



Research Report: Emotional Intelligence

June 2011

Disclaimer:

The information contained herein is only intended for information and is accurate at the time of printing and in no way constitutes any contractual obligation on the part of Civil Service College, Singapore. The College reserves the right to withdraw or alter any of the information without prior notice.

Copyright © 2011 by the Civil Service College, Singapore. All rights reserved. No part of this paper may be reproduced, modified, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the Civil Service College, Singapore.

**This research report is prepared by
Valerie Feng and Pang Peow Yeong
of the Centre for Leadership Development**

31 North Buona Vista Road, Singapore 275983
Email: ccollege_cld@ccollege.gov.sg
Website: www.ccollege.gov.sg

Contents

Introduction.....	3
What is Emotional Intelligence?.....	3
Measurement of Emotional Intelligence.....	6
Importance of Emotional Intelligence for Performance in the Workplace.....	9
Importance of Emotional Intelligence for Leadership Effectiveness.....	11
Can Emotional Intelligence be developed?.....	13
Training and Development of Emotional Intelligence.....	14
Conclusion.....	16

Emotional Intelligence

INTRODUCTION

One of the most popular topics in psychology over the past two decades has been emotional intelligence (EI). Interest in the topic was initially fuelled by evidence suggesting that cognitive ability by itself is not sufficient for success (e.g. Hunter and Hunter, 1984; Sternberg, 1996). We have also commonly encountered anecdotal evidence demonstrating that people could score high on traditional intelligence tests and yet do poorly in other areas such as social relations and work success. Researchers in the field of EI were thus spurred by attempts to go beyond cognitive ability to explain behaviour and success.

Ashkanasy & Daus (2005) has observed that opinion about EI as a construct has varied greatly among researchers and produced much controversy about its definition, measurement and practical impact. This paper aims to address some of the controversies around EI by presenting an overview of the field of EI, its measurement and relevance to job performance and leadership effectiveness in the work context.

WHAT IS EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE?

Historical roots of EI

The early roots of EI can be traced back to researchers in intelligence such as Wechsler (1958) who defined intelligence as “the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to deal effectively with his environment” (p.7). Wechsler had recognized that in addition to cognitive factors, there are also non-cognitive factors that determine intelligent behaviour. More recently, Gardner (1983) introduced the concept of multiple intelligences. Among the intelligences, he included interpersonal intelligence, which is “*the capacity to understand the intentions, motivations and desires of other people*” and intrapersonal intelligence, which Gardner defined as “*the capacity to understand one self, to have an effective working model of one self and to use such information effectively in regulating one’s own life*”. The current work on EI builds on this foundation of research on the role of non-

cognitive factors in helping people to succeed in both life and the workplace. There are three conceptual models of EI: as an ability; as a set of competencies and as a trait.

Emotional intelligence as an ability

When Salovey and Mayer (1990) coined the term “emotional intelligence”, they were aware of the previous work on non-cognitive aspects of intelligence and sought to develop a new distinct type of intelligence that involved emotional information processing. They provided the first formal definition of emotional intelligence and described it as a form of intelligence that “*involves 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 action*” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Thus, they initially conceptualized emotional intelligence as a unitary intelligence with three broad areas: appraisal and expression of emotion, regulation of emotion and the utilization of emotion.

Mayer & Salovey (1997) subsequently reviewed and refined their earlier definition, which focused only on perceiving and regulating emotion and omitted thinking about feelings. They expanded the EI construct and defined it as: “*the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others*”. This new model conceptualizes EI as a composite of four distinct emotional reasoning abilities: the ability to perceive emotions, the ability to use emotions to facilitate thought, the ability to understand emotions, and the ability to manage emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Emotional intelligence as a set of competencies

Other theorists have approached EI from another direction by beginning with the question of performance and trying to identify a set of competencies that are distinct from cognitive ability but are also important for success. A competency is any “characteristic of the person that leads to or causes effective or superior performance” (Boyatzis, 1982). Inspired by the earlier thinking of Mayer and Salovey, Goleman (1995) expanded the EI construct to encompass competencies, such as influence and self-confidence. According to Goleman, it is EI that provides the potential for one to learn and develop emotional competencies that result in leadership effectiveness. These competencies are organized into

four basic clusters: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management. Goleman (1995) can be credited for popularizing the concept of EI to a general audience and sparking interest in the field of EI.

