them to accomplish more than they considered possible"; "they guide their followers toward self development" (p. 28). Transformational leaders attract and nurture talent (Boisot, 1998; Teece, 1998).

Burns (1978) places transformational leadership at one end of the leadership continuum and transactional leadership at the other. Similarly, Conger, Spreitzer, and Lawler (1999) see transactional leaders as similar to managers—strong in technical skills but lacking in transformational skills such as effective communication skills. However, other researchers view transactional and transformational styles as complementary (Bass, 1990b; Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, as cited in Bass & Steidlmeier, 1998). Whereas transactional leaders tend to be strong on systems, structures, and implementation, they tend to be weak on providing vision and emotional and social stimulation to their followers. According to Waldman et al., "The best leadership is both transformational and transactional" (as quoted in Bass & Steidlmeier, 1998, para. 6).

The U.S. Army (1999) advocates transformational leadership and stipulates that leaders adjust their leadership style to the situation and the individuals being led. According to Bass (1990b), with training, leaders can learn to become transformational leaders.

Emotional Intelligence and Leadership

Transformational leaders show traits associated with emotional intelligence, such as self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy, interpersonal skills, the ability to motivate and inspire others, and a desire and ability to foster others' abilities and well-being (Cooper, 1997; Goleman, 1998a; Homrig, 2001). It is, therefore, not surprising that studies have demonstrated a positive association between emotional intelligence and

transformational leadership (Ashkanasy & Dasborough, 1993; Goleman, 1998b). In a study of managers, Mandell and Pherwani (2003) did not find a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership style, but that result appears to be anomalous.

Pitcher (1999) studied one CEO and found that his high emotional intelligence contributed to his success. Sosik and Megerian (1999) reported a positive correlation between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership in four areas: (a) instilling professional standards of behavior in others, (b) inspiring and motivating followers, (c) intellectually stimulating followers, and (d) focusing on others' individual needs. Similarly, Palmer, Walls, Burgess, and Stough (2000) found significant positive relationships between emotional-intelligence subscales and particular components of transformational leadership.

Wong and Law (2002) reported that a leader's emotional intelligence affects the follower's development, performance, and commitment to completing tasks. Using the Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (Palmer & Stough, 2001) and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass, 1985), Gardner and Stough (2002) found a strong relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership in senior-level managers. Other studies of managers, too, have shown a positive association between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership (Leban & Zulauf, 2004; Vraby, 2007).

In a study by Sivanathan and Fekken (2002), leaders who scored higher in emotional intelligence were perceived by their followers as transformational leaders who were more effective than leaders who scored lower in emotional intelligence. Similarly,

other researchers have reported a significant positive correlation between higher emotional intelligence scores and perceived transformational leadership styles (Douglas, Frink, & Ferris, 2004; Kerr, Garvin, Heaton, & Boyle, 2006). Using regression analysis, Mandell and Pherwani (2003) found that emotional-intelligence scores predicted transformational leadership.

A study of top executives in 15 global companies found that, on average, nearly 90% of leaders' success was attributable to emotional intelligence (Spencer, McClelland, & Kelner, 1997). Bar-On (2004a) and Goleman (1995) believe that training and increased self-awareness can enhance an individual's emotional intelligence.

The EQ-i was also used by the US Air Force to select recruiters and with working with Reuvon Bar-On and Richard Handley, it was found that the most successful recruiters scored significantly higher in the emotional intelligence competencies of assertiveness, empathy, happiness, and emotional self awareness. These findings resulted in the Government Accounting Office submitting a report to Congress according to the GAO report filed with the Secretary of Defense. It was also found that the by using the EQ-i as a selection tool and recruiting those that scored significantly higher in the above referenced areas, the U.S. Airforce increased their ability to predict successful recruiters by nearly three-fold. The immediate gain was a saving of $3 million annually. (The GAO report is titled, "Military Recruiting: The Department of Defense Could Improve Its Recruiter Selection and Incentive Systems," and it was submitted to Congress January 30, 1998. Richard Handley and Reuven Bar-On provided this information.)

Reis et al. (2007) found that higher emotional intelligence predicted faster social exchange reasoning. Their study indicated a successful approach using cognitive

neuroscience methods to clarify the relation of emotional intelligence to cognitive, affective and social functioning (Reis et al. 2007).

Characteristics of the Millennial Generation

Today's leaders must guide the millennial generation, considered the most diverse generation to attend college (Lindsay, 2005). In 2004 Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that the millennial generation would make up 25% of the U.S. workforce, about 40 million workers, by 2011 (as cited in Murphy, 2007) and in 2008 the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that by 2015, workers up through the age 39 will continue to increases while workers age 40 and above will continue to decrease. What are the characteristics of the millennial generation?

Cognitive abilities. The millennial generation is accustomed to multitasking and accelerated learning (Prensky, 2001). "A growing body of research" indicates that millennials tend to have IQs that are significantly higher than their counterparts from previous generations (Abram, 2007, p. 57). They also tend to be more creative in their problem-solving (Greenberg & Weber, 2008).

In general, millennials are highly practiced in the use of technology (Friedman, 2007; Goldgehn, 2004). A survey of 27,317 students from 98 U.S. colleges indicated that most were technology-savvy (Salaway, Caruso, & Nelson, 2008). The use of technology stimulates particular parts of the brain and affects how the user thinks (Small, Moody, Siddarth, & Bookheimer, 2009). Partly as a result of their Internet access, millennials tend to have a global perspective (Friedman, 2007). Politically, they tend to be independent, rejecting party dogma and propaganda (Greenberg & Weber, 2008).

Social characteristics. Unlike past generations, the millennial generation continuously uses technology such as smartphones to communicate with parents, peers, and others—for example, through social networks (Prensky, 2001; Salaway et al. 2008). According to Taylor, vice-chairman of the Harrison Group, a consulting and research group, in 2007, millennials were experiencing at least 72 hours of technology-connected time per week (as cited in Tyler, 2007).

Millennials are generally less formal than their predecessors; their interpersonal style is more egalitarian than hierarchical (Martin & Tulgan, 2006). They have been conditioned to be team-oriented and to seek socially acceptable solutions (Orrell, 2008). Compared to previous generations, millennials are generally more tolerant of diversity, more open-minded with respect to social issues (Greenberg & Weber, 2008). For example, they are less gender-biased (Orrell, 2008). Millennial men tend to respect women who speak up, and millennial women do not believe they need a man to find happiness (Orrell, 2008).

Personality traits. Millennials prefer working in a culture aligned with their values (Martin & Tulgan, 2006). They want responsibility, are results-oriented (Lockyer, 2005; Martin & Tulgan, 2006; Deloitte, as cited in McElroy, 2010), and want immediate recognition for their performance (Martin & Tulgan, 2006). They have a work ethic that tells them they get paid to get the job done; they do not measure work achievement in terms of time spent in the office (Murphy, 2007 and Tyler, 2007). Fields and Manning (2004) found that millennials expect that the information they need will be provided in a timely, efficient, manner and that feedback and other communications will travel in both directions.

In general, millennials are more entrepreneurial and self-reliant than previous generations (Jayson, 2006), more self-accommodating (Orrell, 2008; Tyler, 2007). They want to figure things out on their own (Goldgehn, 2004). Research indicates that millennials have "little patience for lectures, step-by-step logic and tell-test instruction" (Prensky, 2001, p. 3). "Millennial professionals do not try to conform, but instead prefer to express themselves in fashion, opinion and community involvement" (Orrell, 2008, p. 30). According to Martin and Tulgan (2006), millennials value their personal life and seek flexible hours that accommodate their desired lifestyle.

Leaders must use training techniques and motivating factors suited to this generation (Lockyer, 2005). A 2009 survey of senior executives from 29 of the largest retailers in the U.S., retailers indicated a critical need to develop leaders capable of effectively leading millennials (Deloitte, as cited in McElroy, 2010).

Lawyer Leaders

In approximately 10 years, millennial lawyers will assume positions of leadership within the legal field. It is crucial that current lawyer leaders recognize and adapt to the needs of millennial lawyers (Orrell, 2008; Tyler, 2007). In a Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) survey of 350 lawyers, 93% of respondents stated that the challenges they face in the workplace are more complex than they were 5 years ago, and 85% felt that the definition of *effective leadership* had changed over the last 5 years (as cited in Smith & Marrow, 2008).

Lawyers' training and experience. Most law schools do not include any leadership courses in their curricula (Polden, 2008). Recognizing the importance of

helping lawyers acquire leadership skills, the Washington State Bar Association (2005) added a leadership program to its recommended continuing education curriculum.

Emotional intelligence differs from academic intelligence (Craig et al. 2009). Instruction in law school enhances critical thinking but does not develop emotional intelligence (Muir, 2007; Sullivan et al. 2007). Like most higher education, it focuses on left-brain cognitive skills rather than right-brain emotional and social skills (Garth & Martin, 1993; Tucker, Sojka, Barone, & McCarthy, 2000). According to a 2001 Yale Law School survey (as cited in Mertz, 2007), student discussion in law-school classrooms tends to be mean-spirited rather than supportive and encouraging.

The Socratic method is the dominant teaching style in U.S. law schools (Sullivan et al. 2007). This method promotes the ability to argue and refute (Scott, 2000; Mertz, 2007) and is therefore especially suited to debate and adversarial situations such as litigation. It does not foster emotional or social skills.

