CHAPTER 11

Emotional Intelligence

Bruce Peltier

> *The term* emotional intelligence *conveys some aspects of present-day zeitgeists; it captures something of the many competing interests or spirits of our age. In some contexts, it refers to an integration in the war between emotion and rationality throughout human history.*
>
> - Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000

> *Currently, EI mostly serves a cheerleading function, helping to whip up support for potentially useful (though seldom substantiated) interventions focused on a heterogeneous collection of emotional, cognitive, and behavioral skills.*
>
> - Mathews, Roberts, & Zeidner, 2004

Daniel Goleman's books sit on the coffee tables of many executives. His audiotapes are under their car seats. His work has become enormously popular in the world of coaching and organizational development. "EI" or "EQ" or "ESI" (Emotional-Social Intelligence), and "SEI" (Social-Emotional Intelligence) are buzzwords in training circles. Emotional intelligence joins the crowd of other intelligences such as "practical intelligence," "social intelligence," and the multiple intelligences of Howard Gardner. Because of EI's popularity and Goleman's claim that emotional intelligence can be more important than IQ, no modern book on executive coaching would be complete without a thorough discussion of this topic. It is clear that "EI appears to have a strong following in the business world." (Schmitt, 2006).

This chapter will explain emotional intelligence, its history and development, discuss important controversies, and describe some ways that coaches can effectively use the ideas that Goleman and others have promoted. While it is essential for coaches to understand the limitations and pitfalls associated with emotional intelligence, the EI phenomenon has potential to open doors and provides a powerful framework and vehicle for coaching.

History

Allusions to emotional and social intelligence have been made all the way back to Darwin (Bar-On, 2006), and the first mention of social intelligence in psychological literature can be found a century ago in the writings of John Dewey, the educational philosopher (1909, p. 43) where he defined social intelligence as "the power of observing and comprehending social situations…"

Edward Thorndike called attention to social intelligence in <u>Harper's</u> magazine in 1920. In that essay Thorndike, an educational psychology professor at Columbia University, made the following observation (p. 228):

> *The facts of everyday life, when inspected critically, indicate that a man has not some one amount of one kind of intelligence, but varying amounts of different intelligences…. No man is equally intelligent for all sorts of problems.*

He goes on to recommend that intelligence be measured in three domains; mechanical, social, and abstract. He describes social intelligence as "the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls—to act wisely in human relations." (p. 228). He notes the difficulty in measuring such intelligence and seems to equate social intelligence with empathy and niceness or "character." He also recommends that work assignments be matched to type of intelligence and provides the example of the superior technical worker who is promoted to a management position only to fail for lack of social skills. (p. 234).

David Wechsler, the creator of several mainstream IQ tests such as the WAIS (Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scales) and WISC (Children's version), defined intelligence as (1958)

> *…the aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally and to deal effectively with his environment."* (p. 7).

This basic, well-accepted definition does not exclude factors that are emotional, social, or non-cognitive. In fact, one of Wechsler's contributions to intelligence testing was his addition of a set of scales that tapped non-verbal skills using block designs and mazes (1981). His "picture arrangement" subtest measures a person's ability to understand common social situations. Shortly after releasing his first major IQ test he began to publish a series of essays about "non-

intellective" components of intelligence (1939). Wechsler was very aware of the limitations of cognitive intelligence. "Dealing effectively with one's environment" obviously requires more than just information and logic. In describing and defining intelligence he went on to write that (1958), "so far as general intelligence is concerned, intellectual ability, per se, merely enters as a necessary minimum." He foreshadowed modern advocates of EI by writing that "Every reader will be able to recall persons of high intellectual ability in some particular field whom they would unhesitatingly characterize as below average in general intelligence" (p. 7). In 1981 he wrote that

> Intelligence is a function of the personality as a whole and is responsive to other factors besides those included under the concept of cognitive abilities. Evidence…strongly implies the influence of personality traits and other nonintellective components, such as anxiety, persistence, goal awareness, and other conative dispositions. (p. 8)

It appears that the first actual use of the term "emotional intelligence" was by a German psychiatrist named Hanscarl Leuner, better known for his advocacy of LSD in psychotherapy. He published an essay in 1966 about women who did not accept certain aspects of gender role, coming to the conclusion that they had low "emotional intelligence."

During this same period psychologists were studying people who did not seem to respond well to psychodynamic psychotherapy. In particular, they were concerned about patients who were not good at introspection or intrapersonal insight, and possessed little emotional self-awareness. Some were diagnosed with psychosomatic illnesses (physical problems thought to have a psychological or emotional basis), and could not put words to their feelings. Clinicians called this condition "alexithymia," and contrasted it against something called "psychological mindedness," the capacity to notice and work with internal emotional states (Taylor & Bagboy, 2000; and McCallum & Piper, 2000).

Social intelligence was an important topic in psychology until interest withered in about 1970. Several formal tests were developed and tested, such as the George Washington Test of Social Intelligence developed by F.A. Moss in 1928 at George Washington University (Landy, 2006). The test had six components:

1. Judgment in Social Situations

2. Memory for Names and Faces

3. Recognition of Mental States from Facial Expression

4. Observation of Human Behavior

5. Social Information

6. Recognition of Mental States behind Words

In spite of how attractive these components appear, research using this instrument showed that people with high IQ tended to score high on the test, ostensibly because successful performance on the test depended on the use of language, "the ability to understand and work with words." This meant, of course, that the test was not measuring anything much different from existing cognitive and abstract intelligence tests. Landy's review of the history of social intelligence concluded that while the concept was very attractive, wishful thinking could not prevail in the face of "an unwillingness to practice the arduous exercises of the scientific enterprise." He went on to say that "It is tempting to come to much the same conclusion regarding current research on emotional intelligence." (p. 117).

In 1983 Howard Gardner offered seven types of intelligence in his theory of multiple intelligences. He was struck by the fact that people continued to adhere to the assumption that there is a single, general capacity of intelligence that every human being possesses to a greater or lesser extent (Gardner, 1993, p. x). His set of intelligences included

Linguistic Intelligence

The ability to understand and manipulate written and spoken words.

Musical Intelligence

The complex capacities to understand, appreciate, and make music.

Logical-Mathematical Intelligence

The ability to understand and manipulate numbers in order to solve numerical problems.

Spatial Intelligence

The ability to perceive a form or object and manipulate it in space. This intelligence is needed to read a map, find a store in a shopping mall, or create a piece of sculpture.

Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence

The ability to understand and manipulate one's physical body to accomplish everyday tasks, to dance, and play sports.

Gardner describes two "personal intelligences" that are distinctly human. They are of particular importance in a discussion of emotional intelligence, because they are so similar to the essence of EI:

Intrapersonal Intelligence

The ability to access and make use of one's own feelings.

Interpersonal Intelligence

The ability to notice and make distinctions about the moods, temperaments, motivations, and intentions of other people.

The first American use of the term EI can be found in an unpublished doctoral dissertation done by Wayne Payne in 1985 titled "A Study of Emotion: Developing Emotional Intelligence." This document asserted that (Hein, 2005):

> *…mass suppression of emotion throughout the civilized world has stifled our growth emotionally, leading us down a path of emotional ignorance.... We've done this because we have had the wrong idea altogether about the nature of emotion and the important function it serves in our lives.*

Payne advocated formal education in the effective use of emotions in everyday life. His dissertation did not seem to stir much interest at that time.