Another model in the field of EI is Bar-On's (1988) model of what he now calls "emotional and social intelligence", which is comprised of five main components: intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, adaptability, stress management and general mood. His research suggested that the personal qualities and skills that help people to adapt to the social and emotional demands of life include the ability to be aware of, to understand, and to express oneself; the ability to be aware of, to understand and relate to others; the ability to deal with strong emotions and control one's impulses; and the ability to adapt to change and to solve problems of a personal or social nature (Bar-On, 1997, 2006).

Emotional intelligence as a personality trait

The most recent model to emerge is known as trait emotional intelligence, which conceptualizes EI in terms of traits, which are predispositions of behaviour and thought. Traits are relatively stable over time, differ across individuals and influence behaviour. With its basis in the psychology of personality as a driver of behaviour and success, Petrides & Furnham (2001) examined existing EI measures and conceptualized trait EI as comprising emotion-related dispositions and self-perceived abilities. Some examples of traits in their model include "self-esteem", "emotion expression" and "social awareness". Petrides and Furnham (2001) coined the term "trait emotional self-efficacy" to avoid the construct being misconstrued as "intelligence". Thus, they distinguished trait EI, which encompasses emotion-related behavioural dispositions and *self-perceived* abilities, versus ability EI which encompasses *actual* emotion-related abilities. For instance, high scorers in the emotion expression trait perceive themselves as more capable than most people of communicating their feelings.

Towards a common definition of emotional intelligence

There remains much debate about the different definitions and models that have emerged in the EI field. Cherniss (2010) attempted to find some common ground by

suggesting that it might be better to formulate and agree on a single definition of EI, rather than to evaluate which model is superior and preferable to adopt.

Although, there is no unanimous agreement, a review of the literature suggests that most researchers have accepted a basic definition proposed by Mayer et al. (2000) which defines EI as “the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others” (p. 396). Goleman, Bar-On, and Petrides all include this definition in their work, where they commonly refer to the perception, understanding, and managing of emotions within the self and others (Ciarrochi, Forgas, & Mayer, 2001; Daus 2006).

For the purpose of this paper, this common definition of the EI construct is adopted in order to provide some clarity and consistency to the topic. There will always be grey areas where it is difficult to reach consensus on whether certain attributes truly are part of EI. Nevertheless, focusing on a common definition of EI provides some coherence to the field without totally abandoning the broader models and also allows one to more easily address the other controversies.

MEASUREMENT OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

The different conceptualizations of EI have led to a range of instruments for the assessment of EI. In the rush to create measures of this emerging construct, researchers have overlooked the difference between maximal versus typical performance and assumed they were operationalising the same construct, thereby resulting in conceptual confusion (Perez, Petrides & Furnham, 2005). Tests of maximum performance are designed to assess how people perform at certain tasks when they are trying hard to perform those tasks well. On the other hand, tests of typical performance are designed to assess how people typically behave rather than how they behave in special circumstances (such as when they are trying hard).

The type of measurement method used has implications for the operationalisation of any construct. The measurement of EI through maximal performance tests leads to its operationalisation as a cognitive ability. In contrast, the measurement of EI through typical performance measures such as self-report questionnaires leads to its operationalisation as a trait. Once one recognizes that ability EI and trait EI are two different constructs,

conceptually, methodologically and empirically, then conflicting research findings can perhaps be resolved.

The following presents a brief overview of the pros and cons of both traditional approaches to measuring EI and suggests some alternative approaches for the development of EI measures.

El measures of maximal performance

There exist only a few measures of ability EI. The most prominent measure of ability EI is the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso, 2002) which was designed to measure EI according to the four core emotional abilities defined in the Mayer-Salovey model. An example of a MSCEIT task would be to identify accurately how people feel by asking the test taker what emotions are being expressed in a photograph of someone's face. If the test taker is shown a photo of a person displaying mild sadness, and the test taker selects an answer indicating that the person is feeling a bit happy and somewhat surprised, then such an answer is considered incorrect. One key advantage of EI ability tests, like other IQ measures, is that they are resistant to faking or responding in a socially desirable manner.

A major criticism of ability EI measures is that in contrast to IQ tests, there are no clear right or wrong answers to some questions. In some questions of the MSCEIT for example, participants are shown pictures of abstract design and asked to indicate the extent to which they believe that a series of distinct emotions are depicted in it. Responses to such questions cannot be objectively scored as correct or incorrect because there is no basis for determining the emotional content of the items.

