International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Clarifying the Meaning of Emotional Intelligence

Nematullah Islmzai
Research Scholar, Department of Management, Faculty of Management Studies, University of Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

* Corresponding Author: **Nematullah Islmzai**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2582-7138
Volume: 05
Issue: 06
November-December 2024
Received: 12-10-2024
Accepted: 16-11-2024
Page No: 1071-1080

Abstract
The idea of emotional intelligence (EI) has been the subject of much debate and misunderstanding. There are three things that have bothered me the most. First, there are numerous competing definitions and models of emotional intelligence. In order to resolve this, I suggest that we first make a distinction between definitions and models before settling on a single definition that appears to be supported by the majority of theorists. I also suggest that we make a clearer distinction between emotional intelligence (EI) and the associated idea of emotional and social competence (ESC). The second matter that has caused concern is the validity of the current measures. After going over the studies on the psychometric characteristics of a number of widely used tests, I come to the conclusion that all of them have intrinsic limitations, even though many of them have some support. In addition to creating new measurements that are more context-sensitive, we also need to rely more on alternative measurement techniques that have been around for a while. The importance of Emotional Intelligence (EI) for outcomes like job performance or leadership effectiveness is the third point of disagreement. Unknown to the critics of the past, recent research indicates that emotional intelligence (EI) and performance are positively correlated. But in many cases, some ESCs are probably better at predicting performance than EI. Additionally, in some types of situations, including those involving social contact or high levels of stress, EI is probably going to be more crucial.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2024.5.6.1071-1080

Keywords: Emotional intelligence, The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), model, Emotional and social competence (ESC)

Introduction

In the past twenty years, psychology has seen a resurgence of interest in the subject of emotion (Barsade, Brief, & Spataro, 2003) [8]. "Emotional intelligence" (EI) has become one of the most well-liked subfields within the field of study. "The ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others" is the definition of emotional intelligence (EI) according to Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2000), p. 396. EI has been studied by researchers in a range of settings, such as education, social adjustment, health, and personal associations, as well as employment (Mayer, Roberts, & Barsade, 2008) [8]. At first, anecdotal evidence which suggests that mental aptitude alone is insufficient for success in life fueled interest in the topic. Additionally, clinical experience provided solid evidence that an individual may have high IQs on conventional intelligence tests but low performance in social and self-regulation domains. Asperger's syndrome serves as an example. Additionally, there were striking illustrations from the literature on neuroscience, including the story of a bright lawyer who had surgery to remove a tumor in the brain. His cognitive abilities were unaffected by the procedure, but he was hardly able to work and his social interactions had significantly declined. An MRI revealed that the neural connections that link the prefrontal cortex to the affective regions of the brain had been injured during the procedure, impairing his ability to make even the most basic decisions (Damasio, 1994) [24]. When combined, these instances showed that emotional intelligence has a significant role in performance and adaptability.

Three tenets form the foundation of the EI philosophy. The first is that feelings are significant in life. Second, different persons have different capacities for sensing, processing, using, and controlling emotions. Thirdly, these distinctions impact an individual's ability to adapt in diverse circumstances, including the place of employment. These fundamental ideas appear to be obvious. But opinions on the concept of emotional intelligence (EI) have diverged widely, particularly in the field of industrial-organizational psychology (I-O) (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005) [2]. Indeed, as noted by Spector and Johnson (2006), "emotional intelligence may be the construct in the social sciences that has generated the greatest controversy in recent years." (Page 325). The idea has been the subject of wild claims that have strongly sparked suspicion. On the one hand, proponents contend that EI is more crucial to effectiveness on an individual and organizational level than IQ. However, some detractors contend that Emotional Intelligence (EI) is just a brand-new umbrella term for ideas that have been present for decades and that it has little bearing on an individual's achievement or quality of life. The reality of EI appears to be more nuanced than either of these extreme viewpoints portray, as is frequently the case. After outlining the most widely used methods for identifying and assessing emotional intelligence, I'll talk about three topics that have sparked the greatest discussion. First, there are numerous competing definitions and models of emotional intelligence. I will propose that distinguishing between definitions and models is one method to address this problem. In fact, there appears to be a great deal of consensus regarding the definition of EI. It is relatively easy to determine which models and measurements are consistent with this common definition once we embrace it. It also becomes evident that the term emotional intelligence (EI) frequently refers to two distinct conceptions. Emotional intelligence is one. and social and emotional competency is the other. Making the distinction between these two concepts helps facilitate clearer communication and thinking in the field. Measurement is the subject of the second problem. Although considerable research has been done to support the construct validity of a number of measures, the majority of widely used measures still need improvement, which is understandable considering how new the discipline is. Future studies on assessment in other fields may pave the path for improved EI metrics. The third concern is the significance of Emotional Intelligence (EI) for key organizational outcomes like job performance and leadership effectiveness. A growing number of researches—published in reputable, peer-reviewed journals—indicates that emotional intelligence (EI) is relevant to work-related processes. Additionally, a number of researches imply that unique variance is explained by EI (incremental validity). Furthermore, an increasing number of researches indicates a connection between performance and emotional and social competence (ESC).

Literature review

The first "emotional and social intelligence" model developed by Bar-On in 1988. Bar-On was interested in determining the characteristics and abilities that enable individuals to adjust to the emotional and social pressures of daily life. According to his studies, these character traits include self-awareness, self-understanding, and self-expression; the capacity to deal with intense emotions and restrain one's impulses; the capacity to perceive, comprehend, and relate to others; the capacity to adjust to change and resolve issues of a social or personal character. His model consists of five essential components: overall mood, stress management, flexibility, interpersonal skills, and intrapersonal abilities (Bar-On, 1997, 2006). The emotional quotient inventory and Bar-On's model are related (EQ-i), a self-report tool created by Bar-On in the middle of the 1980s that has gained popularity since the late 1990s. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso's study (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) is the foundation of another important model. They approached the subject with an interest in personality theory, the psychology of emotions, and mental skills, hoping to create a new, unique kind of intelligence.