John Mayer, a professor at the University of New Hampshire, and Peter Salovey at Yale, were the first to make a serious academic inquiry of emotional intelligence. Their concern that intellect and emotion were generally seen as incompatible opposites motivated them to write an

article in 1990 (Salovey & Mayer) titled "Emotional Intelligence." Their efforts led them to develop one of the most important current models of EI (to be described later in this chapter). They were the first to take a serious look at the *construct* of emotional intelligence (its working definition) and to conduct serious scientific research. They focused attention on a set of *abilities* or *capacities* rather than traits. These abilities will be described later.

Emotional intelligence made its debut into the popular business and consulting world in 1995 with Daniel Goleman's publication of his book Emotional Intelligence. He had previously written two books, one on meditation and the other on self-deception, and had been writing a regular column for lay readers of psychology at the New York Times. Goleman knew of Mayer and Salovey's work and asked their permission to borrow the model and use the name "emotional intelligence" (Paul, 1999). The book was a commercial smash, selling millions of copies, and becoming one of the most successful ever for that publisher. Time magazine (Gibbs, 1995) put emotional intelligence its cover in huge red letters along with the words, "emotional intelligence may be the best predictor of success in life, redefining what it means to be smart." Goleman followed the initial commercial success in 1998 with Working with Emotional Intelligence and again in 2002 with Primal Leadership (with co-authors Boyatzis and McKee). His latest effort is titled Social Intelligence (2006), and all four of these books are available on audio media. He recently collaborated on a book describing ways to develop EI in children (Lantieri & Goleman, 2008).

Starting in 1997 Reuven Bar-On began a series of contributions which added another model of EI along with an instrument to measure it. Over the next decade he and colleagues produced a body of evaluative research that attempted to validate his model and his instrument. Bar-On's work will also be described later in this chapter.

Popularity

There are conflicts in the American psyche and business culture that help explain the attractiveness of emotional intelligence.

First, there is palpable resentment toward the concept of IQ and toward those who possess too much of it. One reviewer (Brody, 2006) even asserts that we "*hate g*," (*g* is psychological notation for a person's total overall intelligence). Intelligence or IQ can be intimidating, especially to anyone who was not on the fast track in school. Brainy types are not

universally respected or trusted in the mainstream American cultural view. Current emphasis on test scores (such as the SAT and ACT) in college admissions as well as IQ tests for entrance to private elementary schools have left many with a bad taste in their mouth regarding intelligence and related forms of testing. Some (Mathews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2002) have even observed *"an antipathy to people with high IQs in Western society."* Goleman has a chapter in his first book (1995) devoted to the ways that people with high IQ can do socially inept things (Chapter 3, "When smart is dumb") and Robert Sternberg, arguably the modern dean of intelligence theory edited a book in 2002 titled, <u>Why Smart People Can be so Stupid.</u> Several observers (Mathews, et. al, 2002; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000; and Paul, 1999) note that emotional intelligence serves as a counter balance to a book titled <u>The Bell Curve</u> (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994) published in the year prior to Goleman's first best seller. <u>The Bell Curve</u> was a polemic; it asserted that intelligence is normally distributed and immutable. Intelligence, it reported, was an important reason for the existence of social class, unequal distribution of wealth, and of poverty. It implied that people were successful because they were born with high IQ, and there is little that can be done after that. This was, "a rather pessimistic message for an egalitarian society and offered little hope for the future of those destined to be born into lower-class families or those coming from ethnic-minority backgrounds" (Mathews, et al., 2002). Some still had the 1984 movie "Revenge of the Nerds" in their consciousness, and everyone knew a technological whiz who could not manage or lead others.

EI was attractive, partly because it diminished the importance of IQ and symbolically opened the door to those who did not possess it. It more than leveled the playing field, and Goleman suggested that it could be taught and learned.

Second, emotional intelligence is popular because of the historic conflict between emotion and reason in western culture, combined with the tendency of American businesses to distrust or devalue feeling when compared to rational thinking and statistical analysis. Salovey & Mayer (1990) describe the Western view of emotions as "disorganized interruptions of mental activity, so potentially disruptive that they must be controlled." Recent business trends including Six Sigma, TOC (Theory of Constraints), TQM (Total Quality Management), and Kaizan (Continuous Process Improvement) all emphasized rational methods of progress and constant measurement of explicit goals or metrics. These methods were embraced by business schools in the 1990s. Feeling and emotion were squeezed out of decision-making. Then, emotional

intelligence came along in 1995 and provided plausible support for those who consulted feelings along with logic and reason.

Emotional intelligence also offers a pathway toward integration of rational thinking and emotion. That view makes it attractive to both parties to this historic argument. <u>Descartes' Error</u> by Antonio Damasio (1994) reported that decisions made in the absence of emotion are likely to be faulty, if not tragic. Damasio's research suggests that "without feelings, the decisions we make may not be in our best interest." (Grewal & Salovey, 2005, p.332). Emotional intelligence argues that emotions should inform reasoning and decision-making, a suggestion that is difficult to fault.

Furnham (2006) also notes that EI is popular because it is simple and supposedly learnable. Goleman's books in particular use positive anecdotes and success stories to make their points. Little about EI is counter-intuitive; it all makes sense, even to people uninterested in deep examination of workplace and personal problems. Furnham also notes that since EI focuses on individuals, it does not require that organizations change their ways. Emotional intelligence is about feelings, and it feels good.

Models of EI

While it is not obvious to popular consumers, there are at least three distinct models of emotional intelligence in the literature. Consultants can provide an important service to clients by understanding those models and implementing the most defensible aspects in consistent and useful ways. Executive coaches need to be able to articulate the most valuable concepts and components of EI in ways that make sense to clients. Executives who scan one of Goleman's popular books (or listen to it in their car) will not derive much of practical value without a coach. At best, they may perceive that emotional intelligence is just another way to emphasize "soft skills" in the workplace; at worst they may feel confused or at a loss to define the value of EI.

This section describes the three most important models of emotional intelligence along with a fourth possibility. The first is an "ability based method," the second and third are mixed models (consisting of a combination of traits, abilities, and personality characteristics). The models are presented in rough historical order.

Model 1: Mayer and Salovey's Four-Branch Model

John Mayer and Peter Salovey were the first to conceptualize EI in a comprehensive way, beginning with the idea of "emotional information processing." They first (Salovey & Mayer, 1990) defined emotional intelligence as "the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and action." They refined their definition years later (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) to mean "the ability to perceive emotion, integrate emotion to facilitate thought, understand emotions, and to regulate emotions to promote personal growth." The basic idea is that emotional intelligence involves the ability to perceive, assimilate, understand, and regulate emotions. In their view, emotions are "internal events that coordinate many psychological subsystems including physiological responses, cognitions, and conscious awareness" (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000). Emotions are enmeshed with thoughts; the ability to understand and use them to help think and behave is essential. Emotional information is seen as necessary and useful. Mayer and Salovey's view is that "emotional intelligence is a set of interrelated skills that allow people to process emotionally relevant information efficiently and accurately" (Salovey & Grewal, 2005). Mayer has also described EI as "the capacity to reason with emotions" (1999).

Their working model describes skills or abilities in a hierarchy of four areas that they call branches:

Branch 1. Perception, identification, appraisal, and expression of emotion. This is the non-verbal ability to notice and read emotions in self and in others and to express them effectively. It also includes the ability to distinguish between emotions that are similar and between honest, sincere emotions and false ones. This first branch is the building block for the rest of emotional intelligence. It involves reading emotional clues in self and others.

Branch 2. Using emotion to facilitate thinking. This is the ability to integrate emotions into the thought process. Emotions can help thinking in the following ways: they can direct one's attention to a specific line of thought, change perspective from pessimistic to optimistic, cause a change in priorities (from mundane to important or urgent or vice-versa), cause one to understand things from a different perspective, or motivate one to look at something in a different or more focused way.

