Measuring Emotional Intelligence:
Development and Validation of an Instrument

Kerry D. Carson

Paula Phillips Carson

Betty J. Birkenmeier
University of Louisiana at Lafayette

ABSTRACT

Emotional intelligence has been discussed in the popular business press over the past few years and has recently found its way into prestigious business and industrial psychology journals. However, there is no validated instrument available in the academic literature for management consultants, trainers, and business practitioners to use when surveying employees' perceptions of their emotional intelligence. The authors therefore constructed and examined a new measure, beginning with 269 items which were eventually trimmed to 30 items. All items loaded cleanly on their respective factors. In Study 1 and Study 2, reliabilities were: Emotional Intelligence measure = .86, 91; Empathetic Response dimension = .87, 92; Mood Regulation dimension = .77, 76; Interpersonal Skills dimension = .82, 82; Internal Motivation dimension = .78, 81; and Self-Awareness dimension = .69, .70, respectively. It was found that emotional intelligence was positively related to proactive personality and personal control, but negatively related to irritability/verbal hostility and emotional exhaustion. The construct's relationships with selected demographic variables were inconclusive.

Emotional intelligence appears to be a concept which has now come of age. Touted as a construct which can assist organizations in reducing turnover, identifying transformational leaders, facilitating executive coaching, creating more effective work teams, improving organizational culture, stimulating creativity, and enhancing employee acceptance of radical change (Fernandez-Araoz, 1999; Huy, 1999), emotional intelligence is experiencing increasing acceptance by organizational consultants and business practitioners working in domains as varied as profit-seeking businesses, public school systems, and not-for-profit social service agencies. The promised individual and organizational benefits yielded by a greater understanding of emotional intelligence, coupled with the emerging assertion that everyone can (and should) be trained to become more emotionally intelligent (Reich & Goleman, 1999), has encouraged the emergence and/or strategic repositioning of consulting firms and institutions. For example, Hay Group has joined the ranks of Daniel Goleman (1995, 1998; recognized advocate and guru of emotional intelligence in the mainstream) and Case Western Reserve University to sponsor a three-day seminar on emotional intelligence. And, numerous web sites

33

have been established promoting greater awareness of the efficacy of emotional intelligence measurement and enhancement (for example, see www.eq.org, www.eiconsortium.org, and www.eqi.org).

It has been a decade since the construct of emotional intelligence was first introduced into the psychology literature (e.g., Mayer, DiPaolo and Salovey, 1990; Mayer and Salovey, 1995; Salovey and Mayer, 1989-90), it has more recently created a stir in the popular business press (e.g., Bates, 1999; Epstein, 1999; Farnham, 1996; Koonce, 1996; Martinez, 1997; O'Brien, 1996), as well as in the academic business literature. In fact, emotional intelligence has been discussed in such prestigious outlets as the <u>Academy of Management Review</u> (Huy, 1999), and the <u>Harvard Business Review,</u> where Goleman (1998a) suggested that research "clearly shows that emotional intelligence is the sine qua non of leadership" (p. 94). While there are many proponents of emotional intelligence, caution is also warranted as some have suggested that emotional intelligence is a very broad concept and is just another management fad (e.g., Tossman, 1999).

Despite all this press and publicity, what is evidently and frustratingly lacking is a robustly validated, non-proprietary measure of emotional intelligence in the public domain. Because it has been suggested by some that emotional intelligence may play a key role in the workplace (Huy, 1999; Goleman, 1998b), it is important that there is a psychometrically-sound, readily-available emotional intelligence instrument. No instrument has been published, however, in the academic literature. Therefore, the purpose of this research effort is to develop a reliable, valid measure of employees' perceptions of their emotional intelligence. Consultants, practitioners, and trainers can use such a measure to assess their interventions to increase emotional intelligence among employees, and researchers can assess the construct's importance. Additionally, standardized measures of this type of intelligence can generate new research streams (cf. House and Aditya, 1997).