In attempts to circumvent this problem, ability EI tests have employed alternative scoring procedures that attempt to identify correct responses according to consensus among participants in a normative sample or among subject-matter experts. In the first approach, the correct answer is determined by the majority of those taking the test, whereas in the second approach, the correct answer is determined by a group of emotion researchers. Consensus scoring is problematic for contradicting the foremost function of tests, which is to discriminate between test-takers as well as the impossibility of incorporating difficult items in the test, since the "correctness" of a response is determined by the number of people who

would endorse it. There are also limitations to expert scoring such as the inherent difficulty in identifying relevant experts in emotional intelligence. In addition, it is based on the assumption that these experts have more insight into normal adults' emotional states than the test-takers themselves, especially in cases such as intrapersonal EI.

El measures of typical performance

The popularity of EI resulted in an influx of measures, especially questionnaires, which may be administered in a self-report format or to multiple raters (e.g., 360-degree questionnaires). Some examples of these include the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI; Boyatzis, Goleman, & Hay/McBer, 1999), the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-*i*; Bar-On, 1997) and the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue, Petrides, 2001; Petrides & Furnham 2003). Such instruments typically ask respondents to indicate on a Likert response scale their preferences or self-perceptions across multiple items measuring the various factors of EI.

On the surface, self-report questionnaires are desirable: they are less costly, easier to administer, and take considerably less time to complete than performance tests. However, they are also problematic because respondents can provide socially desirable responses rather than truthful ones, or respondents may not actually know how good they are at emotion-based tasks.

The future of EI measurement

Given that the field of EI is relatively new, it is difficult at this point to reach any firm conclusions about the quality of existing measures of EI. However, some promising new measurement strategies are beginning to emerge. New measures such as video-based situational judgment tests of emotional regulation and emotional understanding (Newman, Joseph & McCann, 2010) appear to be better than either the ability measures or self-report measures that have dominated the field up to now.

Other researchers offer suggestions that can guide the way forward. For example, Riggio (2010) highlights many existing measures of important emotional abilities that have been studied for decades, such as the *Interpersonal Perception Task*. He also suggests

devoting more time and effort to developing more narrow measures of particular emotional competencies. Such measures may prove to be more useful than very broad concepts such as EI, not only by providing greater clarity of the construct in question, but also because narrow constructs are likely to be more amenable to further applications such as training and development.

IMPORTANCE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE FOR JOB PERFORMANCE IN THE WORKPLACE

Although there is some debate among the advocates of the different EI concepts, there is good reason to believe that all types of EI measures predict job performance as they measure at least part of the core concept behind EI. It is likely that the ability to recognize emotions in the self and in others contributes to effective social interaction, as does the ability to regulate one's own emotions. Therefore, EI may contribute to performance by helping with group tasks and facilitating teamwork. For example, Offermann, Bailey, Vasilopoulos, Seal, and Sass (2004) found that EI better predicted performance on student teamwork projects, whereas a cognitive ability measure better predicted student performance on individual cognitive tasks like tests.

What might be most important to organisations is the extent of the purported link between EI and outcomes such as job performance. The evidence suggests that EI is indeed associated with job performance across a wide spectrum of occupations. Some studies have found a relationship between EI and job performance as measured by company rank and merit salary increase percentage in a group of analysts and clerical employees (e.g. Cote & Miners, 2006; Lopes, Grewal, Kadis, Gall, & Salovey 2006). EI has also been found to be correlated with the extent to which managers conduct themselves in ways that are supportive of the organization's goals as rated by their supervisors (Cote & Miners, 2006) and with the team performance of MBA students (Rapisarda, 2002).

The question that follows would be the extent to which EI is related to job performance after existing factors such as cognitive ability and personality are taken into account. We can turn to recent meta-analytic studies that combine the results of several studies to shed some light on this question. O'Boyle, Humphrey, Pollack, Hawver and Story (2010) found that EI predicted job performance incrementally after taking cognitive ability and personality into account. In addition, EI ranked third in relative importance to cognitive

ability and conscientiousness as measured by the five factor model of personality in predicting job performance. These findings not only support earlier research which argued that EI is an important predictor of work-related outcomes, but also indicate that cognitive ability and personality by themselves are insufficient to explain job performance.

