2.1 Introduction

In an attempt to better understand the relationships between EI and job stress and its influence to prevent the stress in job discussed in Chapter One, this chapter presents an overview of the research relevant to the study and discusse the different model’s sources of EI and Job stress, mediators, and consequences for bank employees and the organization. The main objective of this section is to review those current studies that have yielded significant findings and have application to this current study.

Stress is considered to be one of the main themes in the research for last two decades and a significant growth observe in researchers’ interest as a concern to both employers and employees (Hochwartar, Perrewe, Meurs & Kacmar, 2007, Cartwright, 2000). Stress is the destructive physical, mental and emotional reaction that transpires when there is a poor match between job demands and competencies or employees’ resources to manage with job pressure. The basic root cause of stress in the organization, when employees face difficulties and changes in his daily working routine but always avoid and this condition creates stress, anxiety, fears, worries, tension, etc. (Akinboye, Akinboye & Adeyemo, 2002).

Recently studies have shown great researchers’ interest in the study of the relationship between EI and stress in the light of organizational performance and several studies investigated the impact of EI competencies on stress, which report the existence of positive relationship (Gardner, 2005, Spector and Goh, 2001, Ciarrochi, Chan, & Bajgar, 2001). The EI competencies play a role to create the abilities in an individual’s to better control the stress in the workplace. The previous studies reveal that the EI individuals have strong emotions and attitude to deal stressful events in a positive way. The EI competencies generate the skill in individual to choose various courses of action to deal stress without collapsing, to be positive to solve a problem, and feel that one can control the situation (Slaski and Cartwright, 2002).

The employees having EI competencies manage their negative emotions in the workplace and report fewer psychological problems with high levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Gardner, 2005). Bar-On, Brown, Kirkcaldy, and Thome (2000) investigated the impact of EI on police officers and health-care professionals. They conclude that police officers have high EI respond to stress with better coping strategies and report less depression comparatively than health-care professionals having low EI. In
another study of American and Australian college students show that students with high EI level, report fewer physical symptoms, less social anxieties and depression. They have self-esteem and interpersonal satisfaction and use active coping strategies to deal their psychological problems (Salovey, Stroud, Woolery & Epel, 2002, Ciarrochi, Deane, & Anderson, 2002).

Abraham (1999) hypothesized that EI would have a positive effect on the organizational outcomes of work-group cohesion, congruence between self- and supervisor appraisals of performance, employee performance, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship. Abraham found that the participants who reported higher levels of EI tended to show higher levels of job performance. Likewise, Langhorn (2004) argued that emotional intelligence can improve management performance. He reported that emotional intelligence was able to predict the performance of general managers (co-opted in the study) with a significant degree of accuracy (F =2:44; p = 0:003); and that EI contributed 21 percent to this specific type of performance (regression, R = 0:45): Langhorn also found that emotional intelligence of the general manager was able to predict team satisfaction with a reasonable degree of accuracy (F = 1:07; p = 0:393) and team turnover with a moderate degree of accuracy (F = 1:332; p = 0:191): Ashkanasy and Hooper (1999) examined the perception and management of EI in the workplace. Utilizing the proposition that affective commitment towards workmates is a necessary component of social interaction, they argued that the showing of positive emotions is associated with a high likelihood of success at work. Deshpande et al. (2005) studied the impact of emotional intelligence on counterproductive behavior in China.

Moreover, Wong and Law (2002) hypothesized that EI of superiors and subordinates should have positive effects on job performance, therefore they tested the effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude. The results revealed that the EI of subordinates affects job performance and job satisfaction, while the EI of superiors affects their satisfaction and extra-role behavior. Furthermore, Wong and Law (2002, p. 243) reported: “for followers, the proposed interaction effects between EI and emotional labor on job performance organizational commitment and turnover intention are also supported”.

Jordan et al. (2002) attempted to study relationships between EI, team process effectiveness and goal focus. The results suggest that the average level of EI of team members is reflected in the initial performance of teams. They found that low EI teams
initially performed at a lower level than the high EI teams. In addition, Darling and Walker (2001) argued that a primary key to successful organizational leadership is effective conflict management. Therefore, they addressed the use of the behavioral style paradigm as a tool to manage conflict effectively. Darling and Walker highlighted the role of EI in affecting conflict. They supported Alessandra’s (1996) suggestion that states: the major leaders are the people whose social intelligence put them at the heart of the communication networks that would spring up during times of conflict, crisis or innovation.

Fenwick (2003) was able to replicate Easterby-Smith et al.’s conclusion in her recent study entitled: Innovation: examining workplace learning in new enterprises, she found that emotion plays an important role in employees’ readiness to create and innovate. Fenwick (2003, p. 130) concluded: “a central motivator was the link of their personal project to a worthwhile social purpose, which embedded both identity and desire and which in turn fueled innovative learning”. Park (2005) explored the link between an organization’s emotional environment and its performance. Brooks and Nafukho (2006) attempted to show the integration among EI, human resource development, social capital and organizational productivity. They concluded that EI is clearly related to organizational productivity and organizations would seek to employ and develop workers with high EI.

The concept of EI was first proposed by Salovey and Mayer (1990, 1994, p. 773) who define it as “a form of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and action.” The ability model of EI proposed by Salovey and Mayer (1990) consisted of four dimensions: (1) the ability to perceive, appraise and express emotion; (2) the ability to generate feelings when they facilitate thought; (3) the ability to understand emotion; and (4) the ability to regulate emotion. Goleman (1995) popularized Salovey and Mayer’s model to reinforce how emotional intelligence differs from cognitive intelligence in his book Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ. Goldman went on to define EI as the ability to recognize and regulate our own feelings and the feeling of others. EI was described by Bar-On (1997, p.1) as “an array of personal, emotional, and social abilities, and skills that influence and individuals’ ability to cope with effectively with his or her given environmental demand and pressures.” Although there are various definitions of EI, two distinct approaches exist in understanding the nature of EI. The ability approach mainly focuses on emotion-related
cognitive ability to effectively join emotion and reasoning. The ability EI must be measured by maximum performance tests (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). On the other hand, the trait approach, proposed by Bar-On (1997), involves emotion-related behavioral dispositions and self-perceived abilities and use self-report measures. However, some researchers have doubted the validity and reliability of the EI construct. For example, EI has been criticized as an “invalid concept” (Locke, 2005). Although there are some criticisms regarding the various concepts and measurement of EI construct, there is also a growing body of literature emphasizing the importance of EI (Goleman, 1995; George, 2000; Law, Wong, & Song, 2004).

The existence and potential importance of forms of intelligence other than memory and problem solving have long been recognized, most notably by some of those most closely associated with establishing the contemporary understanding of cognitive intelligence (Piaget, 1981; Thorndyke and Stein, 1937; Wechsler, 1940). However, it was the work of Goleman (1995) and its emphasis on the potential benefits of EI, which caught the attention of practitioners and management researchers. In the last two decades the interest in EI has been simultaneously intense and controversial. Essentially, two distinct formulations of EI have emerged: an ability model and a mixed model. The ability model, most closely associated with the work of Mayer and Salovey (1993), actually predates Goleman’s (1995) work and is an empirically derived combination of emotion and intelligence. Mayer and Salovey (1993, p. 434) define EI as the “ability to advantageously deal with one’s own emotions and those of others in problem solving and decision making”. The key dimensions of an ability model are generally described as: the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions; to discriminate among those emotional states; and to use this information to effectively guide one’s thinking and action (Salovey and Mayer, 1990).

The mixed model of EI, as advocated by Goleman (1995, 1998), combines traits with social behaviors and competencies. Bar-On (1997, p. 122), usually associated with the mixed model of EI, concluded that emotional and social intelligence are a “multifactorial array of interrelated emotional, personal, and social abilities that influence individual ability to actively and effectively cope with daily demands and pressures”. Bar-On’s (1997) conceptualization is reflected in his EQI, an assessment instrument extensively used to measure the mixed model of EI. In the EQI, the elements of a mixed model of EI are measured through scales which assess awareness of individual emotional states,
interpersonal skills, adaptability, the ability to handle stress and general mood (Bar-On, 1997). The mixed model has been both advocated and criticized. Support typically centers on contentions of a correlation between mixed model EI and desired organizational outcomes (Goleman, 1995, 1998; Goleman et al., 2002). Criticisms of the mixed model have tended to focus on a lack of scientific rigor in model development (Conte, 2005; Landy, 2005; Mayer et al., 2008), a lack of content validity (Antonakis et al., 2009; Mayer et al., 2008), or overstatements regarding benefits (Ashkanasy and Daus, 2005; Grubb and McDaniel, 2007). Nevertheless, mixed models in general, and the EQI in particular, continue to be very widely utilized in organizational development and practitioner settings. In fact, the EQI has been found to be a key predictor of job performance (Bachman et al., 2000) with stronger support than either cognitive ability (Jae, 1997) or academic achievement (Parker et al., 2004) in determining job performance. Despite their differences, both the mixed and ability models posit a positive relationship between non-cognitive capabilities and desired interpersonal and organizational outcomes (e.g. Goleman et al., 2002; Wong and Law, 2002; Mayer and Salovey, 1997). While practitioners have found the notion of EI intuitively satisfying and compelling, vigorous disputes have arisen in the academic literature regarding a number of aspects of EI. There is debate over the very existence of EI (Antonakis et al., 2009; Landy, 2005; Locke, 2005), how it is measured (Conte, 2005), and criticism/advocacy for particular models of EI (Ciarrochi et al., 2000; Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005; Mayer et al., 2008; Mayer et al., 2000). Despite this considerable attention, matters of common definition, measurement and the nature of the relationship between EI and desired outcomes have not been conclusively resolved (Brown and Moshavi, 2005). Recent studies and reviews suggest movement toward a resolution of long-standing definition, measurement and application issues and support the potential value of EI to organizational behavior (e.g. Cote and Miners, 2006; Gowing et al., 2006; Mayer et al., 2008).