According to Mayer, Roberts, *et al*. (2008) [13] and Van Rooy & Viswesvaran (2004), their model is regarded as a "mental ability" or "information-processing" approach, and measurements based on it typically correlate more highly with tests of cognitive ability than with tests of personality. According to Mayer, Roberts, *et al*. (2008) [13], there are four main elements (or "branches") to their model: the capacity to observe emotions, the capacity to use emotions to promote cognition, the capacity to comprehend emotions, and the capacity to regulate emotions. The Mayer–Salovey–Caruso emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT) is the most current measure to be produced by the model's inventors, despite the fact that several others have been created based on it. The MSCEIT is a capability test created to gauge emotional intelligence by assessing real-world performance on a variety of tasks. For example, evaluating the emotional expressions on several faces is one way to gauge a test-taker's emotional perception.

Boyatzis and Goleman's study (Boyatzis & Sala, 2004) [12] serves as the foundation for a third key paradigm of emotional intelligence. Their approach was created to include the social and emotional qualities that are associated with exceptional performance in the workplace, even if it was influenced by the earlier ideas of Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso. The research of McClelland (1973), Boyatzis (1982) [10], and Spencer and Spencer (1993) has a significant influence on the Boyatzis-Goleman model. The paradigm comprises several distinct talents arranged into four fundamental "clusters": relationship management, social awareness, self-management, and self-awareness. The emotional and social competence assessment and the emotional competence inventory (ECI) are the main metrics linked to this approach. stock (ESCI). These are "360 degree" or multirater instruments. Goleman (2006) has made a distinction between emotional intelligence (EI) and "social intelligence" (SI) in recent times. He has suggested that the final two elements of the original model which he now refers to as social awareness and social facility—be categorized as SI components.

"Trait emotional intelligence" is the most current model to surface. Given that it was created to incorporate many of the personal attributes found in previous models, this one may be regarded as a second-generation model (Petrides, Pita, & Kokkinaki, 2007). It is designed to incorporate all "personality facets that are specifically related to affect" and is based on a comprehensive review of early EI assessments. p. 274 in Petrides *et al*. (2007). The model comprises four elements: emotionality (emotional perception of self and others, emotion expression, and empathy), self-control (stress management, emotion regulation, and low impulsiveness), sociability (social competence, assertiveness, and emotion

management of others), and well-being (emotional confidence, happiness, and optimism) (Petrides *et al*., 2007). There is a tendency for the four models to be linked to distinct methods of measurement. Self-report measures have been the main means of operationalizing Bar-On's model and trait EI. A multirater instrument has been employed by Boyatzis and Goleman, whereas Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso have used ability tests. But in their analysis of the "three streams of research" on Emotional Intelligence, Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) [2] proposed that theoretical models and assessment methodologies should be distinguished from one another. A given theoretical model of emotional intelligence can be quantified in multiple ways. For instance, the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso model has served as the foundation for several researchers' self-report measures (Schutte *et al*., 1998; Wong, Law, & Wong, 2004). Likewise, Bar-On's EQ-i has a multirater version.

Research objective

The objective is to comprehensively clarify the meaning of Emotional Intelligence by addressing its theoretical foundations, identify the key components that contribute to its conceptual understanding, and explore its practical applications in various context

Research Methodology

The paper's foundation is a thorough analysis of secondary data gathered from several books, national and international journals, and public and commercial publications that are accessible on websites and in libraries and that cover a range of topics related to Emotional intelligence. This study also consists of desk research based on secondary data from several websites, journals, and papers. The purpose of this study was to gain a thorough meaning of emotional intelligence. The descriptive technique was employed to make the study convenient for doing research while maintaining the study's qualitative and quantitative components.

Current Arguments and Some The potential Answers

The idea of emotional intelligence has caused a great deal of criticism, as was already said. Among all the critiques that have been made, the most basic one is the disagreement over the definition of emotional intelligence. Since the other issues, such the importance of EI for work-related performance, depend on one's definition of EI, this one must be resolved first.

Difficulty of Clarity on Definitions and Approaches

The plethora of diverse definitions and models that have surfaced has alarmed proponents and detractors of the emotional intelligence concept alike. "The label 'emotional intelligence' has been rather haphazardly used to refer to a multitude of distinct constructs that may or may not be interrelated," according to Matthews, Emo, Funke *et al*. (2006) (p. 8). Murphy (2006) points out that there are a variety of meanings associated with the term "emotionally intelligent." Even more direct was Locke (2005, p. 428), who asked, "What does EI... not include?" Salovey, Caruso, and Mayer (2008, p. 503) stated that "too many different things are now covered by the term." Furthermore, "These [different] models have done more harm than good regarding establishing emotional intelligence as a legitimate, empirical construct with incremental validity potential," claimed Daus and Ashkanasy (2003, pp. 69–70) [3].

Despite the fact that opponents of the EI idea have focused a lot on the lack of consensus about definitions, this issue is not specific to EI. Notwithstanding a century of intensive research on the subject, there is still a great deal of debate over the definition of general intelligence. When asked to describe the idea of intelligence in the middle of the 1980s, a group of twenty eminent specialists on the subject provided two dozen alternative interpretations (Detterman & Sternberg, 1986). A sizable additional panel of specialists who were asked to weigh in on the issue stated that "Such disagreements are not cause for dismay." Although they may eventually result in them, fully accepted definitions are not usually the starting point of scientific study (Neisser *et al*., 1996, p. 77). It should come as no surprise that there are multiple models of emotional intelligence (EI) if intelligence experts are still stating this about conventional intelligence after a century of research. However, the widely differing perspectives on what Emotional Intelligence is appear to be a serious obstacle to the field's advancement and empirical validity.

In response to the issue of many definitions and models, various approaches have been taken. One approach is to utterly deny the idea of emotional intelligence (Landy, 2005; Locke, 2005). In response, Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) [2] asserted that the ideas of SI and EI differ significantly in a few key ways. They contend that issues with specific definitions, models, and metrics at this early research phase shouldn't force us to completely give up on the idea. They suggest that we ignore the erroneous assertions and concentrate on the increasing amount of study that has been published in peer-reviewed publications.