The lack of emphasis on emotional and social skills is somewhat ironical because those skills highly contribute to effectiveness as a lawyer (Lee, 2011). In a multi-year study at Boalt Law School, Shultz and Zedeck (2008) found that such aspects of emotional intelligence as empathy, integrity, emotional investment, mentoring others, an ability to listen, a desire to influence others, and community involvement and service were positively associated with effectiveness as a lawyer. Law schools are slowly recognizing the need to include emotional and social skills in their curricula (Sullivan et al. 2007). They have started replacing lectures and Socratic-style seminars with case-based simulations and a greater focus on interpersonal skills (Lee, 2011). Indiana University's Maurer School of Law now offers a course on emotional intelligence. "The

class has no textbook and instead uses personality assessments and peer reviews to develop students' interpersonal skills" (Lee, 2011, para.2).

In general, lawyers' job experience does not foster emotional intelligence. By their very nature, legal cases involve opposing sides. As expressed by Sullivan et al. (2007), lawyers continually function within a "clash of interests" (p. 82). An adversarial stance toward others is counter to transformational leadership, which is based on a win-win view of leader and follower. Also, lawyers are encouraged to maintain emotional distance with respect to their legal practice.

Daicoff (1997) reported that many lawyers are dissatisfied with their career choice; the long hours and other stress of the profession do not allow adequate time for life outside of work. Similarly, in a 2000 American Bar Association survey of young lawyers, one fourth of respondents reported being dissatisfied with the practice of law; young lawyers wanted a higher quality of life and more opportunities to give back to their community. Thompson (2005) found that stress reduces the ability to use one's emotional intelligence. He found that a change from a normal to stressed mindset had a statistically significant impact on the EQ-i results for happiness, self-actualization, optimism, social responsibility, interpersonal relationship, empathy, stress tolerance, flexibility and problem solving.

Personal characteristics of lawyers. Overall, lawyers appear to lack adequate emotional intelligence to effectively lead. In Maccoby's (2000) view, lawyers tend to be narcissists. Ratner, a board-certified psychiatrist who works with lawyers and serves as a forensic psychiatrist in bar disciplinary cases, agrees: "Lawyers, generally, and litigators, in particular, tend to have generous helpings of narcissism" (as quoted in Burger, 2008,

para. 9). According to Ratner, extreme narcissists will go to considerable lengths (including deception of self and others) to protect their egos (as cited in Burger, 2008). Using the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator, Cowan (1989) and Stephens (n.d.) found that most lawyers fall into the category of thinkers/judgers rather than feelers. Hengstler (1993) found in the American Bar Association sponsored survey of attorneys, only 20% of respondents indicated they consider themselves caring and compassionate; 65% reported they did not see themselves as leaders (as cited in *Vox Populi, The Public Perception of Lawyer*, Hengstler, 1993).

Leadership style of lawyers. Lawyers in positions of leadership face the challenge of communicating with a generation raised in the digital age (Prensky, 2001). Smith and Marrow (2008) note that lawyers need to be better communicators and need to improve teamwork and collaboration in both associate and client service. The previously cited CCL survey identified the two core competencies of successful lawyer leaders as flexibility and self-awareness (as cited in Smith & Marrow, 2008).

A hierarchical, authoritarian leadership style does not suit millennials, but lawyers are trained to manage rather than lead. Research indicates that lawyers' leadership style tends to be pacesetting or commanding ("Case for Lawyers," 2005). Pacesetters "set unattainable goals, micromanage, and have a hard time letting go of tasks that would be better handled by associates" (Snyder, as quoted in "Case for Lawyers," 2005, para. 7); they often push employees until they are overwhelmed. Hay Group researchers found that the "best partners were far less likely than their peers to be pacesetters" (Snyder, as quoted in "Case for Lawyers," para. 7). Commanding leaders tend to order employees

rather than treat them respectfully. Such behavior may be suited to crisis management, but it does not result in leadership that is effective overall ("Case for Lawyers," 2005).

Summary

The current study employed the EQ-i, designed by Bar-On (2004a). The instrument assesses intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, ability to manage stress, adaptability, and general mood. Studies have demonstrated a positive association between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership (e.g., Ashkanasy & Dasborough, 1993; Gardner & Stough, 2002; Goleman, 1998b; Leban & Zulauf, 2004; Mandell & Pherwani, 2003; Palmer et al. 2000; Sosik & Megerian, 1999; Vraby, 2007). Research indicates that transformational leadership is most effective (Alston, 2009; Boisot, 1998; Dansereau et al. 1995; Teece, 1998).

Transformational leadership is particularly important in leading millennials, whose sophisticated cognitive abilities (Abram, 2007; Prensky, 2001), creativity (Greenberg & Weber, 2008), egalitarianism (Greenberg & Weber, 2008; Martin & Tulgan, 2006; Orrell, 2008), team orientation (Orrell, 2008), and independence (Goldgehn, 2004; Jayson, 2006) make an authoritarian, technocratic, or largely transactional leadership style especially unsuitable.

Unfortunately, lawyers' training and experience are not conducive to transformational leadership. Most law schools do not include any leadership courses in their curricula (Polden, 2008). Also, law schools give little attention to emotional and social skills (Garth & Martin, 1993; Muir, 2007; Sullivan et al. 2007; Tucker et al. 2000). In addition, the practice of law discourages positive emotional involvement (Daicoff,

1997). In general, lawyers appear to be low in empathy (Ratner, as cited in Burger, 2008; Cowan, 1989; Hengstler, 1993; Stephens, n.d.).

Not surprisingly, lawyers' leadership style tends to be pacesetting or commanding rather than transformational ("Case for Lawyers," 2005). It is, therefore, important that lawyers become more aware of the importance of emotional intelligence and cultivate such intelligence. This study is intended to contribute to that process.

CHAPTER 3: Methods

This chapter states the research problem that was investigated and the study's purpose, lists the research questions, explains the research design, describes the population and sample, discusses the assessment instruments that were used, addresses ethical considerations, and describes the methods of data collection and analysis.

In order to thoroughly examine whether general counsels in leadership positions are emotionally intelligent enough to lead millennial lawyers, the researcher collected data using the EQ-i and a demographics/leadership questionnaire that she created for the study. The researcher expected that the sample would not score high in emotional intelligence. The findings were therefore expected to support the view that effective leadership of millennial lawyers will require training/coaching of lawyer leaders and the incorporation of leadership courses into law school curricula.

Statement of the Problem

Effective leadership of millennial lawyers requires that general counsels and other lawyers in leadership positions be emotionally intelligent. Differences between millennial lawyers and previous generations of lawyers who were trained in ways that do not foster transformational leadership make this need all the more pressing.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to identify and quantifiably score the emotional intelligence of general counsels in leadership positions. The goal is to optimize leadership of millennial lawyers.

Research Questions

This study focused on the following research questions:

1. To what extent do the current sample's mean EQ-i scores differ from those of the EQ-i normative sample?
2. Are the mean responses to particular EQ-i survey statements related to the respondent's age and/or gender?
3. What do participants' responses to questions about leadership indicate about their view of leadership of millennial lawyers?
4. Are participants' responses to questions about leadership related to their demographic characteristics?

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative method involving an ex-post-facto research design with no hypotheses or tests of alternative hypotheses. This design was used to maximize internal validity and explore the relationships between variables. The researcher used (a) descriptive statistics to determine means, (b) standard deviations, frequencies, (c) percentages in order to compare respondents' responses to questions about leadership, (d) Spearman rank correlation coefficient, a nonparametric measure of correlation, to provide a distribution-free test of independence between two variables, (e) paired *t* tests to determine the differences between two observations, and (f) frequency analysis accomplished by computing statistics across and within strata.

Population and Sample

The researcher e-mailed all 630 members of the Southern California, San Diego, and Sacramento chapters of the ACC who were listed with the title of general counsel, inviting them to participate in the study (for the letter of invitation, see Appendix B). As an ACC member, the researcher had access to the membership list. The target group was

chosen because its members were highly likely to be responsible for leading millennial lawyers. Potential participants were given 2 weeks to respond to the initial invitation. A follow-up email was sent to ensure receipt. A copy of the informed-consent form (Appendix C) was attached to each e-mail, along with instructions on completing the demographics/leadership survey and the EQ-i. No incentives were provided to any participants. A sample size of 30 was determined to be the minimum for statistically usable data. Forty-four individuals completed the demographics/leadership survey, and 35 completed the EQ-i.

Instrumentation

The study employed a multiple-choice demographics/leadership survey that the researcher created for the study (Appendix D) and Bar-On's EQ-I assessment (Appendix E). The demographics/leadership survey asked age, gender, industry, number of years working as a lawyer, size of the lawyer's staff, whether the lawyer had received leadership training or coaching, and questions about leadership of millennial lawyers.

The EQ-i was used instead of the Goleman's ECI because the EQ-i has been empirically shown to have a high level of statistical reliability (average internal consistency coefficient of .76) and factorial validity (close match between the expected theoretical structure and the empirical structure (2004b). The EQ-i measures interpersonal skills and the ability to deal with the daily environmental demands and pressures of being a leader. The instrument assesses four domains: Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, and Relationship Management. The first two of these domains address intrapersonal intelligence, and the last two domains address

interpersonal intelligence (Gardner, 1993). The researcher purchased the EQ-i from Multi-Health Systems.