In a study using Goleman’s emotional intelligence framework, superior leaders demonstrating higher levels of emotional intelligence lead more effectively than those with lower levels of emotional intelligence (Watkin, 2000). Van der Zee and Wabeke (2004) also looked at the trait-based emotional intelligence of leaders using the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory. Top managers were found to obtain higher scores on EI dimensions compared with the general population. Using the ability-based model, Carmeli (2003) found that senior managers’ emotional intelligence was related to both positive work attitudes and work effectiveness. A significant range of literature has provided
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Evidence to support the proposition that transformational leadership style could be predicted from trait-based emotional intelligence (Barbuto and Burbach, 2006; Brown and Moshavi, 2005; Mandell and Pherwani, 2003, Hayashi, 2005; Sosik and Megerian, 1999). In addition, others have asserted the significant role played by ability-based emotional intelligence in transformational leadership literature (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005; Coetzee and Schaap, 2004; Walter and Bruch, 2007). However, contrasting views do exist questioning the empirical evidence for the necessity of EI in leadership effectiveness. Opponents argue that more data based on defensible methodologies are needed to prove the validity of the EI/leadership link (Antonakis, 2003; Locke, 2005). Weinberger (2003) also found that ability-based EI has no significant correlation to perceived styles of transformational leadership, transactional leadership or laissez-faire leadership. To address the above criticisms of the field of EI, continued conceptual and empirical contributions made by Low and Nelson’s skill-based EI model have provided clear and compelling cases for the significance of the transformative learning process to college success, academic achievement, retention, personal health, and leadership. Through transformative learning, individuals are able to improve themselves and their performance in life and throughout their careers (Elkins and Low, 2004; Low and Nelson, 2004). Furthermore, Nelson and Low’s skilled-based EI provides a reliable and valid measure of EI construct consistent with humanistic-existential theory that educational and counseling practitioners can use for professional and leadership development (Cox and Nelson, 2008).

Easterby-Smith et al. (2000) examined the debates of organizational learning: past, present and future they concluded that the innovative learning is obviously complex, involving a mix of rational, intuitive, emotional, and social processes. Fenwick (2003) was able to replicate Easterby-Smith et al.’s conclusion in her recent study entitled: Innovation: examining workplace learning in new enterprises, she found that emotion plays an important role in employees’ readiness to create and innovate. Fenwick (2003, p. 130) concluded: “a central motivator was the link of their personal project to a worthwhile social purpose, which embedded both identity and desire and which in turn fueled innovative learning”. Park (2005) explored the link between an organization’s emotional environment and its performance. He hypothesized that how far people experience an organization as enabling them to feel capable, listened to, accepted, safe and included affect their creativity and innovation. The research found that there was a correlation between the extent to which staff experienced the five dimensions described above, and the extent to which they were able to be curious, resilient, creative, strategic and
interdependent as well as manifesting other qualities associated with “learning power”. 

Park concluded that organizations are more likely to enhance productivity and creativity by focusing on the quality of their emotional environment than they are by setting targets towards achieving those outcomes. Brooks and Nafukho (2006) attempted to show the integration among EI, human resource development, social capital and organizational productivity. They concluded that EI is clearly related to organizational productivity and organizations would seek to employ and develop workers with high EI.

In addition to examining relationships between managerial strategies or performance and agreement categories, researchers are interested in other variables that might be associated with self-other agreement. The emotional self-awareness aspect of EI makes it a key variable in self-other agreement research and the theory of self-awareness in leadership success (Gardner et al., 2005).

The primary question in these studies is: does the emotional self-awareness aspect of EI have a positive relationship with a manager’s awareness of leadership skills? Sosik and Megerian (1999) looked at the relationship between EI and transformational leadership based on whether leaders were in agreement or not in agreement. They found that for leaders who were in agreement, subordinate evaluations of transformational leadership were positively related to EI. They suggested that self-aware managers (those in agreement) had higher EI and were considered to be more effective by both superiors and subordinates. They also found that one aspect of EI, social self-confidence, was positively related to ratings of transformational leadership for underestimators, while subordinate ratings of transformational leadership were negatively related to another aspect of EI, sensitivity, for overestimators (Sosik and Megerian, 1999). This study follows the theoretical approach of Atwater and Yammarino (1997) and the methodological approach of Sosik and Megerian (1999) to extend the use of empirical methods to examine the influence of individual and personality characteristics on self-other rating comparisons. Sosik and Megerian (1999) examined the relationship between self-awareness, measured by 63 self and 192 follower assessments of leader transformational leadership behaviors, and elements of EI, assessed by an adhoc measurement instrument. Their study provided evidence in support of the contention that EI could be a useful dispositional factor in identifying effective management candidates. However these findings are limited by Sosik and Megerian’s (1999) operationalization of EI with an untested, unvalidated measure.
2.2 Emotional Intelligence

Despite a substantial amount of research (see Kerr et al., 2006), there is currently no consensus about the exact nature of emotional intelligence since “different authors propose differing numbers of factors/elements that should be included in the construct” (Barling et al., 2000). Among the most popular EI definitions are those suggested by Salovey and Mayer (1990), BarOn (1997), Mayer and Salovey (1997) and Goleman (1998a).

Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (1999) outlined three criteria in conceptualising an EI model, which has been adapted in this thesis to create a set of criteria for EI in the workplace. Firstly the conceptualisation must reflect an ability to perform in the workplace, rather than reflecting preferred ways of behaving; secondly, the conceptualisation should encompass a set of related abilities that are distinct from already established psychological constructs (such as personality or general intelligence); and thirdly, the conceptualisation should be developmental, that is, it not only develops with age but is able to be enhanced and further developed within the individual through professional training programs. The creation of a criterion for assessing workplace EI has the potential to assist researchers and practitioners alike in programs of selection, assessment, training and development of employees at every level within an organisation. This chapter will now present three well developed and popular conceptualisations of EI. Each of these conceptions (models) draws in some way from the criteria suggested by Mayer et al. (1999) outlined above.

2.2.1 Conceptualisations of Emotional Intelligence

Salovey and Mayer: An Ability Model of Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence as originally conceptualised by Salovey and Mayer (1990, p.10) “involves the ability/capability to appraise, perceive accurately, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the skill/ability to regulate or control emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth”. Mayer and Salovey (1993) suggested that there are individual differences in EI relating to differences in our ability to appraise our own emotions and those of others. They further suggested that individuals higher in EI might be more open to internal experience and better able to label and communicate those experiences. Salovey and Mayer (1990) initially posed that the mental processes involving emotional information included the appraisal and expression of emotion, regulation of emotion and adaptive use of emotions. However, this framework also included personality traits; for instance, EI was hypothesised to be able to distinguish
between individuals who were ‘genuine and warm’ compared to those who were ‘oblivious and boorish’. Because the concept of EI would be more useful if it was separated from personality traits and confined to a mental ability, the model was revised in 1997 (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) to give greater emphasis to the cognitive components of EI and to highlight the potential for emotional and intellectual growth. The revised EI model is ordered hierarchically from basic psychological processes to more psychologically integrated processes and includes four branches. This model is presented in Table 2.1 below, which sketches the four branches and the corresponding stages in emotion processing allied with each branch.

### Table 2.1: Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) model of Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Intelligence Dimension</th>
<th>Emotional Abilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perception, appraisal and expression of Emotion</td>
<td>The accuracy with which individuals can identify emotions and emotional content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emotional facilitation of thinking</td>
<td>Describes emotional events that assist intellectual processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Understanding and analysing emotions and employing emotional knowledge</td>
<td>The ability to recognise, label and interpret Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reflective regulation of emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth</td>
<td>Conscious, reflective regulation of emotions to enhance growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the stages in the model (presented in Table 2.1) includes levels of abilities which it is hypothesised that an individual completes in sequence before progression to the next stage or branch. Those who have higher levels of EI are believed to progress through these abilities quicker than those with lower levels of EI.

#### 2.2.2 Emotional Intelligence

**Goleman: A Mixed Model of Emotional Intelligence**

Goleman (1995a; 1998) popularised the concept of EI with the publication of two books. In his first book, Goleman describes EI to include “self-control, persistence & zeal and the ability to motivate oneself” (1995a, p.xii); and as being able to “control impulse and delay
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gratification,” to “keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to empathize and to hope” (1995a, p.34). He later defined EI in his second book as “the capacity/ability for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and our relationships” (1998, p.317). Goleman (1998) has expanded Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) definition of EI by incorporating what he terms personal and social competencies. His model consists of five dimensions of EI and twenty-five emotional competencies and is presented in detail in Table 2.2 below. Interestingly, Goleman’s conceptualisation of EI closely parallels the earlier ideas of social intelligence (Thorndike, 1920) and personal intelligence (Gardner, 1993), however, it departs significantly from Salovey and Mayer’s ability model (see Table 2.1 and Table 2.2).

Table 2.2: Goleman’s (1998) model of Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Intelligence Dimension</th>
<th>Emotional Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal competencies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-awareness</td>
<td>Emotional awareness, accurate self-assessment and self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-regulation</td>
<td>Self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Motivation</td>
<td>Achievement drive, commitment, initiative and Optimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social competencies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Empathy</td>
<td>Developing others, Understanding others, service orientation, political awareness and leveraging diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social skills</td>
<td>Influence, conflict management, communication, leadership, building bonds, change catalyst, cooperation &amp; collaboration and team capabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the year 2001, Goleman further developed his EI model. Statistical analysis collapsed the original twenty-five competencies into twenty, and the five domains into four. This revised model of EI is presented in detail in Table 2.3.

Table 2.2 and Table 2.3 outline the development of Goleman’s (1998, 2001) model of EI. His original model (presented in Table 2.2) incorporated a large number of competencies, all which Goleman believed belonged to the construct EI. Further work with his model (outlined in Goleman 2001) collapsed the model into a more concise framework.
(presented in Table 2.3). However, because of the large scope of attributes covered in Goleman’s framework of EI, researchers have questioned which adaptive attributes Goleman wouldn’t consider part of EI (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2000a).

Table 2.3: Goleman’s (2001) model of Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOGNITION</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>REGULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF</strong></td>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td><strong>SELF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Competence</td>
<td>Social Competence</td>
<td>Personal Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-Awareness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social Awareness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Self-Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Self-Awareness</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Self-Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate Self-Assessment</td>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confidence</td>
<td>Organizational Awareness</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOGNITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>REGULATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relationship Management</strong></td>
<td><strong>SELF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Self-Control</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>Developing Others</td>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Achievement Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Drive</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Change Catalyst</td>
<td>Building Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teamwork and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goleman’s definition of EI, unlike the ability model presented in Table 2.1, incorporates a combination of personality traits, abilities and emotional traits (for example, as shown in Table 2.3 his model includes attributes such as conscientiousness, trustworthiness and leadership). Despite the limitations of Goleman’s (1998, 2001) models of EI, in his books he theoretically outlines linkages between EI and workplace variables which have not been previously explored in any detail. He hypothesised that EI accounts for which individuals would excel at any given job, who would be an outstanding leader, and that an emotionally intelligent organisation is better equipped to survive than one which is not. Although Goleman himself does not empirically test these claims, they exist as an important basis for future directions of research on EI. Goleman hypothesises that the dimension of self-awareness (refer to Table 2.3) is essential in being able to recognise one’s own strengths and weaknesses and that accurate self-assessment leads to superior performance in the workplace. Interestingly Goleman believes that each of the twenty emotional competencies in his revised model, presented in Table 2.3, are job skills that can be learned.
Bar-On: A Mixed Model of Emotional Intelligence

The director of the Institute of Applied Intelligences in Denmark and consultant for several other institutions and organizations, Reuven Bar-On developed one of the first measures of emotional intelligence that used the term "Emotion Quotient". Bar-On's model of emotional intelligence relates to the potential for performance and success, rather than performance or success itself, and is considered process-oriented rather than outcome-oriented (Bar-On, 2002). A third model of EI has been proposed by Bar-On (1997), focuses on an array of emotional and social abilities, including the ability to be aware of, understand, and express oneself, the ability to be aware of, understand, and relate to others, the ability to deal with strong emotions, and the ability to adapt to change and solve problems of a social or personal nature (p.14). Bar-On’s (Bar-On, Brown, Kircaldy & Thome, 2000; Bar-On, 1997) model of EI is presented in detail in Table 2.4.