Branch 3. Understanding and comprehending emotions. This is the ability to understand emotions and apply emotional knowledge, to label emotions accurately, to interpret emotional meaning, to understand complex emotional nuance and reactions, and to discern the transition from one emotion to another, such as the transition from feeling hurt to expressing anger. Emotions can represent complex combinations and summaries of conscious and unconscious thoughts. Emotions convey important information.

Branch 4. Reflective regulation and management of emotion. This branch refers to the ability to remain open to feelings and be comfortable with the positive and negative feelings of others, to monitor emotional states, and to manage expression of emotion without repressing too much feeling. It is the ability to control emotions effectively in one's self and to work with and manage the emotions of others.

Lower numbered branches must be mastered first, in order to use the subsequent branches. For example, one must learn to accurately perceive emotions before he or she can use them to understand thinking. One must understand emotions before he or she can learn to regulate them effectively.

Mayer and Salovey's ability-based model has generated the most research and the most respect in the academic world. Its constructs and theoretical basis allow for empirical study, making it attractive to researchers and academics, if not consultants.

Model 2: Goleman's EI

This model is obviously the best known, especially in the popular press. Nearly everyone in business has heard of the term "Emotional Intelligence," and most of them have heard of Goleman. They probably do not know of the other models and thought leaders. One text (Mathews, et al., 2002) notes that Goleman's impact on the field *"has assumed epic proportions"* (p. 11). In effect, Goleman is responsible for the fact that coaches are interested in emotional intelligence at all.

In his first book, <u>Emotional Intelligence</u>, Goleman began by claiming that new brain research demonstrates the importance of managing fight-or-flight responses. He highlighted the human capacity to "harmonize emotion and thought." He appears to use brain studies to assert that frontal cortex control of the more primitive limbic system is an important component of success in life, and the book couched emotional self-control in the language of neuroscience. He

pointed out that people with high IQ can make serious errors when they do not understand and harness their emotional reactions. He asserted that IQ does not explain much of why some people succeed while others don't, especially in the schools he attended (Amherst and Harvard) and in corporate America, where the vast majority have high IQ. At each level in an organization, everyone has about the same IQ (researches call this "range restriction."), so differences in success must be explained by factors other than IQ. For example, in medical school, there is probably little difference in IQ scores or GRE scores between students. They all have high IQ.   Goleman presents emotional intelligence as the thing that explains differential success.

A reader is hard-pressed to find a concise definition of emotional intelligence in Goleman's books. In a 2002 chapter (Goleman, p. 14) he offers that EI "refers to the ability to recognize and regulate emotions in ourselves and in others."   Goleman sees himself as a "synthesizer" who "brings together a broad array of findings and theories in psychology and integrates them into the emotional intelligence framework." (Goleman, 2002). His model is built on four "domains of emotional intelligence" (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McGee, 2002). They are:

  • **Self-awareness**
   perception and accurate understanding of one's own emotional states

  • **Self management**
   emotional self-control, effective intrapersonal reactions to feelings

  • **Social awareness**
   awareness of relationship surroundings, empathy, understanding of the emotions of
      others, understanding how organizations work

  • **Relationship management**
   working effectively in the social arena, accomplishing goals with and through others,
      collaborating with teams and organizations

The first two of the above domains are about self; the last two about others. Self-awareness and social awareness focus on recognizing and knowing; self-management and relationship management focus on action and accomplishment. So, the model advocates awareness and management of personal feelings along with recognition and management of the feelings of others.

In chart form, the model looks like this (Cherniss & Goleman, 2002, p. 28):

A FRAMEWORK OF EMOTIONAL COMPETENCIES.

	Self (Personal Competence)	Other (Social Competence)
Recognition	**Self-Awareness** • Emotional self-awareness • Accurate self-assessment • Self-confidence	**Social Awareness** • Empathy • Service orientation • Organizational awareness
Regulation	**Self-Management** • Emotional self-control • Trustworthiness • Conscientiousness • Adaptability • Achievement drive • Initiative	**Relationship Management** • Developing others • Influence • Communication • Conflict management • Visionary leadership • Catalyzing change • Building bonds • Teamwork and collaboration

Boyatzis, Goleman & Rhee (2000) define EI in the following way:

> *emotional intelligence is observed when a person demonstrates the competencies that constitute self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills at appropriate times and ways in sufficient frequency to be effective in the situation.* (p. 344).

They go on to describe 25 competencies in five clusters to flesh out their model, defining a competency in the following way: a "learned capability based on emotional intelligence that results in outstanding performance at work." (p. 344).

The technical manual for the ECI, Goleman and Boyatzis's assessment instrument provides the following definition (Wolff, 2005):

> *Emotional intelligence is the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves and for managing emotions*

effectively in ourselves and others. An emotional competence is a learned

capacity based on emotional intelligence that contributes to effective performance

at work. (p. 10).

While this definition seems somewhat circular, they go on to list the following competencies in the popular 1998 Goleman book, <u>Working with Emotional Intelligence</u>:

Self-Awareness Cluster:

Emotional Self-Awareness (recognizing one's emotions and their effects)
Accurate Self-Assessment (knowing one's own strengths and limitations)
Self-Confidence (strong sense of self-worth and capability)

Self-Regulation Cluster:

Self-Control (keeping disruptive emotions and impulses in check)
Trustworthiness (maintaining standards of honesty and integrity)
Conscientiousness (taking responsibility for personal performance)
Adaptability (flexibility in handling change)
Innovation (comfortable with new ideas, approaches, and information)

Self-Motivation Cluster:

Achievement Orientation (striving to improve and excel)
Commitment (aligning personal goals with organizational goals)
Initiative (readiness to act on opportunities)
Optimism (persistence in pursuing goals despite obstacles and setbacks)

Empathy Cluster:

Understanding others (sensing, being interested in others' feelings, perspectives)
Developing others (sensing needs and bolstering the ability of others)
Service Orientation (anticipating, recognizing, meeting customers' needs)
Leveraging Diversity (cultivating opportunities with different kinds of people)
Political awareness (reading group's emotional currents, power relationships)

Social Skills Cluster:

Influence (wielding effective tactics for persuasion)
Communication (listening openly, sending convincing messages)
Conflict Management (negotiating, resolving disagreements)
Leadership (inspiring, guiding individuals and groups)
Change Catalyst (initiating and managing change)

Building Bonds (nurturing instrumental relationships)
Collaboration & cooperation (working with others toward shared goals)
Team capabilities (creating group synergy toward collective goals)

The background for each of these competencies is described in Working with Emotional Intelligence, mostly through anecdotes and success stories. The list varies slightly from publication to publication. The model is hierarchical, meaning that precursors are essential to development of later competencies on the list. Goleman claims that the competencies are independent from each other, although it is difficult to see how "sending convincing messages" is independent from "wielding effective tactics for persuasion" or how "bolstering the ability of others" is that much different from "nurturing instrumental relationships." The competencies are said to be interdependent, as well, though. They are necessary abilities, but not sufficient to guarantee success. Finally, Goleman notes that the list is indeed generic, so that some of the competencies apply to some conditions but not necessarily to all jobs or organizations.

Model 3: Bar-On's ESI

Reuven Bar-On claims to have begun the exploration of emotional intelligence in an unpublished dissertation in South Africa in the 1980s and that would make him a pioneer. He observed that there are important interpersonal as well as intrapersonal components of the construct and therefore favors the term "emotional-social intelligence" or ESI (Bar-On, 2006). He defines ESI as (Bar-On, 2007):

> *a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how well we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate with them, and cope with daily demands, challenges and pressures.*

The model is typically thought to be a mixed model comprised of various personality traits, qualities, mental abilities, and skills. (Mayer, et al., 2000; Mathews, et al., 2002).

