Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Few movements have intrigued mainstream society to the extent of the study of emotional intelligence (Salopek, 1998). Written in 1995, Goleman’s book, Emotional Intelligence, has been translated into 30 languages and has become a best seller around the world (Salopek). The term “emotional intelligence” (EI) was first coined by Salovey and Mayer (1990) to explain a different type of intelligence. Many have noted the distinction between academic intelligence and social intelligence (Neisser, 1976). While the standard intelligence quotient (IQ), tends to be static, EI can be learned (Salopek).

Specifically, EI is the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997a). Mayer and Salovey subsume Gardner’s inter-and intra-personal intelligences and involves abilities that maybe categorized into five domains: self-awareness, managing emotions, motivating, empathy, and handling relationships (Salovey and Mayer, 1993). In an earlier conception, Gardner (1983) described what is now recognized as EI as being a deep awareness of one’s own emotions and the ability to label and draw upon those emotions as a resource to guide behavior.

Goleman (1995) later developed his four dimensions of EI to include knowing and managing one’s emotions, self- motivation, empathy toward others, and social deftness. The benefits of EI are many and varied. A group of four-year old children - found to resist impulse - were tracked through high school and were found to be more self-assertive, socially skilled, independent, and persevering than their more impulsive peers. In addition, they achieved significantly higher SAT scores (Shoda, Mischel, & Peake, 1990). Harrington-Lueke (1997) found in their research that being emotionally intelligent is just as important to success in life as good
grades. Essentially, people with high levels of EI experience more career success, build stronger personal relationships, lead more effectively, and enjoy better health than those with low levels of EI (Cooper, 1997). Rosete and Ciarrochi (2005) exhibited that executives higher on understanding their own feelings and that of their subordinates are more likely to achieve business outcomes and be considered as effective leaders by their employees and direct manager. According to Diggins (2004) the best managers need to possess emotional intelligence (EI) to make decisions that based on a combination of self-management and relationship skills and an awareness of how their behavior affects others in the organization. He argued that emotional intelligence plays a greater role than “traditional” intelligence in determining leaders and organizations’ success and concluded that EI helps people to be more aware of their interpersonal style; recognize and manage the impact of emotions on their thoughts and behavior; develop their ability to judge social dynamics in the workplace; and understand how well they manage relationships and how to improve.

Diggins (2004, p. 34) suggested that EI is the key to effective performance and to staying ahead of the pack at times of organizational change. In his words: “In organizations, the inclusion of emotional intelligence in training programs has helped employees to co-operate better and be more motivated, thereby increasing productivity and profits”. According to Brown and Brooks (2002, p. 327) “an understanding of emotion, both our own and those of other people, plays an important part in organizational life”. In this context, Mayer et al. (2004) stated that superiors need to manage the mood of their organizations and that a mysterious blend of psychological abilities known as emotional intelligence is what leaders need to accomplish that goal.

Emotions & intelligence research

Although EI is promoted as a “new” construct, similar constructs have been circulating for over 80 years. Salovey and Mayer (1990) referred to EI as an aspect of social intelligence. Social intelligence was defined as the ability to understand and manage emotions (Thorndike, 1920). This type of intelligence was viewed as being a part of a multifaceted construction of intelligence.
Practical intelligence Sternberg's (1985) triarchic theory of intelligence classifies three types of intelligences: (1) Analytic Intelligence, which assesses one's logical and mathematical ability; (2) Creative Intelligence, which measures one's ability to cope with new tasks; and (3) Practical intelligence, which assesses one's ability to adapt to their environment. Gardner (1983) also viewed intelligence as being multifaceted. Two types of socially-based intelligences are related to EI: interpersonal intelligence involves the ability to understand other people; successful in neither defining nor measuring social intelligence (Cronbach, 1960; Riggio, Messamer, & Throockmorton, 1991).

**Emotional intelligence – the balancing of individual and organizational needs**

Given the presence and complexities of these internal and external influences, the leader of the knowledge-based organization is often faced with the prospect of reacting to constant changes in the internal and external environment. In order to be effective in that regard the leader must possess the characteristics most often associated with the description of emotional intelligence: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skill. Additionally, the leader must be effective at injecting these same characteristics throughout the knowledge organization, since having these skills concentrated in a single individual within the organization is not optimal. This process in and of itself creates a tension between the needs of the organization and those of the individuals within the organization. One can argue the balancing of those interests requires an even higher level of emotional intelligence in the knowledge-based leader. Recognizing the tension between the competing interests of the organization and individual is one thing; knowing what to do about it and acting on it is quite another. Heskett et al. (1997) made the case that regardless of business type the only path to enduring success begins with creating a work environment that attracts and retains talented employees. Nationally, this focus propagated the notion that the organization is no more talented than the cumulative sum of its employees and has been the impetus for the development of new wave cultural adaptations of the workplace setting. The onslaught of day care facilities, employee concierge services and dress code abandonment were all mechanisms presumably designed by emotionally intelligent leaders to provide an environment where workers believed their interests constituted those of the organization.
Stewart (1998) concluded in an intellectual economy the majority of an organization's value lies in the talent and knowledge of its employees. Applied to the knowledge-based setting, this required emotionally intelligent leaders to develop mechanisms to attract what they believed to be the best and brightest knowledge workers. Signing bonuses and flexible working hours for knowledge workers became common practice and more recently retention bonuses have become vogue. The recruitment of knowledge workers has become somewhat methodical with a specific calculus for comparative purposes. The specific recruitment variables developed by knowledge-based organizations were relocation expenses, signing bonuses, salary guarantees, relaxation of initial productivity standards and student loan forgiveness. While all of these mechanisms were helpful in attracting employees, they also created an environment whereby the employee had every right to believe the culture of the organization was defined by the needs of the individual. After all, "did they not tell me that the success and future of the organization was dependent upon my presence there."

Ironically, the leaders of the knowledge-based organization had every right to believe the recruitment mechanisms developed were merely a means to an end. That is to say, the organization's need was to employ the professionals and technicians it needed to meet its mission: to provide the highest quality and most technologically advanced products or services at the lowest cost to as many as possible. Further complicating the circumstance is the overarching cultural need of every knowledge-based organization to focus on the desires and preferences of the customer. Far and away the most prevalent verbiage in the mission statements of knowledge-based entities is a focus on the customers they intend to serve. The implementation of this mission statement into knowledge-based products and services that exceed those of competing organizations requires employees to sublimate their needs and to exercise the very emotional intelligence skills that were utilized by others to recruit them to the organization.

Stewart (1998) concluded the most valuable aspects of jobs in an intellectual economy are sensing, judging, creating and building relationships. Arguably, these are not altogether dissimilar to the skills set most often identified with emotional intelligence and also represent
The presumed primary beneficiary of all efforts of the knowledge-based entity is the customer, and all issues facing the knowledge-based organization, be they internal or external, are addressed with the ultimate interests of the customer in mind. To answer the question of to whom the benefits of emotional intelligence accrue in the knowledge-based organization, it is best viewed as a continuum with the interests of the individual and organization on opposite ends suspended on a fulcrum sliding from one end to the other in an attempt to balance those needs. The knowledge-based leader with requisite emotional intelligence skills represents that fulcrum. On any given day on any given issue, the interests are never equally balanced; rather, the interests vary from issue to issue over time. The goal of the knowledge-based leader is to attempt to keep the balance within acceptable ranges, never allowing one to become dominant over the other. To that end, emotional intelligence or the by-products of practicing emotional intelligence should not be viewed as toxic or a manipulative tool, but rather as a means of dialogue among the internal constituencies of the organization. The skills and processes of emotional intelligence may be utilized as the balancing mechanism among interests to achieve the desired outcomes and results for the benefit of customers. Even more importantly emotional intelligence can be viewed as therapeutic for the knowledge-based organization and its cultural development, and as such may serve as a means of continuous organizational development.

**Applying emotional intelligence as organizational development**

Self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skill, as identified by Goleman (1998), constitute the behaviors most readily identified among individuals described as emotionally intelligent. These behaviors, while historically described as present in an individual, may alternately be viewed as processes to balance the internal interests of the organization for the benefit of those it intends to serve. Specifically, the utilization of the emotional intelligence principles to develop a shared sense of culture can transform emotional intelligence from an individual behavior to a group dynamic (Blattner and Bacigalupo, 2007).
Applying Buckingham and Coffman’s (1999) conclusions to the knowledge-based setting, the following questions may be addressed by supervisors and managers as a means of determining their own self-awareness in the knowledge work environment:

1. Do my knowledge workers and team members know what is expected of them?

2. Do my knowledge workers and team members have the materials and equipment to perform at an outstanding level?

3. Do my knowledge workers and team members have the opportunity to outperform previous levels each day?

4. Have I praised my knowledge workers and team members in the last seven days?

5. Does each of my knowledge workers and team members feel that I care about them as a person?

6. Do my knowledge workers and team members feel that I encourage their development?

7. Do my knowledge workers and team members feel that their opinions matter and are sought?

8. Do my knowledge workers and team members feel that their job is important to the mission of the organization?

9. Do my knowledge workers and team members believe that the other members of the team are committed to performing at the highest level?

10. Do my knowledge workers and team members have a best friend at work?

11. Have I communicated with each of my knowledge workers and team members about their continued progress in the last six months?

12. Has each of my knowledge workers and team members had an opportunity to learn and grow in the last year? In the continual addressing of these questions, the knowledge-based
leader can develop and exhibit their own emotional intelligence behaviors as well as serve as a role model for aspiring managers within the organization. At the team level, these questions can be utilized by managers and supervisors to develop a starting point to foster a dialogue on shared goals and objectives.