The EQ-i comprises 133 questions (each with a 5-point response set), takes approximately 35-40 minutes to complete, and is suitable for individuals 16 years or older. The questions are written at a North American (United State and Canada) sixth-grade level based on the Flesch formula (Flesch, as cited in Bar-On, 2004b).

There is a normative base of almost 4,000 participants supported by over 17 years of research from which predicting success in business and industry (Bar-On, 2004b) and in leadership (Handley, 2009) can be made. In the normative sample, mean total EQ-i score is 465.31 (*SE* = .86), determined by the mean scores on the five subscales which are as follows: 156.70 (*SE* = .34) on Intrapersonal (self-awareness and self-expression), 99.52 (*SE* = .18) on Interpersonal (social awareness and interaction), 100.32 (*SE* = .21) on Adaptability (change management), 68.27 (*SE* = .16) on Stress Management (emotional management and control), and 70.50 (*SE* = .15) on General Mood (self-motivation; (Bar-On, 2004b). Bar-On (2004b) calculated the standard errors based on reliability estimates (α) for the scales.

Indicators of the validity of a particular administration of the EQ-i include the omission rate (the number of incomplete items). If more than 6% of items are unanswered, the results are deemed invalid (Bar-On, 2004b). Positive and negative impression scales measure test sabotaging by the respondents; if the scores on the impression scales exceed two standard deviations above the mean, the test is deemed invalid (Bar-On, 2004b). The inconsistency index indicates response inconsistency;

highly inconsistent responses (a score above 12) cast doubt on the validity of the scores (Bar-On, 2004b).

Ethical Considerations

Before proceeding with the study, the researcher obtained the approval of the Pepperdine University Institutional Review Board (IRB; Appendix F). All participants signed an informed-consent form (Appendix C). Participants' privacy was protected. Respondents were instructed to use a username consisting of numbers and letters and were advised not to use their first or last name. Thus, results could not be linked to an identifiable individual.

Data Collection

Participants completed both questionnaires online. They completed the demographics/leadership survey through Survey Monkey, and they completed the EQ-i through a secure Web site. Links to both websites were e-mailed to each participant. Each participant was told that it would take approximately 30–40 minutes to complete both surveys. Participants were given a 2-week period in which to participate.

Survey Monkey electronically delivered the data collected on the demographics/leadership survey, and Multi-Health Systems electronically delivered the data collected on the EQ-i. The researcher transferred the raw data into a password-protected spreadsheet for analysis on a password-protected computer.

Data Analysis

The data were maintained on a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. To answer Research Question 1 ("To what extent do the current sample's mean EQ-i scores differ from those of the EQ-i

normative sample?"), a one-sample *t* test was used to determine any statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the two samples.

To answer Research Question 2 ("Are the mean responses to particular EQ-i survey statements related to the respondent's age and/or gender?"), a frequency table and Spearman rank correlation coefficient were used to determine the degree of positive or negative correlation between EQ-i responses and the independent variables of age and gender.

To answer Research Question 3 ("What do participants' responses to questions about leadership indicate about their view of leadership of millennial lawyers?"), a frequency table and descriptive statistics were used to determine means and standard deviations of the relevant data.

To answer Research Question 4 ("Are participants' responses to questions about leadership related to their demographic characteristics?"), Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used to determine any correlation between the five demographic variables and answers to the eight questions about leadership.

Summary

The current study investigated the emotional intelligence and views of leadership of general counsels in leadership positions. The purpose was to provide information that will help lawyer leaders more effectively guide millennial lawyers.

Data were collected using the EQ-i and a demographics/leadership survey created for the study. The researcher invited all members of the Southern California, San Diego, and Sacramento chapters of the ACC who were listed as general counsels to participate in

the study. Forty-four individuals completed the demographics/leadership survey, and 35 completed the EQ-i.

The data were analyzed using SPSS. *T* tests, frequency tables, Spearman rank correlation coefficients, and descriptive statistics were used to determine the answers to the study's four research questions. The next chapter presents the findings.

CHAPTER 4: Findings

The purpose of this study was to identify and quantifiably score the emotional intelligence of a sample group of general counsels in leadership positions in order to elucidate beliefs held by current general counsels about leadership and thereby reveal ways to improve lawyer leadership. The EQ-i responses of the participants were compared to the normative score of 100 (Bar-On, 2004b). The study also examined emotional intelligence scores in relation to age and gender.

This chapter presents the results of the study. It provides the demographic data and the primary findings with respect to the four research questions.

Demographic Characteristics

Table 1 presents the frequencies and percentages for the full sample's demographic characteristics. The median age was 44, the median years of practice 18, and the median number of direct reports 4. Gender consisted of 41% female and 59% male. The more common industry was industrial/manufacturing and technology with 18% of the applicants working in each of these industries respectively.

Table 2 shows the breakdown of age and gender for the 35 respondents who completed the EQ-i. The mean age was 46 (SD = 8.47) and gender consisted of 40% female and 60% male.

Table 1

*Demographic Characteristics of the Full Sample (*N = *44)*

Variable	*F*	%
Age (years)		
20–30	2	4.5
31–40	11	25.0
41–50	17	38.6
51–60	10	22.7
61+	4	9.1
Gender		
Female	18	40.9
Male	26	59.1
Had leadership coaching/training		
Yes	27	61.4
No	17	38.6
Attended an accredited law school		
Yes	44	100.0
No	0	0.0
Years practicing law		
5–10	4	9.1
11–15	12	27.3
16–20	12	27.3
21–25	8	18.2
26–30	4	9.1
31+	4	9.1
Number of direct reports		
0–1	9	20.5
2–5	27	61.4
6–10	5	11.4
11+	3	6.8
Industry		
Retail	4	9.1
Industrial/manufacturing	8	18.3
Education	3	6.8
Real estate	3	6.8
Nonprofit	3	6.8
Technology	8	18.3
Health	4	9.1
Finance	7	16.0
Other	4	9.1

Table 2

*Age and Gender Frequencies of Participants Who Completed the EQ-i (*n *= 35*)*

Variable	*f*	%
Age (years)		
26–28	2	5.9
31-40	7	20.6
41–50	14	41.2
51–60	8	23.5
61–64	3	8.8
Gender		
Female	14	40.0
Male	21	60.0

**35 sample respondents responded to the EQ-i survey of which only 34 responded to the age question*

Primary Findings

Research Question 1. Research Question 1 asked, "To what extent do the current sample's mean EQ-i scores differ from those of the EQ-i normative sample?" A one-sample *t* test was used to compare the scores of the two samples. The normative mean score, which had been adjusted for age and gender, was 100 (*SD* = 15; Bar-On, 2004b).

Table 3 shows the current sample's 22 mean EQ-i scores (positive impression, total EQ, five subscales, and 15 subsets) and the resulting one-sample *t* tests. Only four scores of the current sample significantly differed from the corresponding scores of the normative sample: the current sample had significantly higher scores for positive impression, assertiveness, independence, and stress tolerance. The two samples had nearly identical total EQ mean scores.

Table 3

EQ-i Scores of Current Sample (n = 35) and Comparison to Scores of Normative Sample

EQ-i Variable	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Positive Impression	106.77	11.80	3.40	.002
Total EQ	100.29	12.44	0.14	.89
Intrapersonal	100.71	14.51	0.29	.77
Self-Regard	97.20	14.30	1.16	.26
Emotional Self-Awareness	100.54	15.61	0.21	.84
Assertiveness	106.03	13.78	2.59	.01
Independence	103.83	11.21	2.02	.05
Self-Actualization	96.83	16.37	1.15	.26
Interpersonal	97.14	15.09	1.12	.27
Empathy	98.17	14.45	0.75	.46
Social Responsibility	97.89	12.80	0.98	.34
Interpersonal	97.97	16.10	0.75	.46
Stress Management	102.83	13.93	1.20	.24
Stress Tolerance	103.94	12.77	1.83	.08
Impulse Control	100.71	14.53	0.29	.77
Adaptability	101.37	11.77	0.69	.50
Reality-Testing	100.63	12.32	0.30	.77
Flexibility	102.66	12.70	1.24	.22
Problem-Solving	100.23	11.81	0.12	.91
General Mood	99.74	13.36	0.11	.91
Optimism	100.86	11.59	0.44	.67
Happiness	99.54	15.21	0.18	.86

Research Question 2. Research Question 2 asked, “Are the mean responses to particular EQ-i survey statements related to the respondent’s age and/or gender?” Based

on the normative adjusted scores, males scored significantly higher than females in independence, empathy, adaptability, reality-testing, and flexibility (see Table 4). Note that the scores from the current sample were gender-adjusted; that adjustment could skew the results. There were no significant differences based on age.

Table 4

Correlations of EQ-i Scores With Gender and Age (n = 35)

EQ-i Variable	Gender r_s	Age r_s
Positive Impression	.20	.20
Total EQ	.22	.04
Intrapersonal	.14	.11
Self-Regard	.01	.22
Emotional Self-Awareness	.15	.04
Assertiveness	.11	.11
Independence	.33**	.11
Self-Actualization	.06	.20
Interpersonal	.26	.10
Empathy	.34**	.06
Social Responsibility	.09	.07
Interpersonal Relationships	.21	.10
Stress Management	.10	.11
Stress Tolerance	.17	.10
Impulse Control	.04	.02
Adaptability	.33*	.03
Reality-Testing	.34**	.07
Flexibility	.37**	.05
Problem-Solving	.11	.07
General Mood	.07	.22
Optimism	.08	.17
Happiness	.12	.15

*p <10. **p < .05.