Salovey and Mayer (1989-90) originally defined emotional intelligence as the "ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and use this information to guide one's thinking and actions" (p. 189). Individuals high on emotional intelligence defer immediate gratification and exhibit self-control in order to optimize pleasure over their lifetime. Also, they display enlightened self-interest by engaging in activities that are both pro-individual and pro-social. Finally, they neither over-repress nor over-express emotionality, but rather feel emotions flexibly and appropriately to the situation (Mayer and Salovey, 1995).

Daniel Goleman, author of the best-selling book titled <u>Emotional Intelligence</u> (1995) and more recently <u>Working with Emotional Intelligence</u> (1998), indicates that emotional intelligence is a multidimensional construct. He suggests that the five underlying factors of emotional intelligence are: (a) empathetic response, the facility to pick up on others' feelings; (b) mood regulation, the capacity to control negative emotions; (c) interpersonal skill, social competence to interact smoothly with others; (d) internal motivation, the ability to delay gratification in pursuit of a goal; and (e) self-awareness, psychological insight into one's own true feelings. These five dimensions were used in the development of an emotional intelligence measure.

Construct Validity

In attempting to determine the construct validity of a new measure, it is necessary to examine the nomological network of the instrument by assessing its convergent and divergent properties. To establish convergent validity, the emotional intelligence measure is compared to two constructs: (a) proactive personality, and (b) personal control. Divergent validity is evaluated by comparing the focal instrument to: (a) emotional exhaustion, and (b) irritability/ verbal hostility.

Those with a proactive personality look for opportunities, seek improvement, and want to make a constructive difference. They enjoy overcoming obstacles and challenging the status quo. They are goal-oriented, initiate change, and persevere until a task is accomplished (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Proactive personalities are action-oriented individuals who, rather than being constrained by a situation, look for ways to change, manipulate, and exploit the environment (Seiber, Crant, & Kraimer, 1999). Similarly, individuals high on emotional intelligence are adaptive. They understand how their behaviors contribute to life's outcomes, so they actively engage in goal-setting and planning. They are willing to accept challenging tasks, persist in the face of adversity, and reward themselves for their accomplishments (Goleman, 1995). Thus, high convergent validity would be expected between emotional intelligence and proactivity.

Those individuals who are low on personal control like being told what to do and avoid autonomy so they don=t get into trouble. They prefer that a supervisor dictate rather than involve them in decision-making. They like the familiar and routine. In contrast, those high on personal control are not passive and helpless when it comes to work. They feel a sense of empowerment and want to take action. They persist in the face of obstacles (Frese, Kring, Soose, & Zempel, 1996). Additionally, those high on personal control, like those high on emotional intelligence, feel more connected and socially integrated at work (Ross & Wright, 1998). Emotionally intelligent individuals display initiative, strive for improvement, and show flexibility while toiling through task performance (Goleman, 1998b). Emotionally intelligent individuals are optimistic. They believe they can influence their environment, so they are self-motivated to do so (Sosik & Megerian, 1999). They are self-confident, sure of their capabilities, and want responsibility/control. Resultantly, they like being autonomous, making decisions, and engaging in calculated risks (Goldman, 1998b; Salovey & Mayer, 1989-90). Given the similarities between personal control and emotional intelligence, the constructs should be highly correlated.

Emotional exhaustion, with the associated feelings of being over-extended and psychologically drained, is the key component of burnout (Schutte, Toppinen, Kalimo, & Schaufeli, 2000). Emotional exhaustion is the opposite of enthusiasm, commitment, energy, spirit and creativity (Layman & Guyden, 2000). Individuals who feel emotionally exhausted are typically drained, fatigued and stressed (Maslach & Jackson, 1984). Relatedly, those low in emotional intelligence are likely to feel unrewarded, underappreciated, and distressed (Salovey & Mayer, 1989-90). This negative affectivity translates into emotional exhaustion in the workplace (cf. Staw, Bell & Clausen, 1986). In contrast, those scoring high on emotional intelligence are able to challenge their foul moods and not dwell on negative thinking (Mayer &

Salovey, 1995). Further, those high on emotional intelligence are even-tempered (Sosik & Megerian, 1999), not irritable or verbally hostile. People who are irritable are impatient, lose their tempers easily, are grouchy, and let unimportant irritations bother them. Behaviors associated with verbal hostility include getting into arguments, using strong language, raising voices, and saying disagreeable things (Richins, 1983). When anger is counterproductive in a situation, and an individual continues to behave with irritability and hostility, low emotional intelligence is being displayed (Mayer & Salovey, 1995). Therefore, there should be negative relationships between irritability/verbal hostility and emotional intelligence and between emotional exhaustion and emotional intelligence.