Table 2.4: Bar-On’s (1997) model of Emotional Intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Intelligence Dimension</th>
<th>Emotional Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intrapersonal skills</td>
<td>Being aware of and understanding oneself and one’s emotions, expressing one’s feelings and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Being aware of, understanding and appreciating other’s feelings, establishing and maintaining satisfying relationships with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adaptability</td>
<td>Verifying feelings with external cues, sizing up immediate situations, being flexible in altering feelings and thoughts with changing situations and problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stress management</td>
<td>Coping with stress and controlling impulses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General mood</td>
<td>Being optimistic and being able to feel and express positive emotions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As outlined in Table 2.4 above, Bar-On’s (1997) model of EI incorporates five EI dimensions, which is similar in size to the model presented by Mayer and Salovey (1997), however differs markedly in content to their model outlined in this chapter (refer to Table 3.1). Bar-On’s model is more aligned with Goleman’s (2001) model of EI than with the Mayer and Salovey model, with both of these models suggesting that EI includes...
selfawareness, maintaining relationships with others and self-control (see Table 2.3 and Table 2.4).

A difficulty with the competencies of the Bar-On (1997) model of EI is that they theoretically map onto measures of personality. For instance, The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) includes dimensions of self-assurance, interpersonal effectiveness, selfacceptance, self-control, flexibility, and empathy (Cohen, Swerdlik & Smith, 1992). Components in Bar-On’s EI framework include self-regard, assertiveness, interpersonal effectiveness, social responsibility, impulse control, flexibility, and empathy (Bar-On, 2000; Mayer et al., 1999; Mayer et al., 2000a).

Despite the obvious overlap between these constructs Bar-On has stressed that his EI model was not developed to measure particular personality traits. Although this may have been his intention it seems unlikely that the EI model proposed by Bar-On (which is similar to the model proposed by Goleman (2001)), is specific to the construct of EI alone, but more likely that this model also represents other variables commonly used in psychological research such as personality. Overall it has been suggested that the construct of EI may only be useful if it is theoretically and empirically divorced from personality processes and confined to a mental ability assessing the interrelatedness of cognitions and emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

### 2.3 Measuring Emotional Intelligence

Since the popularisation of models of EI, researchers have sought to measure individual differences in EI. A recent review describing a measure of EI based on personality traits by Dulewicz and Higgs (2000, p.341) posed two research questions: “is there any evidence that the claims made for EI can be substantiated in an organisational context?”, and “is it possible to use established robust measures of personality or competency to measure EI, or some aspects of EI?” (p.342). The first question has some scientific merit, particularly considering that most of the claims as to the effectiveness of EI in the workplace have been largely theoretical. However, the second question loses sight of the need to develop the construct validity of EI. Dulewicz and Higgs created a measure of EI using two general measures of personality. Some of the personality traits, which they extrapolated to define their measure of EI included: outgoing, conscientious, trusting, forthright, relaxed, emotionally stable, and socially bold. This conceptualisation essentially defines EI as a collection of personality traits.
It is pertinent at this point to highlight the differences between emotions and personality in order to illustrate that measures based upon personality traits are not a logical basis upon which to develop either a theory or an assessment of EI. In a recent examination into workplace performance and emotionality, Arvey, Renz and Watson (1998) compared the Big Five framework of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1985) to emotions. The first main distinction between personality and emotion is that emotion always refers to affective states and personality does not. The authors posed that two personality factors (extraversion and agreeableness) were more related to emotional display than to internal or felt emotions. The third and the fifth factors of personality defined by the Five Factor Model (conscientiousness and openness to experience) were purported to be unrelated to internal or displayed emotions and only the factor of neuroticism focused on internal emotions. Arvey et al. assert that personality and emotion represent different underlying constructs: Personality represents an individual’s predisposition to have a particular feeling and is considered to be relatively stable whereas emotions reflect what the individual is currently feeling and can vary. Therefore the establishment of measures of EI based upon currently existing measures of personality is not appropriate and suggests that the measure will not be an accurate assessment of EI.

The following sections of this thesis present three of the most comprehensively developed and widely used measures of EI. The first three sections presented below will outline the measures based upon the models reviewed in Section 2.3 above. Following this a more specific measure of EI will be investigated, that of a workplace specific measure. This measure of EI was developed from a large scale study which involved a factor analysis of the main measures of EI, extracting the underlying common dimensions from each of the main measures of EI (Palmer & Stough, 2001).

2.3.1 Measurement of Emotional Intelligence

Based on their earliest model of EI, Salovey and Mayer (1990) developed the 30-item selfreport Trait Meta Mood Scale (TMMS) to measure attitudes about emotions and mood regulation. According to Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey and Palfai (1995) the TMMS can be divided into three sub-scales; attention to feelings; clarity in discrimination of feelings; and mood repair. Essentially the TMMS was developed to assess individual variability in identifying one’s own feelings, the feelings of others, regulating these feelings and the extent to which the information provided by these feelings is used to motivate adaptive social behaviour.
Using the TMMS (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), Fox and Spector (2000) investigated whether EI predicted performance in job interviews. They suggested that the TMMS was a weak measure of EI because it measured the extent to which an individual reports that they engage in certain behaviours, but did not assess the accuracy of these self-reports. Fox and Spector also questioned whether the construct of EI was relevant to interview performance. It is not surprising that these authors did not find the TMMS useful in the context of interview performance, primarily due to the fact that they tested a group of undergraduate students in a simulated interview process. The applications of their findings to ‘real life’ interview processes and outcomes are somewhat limited and may not accurately reflect the actual utility of the TMMS within this area.

A limitation of the TMMS (Salovey & Mayer, 1990) is that it is a self-report questionnaire and does not measure actual performance assessing emotional abilities. In order to develop a performance-based measure of EI the 402-item Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS, Mayer et al., 1999) was constructed, followed closely by a subsequent revised 294-item Mayer, Salovey and Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT, Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 1999). The MEIS was designed to comprehensively assess Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) model of EI (refer to Table 2.1). In much the same manner as an IQ test, the test contains a series of questions for which there are more and less correct answers based on consensual responses. The test yields an overall EI score, as well as sub-scale scores for each branch of their model. The perception of emotion is assessed by three sub-tests that measure the perception of emotion in faces, in landscapes, and in abstract designs. In the faces sub-test the participant views a photograph of a face displaying a particular emotional expression. The respondent must report the amount of emotional content in it, judging for example, how much happiness, sadness, and fear is present.

Several sub-scales assess the extent to which people use emotion to facilitate cognitive activities. The synesthesia sub-test requires the participant to judge the similarity between an emotional feeling, and other subjective experiences such as temperatures and tastes. The idea is that such internal comparisons indicate that emotions are not only sensed and perceived, but also processed in some meaningful initial way.

Similarly, the understanding of emotions is measured by several sub-tests. These include blends, which require the participant to match a set of emotions, such as joy and acceptance, to another, single emotion that is closest to it. For example, ‘which of these alternatives combine joy and acceptance: (a) guilt, (b) challenge, (c) mania, (d) love, or (e)
desire’. Another sub-test that assesses the understanding of emotions is the transitions task, in which the test taker is asked what happens as an emotion intensifies or changes.

Tasks assessing the ability to manage emotions concern the best way to regulate emotions in oneself and in other people. Items typically describe a person with a goal of changing or maintaining a feel, such as staying happy, or overcoming sadness. The participant is presented with a scenario and must indicate which of a number of alternatives describes the best course of action in terms of reaching the goal. For example, if an upset person has the goal of cheering themselves up, the alternatives might involve, talking to some friends, seeing a violent movie, eating a big meal, or taking a walk alone. Some alternatives are more likely to lead to cheering the person up than others, and those are scored more highly according to a consensus criterion.

Studies with the MSCEIT and the previous version of the MEIS have found the scales to be reliable and to show a meaningful pattern of both convergent and discriminant validity, with the internal consistencies of both of these EI measures comparable to many standard intelligence tests (Ciarrochi, Chan & Caputi, 2000; Mayer et al., 1999). Scores on the MEIS have been shown to be theoretically related to variables including empathy, parental warmth, and life satisfaction (Ciarrochi, et al.; Mayer et al., 2000b). Correlations between scores on the MEIS and personality indicate that it is related to, but relatively independent of, normal personality (Ciarrochi et al.). Recent research by Lam and Kirby (2002) reported that scores on the MEIS explained individual cognitive-based performance over & above the level attributable to measures of general intelligence. Collectively, these findings suggest that these measures of EI are measuring a construct that is unique, more specifically they are measuring something over and above intelligence or personality traits

In terms of organisational research the application of the MSCEIT and the MEIS is limited. Rice (1999) has shown that scores on the MEIS are related to certain aspects of effective team leadership and team performance. In this study, a short form of the MEIS was administered to 164 employees of an insurance company, who staffed 26 customer claim teams, and 11 of their team leaders. Department managers rated the claims teams on five variables: customer service, accuracy of claims processing, productivity, commitment to continuous improvement, and team leader overall performance. The MEIS scores of the 11 team leaders correlated (r = .51, p< .05) with the department managers ranking of effectiveness of the leaders. The overall EI of the 26 teams as measured by the average MEIS score across team members was significantly related to the department manger’s
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rating of the team performance for customer service \( (r = .46, p< .05) \). While personality traits such as conscientiousness are linked to performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991, Barrick & Mount, 1993), this study suggests that EI may provide new information on outstanding performers.