A second strategy for dealing with the issue of conflicting definitions and models is to accept and live with the plurality of opinions, at least for the time being (Bar-On, 2006; Emmerling & Goleman, 2003; Petrides *et al*., 2007). One issue with this approach is that the idea of emotional intelligence runs the risk of losing its significance due to the models' extreme differences from one another. For instance, in one study, there was only a.21 correlation between two of the models (represented by the EQ-i and the MSCEIT) (Brackett & Mayer, 2003). While having distinct models for a given construct is acceptable, it is difficult to claim that two models that share the majority of their measurements are measuring the same thing when they only share 4% of the variance. Using one of the current models is a third approach to solving the issue. And Prove beyond a reasonable doubt that it is the greatest. This strategy was used by Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) [2] to suggest that the field should use the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso model. While it is tempting to declare one model to be the only valid one, all of the existing models—including the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso model—have significant drawbacks. Per Matthews, Funke, Emo, and others (2006), Page 7 noted that the model might be overly restrictive: "Several traits commonly associated with emotional intelligence are eliminated, including emotional expressiveness, empathy, perspective-taking, and self-control." Additionally, rival models have distinct advantages. The fact that the broader models combine many of the social and emotional skills necessary for success in the workplace, in school, and in life is one of their advantages. Even Ashkanasy and Daus acknowledged that the larger, "mixed models" can be helpful for people who want to forecast, comprehend, and manage human behavior in organizations.

However, how are all of these models supposed to be classified as "emotional intelligence"? Coming up with a single definition of emotional intelligence (EI) could be a better idea than trying to prove that one model is the sole accurate one. The groups of skills and qualities that make up authentic models of emotional intelligence can then be identified using this shared definition. Such an approach presupposes that, despite a single definition, there may exist a multitude of distinct models. When Salovey and Mayer distinguished between intelligence and models of intelligence, they did it in a somewhat different context, which raises the idea of differentiating between "definitions" and "models." Following Wechsler (1958), they proposed that a wide range of intelligences, including emotional intelligence (EI), fit this broad definition of intelligence as the ability to "deal effectively with the environment" (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 187). On the other hand, there are several distinct models of intelligence that vary greatly from one another. For example, the well-known theory put forth by Spearman (1927) that all intellect is ultimately based on A single underlying factor ("g") is a model of intelligence rather than a definition of it. Despite being obviously at odds with Spearman's model of intelligence, emotional intelligence (EI) should nevertheless be classified as a form of intelligence according to the accepted definition.

This line of reasoning would guide our efforts to develop a shared definition of emotional intelligence (EI) and then assess suggested models and metrics against it. Is it now feasible to pinpoint a standard definition that the majority of academics and thinkers appear to agree upon? A survey of the literature indicates that most researchers have adopted a fundamental concept put forward by Mayer *et al*. in their earlier works, despite the fact that there isn't universal agreement. According to Mayer *et al*. (2000), p. 396, the definition of emotional intelligence (EI) is "the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others." Their current paradigm, which incorporates the four fundamental skills of recognizing, utilizing, comprehending, and controlling emotion, was developed from an early version.

This term appears to be included in the work of Boyatzis and Goleman, Petridis, and Bar-On (Ciarrochi, Forgas, & Mayer, 2001; Daus, 2006). An "emotional intelligence competency," for example, is "the ability to recognize, understand, and use emotional information about oneself that leads to or causes effective or superior performance," according to Boyatzis (2009). In general, the construct of emotional intelligence (EI) posits that individuals differ in how much they pay attention to, process, and use affect-laden information of an intrapersonal (managing one's own emotions) or interpersonal (managing others' emotions) nature. Petrides and Furnham (2003, p. 39) stated as much. Though Bar-On's idea is more comprehensive, it does contain the following aspects of the definition provided by Mayer *et al*.: definition Throughout history, emotional-social intelligence has been described, defined, and conceptualized in various ways. These have typically included one or more of the following essential elements: (a) the capacity to identify, comprehend, and communicate emotions and feelings; (b) the capacity to comprehend others' emotions and relate to them; (c) the capacity to regulate and control emotions; (d) the capacity to change, adapt, and resolve interpersonal and personal problems; and (e) the capacity to produce positive affect and be self-motivated (Bar-On, 2006, p. 3).

In their later works, Mayer *et al*. also stray somewhat from their original definition. According to Mayer, Roberts *et al*. (2008), p. 511, they have redefined emotional intelligence (EI) as "the ability to carry out accurate reasoning about emotions and the ability to use emotions and emotional knowledge to enhance thought." The original four fundamental skills of recognizing, utilizing, comprehending, and controlling emotion are still included in their model and assessment of emotional intelligence. Therefore, even though there isn't unanimous agreement, the majority of prominent theorists appear to agree that emotional intelligence (EI) is defined as "the capacity to recognize and articulate emotion, integrate emotion into cognition, comprehend and rationalize emotion, and control emotion in oneself and others" (Mayer *et al*., 2000, p.396).

An additional benefit of this definition is that it appears to satisfy a prerequisite for a concept to be classified as an intelligence: it is composed of a collection of conceptually related skills, including reasoning, problem-solving, and information processing (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999). Certain models appear to fit better than others when we apply this widely accepted definition of emotional intelligence to the different models that have been put out. Unsurprisingly, the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso model fits well. Still, alternative models satisfy the definition as well. Palmer, Gignac, Ekermans, and Stough (2008), for instance, discovered empirical support for a seven-factor model by starting with the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso description and model. The seven Emotional self-awareness, emotional expression, emotional awareness of others, emotional reasoning, emotional self-management, emotional management of others, and emotional self-control were the factors that surfaced. Based on this concept, they have created a multirater measure intended for use in professional settings (Palmer, Stough, Hamer, & Gignac, 2009).

Some of the existing models appear to go way beyond the basic definition, even though more than one can fit it. They encompass characteristics and other human attributes (including drive for achievement, adaptability, contentment, and self-worth) that don't seem to fit the criteria. There are significant issues for the field if these models are seen as representations of EI. Even while these more inclusive models don't technically fit the definition of "emotional intelligence," they nonetheless have a purpose. They offer a helpful inventory of the character traits that most significantly support adaptation in addition to cognitive intelligence. What models, then, are not to be regarded as EI models if these ones?