There may be some emotional intelligence differences between individuals based on demographics. For example, Goleman (1995) suggests that emotional intelligence increases with age. Additionally, there may be gender differences. For instance, women may have higher levels of empathy (Trobst, Collins & Embree, 1994) and be better at encoding and decoding nonverbal communication than men (Hall, 1987), thus implying a higher level of emotional intelligence. Therefore, older individuals should report higher levels of emotional intelligence than younger individuals and women should report higher levels of emotional intelligence than men.

The Investigation

Construction of the emotional intelligence measure occurred in three major phases. In the first stage of constructing the scale, one of the authors generated 269 positively and negatively worded items to represent the full range of the five emotional intelligence dimensions. Consistent with the theoretical underpinnings of extant research on emotional intelligence, the basis of these items were derived directly from Goleman's (1995) conceptualization of the emotional intelligence dimensions. Next, the second author assessed the items for clarity and meaningfulness, sorting the items back into the five intended theoretical dimensions. This judge trimmed all dimensions back to 16 items each, retaining the items that were evaluated to best represent the dimension. In the second stage, a total of 80 items were then examined in Study 1 with undergraduate students to determine the factor structure and the reliabilities of the intended instrument. In the final stage (Study 2), MBA student respondents were surveyed to examine the emotional intelligence construct's nomological validity. Student samples were deemed appropriate because of the independence of emotional intelligence and extensive work experience (Goleman, 1998).

Study 1

The development of a multi-item measure involves not only item generation and content validity verification, but also an assessment of the individual items and establishment of the new measure's reliability (Churchill, 1979; Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1987). The items generated by the authors should load cleanly on the five theoretical dimensions of emotional intelligence (Hair, Anderson & Tatham, 1987). Additionally, items lowering internal consistency should be identified and deleted. Nunnally (1978) suggests as a guideline that reliabilities should be above a = .70.

Method

Sample

To ensure the likelihood of sufficient score variation in Study 1, surveys were administered to students in variety of business classes from the sophomore level through foundation courses in the MBA program at a large regional university in the southeastern United States. A total of 344 surveys were distributed during class periods. Five of these were not sufficiently completed and were removed from the sample, leaving a total of 339 surveys.

Demographic information was collected on chronological age, gender, ethnic background, and numbers of hours employed per week. The average age of the respondents was 24 years old, 51.5 percent were female, 77.1 percent were Caucasian while 12.4 percent were African-American, and the average hours of employment per week were 20.5.

Procedures

The surveys were administered during class time in Study 1. It was emphasized that completion of the survey was voluntary. Anonymity of the respondents was protected in that names were not requested, and surveys were placed in an individual envelope upon completion. The following prefatory instructions introduced the survey. "This survey includes statements for measuring how you have felt and acted during your everyday encounters over the past few months. It was prepared by university researchers to learn more about how a select group of students generally feel about their life and work. Your responses will be <u>completely confidential</u>. In no instance will an individual be identified as having provided a particular response. The data will be used for research purposes only. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. The best answer is one that is honest. For each statement below, decide which response best indicates your attitude or position - how much you agree or disagree with the statement. Place the number of the response on the line at the left." The 80 items were anchored with a five-point rating scale ranging from 1 for "Strongly Disagree" to 5 for "Strongly Agree."

Results

Analyses were conducted on Study 1 data to examine the factor structure of the construct and to determine the reliabilities of the overall measure and its dimensions. The pool of 80 emotional intelligence items was interpreted using principal-axes factor analysis with an orthogonal rotation to a varimax criterion. The researchers extracted five factors, and items with loadings greater than .40 were initially examined. Factor 1 was identified as Empathetic Response (13 items); Factor 2 as Mood Regulation (15 items); Factor 3 as Interpersonal Skills (13 items); Factor 4 as Internal Motivation (11 items); and Factor 5 as Self-Awareness (10 items). Given that multidimensional measures are ideally reduced to the same number of items per factor and that long measures can result in response fatigue, the dimensions were tailored to six items each (Rummel, 1970). All items with loadings at or above .30 on other dimensions were eliminated and the highest remaining loadings on the respective dimensions were chosen. The retained 30 items and their loadings from this initial extraction are reported in Table 1.