The EI tests developed by Salovey and Mayer are often criticised by the scoring methodology employed (Conte, 2005). Due to the use of ‘ability’ tests these authors have attempted to identify “correct” answers to their questionnaires and have utilised techniques of consensus and expert scoring. Consensus scoring involves determining the correct answer to an item by pooling the judgements of hundreds of people and therefore assesses the extent to which the test taker’s choice matches the majority opinion. Expert scoring involves determining the correct answer to an item by pooling the judgements of ‘experts’ in emotions, a scoring technique which is similar to that used in cognitive ability tests. These methods of scoring have been subject to criticism as consensus scoring techniques are in “contrast to traditional measures of intelligence where an objective measure of truth is considered” (Matthews, Zeidner & Roberts, 2002, p.186) and due to the uncertainty as to how ‘experts’ were chosen when determining the correct answers to items (Matthews et al.). Finally, despite the evidence suggesting that the MEIS is related to effective leadership and performance (Rice, 1999), Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) noted that the ability based EI measures, although being more distinct from personality, have higher correlations with general mental ability than do the self-report EI measures, leaving less room for these ability based EI measures to provide incremental prediction of work criteria (such as leadership and performance). Overall although the ability based measures of EI appear promising, there are still concerns and controversy as to the scoring and application of these measures.

Goleman’s (1995a, 1998, 2001) contributions to the field of EI have been primarily theoretical (see Section 2.3.2 for a description of Goleman’s theoretical models), although he has hypothesised about the effectiveness of EI in academia, the workplace and life in general. Published in the Utne Reader was Goleman’s (1995b) measure of EI based upon his original theoretical model (presented in Table 3.2). This 10-item EI test measures all aspects of what Goleman considers EI including emotional abilities, general social competencies and character, although as emphasised by Mayer et al. (2000a) it is doubtful that Goleman intended that this scale would be used for serious research purposes. The 10-item test contains sub-scales from Goleman’s original conceptualisation of EI including:
knowing one’s emotions, managing emotions, motivating oneself, recognising emotions in others and handling relationships.

A partnership between Goleman (1995a), Boyatzis (Boyatzis, Goleman & Rhee, 2000) and the Hay Group produced the 110-item Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI, Boyatiz et al.). Goleman states that “the ECI is the only instrument/tool that incorporates the full depth of my research. Other instruments/tools use the words ‘emotional intelligence’ but the ECI is the genuine article” (Watkin, 2000, p.89). The ECI is a 360-degree measure designed to assess Goleman's (1998) model of EI (see Section 2.3.2 for a detailed description of this model). This test asks respondents to describe themselves, or another person by responding to declarative statements. For example; “knows how feelings impact own performance” (assessing emotional self-awareness); “strives to keep promises” (assessing conscientiousness); “understands the history and reasons for continuing organisational issues” (assessing organisational awareness); and finally “gains the buy-in of influential parties and enlists their help in convincing others” (assessing influence). Due to proprietary reasons, the developers of the ECI have not allowed many items to be reviewed by independent researchers (Conte, 2005) and therefore few independent, peer-reviewed assessments of the reliability and validity of this test have been undertaken or published. As emphasises by Conte, the reported findings on what the ECI is measuring are tentative at best.

A popular measure of EI (the self-report Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory, EQ-i, Bar-On, 1997) has been developed by Bar-On, and is based directly on his theoretical model (refer to Table 4.4). Bar-On (2000) has stated that the EQ-i is most accurately described as a measure of socially and emotionally competent behaviour. The EQ-i was constructed from a review of personality variables proposed to be related to life success and has since been criticised for its lack of divergent validity with personality measures (McCrae, 2000; Newsome et al., 2000).

The EQ-i (Bar-On, 1997) consists of 133 items that assess 15 sub-scales pertaining to five specific dimensions of emotional and social intelligence (refer to Table 4.4 for an outline of these dimensions). As with other self-report measures of EI, the EQ-i is described to provide an index of cross-situational consistencies (emotionally and socially) in competent behaviour and as such provides an estimate of an individual’s EI (Bar-On, 2000). A wide number of correlation studies are reported in the technical manual, in support of the validity of the EQ-i as a measure of emotional and social intelligence. The results outlined
in the technical manual provide preliminary evidence for the construct validity of the EQ-i, however, as with most existing measures of EI; the validity of the EQ-i needs to be further established by independent research.

As with the MEIS and the MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 1999), the application of the EQ-i in organisational research studies is limited. However, its meaningful pattern of convergent validity suggests that it may have important applications in organisational settings. Preliminary research reported in the EQ-i technical manual suggests that scores may predict job performance and job satisfaction. Total EQ-i scores have been found to positively correlate with individual’s sense of job competence and workplace satisfaction. Criterion group studies have shown that individuals from the Young President’s organisation, who have risen to top leadership positions and have earned a minimum of five million dollars by 39 years of age, score higher than the established normative averages on the EQ-i; and that successful Air Force recruiters score higher than unsuccessful Air Force recruiters.

A recent study by Bachman, Stein, Campbell and Sitarenios (2000), reported the use of the EQ-i in an organisational setting. The authors examined EI in 36 debt collectors as a predictor of job performance and claimed that higher levels of EI would lead to enhanced job performance. Performance was assessed by the cash goal attained over a specific time frame and participants were grouped into ‘best practices’ (consistently high producers) and ‘less successful’ (consistently low producers) groups. The overall score for EI for the best practices group was 110 and for the less successful group was 102. The average total EI score according to the EQ-i manual (Bar-On, 1997) is 100, and therefore both of these groups were slightly above average. Out of the 15 subscales of the EQ-i eight did not show a significant difference between the two groups (these include: self-regard, interpersonal relationship, social responsibility, empathy, reality testing, flexibility, stress tolerance and impulse control). Representing one of the first studies to examine the utility of EI in an organisational setting this study has important implications for the future use of EI in this area.

Although these results are promising, one question that currently surrounds the EQ-i is the discriminant validity of the test from measures of personality. A recent study by Newsome, Day and Catano (2000) reports moderate to strong correlations between the five personality factors of the 16PF (Cattel et al., 1970) and the five EQ-i composite scores. The highest correlation in this study was between the total EQ scale score of the
EQ-i and the Anxiety factor of the 16PF ($r = -0.77$) leading these researchers to conclude “that the EQ-i is largely a measure of neuroticism” (Newsome et al., p.1014). Dawda and Hart (2000) have also demonstrated considerable overlap between the EQ-i and personality. These authors found that the total EQ scale score of the EQ-i correlated moderate to strongly with the NEO Five Factor Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Given this overlap with personality, it is possible that the EQ-i may be related to the various indices of success aforementioned because it is essentially measuring personality traits and dispositions known to account for occupational success. The discriminant validity of the EQ-i from personality traits and dispositions, and indeed whether it accounts for variance in other workplace variables not accounted for by well-established personality traits has not yet been empirically substantiated.

2.3.2 A New Workplace Specific Measure of Emotional Intelligence

A limitation of the current tools assessing EI is that they were not designed specifically to assess emotions in the workplace, and it is reasonable to assume that our emotional displays at work may significantly differ from our displays in our personal and family lives. A new measure of EI that has been designed for use in organisational settings is the workplace Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT, Palmer & Stough, 2001). The workplace SUEIT is a self-report inventory that assesses the way people typically think, feel and act with emotions at work and was developed from a large scale factor analysis which attempted to draw out the key EI behaviours underpinning the predominant measures of EI. This test, therefore, is based on the congruency between the models and measures of EI, that is, it extracted the EI dimensions common to each measure of EI and combined them into a five-factor model and measure.

The SUEIT provides five sub-scale scores that indicate specific EI capacities according to the five dimensions of the model: (1) Emotional Recognition and Expression – ability to identify feelings and emotional states, and to express those to others; (2) Understanding Emotions (external) – ability to understand and identify the emotions of others and those that manifest in external stimuli; (3) Emotions Direct Cognition – extent to which emotions and emotional information is incorporated in decision making and problem solving; (4) Emotional Management – ability to manage positive and negative emotions within oneself and others; and (5) Emotional Control – ability to control strong emotional states experienced at work. Correlations reported in the technical manual of the SUEIT (Palmer & Stough, 2001) suggest that scores are related to but relatively independent of
well-established personality traits, and much like the MSCEIT, it is measuring something new and unique. Similarly, Gignac (2004) reported that the construct of EI, when measured by the SUEIT, was not redundant when assessing its relationship with personality, again suggesting the SUEIT measure of EI is related to, but has independence of, personality. However these findings should be further established by independent research.

In one of the first investigations as to the utility of the SUEIT in the workplace Gardner and Stough (2002) examined the relationship between EI and leadership, measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2000) in 110 senior level managers. The authors found a strong relationship between transformational leadership and overall EI \( r = 0.67, \ p < .01 \), as well as a negative relationship between laissez-faire leadership (a ‘do nothing’ style of leadership) and overall EI \( r = -0.46, \ p < .01 \). From the sub-scales of the SUEIT, understanding emotions (external) and emotional management emerged as the best predictors of effective leadership, providing preliminary evidence for the utility of the SUEIT in leadership selection and in occupational research.

A similar study by Downey, Papageorgiou and Stough (2005) examined the relationship between EI, leadership and intuition in a group of female managers. These authors compared the workplace SUEIT and the TMMS in order to evaluate their ability to predict leadership behaviour and use of intuition. Downey et al. reported that the workplace specific measure of EI (the SUEIT) was a better predictor of effective leadership behaviour than the general measure of EI (the TMMS). The authors suggest that workplace specific measures of EI have greater utility in the context of predicting workplace outcomes, over and above general measures of EI. Consequently this paper provides support for the utilisation of a workplace specific measure of EI in the current thesis as the aim in this thesis is to assess workplace outcomes (such as occupational stress, job satisfaction and organisational commitment).

In light of the work by Gignac (2004), Gardner & Stough (2002) and Downey et al. (2004) it appears that the SUEIT measure of EI shows some independence from traditional measures of personality and shows utility in predicting workplace outcomes. Therefore, this measure of EI will be utilised in the current thesis for three reasons. Firstly, this test is the only Australian workplace measure of individual EI (although there does exist another Australian measure of EI, however this test specifically profiles the EI of individuals in work teams, Jordan, Ashkanasay, Hartel and Hooper (2002)) and therefore appropriate.
normative information for the current thesis is available. Secondly, in comparison to the other major measures of EI, this test was developed specifically for use in the workplace with questions focussed on emotional experiences at work. Finally, this measure is relatively short in length (comprising 64 questions) which makes it practical to implement in an organisational setting where time is limited.