In tracing the relationship between EI and job performance, Cherniss (2010) recommended greater attention to the context of job demands. One such contextual variable would be emotional labour, which Grandey (2003) defined as “the degree to which workers are expected to express positive emotion and hide negative emotions as part of the job”. Some examples of high emotional labour jobs would include cabin crew, hospitality staff or customer service officers. Joseph and Newman (2010) confirmed in their research that the EI-job performance relationship varied depending on the level of emotional labour. Specifically, their meta-analysis indicated that EI predicted job performance in high emotional labour jobs but showed no relationship to job performance for low emotional labour jobs. Further, after controlling for cognitive ability and personality, the relationship of EI to job performance was positive for high emotional labour jobs but negative for low emotional labour jobs. This indicates that the use of EI measures should only be used to select applicants into high emotional labour jobs, otherwise there may be negative impact.

While the research evidence does not indicate that EI makes a larger contribution to outcomes such as individual success than does cognitive ability as Goleman (1995) claimed, it is safe to say that the research at this point suggests that EI makes a unique and important contribution in predicting job performance, particularly in situations characterized by high emotional labour. Thus, although EI is generally not used in personnel selection and hiring today, the present research makes a fairly persuasive case for the inclusion of EI with cognitive ability and personality in applicable selection processes.

There remain some unanswered questions in the EI-job performance relationship that could be addressed by further research. One such area might be the extent to which the relative importance of EI, cognitive ability and personality varied by the type of job being performed. Although most jobs may involve at least some interpersonal contact relevant to EI, the degree to which jobs draw upon cognitive skills, personality and EI may vary considerably by job characteristics and other factors. Another avenue of research would be to examine the relationship between EI and other facets of job performance such as organizational citizenship behaviours and counterproductive workplace behaviours, rather than traditional task performance. Moving forward, these efforts would constitute steps

toward developing integrative models that include how cognitive ability, personality and EI impact on job performance.

IMPORTANCE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE FOR LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

During the last decade, evolving leadership requirements (e.g., managing and motivating in today's environment, charting new paths and inspiring people with clarity of vision and optimism) have placed new demands on leadership, resulting in the construct of EI gaining popularity as a potential contributor to effective leadership.

While EI may appear as a superficial aspect of leadership, Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) suggested that EI becomes more important as one goes higher up the organization. In particular, EI dimensions — namely the ability to monitor emotions and the ability to manage emotions — are predictors of transformational leadership, a leadership style “consistently found to promote greater organizational performance” (Palmer, Walls, Burgess & Stough, 2001), suggesting that EI may be integral to effective leadership.

Emotional Intelligence and Effective Leadership

Leadership is the process of producing direction, alignment, and commitment in collectives. Some of the specific capabilities that enable leaders to carry out leadership tasks, such as setting direction, gaining commitment, and creating alignment effectively, include: the management of one's own thoughts, feelings and actions (i.e., leading oneself); working effectively with others in a social system (i.e., leading others); and facilitating the accomplishment of organizational work (i.e., leading the organization) (Velsor, Mccauley & Ruderman, 2010). We can see how EI may contribute to self-leadership capabilities and the ability to work effectively with and through others and therefore to effective leadership.

Specifically, EI enables a leader to understand his strengths and weaknesses, why he is the way he is, the impact of his strengths and weaknesses on people around him, and his effectiveness in various roles (Velsor, Mccauley & Ruderman, 2010). This helps him to recognize the sources of tension that interfere with positive relationships and to pick up

emotional undercurrents which enable him to respond effectively in situations (Goleman, 1998, 2001; Weisinger, 1998). In the process, he learns to “control his impulses, manage his emotions” and be more socially aware of the needs and concerns of others (McKee, Johnston, & Massimilian, 2006).

George (2002) has proposed that the ability to understand and use emotions in oneself and others contributes to leadership effectiveness. By accurately appraising how subordinates feel, this information can be used to engage their emotions to gain buy-in and receptivity to the organization’s goals or initiatives (Gardner & Stough, 2002). Leaders are able to improve decision making with their management and knowledge of emotions. Those who are able to accurately recognize emotions can judge if the emotion is linked to opportunities or problems, and thus use these emotions in the process of decision making (Schwartz, 1990). This is also important as being a leader calls for one to have the ability to inspire, to motivate, to develop subordinates by diagnosing their development needs and to encourage behavioural changes (Velsor, et al., 2010).