Table 1
Factor Analysis of the 80 Items: Five-Factor Solution

Factors	1	2	3	4	5
E16 I am keenly aware of feelings of other people	.72	.04	.15	-.01	.11
E17 I am gifted at sensing what others around me are feeling.	.81	.01	.02	-.01	.05
E21 I pick up the subtle signals of feelings from another person.	.60	-.04	.09	.09	.19
E40 I have good insight into how others are feeling.	.75	.02	.11	.15	.13
E65 I am astute at reading other's reactions and feelings.	.73	.14	.06	.12	.10
E76 I have an aptitude for reading other's feelings.	.76	.05	.17	.03	.01
R14 My emotions are often out of control.	-.08	.57	.13	.01	.14
R25 I can often shrug off a foul mood and go on with my day.	.06	.63	.09	.10	-.01
R38 I feel negative emotions more strongly than other people.	-.09	.59	.18	-.03	-.06
R63 I can regulate my moods so that they don't overwhelm me.	.15	.60	-.02	.21	.07
R67 I have emotional battles inside me that interfere with my thoughts.	-.08	.59	.18	.08	.14
R77 My feelings are so intense that I often feel overwhelmed.	-.07	.65	.05	.02	.13
I30 I have good people skills.	.27	.05	.63	.24	-.02
I41 People seem to avoid interacting with me.	.14	.11	.64	.04	.06
I42 I am good at interpersonal relationships.	.29	.09	.55	.20	.18
I48 Socially, I could be described as awkward.	.14	.19	.62	.08	.20
I57 I have good social skills.	.21	.05	.69	.19	.11
I69 I could be described as a good team player.	.01	.13	.55	.21	.10
M6 I have the will to accomplish my goals.	.01	.13	.19	.55	.13
M13 I am almost always enthusiastic about pursuing my goals.	.12	.12	.12	.54	.19
M26 I relentlessly pursue any personal or work-related goals I set.	.04	.04	.04	.52	.03
M39 I have too little motivation to try hard enough to do well.	-.08	.18	.25	.56	.21
M49 I consistently pursue important goals.	-.02	.02	.19	.64	.12
M59 I am what others call a "self-starter."	.13	.11	.17	.58	.04
A37 I am always aware of my moods.	.16	-.11	.06	.08	.61
A15 I have good insight into what makes me tick.	.27	.14	.09	.25	.49
A43 Sometimes I'm in a foul mood and don't even know it.	-.07	.17	.07	-.09	.59
A44 I have difficulty describing my feelings to others.	.12	-.12	.18	.06	.60
A52 I can't put my feelings into words.	.14	.05	.21	.12	.49
A71 Other people have to point out that I'm in a nasty mood before I realize it myself.	-.05	.06	.13	.09	.57
Eigenvalues	4.8	5.9	3.0	2.8	2.6
% of item variance explained	18.5	7.4	3.8	3.5	3.3

An examination of the internal consistency and domain sampling adequacy suggested that these items sufficiently tapped the factor structure of emotional intelligence. Reliability for the overall measure was .86, and the reliabilities for the Empathetic Response, Mood Regulation, Interpersonal Skills, Internal Motivation, and Self-Awareness dimensions were .87, .77, .82, .76, and .69, respectively. Thus, the overall measure and its dimensions are adequately reliable, except for a lower than desired internal consistency of the Self-Awareness dimension. Correlations among the dimensions as well as with demographic variable are shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix with Undergraduates