Despite the broad interest in EI there is little consensus concerning how to best conceptualise and measure this construct in organisational research. Generally performance based measures are purported to assess one’s actual capacity while, in contrast, self-report measures of EI are assumed to provide an indication of one’s beliefs about one’s own EI. However, as with the experience of occupational stress, it may be that our perception of our EI behaviours play a major role in utilising these behaviours and as such self-report measures of EI may prove to be equally as reliable as performance based measures, and in fact, Bandura (1977) noted that people often act upon their beliefs as opposed to their actual abilities. In terms of practicality, self-report measures are more applicable in organisational research as currently no workplace specific performance based measure exists. Secondly, existing performance based measures tend to be overly long (for example, the MSCEIT, Mayer, et al. (1999) contains 294 questions) which can be impractical for use in organisations and finally, these ‘ability’ measures have been considered to be controversial in their scoring method. Therefore, it is argued in this thesis that to best measure EI in the workplace a workplace specific EI tool should be utilised and that that tool may be self-report in its application.

2.4 The Emotional Intelligence Dimensions (SUEIT)

1. Emotional Recognition and Expression

Processing emotional information begins with accurate emotional perception and recognition (Mayer, 2001). Being aware of one’s own emotions involves accurately identifying the emotion being experienced, understanding how the emotion is related to one’s goals and values, realizing how the emotion is linked to thought and behaviour, and appreciating how the experience of emotion may affect accomplishments (Matthews et al., 2002). Part of this ability is said to be able to distinguish between accurate and inaccurate expression of emotion and honest and dishonest expression of emotion (Jordan & Troth, 2004). The ability/skill to recognise one’s own emotions is commonly considered to be one of the basic building blocks of EI in the occupational environment (Goleman, 1998; Matthews et al., 2002; Salovey et al., 2000). Employees high in this ability will be able to
label feelings, understand the relations they represent, how their emotions blend together and the transitions of emotional experience (Mayer).

2. Understanding Emotions
Understanding the emotions of others can be difficult at times, particularly if the individual you are attempting to understand is not being very emotionally expressive. Understanding others’ emotions is similar to Emotional Recognition and Expression except that it requires the individual to be aware of and distinguish between the emotions someone else is expressing. This EI ability taps into a previously mentioned construct – that of empathy. This facet of EI refers to being aware of others’ feelings, needs, and concerns and implies taking an active interest in other individuals’ concerns and feelings and being able to respond to unspoken as well as spoken feelings (Matthews et al., 2002). According to Goleman (1998) being able to understand others in the work environment includes being attentive to emotional cues from others, showing sensitivity and understanding of different perspectives people may have, and displaying helping behaviours based upon this understanding.

3. Emotions Direct Cognition
Emotions are not just a feeling that an individual has, they are also a source of information and can be used to assist in decision making; for instance mutual feelings of warmth and trust provide information about the level of friendship or affinity with another person (Palmer & Stough, 2001). Traditional models of decision making have often included the implicit assumption that all decision making processes are inherently rational (Ashkanasy & Hartel, 2002). Recent evidence from the field of neuropsychology supports the notion that emotions are able to assist decision making (Damasio, 1994; 1999). Damasio suggested that components of the limbic brain play a large role in decision making and that decisions are conditioned by somatic states which enable individuals to make value judgments. In terms of the organizational literature, Hay and Hartel (2000) have argued that emotions are a large component of leaders’ decision making in certain situations. Similarly, Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) noted that managers themselves may be unaware of the role emotions play in making decisions and suggest that this might be because they are attempting to conform to social norms of rationality, however, regardless of this lack of awareness, Ashforth and Humphrey suggests that managers do use emotions when it comes to making decisions.
4. Emotional Management

Management of emotion begins with being open to emotions (Mayer, 2001). The regulation of emotion involves an individual’s ability to connect or to disconnect from a particular emotion depending on its usefulness in the situation at hand (Jordan & Troth, 2004). Mayer and Salovey (1997) suggest that the management of emotions reflects the ability to monitor the emotions of oneself and others and to manage those emotions by moderating negative emotion and enhancing pleasant emotion. Matthews et al. (2002) note that managing one’s own emotions includes controlling and restraining impulses, dampening distress, effectively dealing with negative affect, and intentionally eliciting and sustaining pleasant (or unpleasant) emotions where appropriate. Matthews and colleagues further suggest that in the organizational environment, management of emotions also involves inhibiting personal needs, desires and emotions in place of organizational needs. Damasio (1994) implies in his work that emotions and emotional management may be critical to effective management in general.

In terms of managing the emotions of others, Mayer and Salovey (1997) suggest that this involves being able to realize how clear, typical, influential and reasonable the emotions of others are. They further suggest that to manage the emotions of others one needs to be able to moderate and enhance the appropriate emotions for the situation, still being aware of the information these emotions convey about the individual. Organisations are commonly viewed as integrated systems that depend upon the dynamic and complex pattern of interrelationships of the employees who comprise the organisation. The success of an organisation depends in part on the ability of employees to manage their own behaviour, but also on others being helped to do the same so that each individual can maximize their capabilities (Matthews et al., 2002). Matthews and colleagues suggest that there are two basic sub-skills to managing the emotions of another individual in the work environment: influence (building consensus and support and winning people over) and effective communication (dealing with difficult issues directly, listening well and sharing information).

5. Emotional Control

Having the ability to control strong emotions from affecting behaviour and the ability to work effectively can be difficult. Goleman (1998) suggests that this ability is largely invisible and that it manifests in the absence of more obvious emotional ‘fireworks’, such as being unfazed under strong threats of stress or handling a hostile individual without
lashing out at them or another individual in return. Matthews et al. (2002) note that individuals high in emotional control are able to keep disruptive emotions and impulses in check and therefore avoid being impaired cognitively or behaviourally by the negative consequences of these affects. Further, these individuals are claimed to be more likely to make personal sacrifices when organizational needs are present. Goleman advocates that this type of control is essential to maintain self regulation in order to meet ongoing work requirements and to resist seemingly urgent but actually trivial demands or the lure of time wasting distractions. Finally, as outlined by Matthews et al., control of emotions does not mean denying or repressing feelings. Negative emotions and bad moods can have important social functions, for example, anger can be a strong source of motivation, especially if it stems from the urge to right inequity or injustice.

2.5 The Role of Emotions in the Workplace

Emotions are an inseparable and integral part of everyday organisational life. The experience of work is saturated with emotions, from moments of fear, joy, frustration or grief to an enduring sense of commitment or dissatisfaction (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). A review on emotions in the workplace (Ashforth & Humphrey) emphasised how past research fostered the belief that ‘emotion is the antithesis of rationality’. Ashforth and Humphrey argue that this belief is too simplistic and that the experience/understanding of work is saturated with emotion of employees whether manager or non-manager.

A manager is a person/individual who have to manage/cope the mood of their organisations. The most gifted corporate leaders achieve that by means of a mysterious combination of psychological abilities/skills known as emotional intelligence. They are empathetic and self-aware. They can regulate or control and read their own emotions while intuitively grasping how others gauge and feeling their organisation's emotional state. Emotional Intelligence (EI) has been recently validated with major skill areas that can influence your career and create abilities/skills that improve your value/worth at work. A very recent and excellent review of the EI literature (Dulewicz and Higgs, 2000) demonstrates clearly that EI impacts on work success. Research studies of approximately 500 organisations worldwide, reviewed by Goleman, point out that individual who scores highest on EQ measures, raise to the top of corporations. For example, 'Star' employees possess more confidence and interpersonal skills, than 'Regular' employees who obtain less glowing reviews of performance.
Research also demonstrates a relationship between EI and individual and team performance. Perhaps due to an enhanced ability to recognize and manage emotions and brace against distracting emotions, EI skills connect both to individual cognitive-based performance and team task performance skills. A study (Lam and Kirby, 2002) of 304 undergraduate students demonstrated a positive influence of EI and the EI competency areas of emotional awareness and management on individual cognitive-based performance. Additional research (Jordan and Troth, 2004) found that teams comprised of members with high EI displayed better task performance skills when compared with teams made up of less emotionally intelligent members. Goleman (1998) suggests that for technical and complex positions in particular, a lack of EI may lead to diminished cognitive performance and an inability to accomplish tasks, especially with others.

According to such research, EI is supported as a vital element in excellent job performance profiles, in employee behavior and organizational practices leading to an outstanding climate for service delivery, and in employee concern for quality and ability to deal with workplace conflict. Goleman’s (1998) analysis of performance profiles from various positions in 121 companies around the world revealed that EI abilities rank as more than twice as crucial for excellence than technical and cognitive abilities. In their tools used to measure performance competencies, worldwide professionals deemed critical excellence skills to be 23 percent based on intellect and technical expertise, and 67 percent clearly centered on EI capacities. Research also links EI with customer satisfaction, quality assurance, and problem solving ability. Organizational policies and procedures that reward employee behavior based on EI and treat employees as internal customers result in a climate for services regarded as excellent by customers (Bardzil and Slaski, 2003). Further, a study of 222 participants resulted in positive correlations between the EI competencies of self-regulation and empathy and manager’s concern for product and service quality; and between the self-awareness and self-regulation competencies and effective problem-solving skills during subordinate conflict (Rahim and Minors, 2003).

'Emotional intelligence matters twofold as much as analytic and technical skill combined for star performances,' he states. 'And the higher individuals move up in the organisation, the more vital/crucial EI becomes.' Leaders and Bosses, especially, need high EQ because they represent the company to the public, they interact with the highest number of individuals outside and within the organisation and they set the tone for employee morale, states Goleman. Leaders with empathy are able to recognize/understand their employee’s
needs or wants and provide them with productive/constructive feedback. Different jobs also call for different types of emotional intelligence. For example, success in sales involves the empathic ability or skill to gauge the interpersonal skill and a customers’ mood to decide when to keep quiet and when to pitch a service or product.

“Don’t bring your personal problems to work” is one distinction of the argument that emotions are inappropriate in the organisation. Trade decisions, so the argument goes, should be based on logic, information and calm/cool reason, with emotions kept to a least/minimum. But it is unrealistic and impractical to suppose that emotions can be checked at the door when you reach at workplace. Some employees may assume, for a numerous reasons, that emotional neutrality is an ideal, and try to keep feelings out of sight. Such employees/individuals relate and work in a certain way: usually they come across as fearful, detached or rigid, and fail to contribute fully in the life of the workstation. This is not certainly bad in some circumstances, but it is usually not good for an organisation for such employees to move into administration roles. The same would be true for individuals who emote excessively, who express how they feel about everything in the organisation. Merely being around them can be time consuming and exhausting.