In order for emotional intelligence to make the transformation to an organizational development tool, individual teams and team members must be willing to determine their responsibility in meeting the needs of the organization, as well as their own level of commitment to meeting those needs. The goal here is to create an environment where teams and team members can become self-regulating, taking initiative and actions that will further the interests of the organization, while simultaneously developing the emotional intelligence skills of each team member. The implementation process requires a starting point from which teams can weave the emotional intelligence process into the cultural fabric of each team. Following the parameters of the 12 questions previously outlined by Buckingham and Coffman (1999), these additional questions may be utilized to cultivate emotional intelligence as a process into the fabric of each team and team member:

- Do I understand the needs of my knowledge-based organization and the role I play in meeting those needs?
- Am I committed to the mission of my knowledge-based organization?
- Do I perform my job in such a manner as to assist my knowledge-based organization in the achievement of its mission?
- Do I encourage others to perform at their highest level?
- Have I taken the opportunity to praise my manager and other leaders and encourage them?
- Have I communicated my opinions and suggestions in a positive manner?
- Do I represent my knowledge-based organization in a positive light in the community?
• Do I empathize with the customers and/or staff I serve?

• Am I aware of how others perceive me?

• Do I set goals for myself that will push my team further toward the goals we have set?

This interrogatory process is designed to assist team members in the self-awareness and self-regulation process. Additionally, an honest assessment of the answers should stir some degree of empathy for the roles and responsibilities of others in the organization. All of which should foster the emotional intelligence framework in the individual team member. In order for emotional intelligence to be viewed as a process rather than an outcome, it must be approached as a methodology. Human resource and training professionals within the knowledge-based organization must provide support for the process just as if it were a continuous quality improvement or assessment program. Seminars, case studies, group discussions, retreats and resource materials must be developed around the emotional intelligence process so that teams can be comfortable in pursuing the methodology, knowing that they are not doing so alone and without guidance. As always the example set by the executive team is paramount. If teams see that those at the top of the organization are pursuing emotional intelligence as a development process, then they are much more likely to participate and embrace the concept.

Additionally, an important facet of the transformation of emotional intelligence to an organizational development tool is the means by which the desired behavior and outcomes are measured. Are the behaviors and skills producing the desired results? Do teams who practice emotional intelligence perform at a higher level? Is the organization as a whole performing at a higher level as a result of viewing emotional intelligence as a process? Finally, has the utilization of the emotional intelligence processes had an impact on the perceived tension between the needs of the knowledge worker and those of the organization?

Competencies as behavioral manifestations of emotional intelligence
Emotional intelligence and social intelligence (i.e. EI and SI) are convenient phrases with which to focus attention on the underlying emotional and social components of human talent. While the earliest psychologist to explore the related concept of "social intelligence" (Thorndike in the 1920s and 1930s, cf. Goleman, 1995, 2006) offered the idea as a single concept, more recent psychologists have appreciated its complexity and described it in terms of multiple capabilities (Bar-On, 1992, 1997; Goleman, 1998; aarni, 1999). Sharma (2008) reviews the history beginning with Spinoza and other philosophers before getting to Thorndike. Gardner (1983) conceptualized this arena as constituting intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence – two of the seven intelligences. Salovey and Mayer (1990) first used the expression "emotional intelligence" and described it in terms of four domains: perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions. Other conceptualizations have used labels such as "practical intelligence" and "successful intelligence" (Sternberg, 1996), which often blend the capabilities described by other psychologists with cognitive abilities and anchor the concepts around the consequence of the person's behavior, notably success or effectiveness. The major themes of criticism of the EI concept is found in Matthews et al. (2002), but they often confused the theoretical distinctions and the measurement issues.

The major theories and measures of EI from the literature are, in a comparison extending the work of Fernández-Berrocal and Extremera (2006). They have been organized around three conceptual/methodological themes: EI ability measures and models; EI behavior methods and models; and self-perception methods and models. Mayer et al.'s (1999) three standards for intelligence” are:

(1) It should reflect a “mental performance rather than preferred ways of behaving” (pp. 269-270).

(2) Tests of it should show positive correlation with other forms of intelligence.

(3) The measures should increase with experience and age.

Different interpretations of "intelligence" are offered in the literature. For example, Petrides and Furnham proposed difference between trait and ability EI (see Guillen et al., n.d.):
Trait EI is closer to the personality realm. Ability EI is a new realm. Boyatzis and Sala (2004) claimed that to be classified as "intelligence," the concept should be:

- Behaviorally observable.
- Related to biological and in particular neural-endocrine functioning. That is, each cluster should be differentiated as to the type of neural circuitry and endocrine system involved.
- Related to life and job outcomes.

Sufficiently different from other personality constructs that the concept adds value to understanding the human personality and behavior. The measures of the concept, as a psychological construct, should satisfy the basic criteria for a sound measure that is show convergent and discriminate validity (Campbell and Fiske, 1959).

The Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey criterion #3 will be related to our third, fourth, and fifth criteria somewhat. But their first and second criteria claim that because EI is "Intelligence," it should correlate with measures of cognitive intelligence. As a theory of emotional intelligence, we believe that there should be a link to neural (or possibly neuro-endocrine) functioning. If the theory claims that there are multiple components of this emotional intelligence, then these different components should have different neuro-endocrine pathways. This first proposed criterion is more specific than the Mayer et al. (1999) first and second criteria. The construct should actually be able to predict neural and endocrine (i.e. hormonal) patterns within the individual.

Regarding the rationale for including criterion #2 (i.e. job and life outcomes), the American Psychological Association's Task Force on Intelligence (American theoretical basis Authors Measurement distinctions Ability Mayer, Solavey and CarusoMSCEIT – direct performance assessment of emotional processing, some scenarios testing; confusion on scoring between consensus and expert scoring models (Mayer et al., 1999; Salovey and Mayer, 1997) Schutte et al. Self-report measure based on Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso model (Schutte et al.,
Behavioral Boyatzis and Goleman ESCI-360, functional approach inductively derived from effective performance, called competencies (more outcome-oriented and realistic in real settings) (Boyatzis and Goleman, 1996; Wolff, 2005, 2008) Bar-On EQ-i: 360, although originally a self-report, the 360 was introduced in 1997 (see placement later in this table) (Bar-On, 1997) Dulewicz et al. EIQ, a 360 of competencies (Dulewicz et al., 2003) Bradbury EQA, a 360 skill assessment modeled after Goleman and Boyatzis model (Bradbury and Su, 2006) Internal (self)perceptionBar-On EQ-i, originally a self-report, internally process driven model (more psychological than others), but now more behavioral in its 360 form (Bar-On, 1997) Schutte et al. Self-assessment based on Mayer-Salovey-Caruso model (Schutte et al., 1998) Wong and Law WLEIS, a self-assessment based on the MSCEIT model (Law et al., 2004) Petrides and Furnham TEIQue, a self-assessment of trait EI based on a Psychological Association Public Affairs Office, 1997) reported that predicting real life outcomes is an important part of the standard against which we should judge an intelligence. It then went on to add that there should be a consensus within a field as to the definition. Although the consensus is lacking in the field regarding emotional intelligence at this time, the link between EI and SI competencies and real life outcomes is in fact testable.

While Mayer et al. (1999) seem to discard patterns of behavior as irrelevant to their concept of EI; this approach contends that EI and SI should predict behavioral patterns in life and work, as well as the consequences of these patterns in the form of life and work outcomes. This seems a more relevant test of the concept than merely showing a link to experience and age (i.e. as Mayer et al.’s (1999) third criterion). The competency and talent stream of research has focused on explaining and predicting effectiveness in various occupations, often with a primary emphasis on managers and leaders McClelland, 1973; Bray et al., 1974; Boyatzis, 1982; Luthans et al., 1988; Kotter, 1982; Thornton and Byham, 1982; Spencer and Spencer, 1993). As has been explained earlier in this article, in this competency approach, specific capabilities were identified and validated against effectiveness measures, or, often, inductively discovered and then articulated as competencies.
There may be reasons to label the behavioral approach to EI/Sl as something other than "intelligence." For example, they could be called competencies without the additional descriptor. Sternberg (1997) claimed that, "Intelligence comprises the mental abilities necessary for adaptation to, as well as shaping and selection of, any environmental context" (p. 1030). He goes on to claim that intelligence serves two purposes, "external correspondence and internal coherence" (p. 1030). It is precisely the "external," direct consequence to actions in life and work that establishes the competencies as forms of intelligence, whether cognitive, emotional, or social. An integrated concept of emotional, social, and cognitive intelligence competencies offers more than a convenient framework for describing human dispositions (Boyatzis and Sala, 2004). It offers a theoretical structure for the organization of personality and linking it to a theory of action and job performance. Goleman (1998) defined an "emotional competence" as a "learned capability based on emotional intelligence which results in outstanding performance at work." In other words, if a competency is an "underlying characteristic of the person that leads to or causes effective or superior performance" (Boyatzis, 1982), then building on McClelland's (1973) earlier argument about the limits of traditional views of intelligence:

- an emotional, intelligence competency is an ability to recognize, understand, and use emotional information about oneself that leads to or causes effective or superior performance;
- a social intelligence competency is the ability to recognize, understand and use emotional information about others that leads to or causes effective or superior performance; and
- a cognitive intelligence competency is an ability to think or analyze information and situations that leads to or causes effective or superior performance.

If defined as a single construct, the tendency to believe that more effective people have the vital ingredients for success invites the attribution of a halo effect. For example, person A is effective, therefore she has all of the right stuff, such as brains, savvy, and style. Like the issue
of finding the best "focal point" with which to look at something, the dilemma of finding the best level of detail in defining constructs with which to build a personality theory may ultimately be an issue of which focal point is chosen. The separate competencies, like the clusters, are, we believe, the most helpful focal point for description and study of performance.