One way to conceptualize them would be as ESC models. Any "personality trait that contributes to or results in superior or effective performance" is referred to as a competency. Boyatzis (1982). Therefore, ESC stands for those competencies that are unmistakably related to emotional intelligence (i.e., the ability to recognize, express, comprehend, and control one's own and other people's emotions). An alternative perspective on the distinction is that ESC involves the brain regions linked to emotion. Since empathy depends on one's capacity to discern other people's emotions with accuracy, it is an ESC. Conversely, one example of a cognitive competency is analytical skill.

The original definition by Salovey and Mayer (1990, p. 199) contains this distinction between EI and ESC. For example,

they cited "charisma" as an illustration of how leaders employ emotional intelligence (EI)'s component of emotion control to "influence others "a Boyatzis-Goleman model capability. This contrast between the many competencies associated with emotional intelligence (EI) and the notion itself, based on a shared definition, aligns with the perspective of some detractors of the EI construct. According to Matthews, Emo, Funke, *et al*. (2006, pp. 4–5), intelligence is best understood as a "basic aptitude" and a "latent factor in a structural model of ability." Conversely, a competency is a "more loosely defined capability for performing some physical or mental activity that may be influenced by aptitude as well as learning and context." An "aptitude-knowledge continuum" has been proposed by other psychologists (Lichten & Wainer, 2000), wherein aptitude is defined as "the capacity to learn" and knowledge as "what a person actually has learned." (Roberts, Mayer, and others, 2008, p. 513). This idea leads one to believe that EI contributes to the ability required to build ESC.

It is suggested by this perspective that emotional and social competences like "influence" and "stress tolerance" are built upon the core EI abilities, such as emotional awareness. For example, people with the capacity to read others' emotions well (emotional perception) can utilize this knowledge to create more persuasive influence tactics. Additionally, social and emotional skills can reinforce one another. For instance, influence is a rather sophisticated social competency that appears to be based on simpler emotional competencies like optimism and self-worth.

It becomes evident that the abilities revealed in the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso model constitute emotional intelligence (EI), while the other three models mostly consist of social and emotional skills. This is in line with the basic concept of EI and the EI–ESC divide. Having said that, it is important to remember that this does not automatically make the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso model "better" than the others. As noted by McClelland (1973), long ago intelligence as it has been historically defined and tested was not as significant as competence in the end for success in the workplace and in life. But the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso model focuses on emotional intelligence, while the Bar-On, Boyatzis-Goleman, and Petrides models mostly address emotional intelligence (ESC). The area appears to benefit greatly from this differentiation between EI, which is based on a shared definition of the construct and different competences related to it. It is not a perfect solution, though; there will always be a gray area where it is hard to agree on whether or not some traits are indeed a component of emotional intelligence. However, concentrating on a standard definition of EI does provide the discipline some coherence without completely eschewing the more expansive models. It also makes it easier for us to discuss the numerous debates that have surrounded the idea of emotional intelligence.

The Measuring Issue

Measurement is a second contentious issue. There are many reasons why critics believe that the EI and ESC policies are insufficient. Numerous issues are raised by them in relation to the existing tests, such as their unstable factor structures, weak contract validity, and the absence of empirical evidence supporting either convergent or divergent validity (Conte, 2005; Matthews, Emo, Roberts, & Zeidner, 2006). According to some detractors, the EI concept itself precludes the development of suitable measurements (Matthews, Emo, Roberts *et al*., 2006; Murphy, 2006).

Examining the current body of evidence on the most widely used exams suggests a more nuanced picture. While there is some evidence to demonstrate validity and dependability, there are also some fundamental drawbacks and limits. While it is not difficult to analyze EI and ESC well, the most widely used methods appear to have certain fundamental flaws.

Emotional intelligence measurements. The MSCEIT appears to have the strongest correlation with EI of all the various measures that specifically aim to quantify it. backing for the veracity of its material. Its subtests not only closely follow the fundamental notion of emotional intelligence, but they also resemble an IQ exam in that they require the test taker to provide answers to several multiple-choice questions, each of which has a single correct answer. The MSCEIT's reliability appears to be sufficient, as evidenced by split-half estimates of.91 and.93 for the entire scale. The estimated test-retest reliability is r.86 (Mayer, Roberts, *et al*., 2008). Although they have often been above.75, internal consistency reliabilities have not been as excellent (Conte & Dean, 2006). Both the four-branch model that underpins the measure and a single underlying factor have been repeatedly validated by research on the factor structure of the measure. Regarding divergent validity, there is a weak association between personality tests and the MSCEIT. Agreeableness has the largest correlations (r.21 to.28) with the Big Five measurements. Less than.20 correlations are seen with the other four components (Mayer, Roberts *et al*., 2008).

For the MSCEIT, convergent validity presents significant challenges. The Japanese and Caucasian brief affect recognition test (JACBART) and the MSCEIT's emotional perception scales showed almost no correlation at all, and the correlation between the two measures was only r<.20 for the levels of emotional awareness scale (LEAS) and the MSCEIT (Mayer, Roberts *et al*., 2008). Conversely, the MSCEIT exhibits the kind of correlation one would hope for from a form of intelligence that is meant to be connected to but separate from other types of intelligence: r<.36 with verbal intelligence measures and r<.10 –.20 with other types of intelligence.

The MSCEIT's scoring system has drawn the most criticism from critics (MacCann & Roberts, 2008). Conventional intelligence tests consist of questions with a single, obvious correct response. But when it comes to an EI measurement, it might be challenging to determine whether a test item's response is correct or incorrect (Matthews, Funke, Emo, *et al*., 2006). The creators of the MSCEIT have addressed this issue by applying two distinct methods: expert scoring and consensus scoring. According to the first method, the majority of test takers' choices determine the right response. In the second method, a team of emotion researchers determines the right response. Thankfully, there has been nearly complete agreement between these two grading methodologies (r.96 to.98). Still, there are issues with scoring. Murphy (2006, p. 348) noted that "it is unclear whether a person simply has a new (and possibly better) way of thinking, or whether that person is low on that ability, when they think about the emotional domain differently from experts or from the average of several peers. "Another issue with the MSCEIT is that knowledge tests do not accurately reflect a person's true aptitude, and the MSCEIT is more of a measure of knowledge than ability. As mentioned by Spector and Johnson (2006, p. 335), The abstract evaluation of knowledge does not accurately represent the living

performance of emotional intelligence in the complex social context of everyday life. It may seem clear that grinning at someone can elicit a pleasant emotional response, but it may take a different skill to know when to smile in a real-time interaction and how to do so without coming off as phony or disingenuous.