There are two components to Bar-On's model, the conceptual model and the psychometric model expressed in his assessment instrument, the EQ-i.

This broad conceptual model consists of five key components or "meta-factors" (Bar-On, 2006/2007):

   a. **Intrapersonal** - the ability to understand emotions as well as express our feelings and ourselves
   b. **Interpersonal** - the ability to understand others' feelings and relate with people
   c. **Stress Management** - the ability to manage and control our emotions
   d. **Adaptability** - the ability to manage change and solve problems of an intrapersonal and interpersonal nature
   e. **General Mood** - the ability to generate positive mood and be self-motivated

There are fifteen closely related "competencies, skills, and facilitators." They are:

INTRAPERSONAL (*understanding one's own emotions*)

Self-Regard (*being aware of, understanding and accepting ourselves*)

Emotional Self-Awareness (*being aware of and understanding our emotions*)

Assertiveness (*expressing our feelings and ourselves nondestructively*)

Independence (*being self-reliant and free of emotional dependency on others*)

Self-Actualization (*setting and achieving goals to actualize our potential*)

INTERPERSONAL (*social awareness and interaction*)

Empathy (*being aware of and understanding how others feel*)

Social Responsibility (*identifying with and feeling part of our social groups*)

Interpersonal Relationship (*establishing mutually satisfying relationships*)

STRESS MANAGEMENT (*emotional management and control*):

Stress Tolerance (*effectively and constructively managing our emotions*)

Impulse Control (*effectively and constructively controlling our emotions*)

ADAPTABILITY (*change management*):

Reality Testing (*validating our feelings and thinking with external reality*)

Flexibility (*coping with and adapting to change in our daily life*)

Problem Solving (*generating effective solutions to problems of an intrapersonal and interpersonal nature*)

GENERAL MOOD (*self-motivation*):

<u>Optimism</u> (*having a positive outlook and looking at the brighter side of life*)

<u>Happiness</u> (*feeling content with ourselves, others and life in general*)

Bar-On created a test to measure ESI, and he uses this instrument to simultaneously assess clients and to adjust the model. He reports that this instrument, the EQ-i played an "instrumental role in developing the model." (Bar-On, 2006). The instrument is an operational version of the conceptual model, and it will be described later.

Bar-On claims that social-emotional intelligence contributes to overall intelligence and is a significant contributor to overall success in life. He asserts, as does Goleman, that the skills, abilities, and traits in his model can be taught and learned.

A Possible 4th Model: Trait Emotional Intelligence.

British psychologists Petrides, Furnham, and Frederickson (2004) point out that emotional factors are not cognitive abilities, and therefore should not be considered to be "intelligence." Their effort to sort out methodological problems with EI led them to the conclusion that emotional intelligence is best understood and measured as a *trait*. Difficulties involved in trying to measure emotional abilities led them to focus on traits, which they claim are appropriately measured with self-report instruments. Emotional experience is inherently subjective, therefore viewing and measuring it as ability does not make sense. Abilities can be observed and measured by others. Traits (especially emotional ones) are self-perceived, meaning that they can only be perceived by the one experiencing them. They see intelligence as an ability and emotional activities as traits. Traits refer to the future, a tendency to do something (or not) or to do it in a certain way. They actually prefer the term "emotional self-efficacy" rather than emotional intelligence, although they retain the EI terminology in order to stay connected to the emotional intelligence literature. Their definition of the construct is (Petrides & Furnham, 2001; and Petrides, Pita, & Kokkinaki, 2007):

> *a constellation of emotion-related dispositions, behavioral tendencies, and self-perceived abilities that represents a compound personality structure*.

They go on to note that "the precise composition of these self-perceptions and dispositions tends to vary across different conceptualizations, some of which are broader than others" (Petrides & Furnham, 2006).

They also note that "Trait EI theory is unrelated to what lay people understand by 'emotional intelligence' or 'EQ' and incompatible with other models of the construct." (London Psychometric Laboratory, 2001-2008).

People with high trait EI believe that they are "in touch" with their emotions and that they can regulate emotions in a way that promotes well-being. These authors believe that such people should enjoy higher levels of happiness. They go on to say that "we believe that the future of EI lies in its conceptualization as a personality trait (i.e., trait EI)" (Petrides, et al., 2004).

The specific facets of this model and their definitions (Petrides, Sangareau, Furnham, & Frederickson, 2006) are as follows:

Facet	High scorers perceive themselves as
Adaptability	flexible and willing to adapt to new conditions.
Assertiveness	forthright, frank, and willing to stand up for their rights.
Emotion perception	clear about their own and other people's feelings.
Emotion expression	capable of communicating their feelings to others.
Emotion management	capable of influencing other people's feelings.
Emotion regulation	capable of controlling their emotions.
Impulsiveness (low)	reflective and less likely to give in to their urges.
Relationships	capable of maintaining fulfilling personal relationships.
Self-esteem	successful and self-confident.
Self-motivation	driven and unlikely to give up in the face of adversity.
Social awareness	accomplished networkers with superior social skills.
Stress management	capable of withstanding pressure and regulating stress.
Trait empathy	capable of taking someone else's perspective.
Trait happiness	cheerful and satisfied with their lives.
Trait optimism	confident and likely to 'look on the bright side' of life.

Trait EI researchers such as Petrides and his colleagues have produced a body of innovative research which attempts to verify their point of view and validate trait constructs. They conclude that trait EI represents a distinct, compound psychological trait distinct from ability EI and of great future value.

Assessment of Emotional Intelligence

All of the creators of emotional intelligence models have developed formal instruments to assess EI from their point of view. They differ in that some (most) are self-report measures while others attempt to measure abilities using an objectively scored test. Assessment activities typically influence subsequent theory development and refinement. There are serious psychometric challenges involved in this process, the most formidable being the problem of construct validity. Given that there is widespread disagreement about the basic definition of emotional intelligence and its essential components, it should come as no surprise that EI is difficult to measure. There are numerous other psychometric challenges in addition to the construct problem (Mathews, et al., 2002, p. 32-46 and Chapter 5). Even so, there are literally hundreds of instruments that claim to assess EI, the vast majority of them rather unscientific. It is probably wise to avoid using any of these tests for selection, hiring, or promotion decisions. It makes little sense to make important decisions using instruments that may not be valid, and it would be difficult to defend their use if challenged in court. A Google search for "test of emotional intelligence" reveals 863,000 sites, many of which contain a quick or free test of your EI or EQ. The best known and well-accepted measures are described and evaluated below, in the same order that the respective theories were described previously. Table 11.1 provides a quick summary of the four standard instruments used to assess emotional intelligence.