Research Question 3. Research Question 3 asked, "What do participants' responses to questions about leadership indicate about their view of leadership of millennial lawyers?" Table 5 presents the frequencies and percentages for responses to the three yes/no questions.

Table 5

Responses to Yes/No Questions About Leadership (N = 44)

Statement	*f*	%
13. I believe millennial lawyers learn differently than past generation lawyers.		
Yes	25	56.8
No	19	43.2
14. My company has made specific plans to accommodate the learning differences of the millennial generation.		
Yes	5	11.4
No	39	88.6
15. I believe millennial lawyers want or need emotionally intelligent lawyer leaders.		
Yes	38	86.4
No	6	13.6

Table 6 shows the mean responses to the five-point Likert-scale questions about leadership. The respondents believed that training in emotional intelligence helps them to be more effective leaders. The second-strongest belief was that there is a need to train lawyer leaders to effectively lead millennial lawyers. The following belief was nearly as strong: "I can more effectively lead young lawyers today with a different leadership style than the managerial style that was used to develop and manage young lawyers of past generations." The belief that effectively leading young lawyers will require a new management style was rated somewhat lower. The lowest-rated belief was that the Socratic method is the best way to teach future lawyers in law schools.

Table 6

Responses to Likert-Scale Questions About Leadership (N = 44)

Statement	*M*	*SD*
8. I believe that in order to effectively lead young lawyers today, it will require a new management style.	3.30	0.82
9. I believe there is a need to train lawyer leaders to effectively lead our millennial lawyers.	3.50	0.82
10. I believe the Socratic Method is the best way to teach future lawyers in law school.	3.09	1.03
11. I believe I can more effectively lead young lawyers today with a different leadership style than the managerial style that was used to develop and manage young lawyers of past generations.	3.45	0.88
12. I believe training in emotional intelligence is helpful for me to be an even more effective leader.	4.02	0.76

Note. Rating Scale = 1 (*Strongly disagree*), 2 (*Disagree*), 3 (*Somewhat agree*), 4 (*agree*), and 5 (*Strongly agree*).

Research Question 4. Research Question 4 asked, "Are participants' responses to questions about leadership related to their demographic characteristics?" Table 7 shows the Spearman nonparametric correlations between each of the five demographic variables and each of the eight questions about leadership. Of the resulting 40 correlations, only 5 were statistically significant. Age and number of years practicing law each had significant negative correlations with the statement that training in emotional intelligence would help the respondent be a more effective leader. There was also a significant negative correlation between number of years practicing law and the belief that the Socratic method is the best way to teach future lawyers in law school. Leadership coaching/training and number of direct reports (which suggests company size) both showed significant positive correlations with company plans to accommodate the learning differences of the millennial generation.

Table 7

Spearman Nonparametric Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Responses to Questions About Leadership (N = 44)

Statement	Age	Gender	Leadership Coaching or Training	Years Practicing Law	Number of Direct Reports
8. I believe that in order to effectively lead young lawyers today, it will require a new management style.	.04	.13	.05	.04	.13
9. I believe there is a need to train lawyer leaders to effectively lead our millennial lawyers.	-.25*	.06	.04	-.31**	.02
10. I believe the Socratic Method is the best way to teach future lawyers in law school.	.16	.09	.02	-.26*	.13
11. I believe I can more effectively lead young lawyers today with a different leadership style than the managerial style that was used to develop and manage young lawyers of past generations.	.02	.13	.19	.03	.17
12. I believe training in emotional intelligence is helpful for me to be an even more effective leader.	.18	.14	.12	.12	.05
13. I believe millennial lawyers learn differently than past generation lawyers.	-.03	-.07	.16	.02	.05
14. My company has made specific plans to accommodate the learning differences of the millennial generation.	.06	.15	.28*	.00	.48***
15. I believe millennial lawyers need emotionally intelligent lawyer leaders.	.06	.07	.09	.02	.03

$^{*}p < .10$ $^{**}p < .05$ $^{***}p < .01$

Summary

Forty-four general counsels ages 20–61+ completed the demographics/leadership survey; 60% of them were male, and 40% were female. Thirty-five of the participants also completed the EQ-i. Their mean total-EQ score (100.29) was nearly identical to that of the EQ-i normative sample. The two samples significantly differed only in that the current sample scored significantly higher in positive impression, assertiveness, independence, and stress tolerance. There were no significant differences in mean scores based on age. However, males scored significantly higher than females in independence, empathy, adaptability, reality-testing, and flexibility.

A high proportion (86%) of respondents believed that millennial lawyers want or need emotionally intelligent leaders, and a majority (57%) believed that millennial lawyers learn differently than lawyers of previous generations. However, only a small proportion (11%) of respondents reported that their company had made specific plans to accommodate the learning differences of millennials.

On average, respondents somewhat agreed that (a) effectively leading young lawyers requires a new management style, (b) there is a need to train lawyer leaders to effectively lead millennial lawyers, (c) the Socratic method is the best way to teach future lawyers in law school, and (d) they can more effectively lead young lawyers if they use a leadership style different from the managerial style used by past generations. On average, respondents answered “Agree” in response to the statement “I believe training in emotional intelligence is helpful for me to be an even more effective leader.”

Only five Spearman nonparametric correlations between demographic variables and answers to questions about leadership were statistically significant. Age and number

of years practicing law each had significant negative correlations with the statement that training in emotional intelligence would help the respondent be a more effective leader. There was also a significant negative correlation between number of years practicing law and the belief that the Socratic method is the best way to teach future lawyers in law school. Leadership coaching/training and number of direct reports (which suggests company size) both showed significant positive correlations with company plans to accommodate the learning differences of the millennial generation.

CHAPTER 5: Discussion

The current study examined the demographic characteristics, opinions about lawyer leadership, and emotional intelligence (as measured by the EQ-i) of general counsels belonging to the Southern California, San Diego, or Sacramento chapter of the ACC. The purpose of this research was to help lawyers develop the skills to effectively lead millennial lawyers. This chapter will interpret the findings; explain the importance of the study; discuss the study's limitations; and make recommendations with respect to policy, practice, and future research.

Interpretation of the Findings

Research Question 1. Research Question 1 asked, "To what extent do the current sample's mean EQ-i scores differ from those of the EQ-i normative sample?" The results of the current study support this view. Only 9% of the normative sample of the EQ-i held advanced degrees (Bar-On, 2004b). In contrast, all respondents in the current study had attended accredited law schools. All were successful professionals holding positions of considerable responsibility. Nevertheless, their mean total EQ was virtually the same as that of the normative sample representing the general population. The reasons that respondents failed to show above-average total EQ may be related to the legal profession. As previously noted, the practice of law tends to be highly stressful, and stress reduces the ability to act with emotional intelligence (Thompson, 2005).

Hay Group researchers found that lawyers who are effective leaders generally score high in flexibility and self-awareness (as cited in "Case for Lawyers," 2005). The flexibility and self-awareness scores of the current sample did not significantly differ

from those of the normative sample, suggesting that the study participants may not be especially effective leaders.

Compared to the normative sample, the current sample scored significantly higher in independence, assertiveness, stress tolerance, and positive impression. The Socratic method of teaching used in law schools is generally believed to foster critical thinking (Mertz, 2007)), which is related to independence. The legal profession also promotes assertiveness. The current sample's high scores on stress tolerance may reflect the fact that the legal profession is stressful (Thompson, 2005), so lawyers learn to withstand stress. Bar-On (2004b) notes that a high score on positive impression can indicate self-deception, lack of self-awareness, or problematic self-esteem. A high positive-impression score is in line with Ratner's view (as cited in Burger, 2008) that lawyers tend to be narcissistic: narcissists are eager to create a positive impression. Positive impression has also been found to increase with education (Lopes et al. 2006).

Research Question 2. Research Question 2 asked, "Are the mean responses to particular EQ-i survey statements related to the respondent's age and/or gender?" Males scored significantly higher than females in independence, empathy, adaptability, reality-testing, and flexibility. Greater independence in males conforms to traditional gender-based socialization and expectations. However, the finding of greater empathy in the male participants is surprising. In the normative sample, females scored higher than males in empathy, and women are generally considered more empathic than men. Perhaps a higher proportion of male respondents received coaching/training in emotional intelligence, which includes empathy. Another possible explanation is that the scores

were adjusted for gender, as recommended Bar-On (2004b). Males scored higher than females in reality-testing. This result accords with Bar-On's findings (Bar-On, 2004b).

Research Question 3. Research Question 3 asked, "What do participants' responses to questions about leadership indicate about their view of leadership of millennial lawyers?" Although 57% of respondents believed that millennial lawyers learn differently than lawyers of previous generations, 89% reported that their companies had not made specific plans to accommodate the learning differences of millennial lawyers. This finding indicates a need for companies to devise and implement such plans.

On average, respondents believed that training in emotional intelligence would help them lead more effectively. Also, 86% of respondents believed that millennial lawyers want or need emotionally intelligent lawyer leaders. These findings are cause for hope. They indicate that current lawyer leaders recognize the importance of emotional intelligence, even if they themselves do not yet excel in emotional intelligence.