To their credit, Mayer and his associates have acknowledged the shortcomings of the MSCEIT. They have acknowledged that "its factor structure remains open for discussion" and that "the present version of the MSCEIT may be insufficient to validly assess a person's accuracy in emotional perception" (p. 514). "There remains room for further understanding and substantial improvement in these and other areas," they noted in their conclusion (p. 514). Thankfully, new ability tests that appear to address some of the shortcomings of the MSCEIT are starting to surface. The situational test of emotional understanding (STEU) and the mood assessment are two prominent examples. (MacCann & Roberts, 2008).

EI and ESC's own reports. Over the past decade, information has also been gathered on the psychometric properties of self-report measures of EI. One of the most popular is the Schutte Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test (SREIT). The SREIT, based on the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso quadruple model of EI, consists of 33 items. Internal consistency reliability is high (r 0.90) and 2-week test-retest reliability is adequate (r 0.78) (Conte and Dean, 2006). Many researchers used only the total score for measurement, but one study found support for both a one- and four-factor solution, confirming the proposed factor structure (Saklofske, Austin, & Minski, 2003).

Discriminant validity research has been more inconsistent. For example, in a preliminary small study with only 23 college students, there was a strong correlation (r =.54) between Openness to Experience and the Big Five personality traits, but smaller (r =.21 to.28) and statistically nonsignificant correlations with the other personality components (Schutte *et al*., 1998). The correlations with the Big Five in a more extensive study varied from.18 for agreeableness to.51 for extraversion (Saklofske *et al*., 2003). One study found a strong association (r =.55) between the SREIT and pleasant mood (Schutte, Malouff, Simunek, McKenley, & Hollan- der, 2002). A different study found that there was an r.70 association with a psychological well-being measure (Brackett & Mayer, 2003). However, the SREIT went above and beyond what the Big Five explained in terms of variation in life satisfaction and depression proneness (Saklofske *et al*.). It is concerning for those who think that any construct that is meant to represent a type of intelligence should be somewhat connected with other types of intelligence that the SREIT appears to be unrelated to general intelligence as measured by the Wechsler (Saklofske *et al*.).

Bar-On's EQ-i is a self-report tool that is widely used to quantify ESC.

Fifteen distinct abilities and characteristics are covered by the test, such as social responsibility, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, stress tolerance, and empathy. The EQ-i's content validity as an EI measure is called into doubt because it leaves out several of the fundamental EI abilities, such as emotional perception and emotional understanding, and incorporates personality qualities that aren't typically regarded as talents. However, considering that it was "designed to examine... a conceptual model of emotional and social functioning," the content validity appears sufficient as an ESC measure. (Page 15, Bar-On, 2006). According to Bar-On (2004), internal consistency reliability ranges from.86 to.94, with an overall estimate of.97. After three months, test-retest reliability is.79 (Conte & Dean, 2006). Some research have not supported the original factor structure, which was composed of five basic factors (Bar-On, 2006; Palmer, Manocha, Gignac, & Stough, 2003).

There is insufficient evidence regarding the EQ-i's divergent validity. Research has indicated a significant degree of overlap with personality measures, but very little with measures of cognitive ability (Bar-On, 2006; Van Rooy, Viswesvaran, & Pluta, 2005). As an illustration, one study discovered that there was a.77 connection between the EQ-i and the Cattell's 16PF anxiety scale, which measures trait anxiety (Conte & Dean, 2006). Additionally, in a different study, the average correlation with a Big Five measure was.50 (Conte & Dean). In response, Bar-On (2006, p. 16) notes that eight research involving over 1,700 participants suggest that there is "probably no more than 15%" overlap between the EQ-i and personality tests. However, in two other investigations (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Grubb & McDaniel, 2007), the multiple rs ranged from.75 to.79 when the Big Five was used to predict EQ-i scores. Regarding convergent validity, reports indicate that the EQ-i has strong correlations (r.58 to.69) with other self-report measures (Bar-On, 2004).

There are certain clear restrictions on self-report EI or ESC measures. The most evident is that, particularly when such qualities are highly desired, people frequently have incorrect judgments of their own ability. This appears to be a specific drawback for assessments pertaining to the perception and comprehension of emotions. People's assessments of those skills will be more dubious the more deficient they are in these areas. For instance, a somewhat naive person with an anger management issue would state on a self-report assessment that he rarely becomes upset over things that irritate him. By adding "positive and negative impression indicators" to the EQ-i, Bar-On has attempted to address this issue; nonetheless, Grubb and McDaniel (2007) showed that scores on the EQ-i's abbreviated form can be changed.8 standard deviations by skillfully posing as respondents.

alternative operations. An effective substitute for self-report measures is the multirater or "360" evaluation method. Instead of depending solely on the subject's self-evaluations, multirater measures like the Genos EI Inventory, ESCI, and ECI need other people to rate the subject (Boyatzis & Sala, 2004; Palmer *et al*., 2009). Bias can also exist in other people's evaluations, of course, but multirater assessments counteract this by having multiple persons in various roles (boss, peers, subordinates, and customers) score the individual. Nevertheless, multirater evaluation is costlier and more sophisticated than self-report inventories or performance tests. and the politics of the social contexts in which it takes place have the potential to skew its outcomes. This could be one of the causes of the current dearth of published studies on the psychometric qualities of the most popular multirater instruments.

There are several different instruments that assess the same skills or characteristics in addition to the ones that specifically designate as EI or ESC exams. Numerous studies have been conducted on the psychometric qualities of some of these measures, some of which have been around for much longer. A measure of emotional perception, a key element of emotional intelligence, is the diagnostic analysis of nonverbal accuracy (DANVA) (Mayer, Salovey *et al*., 2008; Duke &

Nowicki, 1994). The Seligman attributional style questionnaire (SASQ), which gauges optimism and resilience, is an illustration of an ESC measure (Peterson & Villanova, 1988). According to Peterson, Maier, and Seligman (1993), the SASQ appears to be a reliable indicator of people's reactions to setbacks, hurdles, and challenges. This predictor of success is then applied to several domains, including sales and athletics. There are numerous recognized tests that can be used to gauge ESC or EI, the DANVA and SASQ being only two of them.