Developing and understanding EI in the workplace means recognizing or acknowledging that emotions are always present, and doing something brainy or intelligent with them. Individuals vary enormously in the ability/skill with which they use & manage their own emotions and react/respond to the emotions of others, and can make a difference between good manager and bad manager. It’s not overly equalitarian to suggest that most executives, professionals, managers are fairly smart individuals (obviously there can be glaring exceptions), but there can be a vast difference in how well they handle employees. That is, the department manager may be a genius in service knowledge, technical or product—and get failing marks in terms of people abilities or skills.

2.5.1 Emotions and Job Satisfaction

A recent emotion based theory that is emotional intelligence theory generally explains that individuals who have sufficient interpersonal and intrapersonal competencies can properly manage their emotions (i.e., self-awareness, self-regulation, and motivation) and other employee emotions (i.e., empathy and social skills) to cope with environmental challenges (Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1998, 2003; Salovey & Mayer, 1990, 1997). Specifically, Bar-On’s (1997) model of emotional-social intelligence posits that the level of emotional
intelligence will increase individuals’ competencies and this may help them to decrease external demands and pressures, as well as increase human well-being.

The degree to which an employee likes or dislikes an aspect of their job involves their feelings, and feelings are at the core of emotions (Muchinsky, 2000). Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992) estimated that there had been over 5000 published papers up to that time examining job satisfaction in some way. A study by Fisher (2000) examined what previous studies of job satisfaction had failed to include – the role of emotion while working. Fisher described job satisfaction as an attitude with an affective component (emotions, feelings) and a cognitive component (judgement, belief). Fisher hypothesised that emotions should be directly attributable to the job because emotions have a target and are often triggered by actual events in the workplace (being angry at someone, feeling frustrated because of an obstacle in reaching a goal, being proud of an accomplishment). Internal features of a job such as the relationship the employee has with supervisors and colleagues is likely to be related to emotion and therefore influence an employee’s perception of job satisfaction, more so than external features such as pay and promotion (Fisher).

In analysing data from 121 employees, Fisher (2000) reports that the experience of emotions is related to job satisfaction, with the experience of positive emotions being related to increased job satisfaction, and negative emotions being related to decreased job satisfaction, whereby employees who report experiencing positive emotions in the workplace also report greater feelings of satisfaction with their job than employees who report experiencing negative emotions in the workplace. Little support was found for the hypothesis that only internal features of the job relate to emotion and job satisfaction, and not external features. In this paper both internal and external features of job satisfaction were related to emotions, although the relationships were quite small. In concluding, Fisher suggests that organisational efforts to improve emotions in the workplace may pay off in better attitudes from employees. This study is encouraging as it was the first to explore the relationship between emotions experienced at work and job satisfaction, with the results highlighting the potential consequences of experiencing positive and negative emotions at work.

2.5.2 Emotional Intelligence and job Stress

People may react emotionally to stressful events at work. Sometimes the reaction will be positive. Other times the emotions may be characterized as anger, anxiety and depression.
A person’s ability to perceive and manage their own emotions may influence reactions to stress in a more positive way. Carson & Carson (1998) found EC to be related to career commitment. In their study, individuals most likely to be committed to their career also tended to be more emotionally competent.

Stress in the workplace increases management pressures, reduces productivity and makes individuals ill in numerous ways, evidences of which is still growing. Organizational stress affects the brain performance, together with functions of work performance; learning, memory, and concentration. Workplace stress also provides a serious risk of litigation for all organizations and employer’s, carrying significant liabilities for bad publicity, loss of reputation, and damages. It is here that emotional intelligence comes to our rescue and guides us to respond appropriately to different stressors. EI helps to cope up with stressful situations. Stress management, therefore, largely depends upon striking an emotional balance between a potential stress condition and one’s reaction to it. Researchers proved this fact in their studies, a brief account of which is listed below:

**Cluskey (1994)** carried out a survey on management accountants and examined the relation between stress and job strains. He found main causes of stress to be as follows; (1) Reporting to more than one boss, (2) Heavy workload under time constraints, (3) Work relations in the organisation, and (4) A perceived lack of career progress. Cluskey, also reported an additional source of stress, a mismatch between personality and the task demands of the job.

**Sehgal (1997)** assessed the effect of role stress on the level of involvement a person has in the job & alienation and the coping mechanism used to deal with stress. It was found that resource inadequacy, role erosion and inter-role distance were dominating contributors of role stress. Avoidance style of coping was used more frequently than approach styles of coping.

**Chand and Sethi (1997)** conducted a study to examine the organizational factors as predictors of job related strain among 150 junior officers working in various banking institutions in the state of Himachal Pradesh. Role conflict, strenuous working conditions and role overload were found to be the dearest and most significant predictors of job related strain.

**Abraham (2000)** deliberated that the social skills component of Emotional Intelligence is related to positive interpersonal relationships and it increases the feeling of job satisfaction.
and decreases occupational stress at workplace. She further stated that these social skills foster networks of social relationships which in turn increase an employee’s commitment to the organization.

Spector and Goh (2001) in their theoretical paper examined the role of emotion in occupational stress. They employed a narrow definition of job stress as “any condition or situation that elicits a negative emotional response, such as anger / anxiety or frustration / tension” in an attempt to overcome the broadness of previous definitions and focus on negative emotional responses. The authors suggested that emotions influence how the work environment is perceived, that is, whether a particular condition is appraised as a job stressor or not. They further suggested that these appraising emotions may lead to psychological and physical strains. Psychological strain might result from continual negative emotional experiences and may lead to decreases in job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Physical strains (for example, heart disease & suppression of immune system) may result from the physiological components of experienced emotions that can adversely affect health. It was concluded that an individual’s ability to manage and control their emotions (particularly negative emotions) in the workplace will influence the outcome of stress.

Slaski and Cartwright (2002) investigated the relationship between measures of emotional quotient, subjective stress, distress, general health, and quality of working life, morale, and management performance of a group of retail managers. Significant correlation’s in the expected/projected direction were found, signifying that supervisors who scored higher in emotional quotient demonstrated better management performance, experienced better health and well-being, and suffered less subjective stress.

Kaur (2003) identified role overload, role erosion, role isolation and personal inadequacy responsible for occupational role stress in her study of managers working in different branches of Punjab State Cooperative Bank Ltd.

Aziz (2004) opined that organisational stress originates in organisational demands that are experienced by a person. Stress is built up in the concept of role which is considered as the position an individual occupies in a system. The paper explored the intensity of organisational role stress among women professionals of information technology in the Indian private sector. Organizational stress role scale was used on a sample of 264 professionals to examine the level of role stress. Resource insufficiency emerged to be the
most powerful role stressor, followed by role overload, and personal insufficiency. The research study found dissimilarities in the stress levels between married and unmarried workforces on numerous role stressors. However, level of education did not appear as a significant stressor differentiator.

Duran and Extremera (2004) in their findings including professionals employed in institutions for people with intellectual disabilities, revealed a significant relationship between burnout syndrome and emotional intelligence, and personal accomplishment in particular. The data clearly indicated that emotional intelligence expressed in the ability to recognize, express, and control emotions may have impact on the perceived job stress and the consequences of experienced stress.

Darolia and Darolia (2005) examined the role of emotional intelligence in coping with stress and emotional control behaviour. The study clearly established that emotionally intelligent people who are able to understand and recognize their emotions, manage themselves appropriately so that their impulsiveness and aggression is kept under control in stressful situations.

Chabungban (2005) suggested that by developing emotional intelligence one can build a bridge between stress and better performance. The effects of stress are costly to both the organisation and the employee if left unattended within a given timeframe. Regular administration of emotional intelligence abilities can help employees at workplace to control impulses and persist in the face of frustration and obstacles, prevent negative emotions from swamping the ability to think, feel motivated and confident and to accurately perceive emotions, to empathise and get along well with others.

Gohm, Corser and Dalsky (2005) led a survey among 158 freshmen to find a relationship between stress (feelings of inability to control life events) and emotional intelligence (emotion-relevant abilities), considering personality (self-perception of the meta-emotional traits of clarity, attention, and intensity) as a moderating variable. The results suggested that emotional intelligence (EI) is potentially helpful in reducing stress for some individuals, but irrelevant or unnecessary for others. It may be because they have average EI, but do not appear to use it, presumably because they lack buoyancy /confidence in their emotional ability.

Ogińska-Bulik (2005) examined the association between perceived stress and emotional intelligence in the workplace and health related consequences in human service
employees. The results confirmed that employees reporting a higher emotional intelligence level perceived a lower level of occupational stress and suffered less from negative health consequences. The study confirmed that emotional intelligence plays a buffering role (but rather weak) in preventing the workers from negative health outcomes, especially from depression symptoms.

Singh and Singh (2008) examined the relationship as well as the impact of emotional intelligence on to the perception of role stress of medical professionals in their organizational lives. The study was conducted on a sample size of 312 medical professionals consisting of 174 male and 138 female doctors working for privately managed professional hospital organizations. The findings of the study indicated no significant difference in the level of emotional intelligence and perceived role stress between genders, but significantly negative relationships of emotional intelligence with organizational role stress for both the genders and the medical professionals as a whole.

Shahu and Gole (2008) drew attention on job stress which they said is commonly acknowledged to be a critical issue for managers of private manufacturing companies. Their study examined the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction and performance among 100 managers of private manufacturing firms. The findings of the study suggest that higher stress levels are related to lower performance whereas higher job satisfaction indicates higher performance.

Ismail, Suh-Suh, Ajis and Dollah (2009) carry out a study to examine the effect of emotional intelligence in the association between job performance and occupational stress. The result of the research clearly stated that association between emotional intelligence and occupational stress significantly correlated with job performance. Statistically, the outcome of study confirmed that the inclusion of emotional intelligence in the analysis mediated the effect of job stress on performance of job.

Dasgupta and Kumar (2009) investigated the sources of role stress among doctors and the stress levels among male and female doctors working in Indira Gandhi Medical College and Hospital, Shimla (India). The study revealed that role overload, self-role distance, role isolation, inter-role distance, role stagnation, role expectation conflict, role ambiguity and role inadequacy are the major sources of role stress. It further stated that there is no significant difference between the stress levels among male and female doctors
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except in cases of – inter-role distance and role inadequacy, which was found more in male doctors.

Emotional intelligence, a crucial element responsible for determining success in psychological well-being and life, seems to play a significant role in shaping the interaction between person and their environment of work. The study conducted by Oginska et al., (2005) which was intended to examine the relationship between perceived stress and emotional intelligence in the organization and health-related consequences in human service employees. The outcome confirmed an important, but not very strong, role of emotional intelligence in perceiving job stress and preventing employees of human services from negative health outcomes. They concluded that the ability to effectively deal with emotional information and emotions in the workplace/organisation assists employees in coping with job stress therefore, it should be developed in stress managing training programmes.