As a leader frequently encounters conflicting demands, the ability to manage emotions helps him to handle stress and develop strategies for balancing these conflicts (Velsor, et al., 2010). Self-management and impulse control enable a leader to remain composed during crises and to recover from mistakes. A leader adept at managing adversity is also likely to be able to sustain working relationships amidst such demands and changing circumstances (Ruderman, Hannum, Leslie & Steed, 2001).

Although we cannot conclude that leaders who are more emotionally intelligent are better leaders, research does show that there are basic connections between EI and abilities associated with leadership excellence (Ruderman, et al., 2001). These findings reinforce the notion that leadership is a process of social influence through which leaders affect others' feelings, perceptions, and behaviour. Leaders need to understand emotions, self-management skills and social skills (Boyatzis, 2008), as these abilities can be used to create positive emotions to empower and motivate themselves and others (Bar-On, Tranel, Denburg & Bechara, 2003). Understanding such connections can provide leaders with additional ammunition in their efforts to enhance their leadership (Ruderman, et al., 2001).

CAN EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE BE DEVELOPED?

Given the importance of EI to effective leadership, the question arises as to whether it can be developed. While this has been a contentious issue, there is emerging consensus within the research evidence that EI is developable (Goleman, 1996; Steiner, 1997; Hopfl and Linstead, 1997; Cooper, 1997; Martinez, 1997). It was found that as people increase in age, they tend to score higher on the EQ-*i*, suggesting to a certain extent that it may be learned or developed through life experience.

The most persuasive evidence comes from longitudinal studies conducted with MBA students who underwent a programme to assess and develop their EI competencies (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management). The results showed at least a 40% improvement of EI, with effects sustained for several years (Boyatzis, Cowan, & Kolb, 1995). This supports the notion that it is not only possible to develop EI competencies, but that such changes can be sustained over an extended period of time.

There has been research to assess the stage of an individual's life at which interventions designed to develop EI are most effective. Goleman (1996) asserts that the critical period at which EI is amenable to development is during childhood. However, another view proposes that these core competencies are capable of being developed and changed by workplace experiences, where managers learn emotion management and regulation (Dulewicz and Higgs, 2004). Such emotion management and regulation arise through undertaking the job itself and having the opportunity to reflect on and discuss emotional management experiences with others in the workplace. The exchange of experience through such dialogues gradually increases one's capacity for handling feelings and learning ways to manage the emotions of others and self (Clarke, 2006).

What has generated more debate is the *extent* of development possible. One approach that may be quite informative is the EI model designed by Higgs and Dulewicz (1999). They proposed seven elements that lie on a development continuum ranging from 'easily developable' to 'malleable' to 'exploit' (see Table 1). The study revealed that self-awareness, interpersonal sensitivity and influence are developable, as they improved after EI training. 'Exploitable' elements are those which did not improve after EI training, but did after experiences (i.e., experiences such as team leadership can force or encourage some individuals to exploit their existing capacities for conscientiousness and intuitiveness). The other two elements, emotional resilience and motivation were found to lie between these two

extremes (Dulewicz & Higgs, 1999). This study provides support for the proposition that EI can be developed, and in particular, certain elements of EI are more amenable to training than others.

Elements of EI	Easily developable	Malleable	Exploit
<i>Self-awareness</i>	✓		
<i>Emotional resilience</i>		✓	
<i>Intuitiveness</i>			✓
<i>Interpersonal sensitivity</i>	✓		
<i>Influence</i>	✓		
<i>Motivation</i>		✓	
<i>Conscientiousness</i>			✓

Table 1: Higgs and Dulewicz's development continuum of EI

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Unlike IQ, there is evidence which shows that EI can be developed through feedback and training. Research has also shown that EI competencies can be developed in managers through leadership programmes (Boyatzis & Oosten, 2002). These EI competencies positively impact aspects of job performance and help develop confidence and competence to handle emotionally-charged situations (Koczwara & Bullock, 2009).

According to Goleman (1998), self-awareness is a pre-requisite and building block for effective self-management, which in turn predicts relationship management. What this implies is that EI training should have a logical flow whereby learners' competencies are developed from basic levels (i.e., identifying emotions in themselves and others) to higher order levels (self-management and relationship management).