Apart from the above-mentioned drawbacks, the majority of EI and ESC measures also have a fundamental flaw in that they fail to take context into account. Decades of social psychology study have taught us that conduct can vary greatly depending on the context and circumstance. A single, heavily manipulated context is represented by a sample of behavior in any formal EI test. Performance assessments and self-report measures are both used to evaluate "respondent behavior": An organized scenario is presented to the test taker, and they have to react in a specific way. However, in real life, people typically have to react to situations on the spur of the moment without having a clear plan of action. McClelland (1973). Therefore, it's possible that the majority of ESC and EI tests don't really reflect how people react in everyday settings.

Since they have been aware of these drawbacks for many years, psychologists have created substitute techniques such behavioral event interviews and assessment centers (Lievens & Klimoski, 2001; McClelland, 1998). Spector and Johnson (2006) have proposed some interesting ways that could be used to assess at least some of the abilities associated with Emotional Intelligence (EI), even if these alternatives can be difficult to design and deploy. Role-playing games, for instance, could be used to gauge an individual's aptitude for consoling the distressed. These examinations are costlier than their online or paper-and-pencil counterparts, but considering the risks associated in using assessments for development or selection in the workplace, the expense might be justified.

The significance of Emotional Intelligence for Occupational Success

The suggested connection between emotional intelligence (EI) and significant outcomes like leadership effectiveness or work performance is another topic of debate (Antonakis, Ashkanasy, & Dasborough, 2009) [1]. This is a very significant concern for almost all of their clients as well as for many I-O psychologists. Again, it is important to be clear about whether we are discussing ESC or EI when analyzing the material related to this dispute. Most commonly, those who assert that emotional intelligence (EI) has a greater influence on performance than intelligence (IQ) have been discussing emotional intelligence (ESC) rather than EI. Emotional intelligence (EI)—which is the capacity to recognize, utilize, comprehend, and regulate emotions—is most likely not going to have the same direct correlation with performance as specific ESCs.

Take self-control or waiting for gratification, for example, as examples of emotional competencies that are similar to but distinct from emotional intelligence. In the well-known "marshmallow studies" at Stanford University, which were first carried out in the late 1960s, four-year-old were asked to wait for a researcher to return while they remained alone in a room with a marshmallow. They were informed that they could have two marshmallows if they could wait for the researcher to return. Ten years later, the kids who took part in the study were located by the researchers. Examples of emotional competences that are comparable to but different from emotional intelligence are self-control and waiting for pleasure. The famous "marshmallow studies" at Stanford University began in the late 1960s, when four-year-old were left alone in a room with a marshmallow and asked to wait for a researcher to return. If they could wait for the researcher to come back, they could have two marshmallows. The children who participated in the study were tracked down by the researchers ten years later.

It has also been discovered that children's academic achievement and EI are associated, however the relationship appears to be weaker. According to research, there is a weak but substantial association between school grades and EI as measured by the MSCEIT, with correlations ranging from.14 to.23 (Brackett, Mayer, & Warner, 2004; Or Connor & Little, 2003). As a result, while EI does appear to be a good predictor of accomplishment in children, more context-specific abilities appear to be a stronger indicator. Critics who doubt the ability of EI to anticipate outcomes typically don't take these ESCs into account. For example, Landy (2006) limited his critical examination of the idea of SI to studies that specifically utilized the phrase "social intelligence." He disregarded the numerous studies that indicate a favorable correlation between ESC and performance, such as those on self-control and delaying desire.

Regarding EI, if we limit our analysis to studies published in peer-reviewed journals, we discover that 12 studies (Coˆte´ & Miners, 2006; Day & Carroll, 2004; Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002; Elfenbein, Foo, White, Tan, & Aik, 2007; Feyer-herm & Rice, 2002; Lam & Kirby, 2002; Lopes, Grewal, Kadis, Gall, & Salovey, 2002) have found a correlation between EI and performance. 2006; Mueller & Curham, 2006; Rosete, 2007; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005; Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005); Matsumoto, LeRoux, Bernhard, & Gray, 2004). While some of these studies have concentrated on leadership, others have examined individual contributor performance. Peer and supervisor evaluations, organizational citizenship behavior, and more objective results like wage increases and negotiation outcomes have all been identified as dependent factors. Some of the results were really spectacular, even as others were weak or inconsistent. For example, a study conducted on a group of analysts and clerical staff reported a connection of.35 between the MSCEIT and EI, and a correlation of.43 between business rank and EI (Lopes *et al*., 2006). In a different study, executives working for a major public service firm reported that their EI, as determined by the MSCEIT, was connected with judgments of "achieved business outcomes" (r =.26) and "effective personal behavior" (r =.50) (Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005). Furthermore, research indicates that emotional intelligence (EI) is associated with outcomes that are not performance-based measurements but appear to be crucial for effectiveness in a variety of contexts and occupations. For instance, a number of studies have discovered a connection between the quality of social relationships and emotional intelligence (EI), as determined by performance tests like the DANVA or the MSCEIT (Brackett, Rivers, Shiffman, Lerner, & Salovey, 2006; Carton, Kessler, & Pape, 1999; Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000; Lopes *et al*., 2004; Lopes, Salovey, Coˆte´, & Beers, 2005). Additionally, studies have indicated a connection between psychological well-being and emotional intelligence (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Brackett *et al*., 2006;

Ciarrochi *et al*., 2000; Mayer *et al*., 1999). Lastly, a number of researches indicate that those with higher EI also tend to have lower levels of anxiety, depression, alcohol use, and illicit drug use (Bastian, Burns, & Nettlebeck, 2005; Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Brackett *et al*., 2004; Carton *et al*.; Matthews, Emo, Funke *et al*., 2006).