Emotional intelligence may predict coping strategies and stress responses in a variety of applied organizational settings. Matthews et al., in his study (2006) compared Emotional intelligence (EI) and the personality factors of the Five Factor Model (FFM) as predictors of task induced responses of stress. Results established that low Emotional Intelligence was related to worry states and avoidance coping, even with the Five Factor Model statistically controlled. However, Emotional intelligence (EI) was not precisely linked to task-induced changes in state of stress. Results also established that Neuroticism related to worry, distress, and emotion-focused coping & Conscientiousness predicted use of task-focused coping.

Studies conducted by Montes-Berges et al., (2007) with nursing students have shown that EI is a skill that minimises the negative consequences of stress. They examined the role of measured by the Trait Meta-Mood Scale, in the use of stress coping strategies in the mental health of nursing students, and in the quality & quantity of social support. The results showed positive correlations between social support and repair, clarity and social support, and mental health and social support. Hierarchy regression analysis pointed out that emotional repair is the main predictor of mental health, and emotional and clarity repair are predictors of social support. These results display the importance of perceived emotional intelligence (PEI) in coping of stress within the nursing framework.
Naidoo et al., (2008) has conducted a study to gain some understanding of the explanatory factors for stress and an evaluation of the role that emotional intelligence (EI) plays in the experience of perceived stress (PS). It also aimed to compare emotional intelligence & perceived stress and explore the correlation between satisfaction, academic background, with EI and career choice, and PS in first year dental students. The survey was conducted on 43 male and 55 female students. Results of Correlation analysis between PS and EI showed a statistically significant inverse relationship between EI and PS. Stepwise regression analysis identified significant predictors of PS as previous higher education qualification, gender, satisfaction with decision to study dentistry and emotional intelligence. The t- statistic indicates that EI is relatively the most important predictor of PS. The finding revealed that low EI is associated the stress.

In 1999 Lazarus suggested that stress and emotions are interdependent – where there is stress there is also emotion. Historically, researchers tended not to know or cite emotion research (Lazarus), however, today the practical importance of emotion in stress and psychological and physical well-being are widely recognised (Spector & Goh, 2001). In a chapter investigating the role of emotions specific to the occupational stress process, Spector and Goh (2001) outlined their emotion-centred occupational stress model and suggested how a focus on emotions can enhance employee well-being.

Organisational culture has been suggested to play a role in the experience and expression of emotions at work (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995. Zapf, 2001) and, with regards to occupational stress, the display and feeling rules of an organisation may impact on the psychological and physical health of its employees (Spector & Goh). Spector and Goh’s emotion-centred model of occupational stress is consistent with Lazarus’ (1966) transactional model of stress. Their model proposes that first an employee is exposed to an event in their environment which they may or may not perceive as stressful. If the event is perceived as stressful then negative emotions will arise, leading to one or more of the three forms of strain (psychological, physical and behavioural). These authors note that the continual experience of negative emotions in the workplace is likely to induce job dissatisfaction, a decline in organisational commitment, and increased withdrawal. The model proposed by Spector and Goh is important as it is one of the first models of occupational stress to include the experience of emotion. If, as Lazarus suggests, emotion and stress are interdependent constructs, then the empirical examination of models of occupational stress should always include the effect of emotion in the process.
2.5.3 Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Management

Deficiency or lack of emotional intelligence is one of the main cause of conflict, as the root of all conflict is a lack of sensitivity on the part of one or both parties and sensitivity is directly related to one's emotional intelligence. Leaders or Managers who are high on emotional intelligence will be able to mitigate problems long before they have a larger impact on the company. A brief account of some pertinent studies relating to emotional intelligence and conflict has been reported here:

The study conducted by Afzalur and Clement (2002) in more than seven countries revealed that motivation, one of the dimensions of emotional intelligence, is positively related with effective problem solving style.

Carmeli (2003) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work-family conflict and organizational commitment in ninety-eight senior managers. He suggested that emotional intelligence is a competency that drives positive outcomes and behaviors. Carmeli hypothesized that high levels of emotional intelligence would result in positive feelings and moods which would generate high levels of job satisfaction, that emotional intelligence would augment a higher level of organizational commitment as employees would be able to maintain positive affective states, and finally he hypothesized that employees with high emotional intelligence are more able to balance work-family conflict as they recognize and manage feelings of conflict as they occur with the events.

Jordan and Troth (2004) observed the utility of emotional intelligence for predicting conflict resolution styles, individual performance and team performance. 350 respondents working in 108 teams were administered a measure of team members' emotional intelligence. Respondedants then completed a problem-solving task, individually and as a team member, and afterwards reflected on the conflict resolution tactics used to achieve the team outcome. In line with expectations, emotional intelligence indicators were positively linked with team performance and were differentially linked to conflict resolution methods.

Srinivasan and George (2005) in their study investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and conflict management styles of management students. The subjects for the study were 516 students from business schools in Tamil Nadu, India, who responded to a structured questionnaire. The study revealed that different problems
demand different styles of handling and emotionally intelligent students seem to be capable of applying the different style of conflict management styles as the situation demands.

**Lenaghan, Buda and Eisner (2007)** in their research supported the finding that possession of emotional intelligence will act as a protector variable of one’s wellbeing in the face of work-family conflict. The results revealed that higher emotional intelligence positively influenced well-being. Specifically, those individuals in the study who had high emotional intelligence with low work-family conflict reported the highest well-being while those with low emotional intelligence and high work-family conflict reported the lowest well-being. A total of 205 people participated in this study. This sample was drawn from a large university representing a large variety of jobs including unionized trade workers to executive managers.

**Ayoko, Callan and Hartel (2008)** examined the dimensions of conflict and emotions by integrating features of conflict, reactions to conflict and team emotional intelligence climate. They proposed through their study that teams with less-well defined emotional intelligence climates were associated with increased task and relationship conflict and increased conflict intensity. In addition, team emotional intelligence climate, especially conflict management norms, moderated the link between task conflict and destructive reactions to conflict. They stressed upon the fact that team leaders and members need to be aware of their team members’ reactions to conflict. More specifically, teams that are experiencing destructive reactions to conflict need training in skills related to empathy, emotion management, and conflict management norms. The application of these skills in the team environment will assist team leaders and members in minimizing conflict and in managing conflict for team effectiveness.

**Godse and Thingujam (2010)** observed the relationship between personality, conflict resolution styles and emotional intelligence among 81 technology professionals in India. The results revealed that emotional intelligence was significantly correlated with the integrating style of conflict resolution (i.e. involving the exchange of information and differences toward a solution favourable to both parties), negatively correlated with the avoiding style (i.e. withdrawal from the situations) and not correlated with the dominating, compromising or obliging style. The results indicate that IT professionals with higher perceived emotional intelligence are likely to adapt better styles of conflict resolution in
order to deal effectively with the situations. The study draws our attention to the use of emotional intelligence skills in effectively resolving conflicts in the workplace.

2.5.4 Emotional Intelligence and Job Performance

Among other things / purposes, organizations are places where individuals are “organized” to work. To the extent that the work requires interactions among individuals, emotions such as excitement, anger and fear are indispensable in facilitating cooperation. Employees who are “intelligent” about their emotions will, therefore, be more efficient and effective in their interactions with the work environment and with their co-workers. This emotional intelligence – performance link has been proposed in a few previous studies which are mentioned as follows: An analysis of job competencies in 286 behaviours worldwide indicated that 18 of the 21 competencies in their generic model for distinguishing better performers were based on emotional intelligence (Spencer and Spencer, 1993).

Pesuric and Byham (1996) established that after supervisors in a manufacturing plant received training in emotional competencies, such as how to listen better and help employees resolve problems on their own, lost –time accidents were reduced from an average of 15 per year to 3 per year, and the plant exceeded productivity goals by $250,000. In a study, data from more than 30 different behaviours from banking, mining, geology, sales and health care industries documented that a number of emotional intelligence competencies, qualities such as, achievement drive, developing others, adaptability, influence and self confidence distinguished top performers from average ones (McClelland, 1998).

EI may contribute to performance of work (as reflected in company rank, salary, and salary increase) by enabling employees to nurture positive relationships at workplace, build social capital, and work effectively in teams. Performance of work often depends on the advice, support, and other resources provided by others (Seibert, Kraimer and Liden, 2001). Emotional intelligence enhances performance of work by enabling employees to regulate/control their emotions so as to effectively cope with stress, adjust to organisational change, and perform well under pressure.

A study on 100 bank employees by Manila University (cited in Singh, 2001) showed that intelligence quotient scores were virtually unrelated with job performance whereas emotional quotient score accounted for 27 percent of job performance.
Bhalla and Nauriyal (2004) reported in their study that emotional intelligence is a factor that is potentially useful in understanding and predicting individual performance at work. They further reported that emotional intelligence is extremely important in Indians as they have high affiliation need and emotional intelligence can lead to significant gain in productivity.

Lyons and Schneider (2005) examined the relationship of ability-based emotional intelligence facets with performance under stress. The authors expected high levels of emotional intelligence would promote challenge appraisals and better performance, whereas low emotional intelligence levels would foster threat appraisals and worse performance. The authors found that certain dimensions of emotional intelligence were related more to challenge and enhanced performance, and that some emotional intelligence dimensions were related to performance after controlling for cognitive ability, demonstrating incremental validity.

Cumming (2005) explored the relationship between emotional intelligence and workplace performance with a sample of workers from New Zealand. In addition, she studied the relationship among demographic factors, emotional intelligence and workplace performance. The results of her study suggested that a significant relationship exists between emotional intelligence and workplace performance. In the case of emotional intelligence and demographic factors, no significant relationships were found between gender and emotional intelligence, age and emotional intelligence, occupational groups and emotional intelligence, neither between education and emotional intelligence.

Côté and Miners (2006) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. Subjects were 175 professional, administrative, and managerial full-time employees of a large public university. Findings indicated that cognitive intelligence moderated the association between emotional intelligence and job performance. Emotional intelligence became a stronger predictor of Organisational Citizenship Behavior and job performance directed at the Organisation (OCBO) (e.g., protect the organisation when other employees criticise it) as cognitive intelligence decreased. Results suggested that using cognitive intelligence tests alone to predict job performance entails risk, because low cognitive intelligence employees can perform effectively if they have high emotional intelligence.
Sy, Tram, and O'Hara (2006) examined the relationships among food service employees’ emotional intelligence, their managers’ emotional intelligence, employees’ job satisfaction, and employees’ job performance, as assessed by manager ratings. The results showed that employees’ emotional intelligence was positively associated with job performance and satisfaction. In addition, managers’ emotional intelligence had a stronger positive correlation with job satisfaction for employees with low emotional intelligence than for those with high emotional intelligence. The findings suggest that managers' emotional intelligence makes an important difference to employees who possess low emotional intelligence.