The articulation of one overall emotional or social intelligence might be deceptive and suggest a close association with cognitive capability (i.e. traditionally defined "intelligence" or what psychologists often call "g" referring to general cognitive ability) (Davies et al., 1998; Ackerman and Heggestad, 1997). The latter would not only be confusing, but would additionally raise the question as to what one is calling emotional and social intelligence and whether it is nothing more than an element of previously defined intelligence or cognitive ability.

The Emotional Competency Inventory, version 2 (ECI-2) (i.e. the forerunner to the current ESCI) and the closely related university version (ECI-U) showed desired levels of convergent validity in confirmatory factor analyses for both the theoretical clusters (Goleman et al., 2002; Wolff, 2005) and empirical clusters (Boyatzis and Sala, 2004) in studies by Battista (2005) as well as Battista-Foguet et al. (n.d.). In addition, a wide variety of validation studies showed strong and consistent validity in predicting or explaining life and job outcomes (Boyatzis and Sala, 2004; Wolff, 2005).

The latest version of the ESCI attempts to address the difference between coded behavior from behavioral event interviews and informant based 360 surveys. Construction of the ESCI (i.e. the informant, 360 survey of behavior) dropped the inclusion of all behavioral manifestations found in the earlier indicative validation studies. Some of the items are reflective of the competency, and some are formative, or as they were earlier called, alternate manifestations. To address the lack of context from the 360 informant (that the coded of interviews would have), a statement of the intent was incorporated into each item in the ESCI.

Meanwhile, Guillen et al. (n.d.) revealed no statistically significant relationship between personality dimensions as measured by the NEO-PR and EI or SI competencies. Burckle (2000) and Murensky (2000) showed small but significant correlations between selected personality
dimensions as measured by the Myers Briggs Type Indicator and selected clusters of EI and SI
competencies.

In contrast, the model of EI offered through the MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2003) has a total
score of a person’s EI, two area scores of experiential and strategic, and branches within each
area of:

- Perceiving (with sub-tests of faces and pictures) and facilitating (with sub-tests of
  facilitation and sensations); and
- Understanding (with subtests of changes and blends) and managing (with subtests of
  emotional management and emotional relationships).

Although data from studies comparing these tests are under way, conceptually we
would expect small correlations between these two different measures. The MSCEIT assesses a
person’s direct handling of emotions, while the ESCI which is intended to assess the EI and SI
competencies described earlier assesses how the person expresses his or her handling of
emotions in life and work settings.

Because the internal processing of emotions may, in some areas, emerge as consistent
behavioral tendencies, there may be correlation between:

- self-awareness competencies from the ESCI and the experiential area, in particular the
  facilitating branch from the MSCEIT;
- social awareness competencies from the ESCI and the understanding branch of the
  strategic area; and
- relationship management competencies from the ESCI and the managing branch from
  the strategic area of the MSCEIT.

Similarly, although the data bearing on this issue are presently being collecting,
currently there is no documented relationship among the ESCI competencies and the subscales
of the Bar-On’s EQ-i (Bar-On, 1992, 1997). Although there will be little correlation between the self-report version of the EQ-i and the Others’ views of a person’s competencies through the ESCI, there may be substantial correlation among the EQ-i subscales and ESCI when 360 measures of both are compared. This should occur because the behavior being observed by the informants will be seen as similar or related. There are eight subscales in the EQ-i that are not expected to associate with ESCI competencies. Similarly, there are six ESCI competencies that are not expected to associate with EQ-i subscales. Since the application of one’s EI/SI ability in life and work settings, which we call competencies, it will manifest itself in observed behavior. Therefore, we believe the ESCI generally measures different aspects of EI and SI than the MSCEIT or the EQ-i.

Current models of emotional intelligence

Although EI has become a popular topic among researchers, practitioners, and the general public, there is no consensus as to the definition of EI. There are two competing models of EI: The ability-based model, which is endorsed by Mayer and his colleagues (Mayer, DiPaolo, & Salovey, 1990; Mayer & Salovey, 1997b) and the trait-based (or “mixed”) model, which is endorsed by researchers such as Goleman (1995; 1998c) and Bar-On (1997).

Ability-based model

These previous conceptualizations of social or interpersonal intelligence have focused on the intelligence literature. In addition to the intelligence literature, Salovey and Mayer (1990) examined the emotions literature to develop their conceptualization of EI. They initially defined EI as “the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (p. 189). In this definition of EI, Salovey and Mayer (1990) identified three components of EI: an ability to appraise others’ emotions, an ability to regulate one’s own emotions, and an ability to use emotions to solve problems. The first component draws largely on Ekman’s work on display of emotions. Ekman and his colleagues (Ekman, 1993; Ekman & Friesen, 1975) argued that there are a number of basic (i.e., unlearned) emotions that are universal across all cultures
(although display rules may differ), and that are reflected in the same facial expressions. The second component involves research on emotional knowledge. The third component expands research that looks at how emotions facilitate expression and communication.

According to this ability perspective, EI is a group of abilities that are distinct from the traditional dimensions of intelligence and that facilitate the perception, expression, assimilation, understanding, and regulation of emotions, so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997b). More specifically, Mayer and Salovey (1997b) expanded on their 1990 definition by creating a four-branch model of EI consisting of: (1) Emotional Perception: the ability to perceive emotions in oneself and others, as well as in objects, art, and stories; (2) Emotional Facilitation of Thought: the ability to generate, use, and feel emotions in order to communicate feelings, or use them in other mental processes; (3) Emotional Understanding: the ability to understand how emotions combine and progress through relationship transitions and to reason about emotions; and (4) Emotional Management: the ability to be open to emotions and to moderate them in oneself and others, in order to encourage personal understanding and growth.

Despite the initial research defining EI in terms of ability, subsequent researchers have claimed that EI is composed of non-cognitive related competencies, traits, and skills (Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1995). The trait-based model of EI tends to be more pervasive in non-academic settings than the ability-based approach. Goleman defined EI as being non-cognitive in nature, and including such personal traits as empathy, optimism, adaptability, warmth, and motivation. Bar-On (1997) defined EI in broad terms as a set of non-cognitive abilities, skills, and competencies that affect the way in which individuals cope with environmental demands.

Trait-based model or ‘mixed-model’

Despite the popularity of this view, the mixed-model view of EI has received a lot of criticism from the scientific community. Mayer and Salovey (1997 b) argued that measures of EI must assess actual abilities as opposed to self-report of constructs such as optimism and motivation. That is, they argue that these mixed-model measures of “EI” are really measuring a
construct or constructs other than EI. One of the frequent criticisms of the trait- based measures of EI is that they tend to be highly correlated with personality measures (Davies et al., 1998; Newsome, Day, & Catano, 2000). This lack of discriminate validity from a well-established construct of personality is worrisome. Mixed-model measures of EI also tend to be uncorrelated with cognitive ability, which Mayer and his colleagues claim is imperative for any intelligence.

There is little evidence that mixed-model measures are related to job performance or academic performance (Newsome et al., 2000). However, there is some evidence that certain trait-based measures of EI may be related to life outcomes (e.g., life satisfaction, relationship quality, ability to manage moods; Bar-On 1997; Ciarrochi, Chan & Caputi, 2000) and work outcomes (e.g., career commitment; Carson & Carson, 1998). However, some of this relationship may be explained through common method variance. That is, questions on measures such as the EQ-i ask respondents to indicate how happy they are. We would expect these questions to be highly correlated with the same type of questions on satisfaction measures asking respondents how satisfied they are.

Emotional intelligence model of present study

Drawing upon the support from various sources of research and training in emotional intelligence, EI theory has tended to take two different approaches to model building. Academic researchers view EI as an abstract concept whereas training specialists look at it as a combination of practical competencies acquired by the individual. This study, while drawing heavily upon the insights from academic research, approaches EI from the competency perspective and hence attempts to present a model that construes EI as a constellation of competencies.

Some researchers suggest that emotionally intelligent people may be believed to behave in rationally and emotionally balanced ways because they are in possession of certain attributes called EI competencies (Mayer et al., 2004; Salovey et al., 1999). These competencies can be classified into two broad categories:
1. personal competence in understanding and managing one’s “own self”; and

2. social competence in knowing and dealing with the “self of others” (Feist and Barron, 1996; Goleman, 1995; Mayer and Salovey, 1997 b; Sternberg, 1996; Van Rooy and Viswesvaran, 2004).

Personal competence is the ability of a person to sense one’s own internal mental moods and processes and regulate the operations of the mind in such a way that emotions do not disturb or deter the rational mind from executing its actions rationally and to the best of its intellectual capacity. Personal competence is divisible into two sub-competencies, namely, self-awareness and self-regulation.

Self-awareness is the ability to detect the internal emotions and feelings, in real time, as they occur within us. Self-aware individuals are able to read and “link” their feelings with what they think and act. In EI terms, it is called “emotional literacy” (Mayer and Salovey, 1993; McGarvey, 1997).

Self-regulation is the ability of a person to use self-awareness (or emotional literacy) to manage one’s own emotions. The person uses self-awareness to regulate the rational and emotional operations of the mind in balanced ways so as to provide an emotionally supportive pathway for the reasoning mind to make logically correct and socially acceptable decisions and judgments (Martinez, 1997; Tischler et al., 2002).

Research indicates that people possessing personal competence manage their impulsive feelings and disturbing emotions well and stay composed, positive, and unflappable even during trying moments (Martinez, 1997; Mayer and Salovey, 1995). Such people can think clearly, stay focused under pressures and are able to take sound, decisive decisions despite uncertainties and demands, shifting priorities, and changes in their life (Slaski and Cartwright, 2002). Moreover, they show remarkable tact in adapting to fluid circumstances.