Table 11.1 Major Formal Instruments for Assessment of Emotional Intelligence

Test	EI Model Tested	Time to Test	Approximate Cost (2008)	Scoring Method and Reports	Qual Level	Ordering
MSCEIT	Mayer-Salovey (abilities)	141 items 25-45 mins 8th grade reading level.	$40 per report in addition to set-up costs	Consensus, expert. On-line. Personal summary report 15 scores (total score, area scores, branch scores, task scores.)	B	MHS (Multi-Health Systems, Inc.) http://www.mhs.com/mhs/ (800) 456-3003
ECI-ECSI	Goleman (mixed)	72 item/ 30-60 mins (360 degree multi-rater instrument involves self, peers, manager, direct reports).	$3,000 accreditation fee. $150 each after set up.	On-line, available for consultants to use through Hay Group once accredited.	"a good level of experience in delivering feedback" plus 2-day accreditation course.	Hay Group http://www.haygroup.com/TL/
EQ-i, Bar-On EQ 360	Bar-On	133 items 40 mins for 6th grade reading level. Youth, short, interview, and 360 versions available.	$80-120 per report after set up costs.	Self-report, on-line computer. 5 composite scales and 15 subscales. Development Report, Individual Summary, Resource Report, Business Report, Group Report, Leadership Report.	B	MHS (Multi-Health Systems, Inc.) http://www.mhs.com/mhs/ (800) 456-3003
TEIQue (several forms and versions)	Petrides (trait EI)	Long form = 153 items; Short form = 30 items. 7 – 10 mins.	Free for academic research. About $30 otherwise.	Self-report. 15 facets, 4 factors, global trait EI. Scoring key only available to members of ISSID.*	Researcher.	Long form: k.petrides@ioe.ac.uk. Short form: http://www.ioe.ac.uk/ schools/phd/kpetrides/ The%20TEIQue-SF.pdf. or at http://www.psychometriclab.com/ admins/files/TEIQue%20v.1.50.pdf

B Level administrator = can be administered and scored by professionals with advanced training in psychological assessment and professionals from related disciplines that adhere to relevant assessment standards. Individuals without formal psychological training and professional affiliations need to be trained and certified to use the MSCEIT by the MHS Organizational Effectiveness Group. MSCEIT is classified as a B-level instrument, which requires that, as a minimum, the user has completed courses in tests and measurement at a university and/or has completed the MSCEIT Certification Workshop.

***ISSID** = International Society for the Study of Individual Differences (http://www.issid.org/)

The MEIS and MSCEIT

These two tests were created to measure EI from the ability model of Mayer and Salovey. The MEIS (Multi-factor Emotional Intelligence Scale) was developed in 1998 and was followed by a revised and improved version, the MSCEIT (Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test) in 2002. Recall that the Mayer-Salovey model consists of four branches (emotional perception, facilitation, understanding and management). The test (V 2.0) uses 141 questions to test two areas in each of the four branches (Grewal & Salovey, 2005). In branch one, subjects are asked to rate facial photos (along with landscapes and graphic designs) for the presences and degree of anger, sadness, happiness, disgust, fear, surprise, and excitement. In branch two they are asked to compare emotional states with certain tactile and sensory stimuli and to indicate how certain emotions might impact their performance. (Would boredom help with the task of planning a birthday party?) In branch three they are asked to complete sentences that test their understanding of the vocabulary of emotions as well as the ways that emotions tend to heighten, attenuate, and evolve from one to another. They are also asked to identify the emotions involved in a blended affective state. Branch four is tested with real life scenarios. Subjects are asked to devise a strategy to manage an emotionally laden hypothetical situation. They are also asked how they might handle the emotional reactions of others in order to accomplish a goal. Grading the test is difficult, and users without formal psychometric training are urged to take a certification program sponsored by the test publisher. Mayer and Salovey were unwilling to use self-report methods, and much subjectivity is involved in the emotional world. The test uses two types of scoring methods, a consensual mode and an expert mode. In the consensus method they compare the subjects responses to those of 5,000 subjects in a diverse, worldwide sample group. In the expert scoring they compared subjects' answers to those of 21 experts selected from the International Society for Research on the Emotions. Correlations between these two sets of scores are high, signaling to Mayer and Salovey that the combined score represents a convergence of "emotionally intelligent answers." They conclude that the MSCEIT has good reliability and that it represents something distinct from personality and from standard IQ. While others point to serious problems with this instrument (Mathews, et al., 2002, p. 197-202), there is general agreement that, because it is the single serious instrument that is not based upon self-report, the test is important. It is thought to hold promise, but requires psychometric attention.

This is indeed a difficult area of human behavior to measure, and several authors note that this is a potentially rich arena for ambitious doctoral students in search of a dissertation topic.

The O.K. Buros review in <u>Mental Measurements Yearbook</u> reports that MSCEIT results indicate that women generally score higher than men and whites scored higher than other ethnic groups on 14 of the 15 scales. The Buros report is cautious but generally positive about the instrument (Leung, 2005).

Goleman's ECI and ESCI

Goleman and Richard Boyatzis developed the original version of the Emotional Competence Inventory in 1998 starting with Boyatzis's Self-Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) and emotional competencies clustered by Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee (2000). Goleman and Boyatzis began with five clusters and eventually grouped Goleman's 25 competencies into four clusters. They were: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management. The original instrument had 110 items and took about half an hour to complete. "Tipping points," indicate where a subject was expected to be tipped over into superior performance on job competency (Gowing, 2001). Eventually, the Hay/McBer research team collaborated, and the ECI was replaced with the ESCI (Emotional and Social Competence Inventory). The ESCI is a 72 item, self-report inventory that uses a multi-rater methodology so that peers, managers, and direct-reports contribute to the self-report data. Coaches must complete a $3,000 two-day accreditation program prior to administering the test.

Goleman claims that *"The ECI is the only instrument that incorporates the full depth of my research and that of my colleagues. Other instruments use the words 'Emotional Intelligence' but the ECI is the genuine article."* (Hay/McBer, 2008).

Others are not so enthusiastic. Jensen and colleagues note that "Of all the major measures of Emotional Intelligence, the least psychometric information is available for the ECI." and "…little data is available for the ESCI" and "It is disappointing that better information was not gathered before the publication of the technical manual, or at least set as a priority for research following its publication." (Jensen, Kohn, Rilea, Hannon, & Howells, 2007, p. 18). Mathews and colleagues (2002, pp. 217-218) write that "In truth, because it may be used for high-stakes decision-making, the reliability of the self-report subscales is marginal…" and " an actual evaluation of the validity of the ECI is difficult." and "reliability is a cause for concern."

They go on to conclude "In sum, it is difficult not to be cynical of this measure, given the lack of publicly accessible data supplied by its creators and the constellation of old concepts packaged under its new label." The Buros review (Watson, 2007) of the ECI was unenthusiastic, reporting that test materials were confusing. Their report states that "The ECI may be a reliable instrument. Currently, little empirical evidence has been offered to support this property. Validity too is questionable, given the many limiting factors of the studies reported in the test manual." (This was prior to the ECI version 2.0).

Bar-On's EQ-i

Reuven Bar-On constructed the Emotional Quotient Inventory in the early 1980s as an experimental instrument to explore components of emotional and social functioning (Bar-On, 2000). It was formally published in 1997 and was the first EI test to be included in Buro's <u>Mental Measurements Yearbook</u>. It was also the first such test to be sold by a commercial test publisher, Multi-Health Systems or MHS (Gowing, 2001). Bar-On describes it as "a self-report measure of emotionally and socially competent behavior that provides an estimate of one's emotional and social intelligence" (Bar-On, 2000). He intentionally structured the instrument so that it resembles the format of standard IQ tests. The mean overall EQ score is 100 with a standard deviation of 15. It has been translated into 30 languages and normed internationally against large sample groups (Bar-On, 2006). It takes about 30 minutes to complete and requires a 6th grade reading level.

The test consists of five meta-factors and fifteen sub-factors. The five global factors are intrapersonal, interpersonal, adaptability/stress management and general mood, the same ones listed earlier in this chapter as "key components or meta-factors" in Bar-On's model of emotional intelligence. The test's fifteen sub-factors are the same ones described earlier as "competencies, skills, and facilitators." Hence, the instrument tests the model and the model is defined by the test. A comprehensive description of the sub-factors can be found in Bar-On (2000).

The test uses Likert-type scales and contains four validity indicators (Omission Rate, Inconsistency Index, Positive Impression, and Negative Impression), and computer scoring automatically factors positive and negative impression scores into the total.