However, on average, respondents only somewhat agreed that they should change their leadership style. This finding suggests that lawyer leaders may not directly relate emotional intelligence to leadership style. It also suggests they might be somewhat reluctant to change their own leadership approach.

On average, respondents somewhat agreed that the Socratic method is the best way to teach law students. This finding indicates that most lawyer leaders still endorse that teaching method and may not appreciate the implications of its lack of attention to emotional and social skills.

Research Question 4. Research Question 4 asked, "Are participants' responses to questions about leadership related to their demographic characteristics?" There was a

significant negative correlation between respondents' belief that training in emotional intelligence would help them lead more effectively and both age and number of years practicing law. This result suggests that younger, less experienced lawyers are more likely to appreciate the connection between emotional intelligence and effective leadership.

There was also a significant negative correlation between endorsement of the Socratic method and number of years practicing law (but not the respondent's age). This finding suggests that more-experienced lawyers may come to recognize potential problems with the Socratic method that their less experienced colleagues do not. The results also suggests that the younger lawyers did not have the same Socratic experience in law school and, therefore, do not see it as a significant problem.

Leadership coaching/training and number of direct reports (which suggests company size) both showed significant positive correlations with company plans to accommodate the learning differences of the millennial generation. These results suggest that companies that provide leadership coaching/training may also be more likely to accommodate different learning styles; such companies may be generally more attuned to the components of effective leadership. The results also suggest that larger companies may be more willing and/or better-equipped to provide leadership coaching/training. Companies with larger legal departments tend to have larger budgets, and investment in leadership coaching/training is likely to be more cost-effective when the coaching/training is offered to more employees.

Importance of the Research

Few published studies have focused on lawyer leadership. The current study

provides evidence of a gap between (a) current teaching and leadership practices in the legal field and, (b) the needs of millennial lawyers. Millennial lawyers bring different values, learning styles, and abilities to the profession. To attract and retain millennial lawyers, and nurture their skills and talent, organizations and law firms must provide effective leadership. The current study indicates that today's lawyer leaders are probably failing to provide optimal leadership, partly because they do not fully appreciate the connection between emotional intelligence and leadership and do not consider it imperative to adopt a less managerial leadership style.

Limitations

This study entailed a number of limitations. First, the study was limited to a small sample of general counsels in a particular geographical area. Therefore, results may not be generalizable to other areas and to lawyers who hold other positions. Second, the study employed only the EQ-i, which is a self-reporting instrument. The use of a different emotional-intelligence assessment tool, or of multiple emotional-intelligence assessment tools, might yield different results. Third, this study measured emotional intelligence as a way of determining leadership capabilities. Using other measurement tools or assessments to correlate types of leadership strengths could produce different findings. Fourth, because the current study's participants did not identify themselves on their questionnaires, it was not possible to link particular individuals' EQ-i responses to their responses to the demographics/leadership questions. The two surveys had to be analyzed independently of each other. Fifth, the data may be skewed because there were two millennial lawyer leaders in the sample group with a ten year age difference between the next oldest respondent.

Recommendations

Policy and practice. Law schools need to develop students' emotional intelligence, not just their factual knowledge and critical reasoning. Traditional curriculum generally does not develop emotional intelligence competencies. It focuses on cognitive learning and ignores the complexities of people skills (Dearborn, 2002). The researcher recommends law-school coursework that focuses on interpersonal and leadership skills. Both the current study and previous research indicate that the American Bar Association and state bar associations should add an emotional-intelligence component to their offerings in continuing legal education.

Because law schools currently pay little attention to developing students' emotional intelligence and interpersonal skills, organizations and law firms need to provide the necessary training. Also, lawyers in positions of leadership need to provide millennial lawyers with appropriate guidance. Corporations should consider offering their general counsels coaching/training aimed at enhancing their emotional intelligence and making them more effective leaders. Several studies on emotional intelligence training programs have increased emotional intelligence and performance (AMEX Program, 2003, Goleman et al. 2002). The researcher recommends that all lawyers take the EQ-i to determine their strengths and weaknesses. Given that the characteristics of millennial lawyers differ from those of lawyers of previous generations, organizational consultants/coaches should encourage lawyer leaders to focus on understanding the needs and preferences of millennial lawyers.

Future studies. Much more research is needed to further explore the questions investigated in this study. Future studies might focus on larger or different lawyer

populations. They might also focus specifically on the leadership style best suited to millennial lawyers. Additionally, a longitudinal study that compares lawyers' EQ-i scores to their scores on an assessment of transactional/transformational leadership might reveal correlations between emotional intelligence and effective lawyer leadership. Such research would help educators determine which leadership skills to emphasize to law students.

Another promising study would be one in which lawyers completed the EQ-i before and after leadership training/coaching. Research by Davidson, Jackson, and Kalin (2000) found that the circuit between the amygdale and the medial pre-frontal cortex allows the ability to neurologically distinguish cognitive intelligence and emotional intelligence and, therefore, regulate negative emotions. Results would indicate the extent to which such training/coaching can increase emotional intelligence.

The current study did not include analysis of each participant's individual EQ-i raw scores (not adjusted for gender). Future studies using these data may result in n different findings regarding specific emotional-intelligence comparisons .

Further research is needed on millennial lawyers. A study surveying law-school students could shed light on their perspectives of leadership, their anticipated leadership needs and whether they are prepared at graduation with the necessary relationship skills to enter the practice of law. The Wall Street Journal and the New York Times continue to publish articles on whether law schools are adequately preparing students with the relationship skills needed to work in the legal field or teaching them to pass an exam (Lee, 2011, Segal, 2011, Winston, 2011).

Another promising study would be one that includes a significant blend of millennial lawyers and non-millennial lawyers. A study with data from both the millennial lawyers and the non-millennial lawyers will afford a better understanding of whether there is a generational gap and what, if any, the differences are.

Finally, future studies of lawyer leaders could investigate additional or different variables than those used to answer the current study's 4 primary research questions. An examination of other variables within the context of lawyer leadership or other assessment tools could clarify and enhance the current study's findings.

Conclusion

The study of leadership traits in lawyer leaders is undeveloped. Past research has shown that effective leaders typically have high scores in traits associated with emotional intelligence. The current study examined the emotional intelligence of general counsels and their beliefs about leadership of millennial lawyers.

The average total EQ of the study's participants was nearly identical to that of the normative sample, indicating that general counsels do not excel in emotional intelligence. Nor did the study sample significantly differ from the normative sample in flexibility or self-awareness, traits that Hay Group researchers (as cited in "Case for Lawyers," 2005) found to characterize effective lawyer leaders. In fact, the study sample significantly differed from the normative only with respect to independence, assertiveness, stress tolerance, and positive impression, traits in which the study sample scored higher. The study and practice of law may foster these traits and/or attract individuals who possess these traits. Another reason that the sample scored higher may be due to the fact that their

education level and position in the career genuinely makes them feel more positive about themselves.

Age did not significantly correlate with any EQ-i scores. However, there were some gender effects: males scored significantly higher than females in independence, adaptability, reality-testing, flexibility, and—surprisingly—empathy.

On average, respondents believed (but not strongly) that millennial lawyers learn differently than lawyers of previous generations and that emotional intelligence and a less managerial approach can enhance leadership of millennial lawyers. Nevertheless, a high percentage reported that their companies had not made specific plans to accommodate the learning differences of millennial lawyers. On average, respondents somewhat agreed that the Socratic method is the best way to teach law students. These findings indicate that lawyer leaders would benefit from greater awareness of, and training in, skills associated with transformational leadership.

There was a significant negative correlation between respondents' belief that training in emotional intelligence would help them lead more effectively and both age and number of years practicing law. There was also a significant negative correlation between endorsement of the Socratic method and number of years practicing law (but not the respondent's age). Leadership coaching/training and number of direct reports both showed significant positive correlations with company plans to accommodate the learning differences of the millennial generation. These negative and positive correlations suggest the following: younger, less experienced lawyers are more likely to appreciate the connection between emotional intelligence and effective leadership; as a result of experience, some lawyers may come to recognize problems with the Socratic method;

companies that provide leadership coaching/training may also be more likely to accommodate different learning styles; and larger companies may be more willing and/or better-equipped to provide leadership coaching/training.

Previous findings and those of the current study indicate that law schools should use teaching methods and provide course content that develop students' emotional intelligence and leadership skills, that continuing education sponsored by the American Bar Association and state bar associations should include an emotional-intelligence component, and that organizations and law firms should provide lawyers with coaching/training in emotional intelligence and leadership.

To date, few published studies have focused on lawyer leadership. Future studies on this topic will help lawyers recognize and develop the traits and behaviors needed to lead effectively.

REFERENCES

Abram, S. (2007). Millennials: Deal with them! *School Library Media Activities Monthly, 24*(2) 57–58.

Alston, B. A. (2009). *An examination of the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership practices*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest.

American Bar Association. (1992, July). *Legal education and professional development: an education continuum* (MacCrate Report). Chicago, IL: American Bar Association, Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar.

American Bar Association. (2000). *Career satisfaction.* American Bar Association, Young Lawyers Division Survey. Retrieved from www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/.../satisfaction_800.doc

AMEX Program. (2003). Emotional competence training program-American Express. *Consortium for Research onEmotional Intelligence in Organizations.* Retrieved from http://www.eiconsortium.org/model_programs/emotional_competence_ training.html

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dasborough, M. T. (1993). Emotional awareness and emotional intelligence in leadership teaching. *Journal of Education for Business, 79*, 18–22.