Concepts related to personal competence have been discussed in psychology previously. For example, personal competence may appear similar to self-monitoring - a concept in
psychology proposed by Snyder (1974). Self-monitoring theory refers to the process through which people regulate their own behavior so as to appear and “look good” so that they will be perceived by others in a favorable manner. Self-monitoring theory distinguishes between high self-monitors, who monitor their behavior to fit different situations, and low self-monitors, who are more cross-situation ally consistent (Snyder, 1974). However, while self-monitoring takes care of one’s behavior and appearance in public/social situations, it does not fully enable a person to handle and regulate his/her deeper, disturbing internal feelings and emotions – a feat that EI can achieve. EI should, accordingly, be viewed differently from self-monitoring.

**Social competence** is the ability of a person to gain psychological insight into the emotional world of others and to use one’s empathic capabilities and “relationship skills” (such as leadership, assertiveness, and communication) to produce socially desirable and productive behavioral outcomes both for themselves and others. Social competence includes two distinct sub-competencies: social-awareness and social influence.

**Social awareness** refers to the competence of a person in getting a “true feel” of the emotional mind of others. He/she enters into a covert “emotional dialogue” with the interacting partners (Salovey et al., 1999) and is able to empathize or “feel like” the other person. Empathy forges emotional connection (Kellett et al., 2002) and in many cases bonds people even far deeper and stronger than shared values, ideologies, and beliefs. Goleman believes that empathy underlies many interpersonal aptitudes like teamwork, persuasion and leadership (Goleman, 1998c).

**Social influence** refers to the potential of a person to influence and effect positive changes and outcomes in others by using his or her interpersonal skills. The term social influence, as a component of EI, has received only rudimentary treatment in EI literature. In the classic EI models, the second component of social competence is represented by “social skills”.

Social skills are a misnomer in the study and analysis of EI, so far. A review of 18 journal websites reveals that EI theorists and training specialists have bundled a large repertory of (historically known) interpersonal skills under the competence “social skills” – making it difficult to define as well as measure this competency.
This study, however, assumes that there are prominent interpersonal skills that need to be focused and developed in individuals if EI is to produce desirable effects and impacts on their social environment. While the skills required for effectively influencing others could be many, a few could be rated as important, considering the significance attached to these skills in management development and career counseling circles. Chief among these skills that contribute to a person’s social influence are assertiveness, communication, and empowering leadership. Assertiveness helps a person in establishing a mutually respectful, win-win, I am ok-You are ok relationship with others. Communication skills enable the person to listen carefully to others as well as negotiate successfully to produce desirable outcomes in social transactions. Empowering leadership equips the person with the abilities of guiding and motivating others in situations that involve leadership and group management.

Though these core social influence skills might appear as independent of each other, in actual use they merge and blend with each other and have to be used in a highly synchronized manner to be productive and effective in the social environment.

Social influence might appear akin to the so-called political skill but the two should be viewed as related but different attributes. Political skill is the ability of a person to influence others and get them to buy into one’s own ideas and objectives (Ferris et al., 2000). Political skill in itself is a virtue that is increasingly being advocated today as necessary competency to be effective in organizations (Ferris et al., 2007); but, the possibility exists that it could also be used, at times, for personal gains than for mutual benefits. Social influence on the other hand uses one’s relationships skills in an empathic manner and focuses on buying others into one’s ideas by building trust and pursuing means that mutually benefit each other. These additional elements of empathy coupled with mutuality of benefits to each other in social transactions perhaps demarcate social competence from political skill and distinctly distinguish it from the latter.

In an emotionally intelligent person, the above four competencies work together and in unison. Absence of one or more of these reduces the EI competence of the person and possibly inflicts damages both to the person and to his/her social functioning. However, a word of
caution is due. The first three of the EI competencies, namely, self-awareness, self-regulation, and social-awareness are basically functions of the rational-emotional mind of the person and could be enhanced by a person through rigorous training and practice in EI techniques. The fourth competency, social-influence, on the contrary, is highly interpersonal in nature, and, therefore, the success of this competency is dependent, also, on the attitudes and attributes of the other parties involved in social interactions. Furthermore, while engaging in and deploying the skills of social influence, the person is under pressure to keep aloof from the tendencies to engage in politicking because the means and goals of the latter often conflict with those of emotionally intelligent behavior. The conclusion here is that developing one’s social influence skills is more difficult than the acquisition of other competencies of EI.

Introduction to leadership

People are captivated by the idea of leadership, and they seek more information on how to become effective leaders. Many individuals believe that leadership is a way to improve how they present themselves to others. Corporations want individuals who have leadership ability because they believe these individuals provide special assets to their organizations. Academic institutions throughout the country are creating programs in leadership studies. Generally, leadership is a highly sought after and highly valued commodity. Leadership is an important to any organization, but may be even more important to a business institution. Meyer (1997) outlined the importance of sound leadership across all levels of an organization, and noted “a proficient relationship between the leader and the led.

When examining leadership, we must also examine how it is related other constructs. The “relatively new” concept of emotional intelligence has been creating a lot of interest among employers, practitioners, employees, and academics alike.

Models and definitions of leadership

People are captivated by the idea of leadership, and they seek more information on how to become effective leaders. Many individuals believe that leadership is a way to improve how they present themselves to others. Corporations want individuals who have leadership ability
because they believe these individuals provide special assets to their organizations. Academic institutions throughout the country are creating programs in leadership studies. Generally, leadership is a highly sought after and highly valued commodity. Leadership is important to any organization, but may be even more important to a business institution. Meyer (1997) outlined the importance of sound leadership across all levels of an organization, and noted "a proficient relationship between the leader and the led.

Leaders as functioning elements of organizations are not formally nominated, selected, elected or appointed nor are they born, they are accepted and followed. Leadership is a social skill. It consists of certain attitudes and behavior (acts) towards others and a way of conducting oneself which enables a person to cause others to follow his willingly or which enables one to cause others to follow him for a common goal. The ability of a person to cause others to follow him for a goal. Sometimes followers are attracted to a leader who represents their values and aspirations, and they are willing to place themselves under the leadership of a person who can re-find and act on those values. Mahatma Gandhi was one such leader. When a group of people are working together, there is nearly always an element of uncertainty amongst them. This uncertainty prompts people to choose a leader. Leader reduces uncertainty and confusion in a group. He enables the group to keep it focus on particular goals. In the case of managerial and supervisory leadership in an Organization, the leader keeps the members of his work group focused on the objectives of the organization. A person becomes a leader by displaying certain attitudes and behaviors towards others, which one is not born with and those which can be developed through learning and deliberate practice. Those who display leadership direct other or work through people and get a particular work done by them or galvanize them into productive action or educate and evaluate them or hold the group focus on certain desired goals.

Theories of leadership have revolved around either identifying the individual traits and behaviors of successful leaders, examining the situations that can foster or inhibit effective leadership (i.e., the organizational, societal, and external environments), or examining the relationship between leaders and followers. When examining the relationship between EI and
leadership, it may be argued that the most pertinent leadership theories deal with individual leader traits and behaviors.

**Trait- and Behavior-Based Model**

According to the trait- and behavior-based models, specific traits are associated with effective leadership. For example, intelligence, self-confidence, need for achievement, motivation to lead, emotional stability, honesty, integrity, need for achievement have all been identified as being necessary for successful leadership performance (Greenberg et al., 2000; Johns & Saks, 2001).

Meyer (1997) argued that the factors for “which soldiers are willing to sacrifice their lives for – loyalty, team spirit, morale, trust and confidence – cannot be infused by managing” (p. 59). He noted the individual nature of subordinates, stressing the importance of individual consideration and motivation. He believed that it is the goal of the leader to encourage the subordinate's search for individual growth. Three factors are necessary to produce successful leaders: having strength of character (in terms of honesty, loyalty, courage, self-confidence, and self-sacrifice); having the requisite knowledge; and application of character and knowledge (through teaching, mentoring, setting an example, etc.; Meyer, 1997).

Within the trait literature, many researchers have examined charismatic and transformational leader characteristics. Charismatic leaders are defined as having high self-confidence and a clear vision (Shamir, Zacay, & Popper, 1998), engaging in unconventional behavior, and acting as a change agent, and still being realistic about environmental constraints (Greenberg et al., 2000).

The research on transformational leadership evolved from the charismatic literature. Transformational leaders are defined as leaders that inspire followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of an overall vision (REF). Bass (1985) distinguished between charismatic and transformational leaders in that transformational leaders are charismatic leaders who influence followers and whose followers benefit from this influence. That is, all transformational leaders must be charismatic, although all charismatic leaders are not
necessarily transformational.

There are three key components of charismatic and transformational leadership: (1) inspirational leadership; (2) individual consideration; and (3) intellectual stimulation. Inspirational leadership involves arousal of motivational factors in terms of instilling pride, role modeling, and encouraging followers, and stimulating enthusiasm and self-confidence. For transformational leaders, this inspiration also involves influencing followers to succeed. Individual consideration involves considering followers not only at a group level, but also treating followers differently (yet all fairly) on an individual basis (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1993). Finally, intellectual stimulation involves “the arousal and change in followers of problem awareness and problem solving, of thought and imagination, and of beliefs and values, rather than arousal and change in immediate action” (Bass, 1985, p. 99). Transformational leaders challenge followers to question the status quo (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999).

Charismatic leadership has been associated with increased organizational effectiveness (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramanian, 1996), subjective and objective performance (Fuller, Patterson, Hester, & Stringer, 1996), organizational financial performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993), subordinate ratings or effectiveness (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramanian, 1996). Similarly, transformational leadership has also been associated with higher follower attitudes, organizational commitment, and performance (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Kirkpartick & Locke, 1996), increased organizational financial performance (Avolio, Waldman, & Einstein, 1988; Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996).