Bar-On (2000) claims that high scores on his instrument predict general success in life and makes numerous specific claims that derive from twenty predictive validity studies conducted on a total of 22,971 subjects in seven countries (Bar-On, 2006, p. 18). He claims moderate to clear prediction of physical health, psychological well-being, performance at school, performance in the workplace, and self-actualization. He also recommends that "Encouraging continued empirical work in this area is the best way to discourage the proliferation of ungrounded 'theorizing' that abets misconceptions and false claims of what emotional intelligence is and is not." (2000, p. 386).

EQ-i scores indicate that emotional intelligence (or whatever the instrument actually tests) increases with age up to about fifty, implying that older workers are more emotionally intelligent than younger ones. The test has also produced some small but intriguing gender findings. It appears that women score higher in some of the interpersonal areas including empathy and awareness of emotions, and social responsibility (Bar-On, 2000). Men seem to have higher self-regard, are more adaptable, and have better stress management. These effects were, as mentioned above, small.

A Buros review (Cox, 2001) points out the obvious problems in construct validity (disagreement and difficulty in defining emotional intelligence in the first place), and notes that Bar-On makes assertions without supportive data, but generally gives the EQ-i favorable ratings.

Mathews (et al., 2002) on the other hand is less positive. They observe that some of the subscales are empirically indefensible, and that the EQ-i is actually a measure of self-esteem, empathy, and impulse control. They point out that few of the evaluations of the test have been independent. They suspect that the EQ-i shows considerable overlap with personality tests, especially the "Big Five" personality factors (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism). They also note that the EQ-i does not show convergence with the MSCEIT, meaning that they may not be testing the same construct.

Petrides's TEIQue

As mentioned previously, there are many available self-report measures of trait EI. Petrides points out that since emotional perception is subjective, self-report is the appropriate way to measure it. In 2003 he and colleagues produced such an instrument, the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire. The questionnaire is currently open-access, and there is a free

version available to academics wishing to study the construct and components. The instrument tests four factors: well-being, self-control, emotionality, and sociability. There are 15 subscales within those four main factors, the ones called "facets" in the earlier description of the Petrides model of trait EI. There are currently eight versions of the test in twelve languages, including a 360° version. The standard form has 153 questions using a seven-point Likert-type scale.   A technical manual is currently in preparation. Petrides asserts that "The TEIQue is specifically developed and updated to provide a gateway to trait EI theory and it should not be seen as an alternative to the proliferating, and generally invalid 'EQ tests'" (London Psychometric Laboratory, 2001-2008).

A Belgian study showed promising psychometric results along with observations similar to those of other tests of EI; that is, that women score higher on emotionality and men higher on self-control (Mikolajczak & Luminet, 2007).

Some of the other more substantial instruments available to measure EI include:

Schutte Self-Report Inventory (SSRI)

Emotional Accuracy Research Scale (EARS)

Levels of Emotional Awareness Scale (LEAS)

Emotional Control Questionnaire

Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT)

The Trait Meta-mood Scale (TMMS)

The Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS)

The Workgroup Emotional Intelligence Profile (WEIP)

Most of the information describing each of the tests is written by the authors of the instrument, and they tend to have a self-promotional tone. A recent impartial review done by the psychology department at the University of the Pacific concluded that (Jensen, 2007):

Given the lack of research with EI measures in a university context, it is difficult to recommend the use of one specific measure over the others. Even within the business field, no measure has distinguished itself as the superior alternative. The available reviews…suggest that the MSCEIT shows the most promise based on the fact that it does not overlap as much with personality factors and its more

clearly defined theory and relationship to accepted definitions of intelligence. …it is the most distinct measure of EI, being the only non self-report measure of EI.

Criticisms, Issues, and Challenges

Emotional intelligence is controversial. There is widespread disagreement about EI in academic, consulting, and OD circles. The most skeptical critics are to be found in academia, where standards for new approaches and accompanying psychometrics tend to be high. Business consultants tend to be the least critical, as they are always looking for new ways to make a difference and to create opportunities for new or innovative work. As there are *many* problems with emotional intelligence, it is important for coaches to understand that while EI can be useful, several concerns are quite serious. If coaches are to use EI--and they probably should--they must take care to avoid certain problem areas and to "take the best and leave the rest." It may also be important for coaches to understand the most significant problem areas associated with EI so that they can respond cogently when challenged.

The four most significant areas of criticism are:

1. The construct (basic definition) of EI
2. Old wine in new bottles
3. Lack of empirical (research) support
4. Commercialization and over-promotion of the concept

Construct problems

There is no single, well-accepted definition of emotional intelligence. Current definitions are too broad, and existing definitions are something of a moving target while new definitions pop up all the time. One respected business professor came to the conclusion that emotional intelligence "is defined so broadly and inclusively that it has no intelligible meaning." (Locke, 2005). Mathews (et al., 2002) conclude that "EI is too generalized a construct to be useful." Mathews, Roberts, & Zeidner (2004) conclude that "examination of the literature suggests that there is no clear, consensual definition of EI, and the multitude of qualities covered by the concept appears at times overwhelming."

Mayer and Salovey's definition is the one that seems to have garnered the most respect. Recall that they define emotional intelligence as "the ability to perceive emotion, integrate

emotion to facilitate thought, understand emotions, and to regulate emotions to promote personal growth." (1997). Note that this definition is a revision of their original definition from seven years earlier (something of a moving target).

Goleman's work receives the most negative, even scathing criticism, as his characterization of emotional intelligence is so vast. As mentioned previously, after reading Goleman, it is not entirely clear that he has actually provided a concise definition. His descriptions are so broad that virtually any positive psychological attribute could be included under the umbrella term of "emotional intelligence." For example, Goleman variously includes "self-confidence, moral character, adaptability, optimism, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, commitment, empathy, initiative, persistence, the ability to handle relationships smoothly, the capacity to hope, initiating change, listening openly, and a sense of humor" in his long list of components of EI (1995, 1998, 2002). He eventually concludes that "some might call it *character*" (1995, p. 36).

Some EI constructs are ability-based while others are personality or trait based. Others are a mish-mash of abilities, qualities, skills, and characteristics.

This construct confusion causes many problems, not the least of which is the difficulty in knowing what someone means when they advocate for emotional intelligence. What, exactly, are they seeking or talking about? Another problematic result is an inability to measure EI or to know when it exists, when it is high or low, and when it is not present at all. How do you know if you have something if you do not know its definition? How do you establish a training program to promote something that you cannot define? The construct problem also makes empirical research difficult if not impossible.

Old wine in new bottles

Attempts to demonstrate that EI represents something new or something different from familiar aspects of personality have not been fruitful. It appears that much of emotional intelligence overlaps or recycles what we already know to be core components of personality. Mathews, et al. (2002, p. 529) report much of what self-report EI scales measure "constitutes standard personality traits" and that "for the most part, the scales are redundant." Much work has already been done in mainstream psychology on personality traits, and it appears that emotional intelligence rehashes that work, but in a less careful way.

Consultants, business leaders and followers, for that matter, have long known the importance of social and relationship factors. The notion that emotions and relationships matter is hardly news. The trick is to add something useful to the mix.

Lack of empirical (research) support.

Research psychologists and business consultants live in different worlds and have different standards. In academia, the empirical standards of science rule the roost. For concepts to be valuable they must make their way through the gauntlet of statistical significance and research design. It's different in the business arena where an idea must yield a practical benefit to be of value. Value can be added even when methods don't match the standards required by science. This seems to be the case with EI. While the originators of the concept of emotional intelligence (Mayer and Salovey) continue to work in the academic arena, the vast majority of practitioners apply EI in an unscientific way.