The outcomes of studies employing multirater or self-report EI assessments have been comparable. A minimum of thirteen studies have discovered a correlation between work performance and emotional intelligence (EI), as determined by assessments like the Wong–Law emotional intelligence scale (WLEIS) or the SREIT. (Carmeli, 2003; Foo, Elfenbein, Tan, & Aik, 2005; Jen- nings & Palmer, 2007; Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Hooper, 2002; Jordan & Troth, 2004; Law, Wong, Huang, & Li, 2008; Law, Wong, & Song, 2004; Rozell, Pettijohn, & Parker, 2006; Schutte, Schuettpelz, & Malouf, 2000; Semadar, Robins, & Fer- ris, 2006; Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004; Sy, Tram, & O'Hara, 2006; Wong & Law, 2002). For example, Semadar *et al*. observed a correlation (r.25) between EI scores and job performance as determined by annual performance assessments using the Swinburne University emotional intelligence test (SUEIT) among leaders in a division of a multinational manufacturing organization. A further study that employed the WLEIS with managers and food service employees discovered an r. 28 association between EI scores and managers' evaluations of employees' job performance (Sy *et al*., 2006).

The relationship between ESC and work performance has also been established (Bachman, Stein, Campbell, & Sitarenios, 2000; Chia, 2005; Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000; Dulewicz, Higgs, & Slaski, 2003; Frye, Bennett, & Caldwell, 2006; Hopkins & Bilmoria, 2008; Iordanoglou, 2007; Koman & Wolff, 2008; Nikolaou & Tsaousis, 2002; Offer-man, Bailey, Vasilopoulos, Seal, & Sass, 2004; Petrides & Furnham, 2006; Petrides, Niven, & Mouskounti, 2006; Rapisarda, 2002; Slaski & Cartwright, 2002). One instance was a study conducted on debt collectors, which discovered a correlation between job performance and EQ-i scores (Bachman *et al*.). In a another study, the TEIQue and the ballet dancers' dancing quality as judged by a panel of experts were associated (Petrides *et al*., 2006). Also, a study with MBA students who used the ECI discovered a connection between ESC and team performance over a period of 2 years (Rapisarda).

According to certain research, EI or ESC predicts performance even with general mental ability and personality factors taken into account (a phenomenon known as "incremental validity"). For instance, Rosete and Ciarrochi (2005) discovered that, in addition to personality traits and cognitive competence, the perceiving emotion scores on the MSCEIT predicted how goals were accomplished. After adjusting for scores on a Big Five personality model measure, EI predicted performance in another study that used the MSCEIT (Lopes *et al*., 2006). The favorable relationship between EI and performance persisted after researchers adjusted for personality using a Big Five measure, according to two separate studies that used the WLEIS (Law *et al*., 2004; Sy, Cote, & Saavedra, 2005). Furthermore, an ECI-based study discovered that even after adjusting for the Big Five, there was still a significant correlation between ESC and performance (Offerman etal.,2004). Therefore, the idea that there is a connection between EI or ESC and performance at work has a lot of support. Nonetheless, there are other reasons to consider these encouraging results cautiously. First, when general mental capacity and/or personality are partial led out, the connections are typically minor.

Additionally, a number of the studies have been based on student simulations; additionally, when conducting field studies, the researchers have occasionally included performance metrics such supervisor evaluations, the validity of which has been called into question. Furthermore, a lot of these so-called "positive" research had conflicting or inconsistent results. For instance, some EI dimensions may not predict performance in a study while others do, and performance may be predicted by one EI dimension in one study while it may be predicted by a different dimension in a separate study. Furthermore, EI may be able to forecast some performance metrics but not others. These discrepancies most likely stem from the fact that context has been mostly disregarded in the research. Performance-related EI is likely to depend on the nature of the work, the particular circumstances, the results, and the individuals involved. In professions like sales, politics, psychotherapy, and teaching where there is a lot of social interaction and influence, emotional intelligence (EI) is probably going to be more crucial (Antonakis *et al*., 2009). In a similar vein, team performance should prioritize EI over individual performance (Jordan *et al*., 2002; Troth & Jordan, 2004). Additionally, in high-stress circumstances, EI ought to be more important (Antonakis *et al*.; Daus, 2006). Additionally, one study discovered that when workers had lower cognitive ability scores, the relationship between EI and performance was substantially stronger (Cŏte´ & Miners, 2006). Future studies on the relationship between EI and performance should focus more on context. Additionally, we must take into account the varying impacts of particular EI skills. For instance, in certain situations, emotional perception might be more significant than in others, and in most situations, emotion management might be more significant than emotional perception.

Conclusion

The most crucial finding after analyzing the debates around the term emotional intelligence is that emotional intelligence and emotional or social competence should not be confused. Emotional intelligence (EI) should be defined as the fundamental skills of emotion recognition, regulation, and reasoning. It is best to consider other personal attributes that support positive work-related performance as competences rather than IQ. A distinction like this can assist shed light on some of the most difficult problems the discipline has faced in its first two decades of active research.

Making the distinction between ESC and EI can also assist us in resolving some of the most contentious and counterproductive debates in the profession. "Having a common definition of EI may serve to unite [a] field... that is for the most part fragmented based on preference for a particular model," noted one of the anonymous reviewers of an earlier copy of this study. Instead of conflicting Regarding the legitimacy of certain models, the EI-ESC distinction indicates that all of the major models are not only legitimate but also have the potential to be highly beneficial. Nonetheless, some of the most well-known and significant models are ESC rather than EI representations. Such a conceptual and definitional change shouldn't and does not mean that all disagreements and conflicts are resolved. However, it shifts the debate's focus to ultimately more

helpful questions, like "What proportion of the variance in significant outcomes is explained by ESC and how much by EI?" The differences between ESC and EI also suggest significant new directions for further study. The idea that EI and ESC will be correlated is one that needs more research. Furthermore, compared to EI, some ESC competences ought to be better indicators of particular outcomes. Another theory is that individuals ,those with high EI scores will be able to develop ESC more rapidly and apply it more skillfully than those with low EI scores. There are practical implications for the proposed distinction as well. It implies that, ultimately, concentrating on the selection and development of certain emotional and social competencies associated with emotional intelligence may be more beneficial than focusing solely on EI. For instance, educating aspiring executives how to be more stress-tolerant (an ESC) would be more beneficial than teaching them how to better recognize the emotional tone of a landscape or abstract artwork (one of the eight MSCEIT subtests).