Conger & Kanungo (1994) argued that the main distinction between the charismatic and transformational leadership literature was that the charismatic literature focused on the characteristics and behaviors of the leader, whereas the transformational literature examined the impact of the leader characteristics on the followers.

However, Bass (1985) didn’t make this distinction, and noted that defining a leader as charismatic or transformational depends not only on the leader, but also on the characteristics of the followers and the environment (Bass, 1985). He stated that charisma was defined solely
in terms of how followers perceive it. Moreover, Howell and Hall-Merenda (1999) argued that it is important to look at both the leader characteristics and the leader-follower (i.e., leader-member exchange) perspectives simultaneously. That is, how do transformational leaders develop a relationship with their followers? EI may influence this relationship as well as how this interaction is defined.

**Contingency-based Models**

Contingency or situational theories of leadership are based on the premise that successful leadership depends on environmental factors (such as task clarity and the degree of challenge offered by the task, which are both related to organizational level; Johns & Saks, 2001).

Certain situations may foster the emergence of a charismatic or transformational leader: This emergence depends on factors within the organization and industry, and well as the more general historical, economic, and social circumstances (Bass, 1985). That is, transformational leaders may emerge as a reflection of social values during times of stress or change, when new leaders are sought to solve old problems and encourage organizational survival (Bass, 1985). Similarly, Donohue and Wong (1994) noted several conditions in which transformational leadership may emerge: during an acute crisis or when the organizational culture is being attacked; when a general "malaise" exists; when subordinates are disillusioned.

House's Path-Goal Theory states that the types of leader behaviors (i.e., directive, supportive, participative, and achievement oriented) are most effective in certain situations (House, 1971; House, 1996; Johns & Saks, 2001). Popper, Landau, and Gluskinso (1992) argued that leadership must be examined in the context of the organization's culture and socio-technical issues. For example, in a combat situation involving relatively simple individual tasks (e.g., working in a tank) or in combat situations involving complicated technology and instruments (e.g., a fighter plane), transformational leadership is not critical because the leader does not have any opportunity to influence the individual. However, Popper et al. (1992) argued that transformational leadership is much more critical in an infantry situation
(complicated technology and relatively simple instruments) because the leader has a greater opportunity to express his/her vision and influence the followers' motivation level and behaviors.

The Interaction of Leader and Followers

According to Hersey & Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory, effective leadership style is based on the followers' characteristics, in terms of willingness and ability to do the job (Greenberg et al., 2000). Other theories incorporate both situation and follower characteristics. For example, according to Fiedler's Contingency Theory (Fiedler, 1967; Fiedler, 1978; Fiedler & Chemers, 1974), the orientation of leadership style (i.e., relationship vs. task-oriented) used is dependent on the favorability of the situation.

The impact that leaders have on their followers is influenced by the characteristics of these followers (Lord, Brown, & Frieberg, 1999). Little research has examined how followers affect a leader's tendency toward charismatic, transformational, or transactional leadership. However, this perception of followers and follower characteristics are inherent in the definition of charismatic and transformational leadership. For example, although transformational leaders must exhibit intellectual stimulation and the leader must be seen as having high intellect, he or she must also be able to relate to his or her followers and must gauge the amount of stimulation required for particular followers (Bass, 1985). The ability of the leader to inspire belief in his or her vision is contingent upon the receptivity of the followers to the vision. This receptivity depends on the relevance of the vision (Bass, 1985).

According to the Leader-Member Exchange theory, leadership is a process focusing on the dyadic relationship between the leader and follower (Northouse, 1997). Leaders must focus on the dyadic relationship between leader and subordinate involving mutual trust, respect, and influence. A leader has different relationships with different subordinates (Graen & Wakabayashi, 1994; Greenberg et al., 2000).

In addition to examining the characteristics of and relationship between leaders and followers, it also important to look at the influence of the environment on these types of
leaders.

Task-oriented and socio-emotional leadership

This examines the interaction between task-oriented and socio-emotional leadership for two reasons. First, these two types of leadership have been the focus of tests of interaction in the leadership literature. Second, a large proportion of day-to-day organizational leadership involves behaviors that can be categorized as task-oriented behaviors (e.g. scheduling the work of followers and providing them with instructions/advice) or socio-emotional behaviors (e.g. being approachable and listening to followers) (Luthans et al., 1988; Judge et al., 2004; Komaki, 1986). Task-oriented leadership is multifaceted and encompasses a diverse range of behaviors including assigning followers to particular jobs, emphasizing deadlines, checking that followers observe rules and regulations, setting deadlines, and pressuring followers to work hard (Misumi, 1985). Thus, an important aspect of task-oriented leadership is pressure: that is, pressuring followers to work hard and to maintain quality standards by sampling their work, monitoring their performance, as well as setting and emphasizing deadlines. Pressure appears to be a ubiquitous aspect of leadership. Socio-emotional leadership comprises a wide range of behaviors including providing encouragement to followers and maintaining pleasant leader-follower relationships that are characterized by mutual trust, respect for followers’ ideas, and consideration of their feeling (Bass, 1985). Socio-emotional leadership also involves treating followers fairly reducing their stress levels, expressing appreciation for their efforts (Misumi and Peterson, 1985), and supporting followers by being concerned about their welfare (House, 1971). Thus, an important aspect of socio-emotional leadership is support: that is, showing concern for the welfare of followers and expressing appreciation for their efforts. Support also appears to be a ubiquitous aspect of leadership.

Emotional Intelligence and Leadership

Leadership can be defined as a process of influencing other people’s orientation towards and achievement of goals (Greenberg, Baron, Sales, & Owens, 2000; Johns & Saks, 2001). Transformational leadership involves inspiring followers and communicating a vision.
Intuitively, it may appear logical to expect aspects of the ability-based model of EI to have important consequences for the study of leadership.

**Comparison of EI abilities to leadership traits**

Several of the traits and behaviors associated with effective leaders (e.g., emotional stability, self-confidence, adaptability, and tenacity) overlap with the trait-based view of EI. An integral part of impression management is managing one's own emotions (which requires an ability to perceive others' emotions and one's own emotions). Theoretically, an individual who is high on impression management must also be adept at managing his or her own emotions and must also be able to correctly perceive others' emotions and one's own emotions. Charismatic leaders must have “insight into the needs, values, and hopes of their followers” (Bass, 1985, p.46). This insight may be facilitated through a higher level of emotional awareness and sensitivity. Bass (1985) also claimed that charismatic leaders are great actors, because they are engaging in impression management. Charismatic leaders create, communicate, and instill commitment toward a common vision (Bass, 1985). They create emotional responses (e.g., sense of excitement) in followers. Charismatic leaders create shared norms and tend to “actively shape and enlarge audiences through their own energy, self-confidence, assertiveness, ambition, a seizing of opportunities” (Bass, 1985; p.40).

Bass (1985) noted that when focusing on their individual followers, leaders must be supportive, considerate, empathetic, caring, and must give personalized attention. These requirements may be easier for an individual high in emotional intelligence, who is able to accurately perceive and understand others’ emotions, while managing his or her own emotions. Bass (1985) also recognized that in many situations military leaders are expected to be mentors and counselors to their followers. They must display developmentally-oriented behaviors (e.g., encourages delegation), conduct individual counseling, and become a mentor and role model for followers. Emotional intelligence may also help leaders understand the emotions of followers and understand how to manage his or own emotions. This emotional knowledge helps the leader become an effective mentor by modeling appropriate emotional responses. The emotional perception ability of leaders is critical to the counseling and mentoring role.
Although charismatic leadership has been associated with positive outcomes, charismatic leaders may be ineffective for several reasons. A leader may fail if he or she is unable to cope with the difficulties that s/he faces, if the leader is overly confident and unwilling to compromise his or her principles, or if the leader is cold or arrogant (Bass, 1985). Charismatic leaders who are also sensitive to their followers, who have a good understanding of their own emotions (as well as the emotions of their followers), and who are capable of managing their own emotions (i.e., having high EI) may be less likely to fail. That is, it is possible that EI moderates the relationship between charisma and leadership effectiveness. Future research must examine this issue. Moreover, charismatic leaders are not necessarily effective, and there is a potential dark side of charismatic leaders, which is evident if the number of charismatic leaders who manipulated their followers for their own gain (e.g., Adolf Hitler, Charles Manson, etc.). Some EI researchers have also suggested that an individual who was extremely high in EI may be excellent at impression management to the extent of negatively influencing people.

Mixed-model EI and leadership

Despite the view that mixed-model measures of EI do not actually assess EI, it may be worthwhile to examine these measures in conjunction with leadership. Even if these measures are not really EI, they could be very useful to organizations if they are associated with more effective leader (and organizational) performance.

The only two studies to examine EI and leadership have utilized mixed-model measures of EI. Barling, Slater, and Kelloway (2000) found that EI scores were related to subordinates’ ratings of transformational leadership. Because of the large overlap of the mixed-model measures of EI and personality, the link between EI and leadership may be due solely to the shared variance with personality. Research has indicated that personality may predict effective leadership behaviors. For example, Judge and Bono (2000) found that extraversion and agreeableness uniquely predicted transformational leadership, while controlling for the effects of the other Big 5 factors. Openness to experience had a significant zero-order correlation with transformational leadership, although this relationship disappeared when the five factors were
examined jointly. Neuroticism and conscientiousness were unrelated to transformational leadership.