Many of the claims of enthusiasts have not done well when tested systematically. Mathews (et al., 2002, p. 13) report that "Goleman appears willing to make strong claims with little (or scant) empirical backing" and that he "represents a journalist distilling scientific information for the consumption of the populist, rather than a legitimate scientific theory." (p. 14). Paul (1999) noted that "Mayer and Salovey …concluded that Goleman was indeed playing fast and loose with the research." In a review of EI training, Clarke (2006, p. 437) comes to the following conclusion: "Despite the growth in training programs that purport to influence EI there remains little empirical support regarding their effectiveness." Another review (Conte, 2005) found that "broad claims that EI is a more important predictor than general mental ability (e.g. Goleman, 1995, 1998) are unfounded and unsubstantiated."

Commercialization and over-promotion.

The most important thing about emotional intelligence may be its promotion, and in that arena Goleman has been a smash. Goleman's books and tapes have become enormously popular. Emotional intelligence has put "soft skills" back into the corporate spotlight, and from a coach's perspective, this is a good thing, indeed. Hundreds of companies and schools have incorporated EI principles and methods in their training programs (Paul, 1999).

But there is danger in over-promotion, and some of the claims made on behalf of EI seem overstated if not preposterous. For example, Goleman variously contends that:

- EI accounts for 80% of life success (1995).
- Emotional competencies account for 80% to 100% of leadership success in outstanding performers (1998, p. 187).
- Emotional aptitude is a meta-ability that all other human skills depend upon (1995, p. 36).
- "Great leadership works through the emotions." (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002).

Whether such an overextension of reality will be harmful remains to be seen, but there is danger that emotional intelligence could devolve into just another fad. Skeptics are wary, and there is danger that emotional intelligence could become one more self-help craze in a long line of management consultant jokes. Locke, an influential business professor, warns that (2005) "With respect to the concept of EI… we are more in need of rational guardians than ever." (p. 430).

Claims that emotional intelligence is a panacea, that emotional intelligence (whatever it is) may be the best predictor of success in life, that it can be effectively taught and learned, that it can level the playing field between those with high IQ and the rest of us, and claims that character can be measured and developed through emotional intelligence have the potential to raise unrealistic hopes.

What's a coach to do?

Given the widespread notoriety of emotional intelligence, its following in the business community, and the fact that it is difficult to define and oversold, the answer is simple: Take the best and leave the rest. Throw out the bathwater, but save the baby. It makes good sense for coaches to take advantage of the opportunity that EI offers without further over-promotion.

First of all, coaches can study the available models and make decisions about what is valuable and what is not. Clients will expect coaches to know EI and will rely on them to sort things out. Coaches can provide a valuable service by promoting a realistic view. Coaches certainly need to define EI for themselves, and it seems that a reasonable definition of the construct ought to include the following:

1. **Recognition of internal emotional states.** It is indisputably better to know how you are feeling and to be able to label and study those emotional states immediately or soon after feeling them. It is also essential for clients to be able to accept and live with a variety of real life emotions rather than to ignore or deny them.

2. **Use of emotional information.** Feelings can motivate; they can help us understand our real values, they can caution us, and they can help focus attention on things that may otherwise seem unimportant. They can cause us to feel and express empathy and to make pro-social decisions. They are a source of essential information that may not be otherwise available. Feelings are essential to introspection and reflection, two activities of enormous importance in the EI literature.

3. **Modulate emotional behavior appropriately**. If a client is too emotionally expressive or not expressive enough, connect rational decision-making with felt emotions so that feelings are expressed well. Coaches can be extremely helpful in providing feedback and guidance in this area. Clients can learn to be smart about their feelings and emotional expression.

4. **Pay attention to the affect of others**. In psychology the term "emotion" typically refers to a felt feeling state. The term "affect" refers to the way that emotions are generally expressed by someone, usually as viewed by others. Most clients benefit from enhanced efforts to notice and learn about the affect of people around them. This is especially true for clients who seem to possess little interest in the nature of other people. Many hard-charging executives are waylaid because they have no idea about the feelings of colleagues, superiors, or direct-reports.

5. **Use EI to enhance relationships.** Emotional intelligence provides an opportunity and format for relationship development. Help clients assess the quality of their work relationships and use emotional intelligence concepts to create a plan for improvement. Most executives would benefit from relationship enhancements.

6. **Consider the "fit."** Explore the "match" between a client's level of social and emotional abilities and current job requirements as well as the skills associated with his or her career goals.

Other uses of EI.

In spite of problems cited, emotional intelligence is a perfect vehicle for the smuggling of more interpersonal and intrapersonal skills into the workplace. It can legitimize important so-called "soft-skill" training and coaching. Chosen carefully, EI can be an ideal package for the transmission of crucial but undervalued enhancements. Consultants can use EI as an umbrella to offer a wide range of topics.

These soft or interpersonal skills can be of enormous value when working with clients who lack solid social skills.

Emotional intelligence and some of the EI measures could potentially be used to match people with tasks and environments. If an executive has weak interpersonal or emotional skills, there are two options: improve the skills or place that person in a work environment conducive to his or her skill-set and personality.

Summary and Key Points

The idea that emotional or social factors play an important role in success is an old and enticing notion. The likelihood that there is an important set of skills independent of "intelligence" is especially attractive. Daniel Goleman popularized this idea by publishing several books and audio versions for the popular market, and his view of emotional intelligence is extremely broad. While Goleman's work is criticized in the academic literature, emotional intelligence creates an opportunity for coaches to develop programs to assess and enhance the intrapersonal, social, and interaction skills of clients. Such work has the potential to create significant benefit for individual clients and for organizations, as well. The importance of self-understanding, introspection and reflection, empathy, and effective social interaction skills is indisputable, and can often be enhanced through coaching.

1. Coaches should invest time in the EI literature (and in this chapter) to decide what emotional intelligence should reasonably include. They must come up with a personal working definition of the construct for use in their consulting and must be able to articulate that definition as necessary.

2. There is nearly universal agreement that emotional and social factors are extremely important mediators of work success. Evaluate clients along these dimensions. Provide

feedback to them and work together to establish a plan for development, enhancement, or remediation.

       3. Personal reflection and introspection are important components of any reasonable view of EI. Promote and reinforce these activities in clients and organizations. Use the popularity and credibility of EI to do so.

       4. Be wary of EI measurement instruments. Avoid using them for hiring, selection, or promotion. If you decide to use such tools, use them informally to acquire data for coaching.

       5. Help clients notice intrapersonal events such as feelings, hunches, discomfort, wariness, anxiety, hostility, yearnings, or joy. The coaching relationship is an ideal and unique vehicle for overt discussion of these internal events, as they cannot always be discussed elsewhere.

       6. Work with clients to improve their ability to read other people, especially aspects that are not obvious. Challenge them appropriately to get outside of their own point of view and to develop an interest in what others are thinking and feeling. Help them nurture their empathy.

References

Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the emotional quotient
 inventory. In R. Bar-On, & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence*
 (pp. 363-388). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, 18,
 13-25.

Bar-On, R. (2007). A broad definition of emotional-social intelligence according to the Bar-On
 model. Retrieved on 1/25/09 from http://www.reuvenbaron.org/bar-on-
 model/essay.php?i=2.

Boyatzis, R., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K.S. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional
 intelligence. In R. Bar-On, & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional
 intelligence* (pp. 343-362). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brody, N. (2006). Beyond *g*. In K.R. Murphy (Ed.), A *critique of emotional intelligence* (161-
 185). NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cherniss, C. & Goleman, D. (Eds.). (2002). *The emotionally intelligent workplace.* San
 Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Clarke, N.S. (2006). Emotional intelligence training: A case of caveat emptor. *Human resource
 development review.* 5(4), 422-441.