Both self-report measures of ESC, like the EQ-i and TEIQue, and ability assessments of EI, like the MSCEIT, have their role. But since assessment has been studied and applied for decades, I have argued that there may be more accurate approaches to measure these two ideas. The difficulty lies in discovering novel strategies that are more cost-effective and efficient. Perhaps we can meet this problem with the aid of new computer-assisted simulations. Additionally, I have proposed that going forward, we concentrate more on how itThe link between EI or ESC and human functioning is moderated by the social situation. No doubt, in some circumstances the relationship between EI and performance will be stronger than in others. Additionally, a person's emotional intelligence will vary depending on the circumstance. Like other personal characteristics, EI can only explain a small percentage of the variation in significant outcomes. Situational factors are sometimes more modifiable and frequently have an equally significant, if not larger, impact. More than others, some work environments will promote emotionally intelligent conduct. Both emotionally intelligent individuals and emotionally intelligent environments need to be studied.

References

1. Antonakis J, Ashkanasy NM, Dasborough MT. Does leadership need emotional intelligence? The Leadership Quarterly. 2009;20:247–261.
2. Ashkanasy NM, Daus CS. Rumors of the death of emotional intelligence in organizational behavior are vastly exaggerated. Journal of Organizational Behavior. 2005;26:441–452.
3. Bachman J, Stein S, Campbell K, Sitarenios G. Emotional intelligence in the collection of debt. International Journal of Selection and Assessment. 2000;8:176–182.
4. Bar-On R. The development of a concept of psychological well-being. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rhodes University, Johannesburg, South Africa; c1988.
5. Bar-On R. Bar-On emotional quotient inventory: User's manual. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems; c1997.
6. Bar-On R. The Bar-On emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i): Rationale, description, and summary of psychometric properties. In: Geher G, editor. The measurement of emotional intelligence: Common ground and controversy. Hauppage, NY: Nova Science; c2004. p. 115–45.
7. Bar-On R. The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). Psicothema. 2006;18:13–25.
8. Barsade SG, Brief AP, Spataro SE. The affective revolution in organizational behavior: The emergence of a paradigm. In: Greenberg J, editor. Organizational behavior: The state of the science. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; c2003. p. 3–52.
9. Bastian VA, Burns NR, Nettlebeck T. Emotional intelligence predicts life skills, but not as well as personality and cognitive abilities. Personality and Individual Differences. 2005;39:1135–1145.
10. Boyatzis RE. The competent manager: A model for effective performance. New York: John Wiley and Sons; 1982.
11. Boyatzis RE. Competencies as a behavioral approach to emotional intelligence. Journal of Management Development. 2009;28:749–770.
12. Boyatzis RE, Sala F. Assessing emotional intelligence competencies. In: Geher G, editor. Measuring emotional intelligence: Common ground and controversy. Hauppage, NY: Nova Science; c2004. p. 147–180.
13. Brackett MA, Mayer JD. Convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of competing measures of emotional intelligence. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. 2003;29:1147–1158.
14. Brackett MA, Mayer JD, Warner RM. Emotional intelligence and the prediction of behavior. Personality and Individual Differences. 2004;36:1387–1402.
15. Brackett MA, Rivers SE, Shiffman S, Lerner N, Salovey P. Relating emotional abilities to social functioning: A comparison of self-report and performance measures of emotional intelligence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 2006;91:780–795.
16. Carmeli A. The relationship between emotional intelligence and work attitudes, behavior and outcomes: An examination among senior managers. Journal of Managerial Psychology. 2003;18:788–813.
17. Carton JS, Kessler EA, Pape CL. Nonverbal decoding skills and relationship well-being in adults. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior. 1999;23:91–100.
18. Chia YM. Job offers of multi-national accounting firms: The effects of emotional intelligence, extra-curricular activities, and academic performance. Accounting Education: An International Journal. 2005;14:75–93.
19. Ciarrochi JV, Chan AYC, Caputi P. A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. Personality and Individual Differences. 2000;28:539–561.
20. Ciarrochi JV, Forgas JP, Mayer JD. Emotional intelligence in everyday life: A scientific inquiry. Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis; c2001.
21. Conte JM. A review and critique of emotional intelligence measures. Journal of Organizational Behavior. 2005;26:433–440.
22. Conte JM, Dean MA. Can emotional intelligence be measured? In: Murphy KR, editor. A critique of emotional intelligence: What are the problems and how can they be fixed? Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; 2006. p. 59–77.
23. Côté S, Miners CTH. Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. Administrative Science Quarterly. 2006;51:1–28.
24. Damasio A. Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the

human brain. New York: Grosset/Putnam; c1994.
25. Daus CS. The case for an ability-based model of emotional intelligence. In: Murphy KR, editor. A critique of emotional intelligence: What are the problems and how can they be fixed? Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; 2006. p. 301–324.
26. Daus CS, Ashkanasy NM. Will the real emotional intelligence please stand up? On deconstructing the emotional intelligence "debate." The Industrial–Organizational Psychologist. 2003;41(2):69–72.
27. Day AL, Carroll SA. Using an ability-based measure of emotional intelligence to predict individual performance, group performance, and group citizenship behaviors. Personality and Individual Differences. 2004;36:1443–1458.
28. Duckworth AL, Seligman ME. Self-discipline outdoes IQ in predicting academic performance of adolescents. Psychological Science. 2005;16:939–944.
29. Dulewicz V, Higgs M. Emotional intelligence: A review and evaluation study. Journal of Managerial Psychology. 2000;15:341–372.
30. Dulewicz V, Higgs M, Slaski M. Measuring emotional intelligence: Construct and criterion-related validity. Journal of Managerial Psychology. 2003;18:405–420.
31. Elfenbein HA, Ambady N. Predicting workplace outcomes from the ability to eavesdrop on feelings. Journal of Applied Psychology. 2002;87:963–971.
32. Elfenbein HA, Foo M, White JB, Tan HH, Aik VC. Reading your counterpart: The benefit of emotion recognition accuracy for effectiveness in negotiation. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior. 2007;31:205–223.
33. Emmerling RJ, Goleman D. Emotional intelligence: Issues and common misunderstandings. Issues and Recent Developments in Emotional Intelligence. 2003 Oct;1(1). Available from: www.eiconsortium.org