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Emotional Intelligence	111.33	12.50	(.86)									
2. Empathetic Response	21.33	4.15	.58	(.87)								
3. Mood Regulation	20.92	4.22	.59	.04	(.77)							
4. Interpersonal Skills	24.29	3.70	.73	.39	.28	(.82)						
5. Internal Motivation	22.98	3.81	.67	.18	.30	.42	(.76)					
6. Self-Awareness	21.80	3.73	.64	.22	.24	.32	.29	(.69)				
7. Chronological Age (years)	24.18	5.83	.23	.13	.17	.07	.13	.23	(___)[a]			
8. Gender (Female = 1; Male = 2)	1.48	.50	-.09	-.08	.09	-.11	-.03	-.21	-.06	(___)[a]		
9. Ethnic[b] Background	1.23	.42	-.04	-.02	-.08	-.05	-.04	.08	-.06	-.11	(___)[a]	
10. Hours Worked per Week	20.55	14.12	.08	.06	.09	.11	.05	-.04	.08	.11	-.09	(___)[a]

Note. N = 339. For $r > .11$, $p \leq .05$; $r > .15$, $p \leq .01$. Reliability estimates are in parentheses.
[a] Not applicable
[b] Caucasian = 1; Other = 2

Study 2

To establish the construct validity of the self-report measure, Study 2 was conducted to test the relationships of the overall instrument and its dimensions with other established constructs.

39

Sample

Ninety MBA students at the large regional southeastern university completed surveys in Study 2 (100% response rate; 100% useable). Of these respondents, 43% were female, 49% were married, and the average age was 30.

Procedures

All surveys were distributed during class periods, and the MBA sample received similar instructions from the researchers as did the undergraduate students in Study 1. Directions for Section A of the questionnaire were "The survey begins with statements about your *PERSONAL FEELINGS*. For each statement below, decide which response best indicates your attitude or position - how much you agree or disagree with the statement. Place the number of the response to the left." A 5-point rating scale was used to measure responses (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). For Section B, the instructions were "Below are a number of statements each of which you may agree or disagree with depending on your own personal evaluation of *YOUR PRESENT JOB AND YOUR ROLE*. If you are a full time student, you may consider school to be your present job. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement." The final section of the survey asked for demographic-related information.

Measures

The following measures were used in Study 2 to assess construct validity.

Emotional Intelligence was tapped in the MBA sample (a = .91) with the 30 items developed in the first phase of this study. The 6-item dimensional reliabilities for the sample were: (a) empathetic response (a = .92), (b) mood regulation (a = .76), (c) interpersonal skills (a = .82), (d) internal motivation (a = .81), and (e) self-awareness (a = .70).

Proactive Personality Scale (a = .82) was gauged with seven items from the scale developed by Bateman and Crant (1993). One sample item is "I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life."

Irritability/Verbal Hostility (a = .70) was a seven-item measure from Richins (1983). Sample items include "I lose my temper easily but get over it quickly." and "I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me."

Emotional Exhaustion (a = .80) was a 3-item measure adapted from the Maslach and Jackson (1984) burnout scale. One sample item is "I feel emotionally drained from my work."

Personal Control (a = .80) was gauged using four reversed scored items from Frese and colleagues' (1996) control rejection instrument. A sample item is "I would rather be told exactly what I have to do. Then I make fewer mistakes" (reversed scored).

Results

For the MBA sample, convergent validity was supported as there was a positive relationship between proactive personality and perceived emotional intelligence (r = .61, p $\leq$ .01; empathetic response, r = .37, p $\leq$ .01; mood regulation, r = .38, p $\leq$ .01; interpersonal skills, r = .45, p $\leq$ .01; internal motivation, r = .70, p $\leq$ .01; self-awareness, r = .40, p $\leq$ .01). Also, there was a positive relationship between personal control and perceived emotional intelligence (r = .51, p $\leq$ .01; empathetic response, r = .37, p $\leq$ .01; mood regulation, r = .28, p $\leq$ .01; interpersonal skills, r = .36, p $\leq$ .01; internal motivation, r = .33, p $\leq$ .01; self-awareness, r = .46, p $\leq$ .01).