Conte, J.M. (2005). A review and critique of emotional intelligence measures. *Journal of
 organizational behavior.* 26, 433-440.

Cox, A. (2001). Test review of the EQ-i. From B. S. Plake & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *The
 fourteenth mental measurements yearbook* [Electronic version]. Retrieved June 24, 2008
 from the Buros Institute's *Test reviews online* website: http://www.unl.edu/buros.

Damasio, A. (2005). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain.* NY: G.P.
 Putnam's Sons.

Dewey, J. (1909). Moral principles in education. NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Furnham, A, (2006). Explaining the popularity of emotional intelligence. In K.R. Murphy (Ed.),
 A critique of emotional intelligence (141-160). NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gardner, H. (1983/1993). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences.* New York:
 Basic Books.

Gibbs, N. (1995, October 2). The EQ factor. *Time* Magazine. Retrieved on 1/25/09 from

http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,983503,00.html.

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

Bantam Books.

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

Goleman, D. (2002). Emotional intelligence: Issues in paradigm building. (pp. 13-26). In C.

Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.) *The emotionally intelligent workplace.* San Francisco,

Jossey-Bass.

Goleman, D. (2006). *Social Intelligence: The new science of social relationships*. New York:

Bantam Books.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership; Realizing the power of

emotional intelligence.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Gowing, M.K. (2001). Measurement of individual emotional competence. In C. Cherniss & D.

Goleman (Eds.) *The emotionally intelligent workplace.* (pp. 83-131). San Francisco,

Jossey-Bass.

Grewal, D. & Salovey, P. (2005). Feeling smart: The science of emotional intelligence.

American scientist, 93, July-August, 330-339.

Hay-McBer (2008). Retrieved on 1/25/09 from

http://www.bostonsearchgroup.com/pdf/ECI_overview.pdf .

Hein, S. (2005). Wayne Payne's 1985 doctoral paper on emotions and emotional intelligence.

Retrieved on 1/25/09 from http://eqi.org/payne.htm#The%20original%20abstract.

Herrnstein, R. & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in

American life.* NY: Simon & Schuster.

Jensen, S., Kohn, C., Rilea, S. Hannon, R.,& Howells, G. (2007). *Emotional intelligence; A

literature review.* Unpublished manuscript, University of the Pacific, Stockton, California.

Landy, F.L. (2006). The long, frustrating, and fruitless search for social intelligence: A

cautionary tale. In K.R. Murphy (Ed.), A *critique of emotional intelligence* (81-124). NY:

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lantieri, L. & Goleman, D. (2008). *Building emotional intelligence: Techniques to cultivate

inner strength in children.* Boulder, CO: Sounds True, Inc.

Leung, S. (2005). Test review of the MSCEIT. From R. A. Spies & B. S. Plake (Eds.), *The sixteenth mental measurements yearbook* [Electronic version]. Retrieved on June 24, 2008 from the Buros Institute's *Test reviews online* website: http://www.unl.edu/buros.

Leuner, B. (1966). Emotional intelligence and emancipation. *Praxis der Kinderpsychologie und Kinderpsychiatrie*, 15, 193-203.

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

London Psychometric Laboratory (2001-2008). Retrieved on 1/25/09 from http://www.psychometriclab.com/Default.aspx?Content=Page&id=6.

Mathews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R.D. (2002). *Emotional intelligence, science and myth.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Mathews, G., Roberts, R.D., & Zeidner, M. (2004). Seven myths about emotional intelligence. *Psychological inquiry,* 15 (3), 179-196.

Mayer, J.D. (1999). Emotional intelligence: Popular or scientific psychology? *American psychological association monitor*, 30 (8), September.

Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D.R., & Salovey, P. (2000). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27(4), 267-298.

Mayer, J.D. & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Slater (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational applications* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (2000). Emotional intelligence as zeitgeist, as personality, and as a mental ability. In R. Bar-On, & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 92-117). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCallum, M. & Piper, W.E. (2000). Psychological mindedness and emotional intelligence. In R. Bar-On, & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 118-135). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mikolajczak, M., Luminet, O., Leroy, C. & Roy, E. (2007). Psychometric properties of the trait emotional intelligence questionnaire: Factor structure, reliability, construct, and incremental validity in a French-speaking population. *Journal of personality assessment*, *88*(3), 338–353.

Paul, A.M. (1999, June 28). Promotional intelligence. Salon.com. Retrieved on 1/25/09 from

    http://www.salon.com/books/it/1999/06/28/emotional/index.html.

Petrides, K.V., Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: Psychometric investigation

    with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European journal of personality.* 15, 425-

    448. DOI: 10.1002/per.416.

Petrides, K.V., Furnham, A. (2006). The role of trait emotional intelligence in a gender-specific

    model of organizational variables. *Journal of applied social psychology*, 36 (2), 552-569.

Petrides, K.V., Furnham, A., & Frederickson, N. (2004, October). Emotional intelligence. *The*

    psychologist, 17(10), 574-577. Retrieved on 1/25/09 from

    http://www.ioe.ac.uk/schools/phd/kpetrides/Reprints/Psychologist%20-

    %20T_EI%20(2004).pdf.

Petrides, K.V., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in

    personality factor space. *British journal of psychology*, 98, 273-289.

Petrides, K.V., Sangareau, Y., Furnham, A., & Frederickson, N. (2006). Trait emotional

    intelligence and children's peer relations at school. *Social Development, 15,* 537-547.

Salovey, P. & Grewal, D. (2005). The science of emotional intelligence. *Current directions in*

    psychological science, (14) 6, (pp. 281-285). Retrieved on 1/25/09 from

    http://research.yale.edu/heblab/pub_pdf/pub68_SaloveyGrewal2005_scienceofEI.pdf.

Salovey, P. & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, cognition, and*

    personality, 9, 185-211.

Schmitt, A.J. (2006). EI in the business world. In K.R. Murphy (Ed.), *A critique of emotional*

    intelligence (211-234). NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sternberg, R. (Ed.) (2002). *Why smart people can be so stupid*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale

    University Press.

Taylor, G.J. & Bagboy, R.M. (2000). An overview of the alexithymia construct. In R. Bar-On,

    & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 40-67). San

    Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thorndike, E.L. (1920, January). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's monthly magazine*, 227-

    235.

Watson, T. (2007). Test review of the Emotional Competence Inventory. From K. F. Kiesinger,

    R. A. Spies, J. F. Carlson, & B. S. Plake (Eds.), *The seventeenth mental measurements*

yearbook [Electronic version]. Retrieved on 1/24/08, from the Buros Institute's *Test Reviews Online* website: http://www.unl.edu/buros.

Wechsler, D. (1939). *The measurement of adult intelligence*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 229.

Wechsler, D. (1940). Non-intellective factors in general intelligence. *Psychological bulletin*, 37, 444-445.

Wechsler, D. (1958). *The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence* (4th ed.). Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Company.

Wechsler, D. (1981). *WAIS-R manual. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised.* Cleveland: The Psychological Corporation.

Wolff, S.B. (2005). Emotional competence inventory(ECI) technical manual. Hay Group. Retrieved on 1/25/09 from http://www.eiconsortium.org/pdf/ECI_2_0_Technical_Manual_v2.pdf.

Recommended Readings

Bar-On, R. & Parker, J.D.A. (Eds.). (2000). *The handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mathews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R.D. (2002). *Emotional intelligence, science and myth.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Murphy, K.R. (Ed.). (2006). *A critique of emotional intelligence: What are the problems and how can they be fixed?* NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.