Barkai, J. L. & Fine, V. O. (1982). Empathy training for lawyers and law students. *Utah Law Review, 12,* 505-507.

Bar-On, R. (2000). *Handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment and application at home, school and in the workplace.* San Francisco. CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bar-On, R. (2004a). The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Rationale, description and psychometric properties. In G. Geher (Ed.), *Measuring emotional intelligence: Common ground and controversy* (pp. 115-145). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.

Bar-On, R. (2004b). *The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Technical manual*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Bar-On, R., & Handley, R. (2003). *EQ-360: Bar-On Emotional Quotient-360*. Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990a). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990b). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18(3),* 19–32.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. (1995). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Technical Report. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1998). Ethics, character and authentic transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 181–218.

Bennis, W. (2009). *On becoming a leader* (20th ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Perseus.

Bobbitt, R. (2008). *Exploring communication law: A socratic approach*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Boisot, M. H. (1998). *Knowledge assets: Securing competitive advantage in the information economy.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Boyatzis, R. E., Cowan, S. S., & Kolb, D. A. (1995). *Innovations in professional education : Steps on a journey to learning.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, J. M., & Rollin, P. F. (2004, June 29). "Emotional intelligence" important to business success, say researchers. *San Francisco Business Times*. Retrieved from http://sanfrancisco.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/stories/2004/06/28/daily15.html

Burack, J. H., Irby, D. M., Carline, J. D., Root, R. K., & Larson, E. B. (1999). Teaching compassion and respect: Attending physicians' responses to problematic behaviors. *Journal Internal Medicine, 14(1),* 49-55.

Burger, A. D. (2008, August 22). Why do lawyers lie? One word: Narcissism. *New Jersey Law Review*. Retrieved from http://www.law.com/jsp/nj/PubArticleNJ.jsp?id=1202423998278

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Case for lawyers who lead. (2005, August 18). Retrieved from http://www.haygroup.com/ww/press/Details.aspx?ID=1206

Choi, J. (2006). A motivational theory of charismatic leadership: envisioning, empathy and empowerment. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational studies, 13,* 24-43.

Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Conger, J. A., Spreitzer, G., & Lawler, E. E. (Eds.). (1999). *The leader's change handbook.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cooper, R. K. (1997). Applying emotional intelligence in the workplace. *Training and Development, 51*(12), 31–38.

Covey, S. R. (2004). *Seven habits of highly effective people.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Cowan, D. A. (1989). An alternative to the dichotomous interpretation of Jung's psychological functions: Developing more sensitive measurement technology. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 53*, 459–471.

Craig, A., Tran, Y., Hermens, G., Williams, L. M., Kemp, A., Morris, C., & Gordon, E. (2009). Psychological and neural correlates of emotional intelligence in a large sample of adult males and females. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*, 111–115.

Daicoff, S. (1997). Lawyer, know thyself: A review of empirical research on attorney attributes bearing on professionalism. *American University Law Review,46*, 1337–1427.

Dansereau, F., Alutto, J. A., Nachman, S. A., A-Kelabi, S. A., Yammarino, F. J., Naughton, T. J., Keller, T. (1995). Individualized leadership: A new multiple-level approach. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*(3), 413–450.

Dare, D. E. (2005). *Strategies for meeting learning needs of the millennial generation* (PowerPoint presentation). Retrieved from http://www.powershow.com/view.php?id=P1253036852yZuqw&t=Strategies+for+Meeting+Learning+Needs+of+the+Millennial+Generation

Davidson, R., Jackson, D. C., & Kalin, N. H. (2000). Emotion, plasticity, context and regulation: Perspectives from affective neuroscience. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(6), 890-909.

Dearborn, K. (2002). Studies in emotional intelligence redefine our approach to leadership development. *Public Personnel Management, 31*(4), 523-530.

Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Lead-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 618–634.

Douglas, C., Frink, D. D., & Ferris, G. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence as a moderator of the conscientiousness-performance relationship. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 10*, 2–13.

Elliot, H. G..H. (2011). Emotional Intelligence-Based Leadership, *The Graduate Management Review,* 23-36. Retrieved from http://www.business.otago.ac.nz/mgmt/research/omgr/03elliott.pdf

Felfe, J., Tartler, K., & Leipmann, D. (2004). Advanced research I the filed of transformational leadership. *Zeitschrift fur Personal Forschung*, *18*(3), 262-288.

Fields, B., & Manning, T. (2004, February). *The effects of the millennials on higher education and the workforce* (PowerPoint presentation). Charlotte, NC: Central Piedmont Community College, Center for Research Services.

Friedman, T. R. (2007). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gardner, H., & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 23,* 68–78.

Garth, B., & Martin, J. (1993). Law schools and the construction of competence. *Journal of Legal Education*, *43*(4), 469–509.

Gerdy, K. B., (2008). Clients, empathy, and compassion: Introducing first-year students to the "Heart" of lawyering. *Nebraska Law Review, 87*(1), 1-61.

Goldgehn, L. A. (2004). Generation who, what Y: What you need to know about generation Y. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 5*(1), 24–34. doi:10.1057/palgrave.ijea.2140202

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (1998a). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review, 76*(6), 93-102.

Goleman, D. (1998b). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, *78*, 79–90.

Goleman, D. (2005). *Emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. E., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Graen, G. B., Linden, R. C., & Hoel, W. (1982). Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67,* 868–872.

Greenberg, E., & Weber, K. (2008). *Generation we: How millennial youth are taking over America and changing our world forever.* Emeryville, CA: Pachatusan.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership.* New York, NY: Paulist Press.

Guinier, L., Fine, M., & Balin, J. (1997). *Becoming gentlemen: Women, law school, and institutional change.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Handley, R. (2009). *Presence: the leadership X factor.* Austin, TX: EQ University.

Hengstler, G. A. (1993). Vox populi: the public perception of lawyers: ABA poll. *American Bar Association Journal, 79,* 60.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1993). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Homrig, M. A. (2001). *Transformational leadership.* Retrieved from http://leadership.au.af.mil/documents/homrig.htm

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 891–902.

Jausovec, N., & Jausovec, K. (2005). Gender related differences in visual and auditory processing of verbal and figural tasks. *Brain and Cognition, 59*(3), 277–288.

Jayson, S. (2006, October 2). Totally wireless on campus. *USA Today.* Retrieved from www.usatoday.com/tech/news/2006-10-02-gennext-tech_x.htm

Kerr, R., Garvin, J., Heaton, N., & Boyle, E. (2006). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 27*(4), 265–279.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). *The essence of leadership: The four keys to leading successfully*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.

Kotter, J. P. (1999). *What leaders really do*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kuhnert, R. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(4), 648–657.

Leban, W., & Zulauf, C. (2004). Linking emotional intelligence abilities and transformational leadership styles. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 25*(7/8), 554–564.

Lee, P. G. (2011, July 11). Law schools get practical. *Wall Street Journal*. Retreived from http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304793504576434074172649718.html

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates." *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*, 271–299.

Lindsay, G. M. (2005). Pioneers past and present: Curriculum insights from stories that link through generations. *McGill Journal of Education, 40*(1), 189–199.

Lockyer, S. E. (2005, September 19). Operators motivate Generation Y with responsibility rewards. *Nation's Restaurant News*. Retrieved from www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m3190/is_38_39/ai_n15628885

Lopes, P. N., Grewal, D., Kadis, J., Gall, M., & Salovey, P. (2006). Evidence that emotional intelligence is related to job performance and affect and attitudes at work. *Psicothema, 18,* 132-138.

Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review, 78*, 69–77.

Mandell, B., & Pherwani, S. (2003). Relationship between emotional intelligence and TL style: A gender comparison. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*(3), 387–404.

Martin, C. A., & Tulgan, B. (2006). *Managing the generation mix: From urgency to opportunity* (2nd ed.). Amherst, MA: HRD Press.

Mayer, J. D., DiPaolo, M. T., & Salovey, P. (1990). Perceiving affective content in ambiguous visual stimuli: A component of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 54,* 772–781.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey, & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence and emotional development implications for educators* (pp. 3–31). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (pp. 396–420). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

McElroy, T. (2010). *The retail talent marketplace: An executive perspective on growing people from within*. United States: Deloitte Consulting. Retrieved from http://www.deloitte.com/assets/Dcom-UnitedStates/Local%20Assets/Documents/Consumer%20Business/us_retail_RetailTalentWhitepaper_031710.pdf

Mertz, E. (2007). *The language of law school: Learning to "think like a lawyer."* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Muir, R. (2007). *Growing leaders at Harvard and other business schools*. Retrieved from htp://www.lawpeopleblog.com/articles/conflict

Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Harding, F. D., Owen Jacobs, T., & Fleishman, E. A. (2000). Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. *Leadership Quarterly*, *II*(1), 11-35.

Murphy, S. A. (2007). *Leading a multigenerational workforce*. Washington, DC: AARP. Retrieved from www.assets.aarp.org/aarp/leading_multigenerational_workforce.pdf

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nurco, D. N. & Lerner, M. (1999) A complementary perspective to primary socialization theory. *Substance Use & Misuse, 34*(7), 993-1003.