Developing Self-Awareness and Mindfulness

Self-awareness includes observations of one's feelings and attributions, as well as understanding the impact of one's strengths and weaknesses on others. Self-awareness can be developed using a blend of methodologies, for instance by combining assessment and development tools such as multi-rater feedback, experiential exercises and peer coaching. Combined together, these provide opportunities for the individual to gain insight into identifying and understanding emotions which leads on to self and relationship management.

In EI training interventions, the development of self-awareness is achieved through opportunities that support and encourage feedback and reflection. Feedback is a powerful way to facilitate self-awareness, as it enables the individual to get a better understanding of how others perceive and respond to their behaviours. Elements which provide such opportunities include small group discussions where learners identify and analyze typical situations where EI skills are important in their roles (Koczwara & Bullock, 2009), review how they would approach significant real events (e.g. challenging meetings), and seek peer feedback on instances of emotional behaviour during their management of others. Multi-rater assessment also serves as powerful feedback since this feedback comes from a variety of raters who interpret behaviours differently (Velsor, et al., 2010). In addition, it helps the individual get a gauge of his emotional capacity and pinpoints the EI facets that require development (The Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations).

Since support of feedback and reflection reinforce each other in the development of self-awareness, training interventions should provide space that encourages reflection on real events. This will enable the individual to understand and evaluate the effectiveness of his employed approaches (Koczwara & Bullock, 2009). A framework for reflection and development can be incorporated by guiding the individual to complete a self-development plan that will prompt him to consider the exercises he has completed and the feedback from his peers and facilitators (Shen, Groves & McEnrue, 2008). In essence, reflection helps the individual identify the lessons learnt, integrate feedback from various sources, and understand how his behaviours can influence people's perceptions, thereby increasing self-awareness (Velsor, et al., 2010).

Closely related to self-awareness is mindfulness, which is to "pay attention in a particular way, purposefully, in the present moment, and non-judgementally" (Kabat-Zinn, 1994). According to Goleman's EI theory (1995), there is a clear connection between EI and

mindfulness, and mindfulness is most useful in identifying emotions and assessing them at a deeper level of awareness.

In mindfulness training, the individual is asked to maintain awareness of the present moment, sit still with his feelings and ask himself - Is he the leader he aspires to be? How is he managing the stress of his current situation? How are his key people feeling lately? Are they in sync with each other? Through a process of self-observation, self-inquiry and reflection, mindfulness training helps a leader understand how he responds to people, and to notice the subtle messages from those whom he leads (McKee, et al., 2006). Research has shown that “mindfulness” training — an emotional self-regulation strategy — can alter brain centres which are responsible for both positive and negative emotions by helping people to stay focused on the present, thus keeping out distressful thoughts and pausing before acting impulsively (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003).

The suggested approaches to EI training require motivation, individual desire, feedback, mindfulness, reflection and continuing practice in new situations. The development of EI is therefore an ongoing pursuit.

CONCLUSION

The study and application of EI are still developing with differing theoretical perspectives, various approaches to measuring the construct and questions about the extent to which it can be developed. However, the existence of differing viewpoints within this paradigm does not indicate a weakness, but rather a robustness of the field as researchers and practitioners grapple with the issues to arrive at sound conclusions. The knowledge gained from this rapidly expanding field of EI research will help to inform our understanding of the issues to consider for both the selection and development of leaders.

Today's effective leadership skills have been described to depend, in part, on the understanding of emotions and the abilities associated with EI (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997; Goleman, 1998a; Ryback, 1998), as leadership roles are no longer about controlling, planning and inspecting the running of an organization, but rather, about motivating and inspiring others, fostering positive work attitudes and creating a sense of contribution and importance with and among others (Hogan & Curphy, 1994). Given that EI has been identified as an important attribute of effective leadership and job performance, it would be

worthwhile to consider EI as an additional selection criterion in identifying potentially effective leaders.

Research has also indicated that EI competencies can be developed through leadership development programmes, with sustained effects after the programmes. It would therefore be important for organizations to not only enhance an leader's level of self-awareness and mindfulness through programmes, but find ways to create ample opportunities for the leader to reflect on one's behaviours exhibited in different situations, practise new behaviours and receive feedback how others perceive and respond to these behaviours when he returns to the workplace (Deutschendorf, 2009). It is through such dialogue and reflections that one gradually increases his capacity for coping with feelings and learning appropriate ways to manage the emotions of others and self (Clarke, 2006).