One of the high performance leadership competencies that Schroder and colleagues (Schroder 1997; Spangenberg, Schroder, & Duvenage, 1999) identified is Interpersonal learning. It is feasible that EI (especially the Interpersonal Skills factor of the EQ-i, Bar-On, 1997) would overlap significantly with this factor. Again, these studies on leadership competencies may reinforce the idea that certain factors of the mixed-model measures of EI are not truly EI, but are effective leader competencies. Future research should examine these issues and relate them to existing validated measures (e.g., 5-factor model of personality, self-monitoring ability, empathy, self-control, and delayed gratification).

Introduction to Conflict

Conflict is a pervasive phenomenon that permeates a multitude of organizational processes and outcomes. Its omnipresence and the importance of conflict management has been acknowledged in diverse fields including psychology, communication, organizational behavior, information systems (IS), and marketing (e.g., Deutsch 1990; Greenhalgh 1987; Pondy 1967; Pruitt and Rubin 1986; Putnam and Poole 1987; Robey et al. 1989; Thomas 1976, 1992b; Wall and Callister 1995). Numerous symptoms of conflict have been identified including hostility and jealousy (e.g., Smith and McKeen 1992), poor communication (e.g., Franz and Robey 1984), a proliferation of technical rules, norms, and regulations (e.g., Franz and Robey 1984), and frustration and low morale (e.g., Glasser 1981). As Smith and McKeen noted:

"...conflict is a very real part of corporate life and a major obstacle to effective computerization... conflict appears between IS and almost all other departments in a wide variety of contexts... Lack of trust and understanding, hostility, and frustration with the other group are typical of these conflict relationships and these symptoms were evident between business managers and other personnel (p. 55)."

To provide a context within which to view the study, we first present a general framework of interpersonal conflict based on a review of the general conflict literature (e.g.,
Pondy 1967; Pruitt and Rubin 1986; Putnam and Poole 1987; Thomas 1976, 1992b; Wall and Callister 1995). Although vast, the interpersonal conflict literature shares a general structure whereby conflict is seen as a cycle (Wall and Callister 1995): As with any social process, there are causes; also, there is a core process, which has results or effects. These effects feed back to effect the causes (p. 516).

The level of interpersonal conflict that exists depends in part on the contextual antecedents and in part on the conflict management styles employed by the individuals on the project team. Similarly, the styles individuals employ depend in part on the contextual antecedents and in part on the level of interpersonal conflict present. In other words, individuals select different conflict management styles depending on the level of interpersonal conflict they perceive. As such, conflict is seen as a process whereby interpersonal conflict and management style affect one another. Finally, the interpersonal conflict and style of conflict management will each affect a variety of individual, team, project, and organizational outcomes.

Definitions and Properties of Interpersonal Conflict

The term conflict has been employed in different ways reflecting the different levels at which various conflicts exist (Deutsch 1990; Thomas 1992a). Thomas (1992a) noted two broad uses of the term. The first refers to incompatible response tendencies within an individual, e.g., behavioral conflicts where one must choose whether or not to pursue a particular course of action, or role conflict where one must choose between several competing sets of role demands. The second use refers to conflicts that occur between different individuals, groups, organizations, or other social units; hence, the terms interpersonal, inter-group, inter-organizational, and international conflict.

Here, we focus on this second use, and in particular, on interpersonal conflict which has been defined in many different ways (Thomas 1992a; Wall and Callister 1995). Some examples include: Content-oriented differences of opinion that occur in interdependent relationships and can develop into incompatible goals and interests (Putnam and Wilson 1982, p. 633); an
expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce rewards, and interference from the other party in achieving their goals (Hocker and Wilmot 1985, p. 23); the process that begins when one party perceives that the other has negatively affected, or is about to negatively affect something that he or she cares about (Thomas 1992a, p. 653) and a process in which one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party (Wall and Callister 1995, p. 517).

In a synthesis of the numerous conceptualizations and definitions of conflict, Putnam and Poole (1987) and Thomas (1992a, 1992b) identified three general themes or properties: interdependence, disagreement, and interference. **Interdependence** exists when each party's attainment of their goals depends, at least in part, on the actions of the other party. Without interdependence, the actions of each party have no impact on the outcomes of the other party. In essence, interdependence represents a key structural pre-condition of any conflict situation, providing an interpersonal context in which conflicts may arise. However, while many individuals or groups are in interdependent relationships with others, not all will experience conflict. Thus, interdependence is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for conflicts to occur. **Disagreement** exists when parties think that a divergence of values, needs, interests, opinions, goals, or objectives exists. As such, disagreement represents the key cognitive component of interpersonal conflict. Again, however, disagreement is not, by itself, sufficient for conflict to emerge. Disagreeing parties will not experience conflict when, for example, the areas of disagreement are irrelevant or unimportant (e.g., when there is no interdependence, or when the areas of disagreement are minor). **Interference** exists when one or more of the parties interferes with or opposes the other party's attainment of its interests, objectives, or goals. Interference thus represents the central behavioral characteristic of any conflict. Indeed, many researchers believe that the core process of interpersonal conflict is the behavior where one or more disputants oppose their counterpart's interests or goals (Wall and Callister 1995). Researchers have also shown the importance of incorporating negative emotion into conceptualizations of conflict, reflecting such feelings as jealousy, anger, anxiety, or frustration (Amason 1996; Jehn 1995; Pinkley 1990; Pondy 1967; Thomas 1992a, 1992b). These emotions are thought to emerge when there are major disagreements, or when parties interfere with the
attainment of each others' important goals. Thus, a fourth property, negative emotion, can also be added.

A good definition of interpersonal conflict needs to incorporate all of its definitional properties. Thus, the present study defines interpersonal conflict as a phenomenon that occurs between interdependent parties as they experience negative emotional reactions to perceived disagreements and interference with the attainment of their goals. Together, these perceptions span situational. (Interdependence), cognitive (disagreement), behavioral (interference), and affective (negative emotion) elements of conflict situations.

When individuals involved in any task disagree and act solely with their own interests in mind, their actions are likely to interfere with other parties' interests or goals (Robey et al. 1989) in the form of foot dragging (Newman and Sabherwal 1989), political maneuvering (Markus 1983), steam rolling (Hirschheim and Newman 1991), or a proliferation of technical rules, norms, and regulations (Franz and Robey 1984). Finally, largely as a result of such actions, frustration, hostility, anger, and distrust can emerge (Glasser 1981; Smith and McKeen 1992).

The Assessment of Interpersonal Conflict and Conflict Management Styles

Past research assessing interpersonal conflict can be classified into two groups. One group assessed styles of conflict management (e.g., Blake and Mouton 1964; Kilmann and Thomas 1977; Putnam and Wilson 1982; Rahim 1983). However, note that while potentially related, conflict management style is conceptually distinct from level of interpersonal conflict. The second group of studies directly assessed level of interpersonal conflict (e.g., Amason 1996; Barki and Hartwick 1994b; Brown and Day 1981; Etgar 1979; Habib 1987; Jehn 1995; Robey et al. 1989). At least two shortcomings of these latter studies can be identified. Many assessed interpersonal conflict with a small number of items, typically using items that looked only at perceptions of overall conflict (e.g., Barki and Hartwick 1994b; Robey et al. 1989). Such assessments are useful but do not provide an in-depth look at the underpinnings of the construct. On the other hand, studies assessing conflict in greater depth have not captured all of its definitional properties. While some assessed both disagreement and negative emotion
(e.g., Amason 1996; Jehn 1995), most assessed only disagreement (e.g., Brown and Day 1981; Habib 1987), and few have assessed interference (for an exception, see Etgar 1979). Given the central role conflict researchers ascribe to interference (Wall and Callister 1995), neglecting its assessment from assessments of interpersonal conflict seems to be a serious omission. The present study views interdependence, disagreement, interference, and negative emotion as dimensional indicators of interpersonal conflict.

Within the conflict domain, considerable effort has been expended to examine the management and resolution of conflicts, identifying a number of conflict management styles and their role in achieving satisfactory outcomes (cf., Blake and Mouton 1964; Pruitt and Rubin 1986; Putnam and Poole 1987; Thomas 1976, 1992b; Wall and Callister 1995). Several measures assessing styles of conflict management have also been developed (e.g., Kilmann and Thomas 1977; Putnam and Wilson 1982; Rahim 1983). Traditionally, researchers have identified five different modes or styles of behavior, often labeled as: asserting, accommodating, compromising, problem-solving, and avoiding. These styles are seen as general strategies or behavioral orientations individuals adopt when dealing with conflicts.

**Asserting** occurs as individuals strive to win or prevail. Conflict is seen as a fixed pie, zero sum situation, with one party's gains coming at the expense of the others' (in the case of goal conflicts), or with one party's accuracy or correctness occurring as others are found to be inaccurate or incorrect (in the case of judgment or decision conflicts). Conflict, therefore, is considered a win-lose situation. Alternative labels for this style include competing, dominating, and forcing.

Like asserting, **accommodating** also views conflict as a fixed pie, zero sum situation and occurs when individuals sacrifice their own needs and desires in order to satisfy those of other parties. This occurs as individuals oblige or yield to others' positions, or cooperate in an attempt to smooth over conflicts. Alternative labels for this style include cooperating, obliging, yielding, and sacrificing.
Compromising is a third style that views conflict as a fixed pie, zero sum situations. However, compromising frequently splits the difference or involves give and take behaviors where each party wins some and loses some. Alternative labels include sharing and splitting the difference.

Problem-solving occurs when individuals in conflict try to fully satisfy the concerns of all parties. Here, conflict is not seen as a fixed pie, zero sum situations, as was the case for the first three styles. Instead, actions are aimed at expanding the pie so that all parties can achieve their goals and objectives. Similarly, judgments and decisions are not seen as right or wrong. Instead, a synthesis is sought, integrating all parties' perspectives. Hence, the term win-win solution. Alternative labels of this style include integrating, cooperating, and collaborating.