Further, divergent validity was supported with a negative relationship between irritability/verbal hostility and perceived emotional intelligence (r = -.53, p $\leq$ .01; empathetic response, r = -.37, p $\leq$ .01; mood regulation, r = -.53, p $\leq$ .01; interpersonal skills, r = -.32, p $\leq$ .01; internal motivation, r = -.27, p $\leq$ .01; self-awareness, r = -.41, p $\leq$ .01). Also, there was a negative relationship between emotional exhaustion and perceived emotional intelligence (r = -.39, p $\leq$ .01) though the interpersonal skills dimension was nonsignificant (interpersonal skills, r = -.19, ns; empathetic response, r = -.22, p $\leq$ .05; mood regulation, r = -.37, p $\leq$ .01; internal motivation, r = -.33, p $\leq$ .01; self-awareness, r = -.35, p $\leq$ .01). See Table 3

Table 3
MBA Sample

Factors	Emotional Intelligence ($\square$ = .91)	Empathetic Response ($\square$ = .92)	Mood Regulation ($\square$ = .76)	Interpersonal Skills ($\square$ = .82)	Internal Motivation ($\square$ = .81)	Self-Awareness ($\square$ = .70)
1. Proactive Personality ($\square$ = .82)	.61**	.37**	.38**	.45**	.70**	.40**
2. Irritability/ Verbal Hostility ($\square$ = .70)	-.53**	-.37**	-.53**	-.32**	-.27*	-.41**
3. Emotional Exhaustion ($\square$ = .80)	-.39**	-.22*	-.37**	-.19	-.33**	-.35**
4. Personal Control ($\square$ = .80)	.51**	.37**	.28**	.36**	.33**	.46**
5. Gender (female =1; male = 2)	-.07	-.05	.05	-.16	.06	-.13
6. Age (Years)	.16	.06	.14	.09	.10	.19
7. Marital Status (1= married, 0=other)	-.10	.02	-.19	-.13	-.14	.06

Note: n = 90. Correlations at or above $\pm$ .22, p $\leq$ .05 (*); at or above $\pm$ .28, p $\leq$ .01 (**).

In Study 2, the demographic relationships were not as expected for emotional intelligence or any of its dimensions. Older individuals did not report significantly higher levels of emotional

intelligence than younger ones (r = .16, ns) which may be due to limited variance in the sample. Further, women did not report significantly higher levels than men (r = -.07, ns.

Discussion

In Study 1, items tapping the five factors of emotional intelligence were identified and their psychometric properties examined. Factor analysis revealed 62 items that loaded cleanly on their respective factors, and these were trimmed to six items for each of the five factors. The overall measure was reliable (a = .86). All underlying dimensions displayed adequate reliability except that the self-awareness dimension was slightly low (a = .69). Correlations between the five dimensions ranged from .04 to .42.

For the MBA sample in Study 2, emotional intelligence was positively related to proactive personality and personal control and was negatively correlated with irritability/verbal hostility and emotional exhaustion. The age-emotional intelligence relationship was not significant for the MBA group (r = .16, ns), nor was gender-emotional intelligence relationship (r = -.07, ns). However, post-hoc analyses of data from the undergraduate students in Study 1 yielded linkages between two relevant demographic variables and the overall measure suggested: (a) increasing levels of emotional intelligence as one ages, and (b) possible underlying dimensional differences in emotional intelligence between male and female undergraduate students. Older individuals reported higher levels of emotional intelligence than younger individuals (r = .23, p ≤ .01), primarily due to the self-awareness and interpersonal skills dimensions (r = .23, p ≤ .01; r = .17, p ≤ .01, respectively). Women did not report higher levels of emotional intelligence than men in this sample (r = -.09, ns). However, using one-way analysis-of-variance, women were found to perceive themselves as having better interpersonal skills (F = 3.92, p ≤ .05) and more self-awareness (F = 14.88, p ≤ .01) than men. Men reported better regulation of moods than women at a marginal level of significance (F = 2.80, p ≤ .10), but there was no difference between the two groups on internal motivation (F = .22, ns) or empathetic response (F = 1.84, ns). Because of the mixed and weak results, the relationships between emotional intelligence and its dimensions with demographic variables seem to be inconclusive.