References

- Antonakis, J. Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dasborough, M. T. (2009). Does leadership need emotional intelligence? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 247-261.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, C. S. (2005). Rumors of the death of emotional intelligence in organizational behaviour are vastly exaggerated. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26, 441-452.
- Bar-On, R. (1988). *The development of a concept of psychological well-being*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rhodes University, Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar-On emotional quotient inventory: User's manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI), *Psicothema*, 18, 13-25.
- Bar-On, R., Trabel, D., Denburg, N. L., & Bechara, A. (2003). Exploring the neurological substrate of emotional and social intelligence. *Brain*, 126, 1790-1800.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). *The competent manager: A model for effective performance*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Hay/McBer (1999). *Emotional competence inventory*. Boston: HayGroup.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Cowan, S. S., & Kolb, D.A. (1995). *Innovations in professional education: Steps on a journey to learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Base.
- Boyatzis, R. E., & Sala, F. (2004). Assessing emotional intelligence competencies. In G. Geher (Ed.), *Measuring emotional intelligence: Common ground and controversy*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- Boyatzis, R.E., & Van Oosten, E. (2002). Developing emotionally intelligent organizations. In R.Millar (ed.), *International Executive Development Programmes* (7th edition). London: Kogan Page Publishers. (Retrieved from <http://www.eiconsortium.org>, on 1.6.2007).
- Boyatzis, R.E. (2008). Competencies in the 21st century. *Journal of Management Development*, 27.1.
- Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Shiffman, S., Lerner, N., & Salovey, P. (2006). Relating emotional abilities to social functioning: A comparison of self-report and performance measures of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 780-795.
- Cherniss, C. (2010). Emotional Intelligence: Toward Clarification of a Concept. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3 (2010), 110-126.

- Cherniss, C. & Goleman, D. (2001). *The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ciarrochi, J.V., Forgas, J. P., & Mayer, J. D. (2001). *Emotional intelligence in everyday life: A scientific inquiry*. Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis.
- Clarke, N. (2006). Emotional Intelligence Training: A Case of Caveat Emptor. *Human Resource Development Review*, Vol.5. No. 4, pp. 422- 441.
- Cooper, R.K. and Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: Emotional Intelligence in Leadership and Organizations*. Frosset/Putnum, New York, NY.
- Cote, S., & Miners, C. T. H. (2006). Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 1-28.
- Daus, C. S. (2006). The case for an ability-based model of emotional intelligence. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.). *A critique of emotional intelligence: What are the problems and how can they be fixed?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Deutschendorf, H. (2009). EQ Boost. *Training and Development*. Oct 2009. pp. 92-93.
- Dulewicz, V. and Higgs, M.J. (1999). Can Emotional Intelligence Be Measured and Developed? *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*. 20(5), 242- 252.
- Dulewicz, V., & Higgs, M. (2004). Can Emotional Intelligence be developed? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15 (1), 95-111.
- Emmerling, R. J., & Goleman, D. (2003). Emotional Intelligence: Issues and Common Misunderstandings. *Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations*.
- Furnham, A., & Petrides, K. V. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence and happiness. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 31, 815-823.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, L., & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23/2, pp. 68-78
- George, J.M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: the role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53, 1027-1041.
- Goleman. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1996). *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More than IQ*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Goleman, D. (1998a). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 76, 93-104.