Finally, avoiding occurs when individuals are indifferent to the concerns of either party or refuse to act or participate in conflict. Here, one withdraws, physically or psychologically, abdicating all responsibility for the solution. Alternative labels for this style include withdrawing, evading, escaping, and apathy.

The theory of Blake and Mouton (1964) is based on the dual concern model that conflict is managed in different ways (namely withdrawing, smoothing, forcing, problem solving, compromising) based on high/low concern for production and high/low concern for people. Thomas (1976) extended this model by focusing on the desire to satisfy your own concerns and the desire to satisfy the other’s concerns. Based on Blake and Mouton (1964) and Thomas (1976), Rahim and ve Bonoma (1979) differentiated the styles of handling conflict in two dimensions. The dual concern model shows conflict behavior to focus on whether a person has high or low concern for one’s own outcomes or high or low concern for the other’s outcomes.

Five different styles of conflict management are involved in crossing these two dimensions:

1. Integrating;
2. Obliging;
3. Dominating;
4. Avoiding; and
Integrating style, high concern for self and the others, is characterized by a willingness to exchange information openly, to address differences constructively, and to make every effort to pursue a solution that will be mutually acceptable (Rahim, 1992). This style is the most desired one because it is most likely to yield a win-win solution, especially in a situation identified with long-term dependency on the other party. (Aycan et al., 2000; Pruitt and Carnevale, 1993). Additionally, this style also reduces the level of task conflict and relationship conflict (Friedman et al., 2000). Dealing with complex problems requires the use of an integrative style. Utilizing the skills, information and resources possessed by different parties helps to redefine and formulate problems and find alternative solutions (Rahim, 2002).

Obliging style, low concern for self and high concern for others, focuses on protecting and maintaining relationships rather than pursuing an outcome that meets the individual’s own concerns. When the other party is right and the issue of conflict is much more important to the other party, it makes more sense to use an obliging style. When a party has a weak position and believes that giving up the conflict will engender more beneficial outcomes, it is reasonable to use this style (Rahim, 2002). Also, some conditions – like time pressure – may be the reason for adopting an obliging style (Rubin, 1994).

Dominating style, labeled as “competing” is identified as a win-lose strategy. Ignoring the needs and expectations of the other party and pursuing one’s own interests through the use of forceful tactics is suitable, when the conflict issues involve routine matters or require speedy decision-making (Rahim, 2002). Avoiding style results from having little concern for either one’s own or the other’s interests. When the issue of conflict is important and requires taking on the responsibility of quick decision-making, withdrawing from conflict could generate harmful outcomes for the party (Rahim, 2002).

Compromising style reflects a moderate concern for one’s own interests and a moderate concern for the other’s interests. An outcome that is mutually acceptable for both sides is a desirable strategy to solve conflict. This style involves give and take. When both
parties have equal power and consensus cannot be reached, it makes sense to use this style. The most important point in using this style is that it generates failure in identifying real, complex problems (Rahim, 2002).

There has been considerable debate about whether conflict management styles are dispositional or situational (Friedman et al., 2000). For example, the findings of Antonioni (1998), indicated that there is a strong relationship between Big Five personality factors and the styles of conflict management. On the other hand, Goodwin (2002) found that auditors resolve conflicts according to the nature and seriousness of the conflict issue. Also, recent research findings suggest that styles are partly dispositional and partly situational (Rahim et al., 2001; Graziano et al., 1996). Beyond all these arguments, there is a great need to understand what is universal and culture specific about conflict management theory. Conflict is inevitable in all cultures, but every culture has its own way to struggle with conflict (Brett, 2000; Chiu and Kosinski, 1994). As a culturally bound event, conflict management is affected by cultural values.

The concept of individualism and collectivism provides one means of distinguishing broad differences in cultural values (Hofstede, 1980). People from individualistic cultures tend to be concerned with individual images, task accomplishment, and individual goals relative to the group’s interests; they also tend to exhibit more self-face-saving conflict styles, such as dominating. On the other hand, people from collectivistic cultures tend to see themselves as part of the group, place the group’s goals over the individual’s goals, and focus on maintaining harmony.

From a review of extant literature, it is apparent that many studies have revealed individualists tend to prefer confrontational and competing conflict management styles, whereas collectivists appear to prefer harmony-enhancing conflict management styles (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991, 2000; Morris et al., 1998; Wang et al., 2007). Individualistic cultures prefer to use forcing, rather than collectivist cultures. On the other hand, collectivist cultures choose withdrawing, compromising and problem solving Rahim, 1983; Holt and DeVore, 2005; Kozan and Ergin, 1999).
When we analyzed the extant literature in this context, we were confronted with many studies. For example, Thai participants indicated a greater preference for avoiding and obliging styles of conflict management than the American participants did. Furthermore, the study showed that, the longer the time Thais spent in other cultures, the more they reported using a dominating style, and the less they reported relying on avoiding and obliging styles (Boonsathorn, 2007). According to Kagan et al. (1982), Mexicans (as a collectivist) reported using withdrawing and smoothing more than European Americans, who chose more active, confrontational styles, such as forcing and problem solving. Also, Cai and Fink (2002) found that avoiding was preferred by individualists rather than collectivists. Individualists did not differ from collectivists in their preference for the dominating conflict style, but prefer compromising and integrating more than individualists do, whereas individualism-collectivism had no significant linear effect on preference for the obliging style. Elsayed-Ekhouly and Buda (1996) found Middle Eastern executives to display more integrating and avoiding, while US executives used more obliging, dominating and compromising styles. The results suggest that persons with a tendency for independence choose direct, whereas persons with a tendency for interdependence seem to prefer indirect conflict behaviors.

Kozan (1989, 2002) found that hierarchy played a significant role in impacting conflict management styles. Overall, the tendency was to be more accommodative towards one’s superiors (respect for authority); suppressing/and or avoiding competition between peers (focus on collectivism and group harmony); and imposing solutions on subordinates (analogous to a parent-child relationship). In group-oriented cultures, a “third party” would be used frequently in resolving most conflicts to maintain harmony in organizations (Kozan et al., 2007). Especially, in mediational third party strategy, leaders seem to use their power position not only to manage the process, but also to solve the conflict (Kozan and Alter, 1994). Managers and colleagues are involved in resolving conflicts unrelated to them in order to preserve group solidarity in organizations. In a study conducted with 435 Turkish respondents, Ergin (2000) reported that a third party was involved in more than 65 percent of conflicts in organizations. While individuals in other parts of the world would remain passive in situations unrelated to them, managers and colleagues are expected to get actively involved in resolving
disagreements among others. The behaviors and styles of colleagues and superiors in conflict resolution ranged from giving advice to making a final decision in an authoritarian manner (Kabasakal and Bodur, 1998b).

**Models of Conflict Resolution**

March and Simon (1993) define conflict as “a breakdown in the standard mechanisms of Decision-making so that an individual or group experiences difficulty in selecting an action alternative” (p. 132). Individuals in conflict may either continue to problem solve, elect to do nothing or seek the involvement of a third party to assist in conflict resolution. Four models for conflict resolution have evolved within education and are commonly referred to as the professional, bureaucratic, legal, and mediation models (Neal and Kirp, 1985; Goldberg and Kuriloff, 1987).

**Professional model**

Conflict resolution within public education has traditionally followed the professional model. The professional model recognizes the expertise of educational professionals (school administrators and teachers) and defers the resolution of disputes to those individuals specifically trained within the profession. Similar to the practice of law and medicine, public education has traditionally been managed by the professionals trained within the discipline. The professional model emphasizes professional discretion and decision-making rather than strict adherence to rules. The recipient of services, be it medical treatment, legal representation or education services has little input into the decision regarding the service to be provided. Disputes concerning the services provided to an individual are typically addressed through a limited peer review process. A judgment regarding the appropriate provision of services is made by the peer review panel based upon the panel’s determination of whether or not the provider had adhered to the profession’s accepted standards of care. Within the professional model, the recipient of services is generally passive, deferring to the expertise of the professionals (Neal and Kirp, 1985)

**Bureaucratic model**
The bureaucratic model is typical of federal or state programs that grant benefits to individuals (e.g. food stamps, public assistance, and social security). Employees of state and federal agencies that manage these programs have significant involvement in the development of eligibility standards, the specification of allowable services and the determination of the allowable provision or limitations upon appropriate services. Administrators of programs that operate under the bureaucratic model are expected to defer to regulatory standards and have much less discretion in determining eligibility, allowable services, etc., than within the professional model. Within the bureaucratic model, the recipient of services is granted limited procedural rights to challenge the decision of the person who administers the program. These rights are typically limited to an appeal to a higher level of authority within the organization and a showing that the decision was “arbitrary, capricious or otherwise a violation of the program’s standards” (Maine Administrative Procedures Act, Title V, M.R.S.A. Part 10000 et seq.).

Legal Model

Neal and Kirp (1985, pp. 65-67) characterized the legal model as “fairly new to policy making in the United States” but none the less “a style close to the mainstream of American social and political culture.” The legal model focuses on the “individual as the bearer of rights...(who can) best safeguard their own interests” and “the use of legal concepts and court like procedures to enforce and protect rights.” The legal model is based upon a mistrust of the traditional bureaucratic model and its focus on top-down management, decision-making based upon the benefit to the organization, and “norms of fairness using statistical tests across classes of affected people” (p. 65).