Orrell, L. (2008). *Millennials incorporated: The big business of recruiting, managing and retaining the world's new generation of young professionals* (2nd ed.). Deadwood, OR: Wyatt-MacKenzie.

Palmer, B & Stough, C. (2001). *Workplace SUIET: Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test, Descriptive Report, Organizational Psychology Research Unit*. Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn.

Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2000). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *22*(1), 5–10.

Pink, D. H. (2006). *A whole new mind: Why right-brainers will rule the future*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Pitcher, P. (1999). Artists, craftsmen and technocrats. *Training and Development, 53*(7), 30–33.

Polden, D. J. (2008). Educating law students for leadership roles and responsibilities, *University of Toledo Law Review, 39*, 353-360.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon, 9*(5), 1-6.

Reis, D. L., Brackett, M. A., Shamosh, N. A., Kiehl, K. A., Salovey, P., & Gray, J. R. (2007). Emotional intelligence predicts individual differences in social exchange reasoning. *NeuroImage, 35*, 1385-1391.

Richard, L. (2005). *Herding cats: The lawyer personality revealed*. Retrieved from http://www.lawmarketing.com/pages/articles.asp?Action=Article&ArticleID=350

Richardson, D. B. (2007). Defining legal leadership. *Report to Legal Management, 3*(4), 11. Retrieved from http://www.altmanweil.com/dir_docs/resource/6655a35c-de79-49e4-a6db-97800cf2afdb_document.pdf

Riverstone, L. (2004). Servant leadership: A manifestation of postmaterialism. *Global Virtue Ethics Review, 5*(3), 95–120.

Rogers, N. H. (2007). Law schools to discuss possible major changes: Association of American law schools has given significant attention to teaching methods. *The National Law Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.law.com/jsp/mlj/ppubarticlemlj.jsp?id-1189069349743

Salaway, G., Caruso, J. B., & Nelson, M. R. (2008). *The ECAR study of undergraduate students and information technology, 2008*. Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9*, 185–211.

Scott, G. A. (2000). *Plato's Socrates as educator*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Segal, D. (2011, November 19). Why the don't teach law students: lawyering. *New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/20/business/after-law-school-associates-learn-to-be-lawyers.html?pagewanted=all

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday Currency.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organizational Science, 4*, 577–594.

Shultz, M. M. & Zedeck, S. (2008). *Identification, development and validation of predictors of successful lawyer*. Retrieved from http://ssrn.com/abstract=1353554

Sivanathan, N., & Fekken, G. C. **(**2002). Emotional intelligence, moral reasoning and transformational leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 23*, 198–204.

Slater, D. (2008, November 7). Berkeley calls for research into LSAT alternative: Testing for empathy? *Wall Street Journal law blog*. Retrieved from www.blogs.wsj.com/law/2008/11/07/berkeley-calls-for-research-into-lsat-alternative-testing-for-empathy

Small, G. W., Moody, T. D., Siddarth, P., & Bookheimer, S. Y. (2009). Your brain on Google: Patterns of cerebral activation during Internet searching. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 17*(2), 116–126.

Smith, R. B., & Marrow, P. B. (2008). The changing nature of leadership in law firms. *New York State Bar Association Journal*, *8*(7), 33–38.

Sosik, J. J., & Megerian, L. E. (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance: The role of self-other agreement on transformational leadership perceptions. *Group and Organization Management, 24*(3), 367–390.

Spencer, L. M. J., McClelland, D. C., & Kelner, S. (1997). *Competency assessment methods: History and state of the art*. Boston, MA: Hay/McBer.

Stephens, C. (n.d.). *How your personality affects your law practice*. Retrieved from http://cherylstephens.com/professional/aba-mbticharts.pdf

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Sullivan, W. M., Colby, A., Wegner, J. W., Bond, L., & Shulman, L. S. (2007). *Educating lawyers: Preparation for the profession of law*. Stanford, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sweeney, R. T. (2005). Reinventing library buildings and services for the millennial generation. *Library Administration and Management*, *19*(4), 165–75.

Teece, D. J. (1998). Capturing value from knowledge assets: The new economy, markets for know-how, and intangible assets. *California Management Review*, *40*, 55–79.

Thompson, H. L. (2005). The impact of stress on the BarOn EQ-i reported scores and a proposed model of inquiry. *High Performing Systems, Inc. Technical Report, 15*(5), 1-7.

Thorndike, E. I. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Magazine, 140,* 227–235.

Tucker, M. L., Sojka, J. Z., Barone, F., & McCarthy, A. M. (2000). Training tomorrow's leaders: Enhancing the emotional intelligence of business graduates. *Journal of Education for Business, 75*(6), 331–338.

Tyler, K. (2007, May). The tethered generation. *HR Magazine, 52*(5), 40-47. Retrieved from www.shrm.org/publications/hrmagazine/editorialcontent/pages/0507cover.aspx

U.S. Army. (1999). *The U.S. Army leadership field manual* (978007143691). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Vraby, M. (2007). Emotional intelligence skills and leadership behavior in a sample of South African first-line managers. *Management Dynamics, 16*(2), 25–26.

Washington State Bar Association. (2005, September). *WSBA Leadership Institute wins 2005 ABA Partnership Program Award*. WSBA News Release. Seattle, WA: Washington State Bar Association.

Winston, C. (2011, October 24). Op-Ed, "Are Law Schools and Bar Exams Necessary?," *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/25/opinion/are-law-schools-and-bar-exams-necessary.html

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

APPENDIX A
Interpretive Guideline for EQ-i Scale Scores

Standard Score	Interpretive Guideline
130+	Markedly High—atypically well developed emotional Capacity
120-129	Very High—extremely well developed emotional capacity
110-119	High—well developed emotional capacity
90-109	Average—adequate emotional capacity
80-89	Low—under-developed emotional capacity, requiring improvement
70-79	Very-Low—extremely under-developed emotional capacity, requiring improve
Under 70	Markedly Low—atypically impaired emotional capacity, requiring improvement

(Bar-On, 2004b, p. 40)

APPENDIX B

Letter Inviting Participation in the Study

Date

Dear [ ]

My name is Donna Wanser. I am a doctoral student in education at Pepperdine University, Graduate School of Education and Psychology, under the supervision of Vance Caesar.

As part of my doctorial program and a practicing lawyer who is interested in effectively integrating the millennial layers into our practice, I am conducting a research study about the emotional intelligence of general counsel in leadership positions. This will give us a sample to determine how prepared today's lawyer leaders are in leading the more right-brained millennial lawyer. This research will help us better understand whether we are right-brain oriented enough to understand and retain the millennial lawyers coming into practice today and in the future.

As a thank you for your participation in the survey, you may receive a copy of the results by returning the enclosed request form to my attention. The results will consist of consolidated information and there will be no reference to any particular individual. There are two simple surveys: the first is to determine some basic background information, i.e. years of practice, gender, age, industry you work in, the other is a link to take Baron-On's Emotional Quotient Inventory which measures 15 characteristics of your emotional intelligence.

There are two parts two the survey. The first link will take you to a survey that asks general questions such as age, gender, how long you have been practicing, whether or not you believe that the millennial lawyer needs a different type of leader, etc. The second link will take you to Bar-On's Emotional Quotient Inventory. This is a survey that that has been used and its accuracy proven to test one's emotional intelligence (soft-skills).

NOTE BOTH SURVEYS MUST BE TAKEN AND use a username that consists of numbers and letters and DO NOT use first or last names.

Follow this link to the General Questions Survey: (survey approx 5 min)

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/99RPQG8

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

Click here to take survey

Follow this link to the Emotional Quotient Inventory Survey: (survey approx 25-35 min)

Go to: www.mhsassessments.com
Type Code:1247-001-913
Type Password: eqilaw
Proceed with assessment

The deadline for survey participation is: May 25, 2011.

Participation is voluntary. This survey is anonymous; all results will be presented in the aggregate and will not be tied to personal information, which is captured for qualification and confirmation purposes only.

I want to thank you in advance for your participation. The only foreseeable risk associated with participation in this study are the amount of time involved to take the study and the possibility that reflecting upon your experiences as a lawyer may stir up some thoughts and emotions about the millennial generation of lawyers.

Although you may not directly benefit, a potential benefit of participating is to provide information that can help better plan future mentoring experiences between today's lawyer leaders and the young millennial lawyers.

To protect your privacy, you are not being asked to provide any information that can identify you, such as your name. Please do not write your name on any portion of the survey.

I am required to keep the information collected for this study in a secure manner for at least 3 years. After the survey information is not longer required for research purposes, the information will be destroyed.

A summary of the findings may be obtained in approximately 2-3 months. If you wish to receive a summary of the findings, please send your name and address to the email enclosed on the Request For Survey Results Form. You may request a copy of the findings whether you elect to complete the survey or not.

Feel free to contact me with any questions or comments regarding this study at dlwanser@gmail.com or(516)810-3322. If you have further questions about the study, you contact my dissertation chairperson, Vance Caesar, Pepperdine University, Graduate School of Education and Psychology, 6100 Center Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90045, (562)743-3313. If you have any questions about your rights as a study participant, you may contact Yuying Tsong, Ph.D., Chairperson for the Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board, Pepperdine University, Graduate School of Education and Psychology, 6100 Center Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90045, Yuying.Tsong@pepperdine.edu.