- Goleman, D. (2001). An EI-based theory of performance. In C. Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds). *The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace: How to Select for, Measure, and Improve Emotional Intelligence in Individuals, Groups and Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. & McKee, A. (2002). *The New Leaders*. Little Brown.
- Grandey, A. (2003). When "the show must go on": Surface and deep acting as predictors of emotional exhaustion and service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 86-96.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. & Jogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49, 493-504.
- Hopfl, H. and Linstead, S. (1997). Learning to Feel and Feeling to Learn: Emotion and Learning in Organizations. *Management Learning*. 28 (1), 5-12.
- Hunter, J. E., & Hunter, R. F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 76(1), 72-93.
- Jordan, P. J., & Troth, A. C. (2004). Managing emotions during team problem solving: Emotional intelligence and conflict resolution. *Human Performance*, 17, 195-218.
- Joseph, D. L., & Newman, D. A. (2010). Emotional intelligence: An integrative meta-analysis and cascading model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 54-78.
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (1994). *Wherever You Go, There You Are: Mindfulness Meditation in Everyday Life*. New York: Hyperion.
- Koczwara, A., & Bullock, T. (2009). What is Emotional Intelligence at Work? *Being a GP*, 2 (5), 47-50.
- Loosemore, M., Dainty, A., & Lingard, H. (2003). *Human resource management in construction projects: Strategic and operational approaches*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Lopes, P. N., Brackett, M. A., Nezlek, J. B., Schutz, A., Sellin, I., & Salovey, P. (2004). Emotional intelligence and social interaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1018-1034.
- Lopes, P. N., Grewal, D., Kadis, J., Gall, M., & Salovey, P. (2006). Evidence that social intelligence is related to job performance and affect and attitudes at work. *Psichothema*, 18, 132-138.
- Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., Cote, S., & Beers, M. (2005). Emotion regulation abilities and the quality of social interaction. *Emotion*, 5, 113-118.
- McKee, A. Johnston, F., & Massimilian, R. (2006). Mindfulness, Hope and Compassion: A Leader's Road Map to Renewal. *Ivey Business Journal*, May/June.
- Martinez, M.N. (1997). The Smarts that Count. *HR Magazine*, 42(11), 72-78.

- Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R. D. (2002). *Emotional intelligence: Science and myth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27, 267-298.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence* (pp. 3-34). New York: Basic Books.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence (2nd Ed)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2002). *The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT): User's manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- McClelland, D. C. (1973). Testing for competence rather than intelligence. *American Psychologist*, 28, 1-14.
- Newman, D. A., Joseph, D. L., & McCann, C. (2010). Emotional intelligence and job performance: The importance of emotion regulation and emotional labor context. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3, 159-164.
- O'Boyle, E. H., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver T. H. & Story, P. A. (2010). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, DOI: 10.1002/job.714.
- Offermann, L. R., Bailey, J. R., Vasilopoulos, N. L., Seal, C., & Sass, M. (2004). The relative contribution of emotional competence and cognitive ability to individual and team performance. *Human Performance*, 17, 219-243.
- Palmer, B. R., Manocha, R., Gignac, G., & Stough, C. (2003). Examining the factor structure of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory with an Australian general population sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 1191-1210.
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., Stough, C. (2001). Emotional Intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22/1, 5- 10.
- Pérez, J. C., Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2005). Measuring trait emotional intelligence. In R. Schulze and R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *International Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*. Cambridge, MA: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Petrides, K. V. (2001). *A psychometric investigation into the construct of emotional intelligence*. University College London: Doctoral dissertation.
- Petrides, K. V., Frederickson, N., & Furnham, A. (2004). The role of trait emotional intelligence in academic performance and deviant behavior at school. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 277-293.

- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: Psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 425-448.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence: Behavioural validation in two studies of emotion recognition and reactivity to mood induction. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 39-57.
- Petrides, K. V., Pita, R. & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality factor space. *British Journal of Psychology*, 98, 273-289.
- Rapisarda, B. A. (2002). The impact of emotional intelligence on work team cohesiveness and performance. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 10, 363-379.
- Riggio, R. E. (2010). Trait emotional intelligence theory. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 3, 136-139.
- Ruderman, M.N., Hammum, K., Leslie, B.J., Steed, J.L. (2001). Making the Connection: Leadership Skills and Emotional Intelligence. *Leadership in Action*, 21 (5).
- Ryback, D. (1998). *Putting Emotional Intelligence to Work: Successful Leadership Is More Than IQ*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Woburn
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9, 185-211.
- Schwartz, N. (1990). "Feelings as information: informational and motivational functions of affective states". in Higgins, E.T. and Sorrentino, R.M. (Eds). *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behavior.*, New York: Guilford Press.
- Shen, W., Groves, K. S., & McEnrue, M. P. (2008). Developing and measuring the emotional intelligence of leaders. *Journal of Management Development*, 27 (2), 225-250.
- Steiner, C. (1997). *Achieving Emotional Literacy*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Sternberg, R. (1996). *Successful intelligence*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Velsor, E.V, Mccauley, C.D., Ruderman, M.N. (2010). *Handbook of Leadership Development*. Center For Creative Leadership.
- Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and temperament*. New York: Guilford.
- Wechsler, D. (1958). *The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence (4th Ed.)*. Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Company.
- Weisinger, H. (1998). *Emotional Intelligence At Work*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.