While there is some variation among the results reported, these two studies appear to be instrumental in providing initial information on the psychometric properties and construct validity of a 30-item emotional intelligence measure. This measure should prove useful to consultants and practitioners who want to tap employees' perceptions of their emotional intelligence. Having this information can be of value as it appears that skills associated emotional intelligence can be learned (Goleman, 1995, 1998b). However, it should be noted that this is a self-reported measure of emotional intelligence. Therefore, some social issues (such as impression management) or personality types (such as the narcissists) may influence the respondents= answers. In addition, this instrument needs further external validation in organizations where there are wide variations in emotional intelligence.

Increasing emotional intelligence in the workplace through training and development efforts could help organizations in several ways. For example, workers with high emotional intelligence will provide customers with more empathetic and respectful service (O'Brien, 1996).

42

In addition, the performance of teams would be facilitated (Gibbs, 1995; Martinez, 1997). Further, high emotional intelligence would translate into better collaborative relationships across cultures (cf. Brown, 1994) and better leadership skills (Goleman, 1998a).

Once the trainer has successfully raised the emotional intelligence of employees, managers may have to consider different control mechanisms. The exploratory studies examined here generally suggest that those high on emotional intelligence do not like being given orders. Further, the extant literature suggests that they prefer to be involved in establishing their own objectives. They want to be creative and flexible, emphasizing goals that are both good for them as individuals and good for others. Because those high on emotional intelligence are adaptable, they would avoid being controlled through continuance organizational commitment, becoming entrapped because of economic and sunk-cost issues. Further, they would likely become affectively committed to an organization only if there was true reciprocity in the exchange.

Individuals high in emotional intelligence are self-starters with insight into their personal decision-making processes. They are good at networking. These types of skills suggest that they would be more committed to their careers rather than to their organizations (Carson & Carson, 1998). Because workers can no longer count on their organizations for long-term employment, individuals with high emotional intelligence will likely have the appropriate skills to survive in today's fluid business environment. They are capable of weighing their own options and deciding on a career direction (Farnham, 1996; Koonce, 1996). Thus, emotional intelligence appears to be an important construct for researchers interested in loyalty and career issues.

Emotional intelligence seems to be an emerging area of study for management researchers, because it meets two important criteria. First, it is rational and, second, it is progressive (Abrahamson, 1996). It is rational in that organizational performance can be improved when workers' emotional intelligence is heightened. It is progressive in that it is a somewhat optimistic and spiritual view of human nature that is grounded in science (cf. Brandt, 1996). By using the 30-item measure developed these study, researchers have an opportunity to be on the forefront in this area of study, and trainers have the ability to assess the effectiveness of their interventions.

References

Abrahamson, E. (1996). Management fashion. <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, <u>21</u>, 254-285.

Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. <u>Journal of Organizational Behavior</u>, <u>14</u>, 103-118.

Bates, S. (1999). Your emotional skills can make or break you. <u>Nation=s Business</u>, <u>87</u>(4), 17.

Brandt, E. (1996). Workplace trends: Corporate pioneers explore spirituality. <u>HR Magazine</u> (Internet download), 1-5.

Brown, T. L. (1994, April 4). Conquering complexity. <u>Industry Week</u>, 19.

Carson, K. D., & Carson P. P. (1998). Career commitment, competencies, and citizenship. <u>Journal of Career Assessment</u>, <u>6</u>, 195-208.

Churchill, G. A., Jr. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. <u>Journal of Marketing Research</u>, <u>16</u>, 64-73.

Epstein, R. (1999). The key to our emotions. <u>Psychology Today</u>, <u>32</u>(4), 20.

Farnham, A. (1996, January 15). Are you smart enough to keep your job? <u>Fortune</u>, <u>133</u>, 34-40.

Fernandez-Araoz, C. (1999, July-August). Emotional intelligence. <u>Harvard Business Review</u>, <u>77</u>(4), 108-124.

Frese, M., Kring, W., Soose, A., & Zempel, J. (1996). Personal initiative at work: Differences between East and West Germany. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, <u>39</u>, 37-63.

Gibbs, N. (1995, October 2). The EQ factor. <u>Time</u>, 60-67.

Goleman, D. (1998a, November-December). What makes a leader? <u>Harvard Business Review</u>, 93-102.

Goleman, D. (1998b). <u>Working with emotional intelligence</u>. Bantam Books, New York.

Goleman, D. (1995). <u>Emotional intelligence</u>. New York: Bantam Books.