The professional and the bureaucratic models grant limited rights to recipients of services who challenge administrative decisions. The bureaucratic model determines agency compliance through the application of procedural rights and generally accepted norms to specific groups of individuals. The legal model, with its adoption of court-like procedures, individual rights, and entitlements, shifts the focus of agency compliance to the provision of a substantive right to the individual, based upon the individual’s unique needs. For example, under the bureaucratic model, while parents may request that a building principal review the
placement of their child in Mr. Smith’s third grade classroom, the parents have no substantive right to challenge the principal’s decision. In contrast, under the legal model, parents of a student with disabilities may challenge a school’s administrative decision refusing to provide a full time sign language interpreter to a child who is deaf all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court (Board of Education v. Rowley, 1982).

**Alternative Dispute Resolution / Mediation Model**

Mediation is the fourth conflict resolution model. Mediation is a non-adversarial conflict resolution process that encourages joint problem solving, assists both parties to identify alternative solutions to their problem, and promotes effective communication between parents and schools. While both the complaint process and the hearing process typically result in a win / lose relationship between the parties, the mediation process, if successful, typically results in a win / win relationship through the development of a mutual agreeable solution (Goldberg and Hufner, 1995).

**Methods of Dealing with Conflict**

People and groups, may use several different methods of dealing with controversy. Some methods focus on preserving the relationship and resolving the issue, while others tend to have negative results (Griffin, 1989; Lindgren, 1990; Fisher, Roger & William, 1991).

**Avoidance**

Some people attempt to avoid conflict situations altogether or to avoid certain types of conflict. These people tend to repress emotional reactions, look the other way, or leave the situation entirely (for example, quit a job, leave school, get divorced). Either they cannot face up to such situations effectively, or they do not have the skills to negotiate them effectively.
Avoidance strategies usually do not provide persons with a high level of satisfaction. They tend to leave doubts and fears about meeting the same type of situation in the future.

Diffusion

Diffusion strategies are delaying actions which try to cool off the situation, at least temporarily. Examples include: resolving minor points while delaying discussion of the major problem, postponing a confrontation until a more appropriate time, and avoiding clarification of the issues underlying the conflict. Similar to avoidance strategies, these tactics typically result in feelings of dissatisfaction, anxiety about the future, and concerns about oneself.

Confrontation

The third major strategy involves an actual confrontation of conflicting issues or persons. Confrontation can be divided into win/lose (power) strategies and win/win strategies. Power strategies include the use of physical force (a punch in the nose, war), bribery (money, favors) and punishment (withholding love, money). Such tactics are often very successful from the winners' point of view: they win, the others lose. A closer look at the power struggle suggests that it is probably not this simple. All win/lose strategies suffer from the "conflict trap." The loser has been given justification in her or his own mind for reversing the situation "next time." As a result, win/lose strategies, particularly the power strategy, are as much conflict generators as conflict resolvers. The feelings of the loser are the seed from which the next round of conflict will likely grow.

Arbitration

Arbitration is often the result of a fight strategy. When both sides in the fight are equally powerful and have equal rights, a stalemate begins, and a third party may be asked to decide the issue. The problem with this strategy is that when the third party or judge decides between the conflicting parties, the loser seldom feels that justice has been done. The issue has been decided, but the hostility carries over and becomes a cause for renewed conflict.

Voting
Voting is a civilized form of fighting. A vote, rather than an open fight, is possible when the following conditions are present

- It is possible for participants in a conflict to change their position on the issue if they are convinced (election campaign).
- There are beliefs and commitments to principles or to an organization which holds the parties together in a continuing relationship (democracy).
- The participants will generally abide by the preference of the majority.

**Compromise**

Compromise strategies use negotiation and bargaining in order to “split the difference.” The premise behind compromise is that partial victory is better than winning nothing at all. Ideally, in a compromise each side gives up something of lesser value in order to achieve or retain a great goal. Compromise in this context is a form of negotiation. It does not involve giving up one's principles or values. Compromise, at its best, turns into consensus—a win-win result.

**Consensus**

Consensus seeks to bring all parties in the conflict to a mutually satisfying resolution of the issue. Consensus is possible in an atmosphere where better answers and solutions are likely to emerge from differences. This is often called problem solving, based on common interests (Fisher, Roger & William, 1991).

**Synergy**

Synergy is the highest form of conflict resolution. Imagine a ping-pong game in which your objective is, as a player, to return the ball in a way to maximize the probability that your opponent will hit the increasingly difficult shots successfully. This reverses the win/lose strategy.
The competition is invigorating, when it is used to increase mutual winning. The better each play, the more both win...and the more both enjoy it. Synergistic thinking encourages us to use the mind, resources and values of others to enlarge the amount of winnings.

In a win-win strategy, unlike power confrontations, both sides can win. The aim of these strategies is to resolve the conflict with a solution which is mutually satisfying to all parties involved in the conflict.

In the present study, we examined the correlation between sub-scales- self awareness, self management, Social awareness and social skills of emotional intelligence and five styles- problem-solving, asserting, avoiding, compromising and accommodating of handling conflict. The statistical results for internal consistency of the present study indicate that the alpha values for five dimensions of EI and the five conflict management styles are ranging from 0.66 to 0.85.

**Why Does Conflict Occur?**

Some conflict is inevitable in human relationships. Often clashes occur more over perceived differences than real ones. People anticipate blocks to achieving their goals that may or may not be there (Dunn, 1986; Robinson, 1974). Conflict often results from:

- A lack of communication. Failure to share ideas and feelings allows the other person to "fill in the gap." We “read in” what we think the other person or persons will say, or anticipate how they will respond. Then, we often suspect negative things which provoke anxiety-leading us to look for the worst. If this continues, trust becomes lower and we may become suspicious and defensive.

- A value conflict in which two people have different attitudes, beliefs and expectations. These differences may interfere in making decisions if we are inflexible and hold rigid beliefs about the "right way" to do things. Two people choose different goals or different methods to achieve the same goals because they have different values and beliefs. Since each goal requires an investment of time, effort and some sacrifice, we often cannot pursue one goal without sacrificing the other to some extent.
A lack of effective leadership or decision-making. Lack of agreement about "who's in charge" or "how we are going to get things done" in any situation can be a source of conflict. For example, if one person in a group expects democratic decision-making (all members have input) and the other expects someone to be in charge and tell the members what to do, they may have difficulty resolving differences of opinion. Then when differences exist, members become sidetracked into a hassle over who will decide or whose opinion is going to be accepted as the "right" one, or what the decision-making processes should be. The resulting conflict becomes a "win-lose" struggle.

Discrepancies in role expectations. Difficulties can arise if people see their own and each others' roles differently. For example, if the officers see their role as "running the organization," and the members see themselves as not only contributing information and opinions, but also having a real voice in decisions, conflict may arise.

Low productivity. Being able to accomplish tasks and achieve goals is a necessary ingredient in the organizational environment. And, if the task is not done, the chairperson may get angry. If the other person responds to this anger by performing the task, a response pattern of anger is established to get results.

Groups with low productivity may use nagging, making trade-offs (I'll do this if you do that), and criticizing, but these tend to produce only short-term success. Change that causes disequilibrium. While change is considered to be a "given" for people working and living together, another "given" is that people tend to prefer secure, predictable patterned responses to the unknown. When changes occur abruptly and unpredictably, conflict may follow.

Unresolved prior conflict. As the number of past unresolved conflicts increases between people, so does the possibility of future ones. Many people shy away from conflict management because memories of past conflicts still hurt. Probably the most lasting of those "scars" have been caused by conflicts with those we are closest to -family, close friends and trusted colleagues in volunteer or work groups.
Emotional Intelligence and Conflict management styles

The integrating style has been considered a valuable way to manage interactions with other individuals in conflict situations, facilitating proper resolution of conflict and producing more productive results (Gross and Guerrero, 2000). For example, the integrating and compromising styles were the styles most frequently used by Korean respondents when they faced conflicts (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991; Cho and Park, 1998). Scholars have noted that EI plays an important role in resolving conflict functionally (Borisoff and Victor, 1998; Jordan and Troth, 2002, 2004). Jordan and Troth (2004, p. 196) argued that “the ability to be aware of and manage emotions is also thought to facilitate functional than dysfunctional, conflict resolution and consequently contribute to better team performance”. Emotionally intelligent people have the ability to better manage and regulate their own emotions and the emotions of others (Mayer and Salovey, 1997; Davies et al., 1998; Ng et al., 2007; Mayer et al., 2008). In addition, emotionally intelligent people are those who consider their own emotions and the emotions of others as a basis in framing their relationships with other people (Mayer and Salovey, 1993, 1997).

This characteristic might generate the empathy (Mayer et al., 1999; Schute et al., 2001) that encourages individuals to consider other interests when they want to solve conflicts. Moreover, this empathy can lead people to be altruistic (Singer and Fehr, 2005; Declerck and Bogaert, 2008), cognizant of the existence of other people’s needs (Kamdar et al., 2006) and more skillful in anticipating what other people will behave and act (Singer and Fehr, 2005; Declerck and Bogaert, 2008). With these characteristics, emotionally intelligent people may regard other people’s needs and interests in solving conflict. Thus, a win-win solution produced by integrating and compromising styles may become a priority in resolving the conflicts among individuals in order to satisfy everyone’s interests.

In addition, emotionally intelligent people are more like to select integrating and compromising styles because those styles may have more beneficial outcomes in terms of the efficacy and suitability (Gross and Guerrero, 2000). This idea departs from the notion that “the whole point of emotion was to alert us to danger or to opportunity and to focus our cognitive
processing upon it” (Andrade and May, 2004, p. 216). This may lead to the signal that emotionally intelligent people may have abilities to plainly think and focus on more advantageous styles of handling interpersonal conflicts as those will benefit for them. As integrating and compromising styles have positive effects on conflict resolution (Hocker and Wilmot, 1998; Gross and Guerrero, 2000), we expect that the integrating and comprising styles may become a preference for a person high in EI in solving conflicts.