I would appreciate the survey being completed no later than May 25, 2011. I do hope you will decide to participate in this study. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Donna Wanser

Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education and Psychology
6100 Center Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90045

APPENDIX C

Informed-Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEAQRCH ACTIVITIES

Participant _____

Principal Investigator: Donna Wanser

Title of Project: An examination of the emotional intelligence of general counsel—a skillset for evolving lawyer leaders to effectively lead millennial lawyers

1. I _____, agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Donna Wanser under the direction of Dr. Vance Caesar, chair of her dissertatin committee.

2. The overall purpose of this research:

The purpose of this research is to identify and to quantifiably score the emotional intelligence of general counsel in leadership positions to optimize their investment in leading up and coming young talent--the millennial lawyer. The emotional intelligence strengths and weaknesses of such lawyer leader surveyed will be compared to Bar-On's 7(1999) mean score. General survey information will help determine if the industry in which the lawyer leader is practicing has any impact on the lawyer leader's emotional intelligence. The study will also look at the emotional intelligence differences based on how long the lawyer leaders has been working as lawyers, their age, the size of their staff, their gender, their industry, whether the subjects had leadership training or coaching and what beliefs the participants have on managing the millennial lawyer.

3. My participation will involve the following:
   Taking two surveys. The first survey asks general questions such as age, gen der, how long have you been practicing, and several questins on your thoughts about leading the millennial lawyer. The second survey will consist of Bar-On's Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) which is a tool that measures one's emotional intelligence and is divided into 15 sub categories. This tool has been used world-wide and its accuracy has been significantly proven.

4. My participation in the study will consist of taking approximately 5 minutes to answer the general survey questions and 25-35 minutes to take the EQ-i.

5. I understand that the possible benefits to myself or society from this research will give us a sample of information to determine how prepared today's lawyer leaders are in leading the more right-brained millennial lawyer. This research will help us

better understand whether we are right-brain oriented enough to understand and retain the millennial lawyers coming into practice today and in the future. It will ladd to the limited body of information on lawyer leadership.

6. I understand that there are certain risks and discomforsts that might be associated with this research. The only forseable risk associated with participation in this study are the amount of time involved to take the study and the possibility that reflecting upon your experiences as a lawyer may stir up some thoughts and emotions about the millennial generation of lawyers.

7. I understand that I may choose not to participate in this research.

8. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may refuse to participate and/or withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the project or activity at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

9. I understand that the investigator will take all reasonable measures to protect the confidentiality of my records and my identity will not be revealed in any publication that may result from this project. The confidentiality of my records will be maintained in accordance with applicable state and federal laws.

I understand that the investigator is willing to answer any inquiries I may have concerning the research herein described. I understand that I may Vance Caesar, faculty supervisor if I have other questions or concerns about this research. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I understand that I can contact Yuying Tsong, Ph.D., Chairperson for the Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board, Pepperdine University, Graduate School of Education and Psychology, 6100 Center Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90045, Yuying.Tsong@pepperdine.edu.

10. I understand to my satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have received a copy of this informed consent form which I have read and understand. I hereby consent to participate in the research described above.

    After you have read this consent and agree with its terms, if you choose to take part in the research study, please click on the document attached to open the invitation which includes a written statement further explaining the research study and the links to the actual surveys.

    Research Study Invitation.docx

APPENDIX D

Demographics/Leadership Questions

1. How old are you today?
   - □ 20–30
   - □ 31–40
   - □ 41–50
   - □ 51–60
   - □ 61+

2.What gender are you?
   - □ Female
   - □ Male

3. Have you had leadership coaching or training during your career?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No

4. Was the law school you attended accredited?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No

5. How many years have you been practicing law?
   - □ 5–10
   - □ 11–15
   - □ 16–20
   - □ 21–25
   - □ 26–30
   - □ 31+

6. How many direct reports do you have?
   - □ 0–1
   - □ 2–5
   - □ 6–10
   - □ 11+

7. What industry do you work in?
   - □ Retail
   - □ Accounting
   - □ Industrial
   - □ Real Estate
   - □ Government
   - □ Non-profit
   - □ Other

8. I believe that in order to effectively lead young lawyers today, it will require a new management style.

- □ Strongly Disagree
- □ Disagree
- □ Somewhat Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Strongly Agree

9. I believe there is a need to train lawyer leaders to effectively lead our millennial lawyers.

- □ Strongly Disagree
- □ Disagree
- □ Somewhat Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Strongly Agree

10. I believe the Socratic Method* is the best way to teach future lawyers in law school.

- □ Strongly Disagree
- □ Disagree
- □ Somewhat Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Strongly Agree

11. I believe I can more effectively lead young lawyers today with a different leadership style than the managerial style that was used to develop and manage young lawyers of past generations.

- □ Strongly Disagree
- □ Disagree
- □ Somewhat Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Strongly Agree

12. I believe training in emotional intelligence** is helpful for me to be an even more effective leader.

- □ Strongly Disagree
- □ Disagree
- □ Somewhat Agree
- □ Agree
- □ Strongly Agree

13. I believe millennial lawyers learn differently than past generation lawyers.

- □ Yes
- □ No

14. My company has made specific plans to accommodate the learning differences of the millennial generation.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

15. I believe millennial lawyers want or need emotionally intelligent** lawyer leaders.
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

*Socratic Method: A pedagogical technique in which a teacher does not give information directly but instead asks a series of questions, sometimes antagonistic, with the result that the student comes to the desired knowledge.

**Emotional Intelligence: The ability to understand, manage and control one's feelings and in a positive way manage change and solve problems of an intrapersonal and interpersonal nature.

APPENDIX E

Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory*

Composite Scale	Subscale
Intrapersonal	Self Regard Emotional Self-Awareness Assertiveness Independence
Interpersonal	Self-Actualization Empathy Social Responsibility Interpersonal Relationship
Adaptability	Reality Testing Flexibility Problem Solving
Stress Management	Stress Tolerance Impulse Control
General Mood Components	Optimism Happiness

*Bar-On EQ-i consists of 133 questions measured by five different response choices of *1 (very seldom or not true of me), 2 (seldom true of me), 3 (sometimes true of me), 4 (often true of me), 5 (very often true of me or true of me)*

APPENDIX F

IRB Approval

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY

Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board

6100 Center Drive, Los Angeles, California 90045 ■ 310-568-5600

May 25, 2011
Donna Wanser
1829 Newport Terrace
San Pedro, CA 90732

Protocol #: E0311D14
Project Title: *An Examination of the Emotional Intelligence of General Counsel - A Skillset for Evolving Lawyer Leaders to Effectively Lead Millennial Lawyers*

Dear Ms. Wanser:

Thank you for submitting the revisions requested by Pepperdine University's Graduate and Professional Schools IRB (GPS IRB) for your study, *An Examination of the Emotional Intelligence of General Counsel - A Skillset for Evolving Lawyer Leaders to Effectively Lead Millennial Lawyers.* The IRB has reviewed your revisions and found them acceptable. You may proceed with your study.

The IRB has determined that the above entitled project meets the requirements for exemption under the federal regulations 45 CFR 46 - http://www.nihtraining.com/ohsrsite/guidelines/45cfr46.html that govern the protections of human subjects. Specifically, section 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) states:

> (b) Unless otherwise required by Department or Agency heads, research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are exempt from this policy:
>
> **Category (2) of 45 CFR 46.101**, research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: a) Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

In addition, your application to waive documentation of consent, as indicated in your **Application for Waiver or Alteration of Informed Consent Procedures** form has been **approved**.

Your research must be conducted according to the proposal that was submitted to the IRB. If changes to the approved protocol occur, a revised protocol must be reviewed and approved by

the IRB before implementation. For any proposed changes in your research protocol, please submit a **Request for Modification Form** to the GPS IRB. Because your study falls under exemption, there is no requirement for continuing IRB review of your project. Please be aware that changes to your protocol may prevent the research from qualifying for exemption from 45 CFR 46.101 and require submission of a new IRB application or other materials to the GPS IRB.

A goal of the IRB is to prevent negative occurrences during any research study. However, despite our best intent, unforeseen circumstances or events may arise during the research. If an unexpected situation or adverse event happens during your investigation, please notify the GPS IRB as soon as possible. We will ask for a complete explanation of the event and your response.

Other actions also may be required depending on the nature of the event. Details regarding the timeframe in which adverse events must be reported to the GPS IRB and the appropriate form to be used to report this information can be found in the *Pepperdine University Protection of Human Participants in Research: Policies and Procedures Manual* (see link to "policy material" at http://www.pepperdine.edu/irb/graduate/).

Please refer to the protocol number denoted above in all further communication or correspondence related to this approval. Should you have additional questions, please contact me. On behalf of the GPS IRB, I wish you success in this scholarly pursuit.

Sincerely,
Jean Kang, CIP
Manager, GPS IRB & Dissertation Support
Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education & Psychology
6100 Center Dr. 5th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
jean.kang@pepperdine.edu
W: 310-568-5753
F: 310-568-5755

cc: Dr. Lee Kats, Associate Provost for Research & Assistant Dean of Research, Seaver College
Ms. Alexandra Roosa, Director Research and Sponsored Programs
Dr. Yuying Tsong, Interim Chair, Graduate and Professional Schools IRB
Ms. Jean Kang, Manager, Graduate and Professional Schools IRB
Dr. Vance Caesar
Ms. Christie Dailo