Hall, J. A. (1987). On explaining gender differences: The case of nonverbal communication. In P. Shaver & C. Hendrick (eds.), <u>Sex and gender, volume 7: Review of Personality and Social Psychology</u> (pp. 177-200). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hair, J. G., Jr., Anderson, R E., & Tatham, R. L. (1987). <u>Multivariate data analysis</u> (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? <u>Journal of Management</u>, <u>23</u>, 409-473.

Huy, Q. N. (1999). Emotional capacity, emotional intelligence, and radical change. <u>Academy of Management, 24</u>, 325-345.

Koonce, R. (1996, February). Emotional IQ, a new secret of success? <u>Training & Development</u>, <u>50</u>, 19.

Layman, E. J., & Guyden, J. A. (2000). Renewal versus burnout: A career blueprint. <u>The Health Care Manager</u>, <u>18</u>(3), 52-62.

Martinez, M. N. (1997, November). The smarts that count. <u>HRMagazine</u>, 72-78.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1984). Patterns of burnout among a national example of public contract workers. <u>Journal of Health and Human Resources Management</u>, Spring, 189-212.

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

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1995). Emotional intelligence and the construction and regulation of feelings. <u>Applied & Preventive Psychology</u>, <u>4</u>, 197-208.

Nunnally, J. (1978). <u>Psychometric theory</u> (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

O'Brien, M. (1996, April). Developing your `EQ'. <u>HRFocus</u>, 3.

Ree, M. J., & Earles, J. A. (1993). *g* is to psychology what carbon is to chemistry: A reply to Sternberg and Wagner, McClelland and Calfeee. <u>Current Directions in Psychological Science</u>, <u>1</u>, 11-12.

Reich, R., & Goleman, D. (1999). Point-counterpoint. <u>Training</u>, 53(4), 26-31.

Richins, M. L. (1983). An analysis of consumer interaction styles in the marketplace. <u>Journal of Consumer Research</u>, <u>10</u>, 73-82.

Ross, C. E., & Wright, M. P. (1998). Women's work, men's work, and the sense of control. Work and Occupations, 25, 333-355.

Rummel, R. J. (1970). Applied factor analysis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern U.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1989-1990). Emotional intelligence. Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9(3), 185-211.

Scarpello, V. & Vandenberg, R. J. (1987). The satisfaction with my supervisor scale: Its utility for research and practical applications. Journal of Management, 13, 447-466.

Schutte, N., Toppinen, S., Kalimo, R., & Schaufeli, W. (2000). The factorial validity of the Maslach burnout inventory--general survey (MBI-GS) across occupational groups and nations. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73, 53-66.

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

Staw, B. M, Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. Administrative Science Quarterly, 31, 56-77.

Sternberg, R. J. (1997). Managerial intelligence: Why IQ isn't enough. Journal of Management, 23, 475-493.

Sternberg, R. J. (1988). The triarchic mind: A new theory of intelligence. New York: Viking-Penguin.

Tossman, D. (1999). EQ--vogue or value? New Zealand Management, 46(5), 34-36.

Trobst, K. K., Collins, R. L., & Embree, J. M. (1994). The role of emotion in social support provision: Gender, empathy and expressions of distress. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11, 45-62.

Measuring emotional intelligence: Development and validation of an instrument. Journal of Behavioral and applied Management, 2(1), 810. Cerasoli, C., Nicklin, J., Ford, M. (2014). Improving Emotional Intelligence through Personality Development: The Effect of the Smart Phone Application based Dharma Life Program on Emotional Intelligence. Frontiers in Psychology, 9, 169. http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00169. Prochazkova, E., & Kret, M.E. (2017). Running head: DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF SECQ. Volume 4, Number 2, November 2012 pp 27-42. www.enseceurope.org/journal. Reliable and valid measures of children's and adolescents' social emotional competence (SEC) are necessary to develop in order to assess their social emotional development and provide appropriate intervention in child and adolescent development. A pool of 25 items was created for the Social Emotional Competence Questionnaire (SECQ) that represented five dimensions of SEC: self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, relationship management and responsible decision-making. A series of four studies are reported relating to the development and validation of the measure.