One of the most extensive studies on performance involved the effectiveness of 1,171 United State Air Force recruiters. These recruiters were divided into high-performing groups (those who met or exceeded 100% of their recruiting goals) and low performing groups (those who met less than 80% of their recruiting goals). An emotional quotient was administered to the recruiters, and the results indicated the emotional quotient instrument predicted 28% of the variance in the performance between the two groups. The emotional quotient correctly classified 81% of the recruiters in the high- performing and low-performing groups. Furthermore, recruiters with high levels of emotional intelligence had a greater ability to place recruits in positions that closely matched their knowledge and skills (Bar-On, Handley and Fund, 2006).

Shanker and Sayeed (2006) conducted a research on 139 managers working in various organizations in Western India. The purpose of the study was to establish a relation between emotionally intelligent managers and managers’ professional development. The managerial scores on various dimensions of emotional intelligence were correlated with professional development indicators of managers, conceptualized in terms of number of promotions attained and the rated job success. The assumption that the emotionally intelligent managers would tend to attain greater professional development than those who are less emotionally intelligent was tentatively supported in the findings.

Quoidbach and Hansenne (2009) investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence, performance, and cohesiveness in 23 nursing teams in Belgium. Nursing team performance was measured at four different levels: job satisfaction, chief nursing executives’ rating, turnover rate, and health care quality. The results did not support the generalization that all components of emotional intelligence relate to all measures of performance; however, the data clearly supported a relationship between emotional
Emotional regulation was also positively correlated with group cohesiveness. These results suggest that emotional regulation may provide an interesting new way of enhancing nursing teams' cohesion and patient / client outcomes. The study suggested that including training on emotional regulation skills during team-building seminars might be more effective than focusing only on exercises to create long-term cohesiveness.

Khokhar and Kush (2009) in their study explained the performance of executives on different levels of emotional intelligence and provided a link between emotional intelligence and effective work performance. 20 Male executives (out of 200) within the age range of 40 to 55 yrs from BHEL (Haridwar) and THDC (Rishikesh) of Uttarakhand State (India) were selected. T-tests for independent groups were used to measure the mean difference between groups. The findings of the study revealed that executives having higher emotional intelligence showed better quality of work performance as compared to their counterparts.

Ramo, Saris and Boyatzis (2009) assessed the relationship between emotional intelligence, personality, and job performance, as determined by superior and peer nominations. The participants were 223 employees of three medium-sized Spanish organizations that were involved in a management of competency project based on social and emotional competencies. The results revealed that both personality traits and social and emotional competencies are valuable predictors of job performance. Furthermore, competencies seem to be more powerful predictors of performance than global personality traits.

2.5.5 Emotional intelligence and other work place outcomes

Emotional intelligence has been found to be a significant moderator in various other workplace outcomes like job commitment, team building, positive work culture, etc.

A brief account of such studies is mentioned below:

Cooper (1997) analysed that profitability is also linked to the way employees feel about their job, colleagues and company. He found that having happier employees is that emotional intelligence, not intelligence quotient, or raw brain power alone, underpins many of the best decisions, most dynamic organisations and most satisfying career span.
Cherniss and Goleman (1998) estimated that by not following training guidelines established to increase emotional intelligence in the workplace, industry in the United States is losing between US $ 5.6 and US $ 16.8 billion a year. They found that the impact of training employees in emotional and social competencies with programs which followed their guidelines was higher than for other programs, and by not implementing these programs companies were receiving less of an impact and consequently losing money.

A study on top 10 Indian companies documented that enhancement of emotional intelligence of the member’s generated more positive work culture in the behaviours. (Singh, 2001).

A paper by Nikolaou and Tsaousis (2002) explored the relationship between emotional intelligence, physical and psychological health. These authors had hypothesized that high level of emotional intelligence would relate to better psychological and physical health, and that emotional intelligence would correlate negatively with frequency of smoking and drinking and positively with improved quality of life. Both the hypotheses in their paper were supported and high level of emotional intelligence were associated with better health and improved quality of life.

Sjöberg and Littorin (2003) in their study investigated salespersons in a telecommunications company for their perceived risk, emotional intelligence and a number of additional dimensions of work motivation, personality and performance. They concluded that emotional intelligence was related as expected to other variables, most notably to life / work balance (positively), to positive affective tone (positively), and to materialistic values and money obsession (negatively).

Center for Creative Leadership (2003) reports that higher levels of emotional intelligence are associated with better performance in following areas: participative management, putting people at ease, self awareness, balance between personal life and work, straightforwardness and composure, building and mending relations, decisiveness, confronting problem employees, change management, etc.

Sinha and Jain (2004) conducted a study on emotional intelligence and its influence on relevant outcomes. They reported that the dimensions of emotional intelligence were meaningfully related with the job satisfaction, personal effectiveness, organisational
commitment, reputation effectiveness, general health, trust, turnover intention, organisational effectiveness and organisational affectivity.

**Kakkar (2004)** in his study highlighted that more skilled an organisation’s management team at creating a work environment where employees experience positive emotions, more successful the organisation will be. He opined that emphasis on perception and emotional understanding in an organisation will improve the working of the organisation.

**Brenda and Christopher (2004)** proposed that organizational learning is more effective if enacted by emotionally intelligent employees within clear operating boundaries such as those offered by participation in decision-making. The authors stressed that emotional intelligence, organizational learning and participation in decision-making can be operationalized to improve an organization’s capacity to manage change and improve performance outcomes.

**Malekar (2005)** prepared a matrix of managing human capital from the perspective of emotional intelligence. Her research highlighted that very often organizational systems fail to recognise the softer facets of people and slot people into assignments for which they are inherently incapable. Such situations result in conflict and behaviour that is at times uncondonable and bitter. Job design with an eye on emotional intelligence content of a role is as important as the definition of role, the competencies it requires, and the clean execution of tasks.

**Sharma (2005)** conducted a study on understanding the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment of the executives working in manufacturing and service sectors with at least 10 years of service. The findings state the fact that the employees who are emotionally intelligent are able to find themselves more concerned with the organization as their emotions gets pacified with the working environment, which makes them more committed. Emotional intelligent employees show their concern for the organizations by discharging their duties with responsibility and keep their spirits high even in the critical times.

**Gabel, Dolan and Cerdin (2005)** put forward their views on global team managers who handle business in various complex environments which may require them to use emotional intelligence to understand, accept, or adapt to the norms of a foreign culture. The authors had hypothesized that emotional intelligence is a strong predictor of cross-cultural success for international assignment managers. The results indicated that cross-
cultural adjustment plays an important role in the significant relationship between some dimensions of emotional intelligence and subsequent success of internationally assigned managers. The study proposed that emotional intelligence assessments should be added to the traditional selection criteria for international assignment managers to better predict managerial success.

**Kulshetra and Sen (2006)** investigated the subjective well being in relation to emotional intelligence and locus of control among executives. They conducted a study on 150 executives of different job strata of Hero Honda Motor Ltd. The results of the study revealed that emotional intelligence and locus of control have significant correlation with subjective well being. Subjects with high emotional intelligence and internal locus of control scored significantly high on positive affect and scored significantly low on negative affect.

**Lopes, Grewal, Kadis, Gall and Salovey (2006)** examined the relation between emotional intelligence and workplace outcomes of 44 analysts and clerical employees from the finance department of a Fortune 400 insurance company. Findings indicated that high emotionally intelligent employees held higher company rank and received greater merit increases than their counterparts. These workers also received better peer and / supervisor ratings of stress tolerance and interpersonal facilitation.

**Jennings and Palmer (2007)** examined front line sales managers and sales representatives of a pharmaceutical company in Australia through a six-month learning and development program on emotional intelligence designed to enhance their sales performance. The emotional intelligence and sales revenue of participants were measured before and after the program and compared to that of a control group. The emotional intelligence of the participants measured was found to improve by a mean of 18% while the control group decreased by 4%. In addition, the total sales revenue of the participants was found to increase by an average of 12% in comparison with the control group. The implication of this study was that emotional intelligence development training can result in improvements in sales revenue.

**Kumar (2007)** examined the impact of emotional intelligence on organizational learning. The results depicted emotional intelligence as being positively and significantly related with organizational learning. The findings have implications for management of people towards creating and maintaining organizational learning.
Chiva and Alegre (2008) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. Data was collected from blue-collar employees working for ceramic tile manufacturers in Spain. The results suggested that emotionally intelligent individuals are more likely to experience high levels of job satisfaction. The results also indicated that Organizational Learning Capability (OLC), defined as a set of stimulating factors that facilitate organizational learning (e.g., experimentation, risk taking, interaction with the external environment, dialogue and participative decision making) played a significant role in determining the effects of emotional intelligence on job satisfaction. The most important implication was that job satisfaction was affected by the correlation between individual emotional intelligence and certain working conditions.

Kafetsios and Zampetakis (2008) tested for links between emotional intelligence, affect at work and job satisfaction. The results demonstrated that emotional intelligence is an important predictor of work affectivity and job satisfaction. The results also indicated that positive and negative affect at work substantially mediate the relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction with positive affect exerting a stronger influence. Among the four emotional intelligence dimensions, use of emotion and emotional regulation were significant predictors of affect at work whereas perceiving others’ emotions was uniquely associated with job satisfaction.

Brundin, Patzelt and Shepherd (2008) analyzed how and why emotional displays of managers influence the willingness of employees to act entrepreneurially. Using data from 31 entrepreneurially oriented firms, the findings revealed that managers’ of confidence and satisfaction about entrepreneurial projects enhance employees’ willingness to act entrepreneurially, whereas displays of frustration, worry, and bewilderment, respectively, diminish it. The findings are in line with the emotional intelligence framework that maintains that emotionally intelligent managers are able to use emotions in order to enhance cognitive processes among employees. In other words, managers’ display of emotion may put employees in good or bad moods. By being aware of the consequences of displaying positive or negative emotions, and by being able to be more flexible and alter their displays, managers can impact employees’ work performance.

Salami (2008) investigated the relationships of demographic factors (age, marital status, gender, job tenure, and educational level), emotional intelligence, work-role salience, achievement motivation and job satisfaction to organizational commitment of industrial workers. Participants were 320 employees (170 males, 150 females) randomly selected
from 5 service and 5 manufacturing organizations in Oyo State, Nigeria. The results showed that emotional intelligence, work-role salience, achievement motivation, job satisfaction and all demographic factors except gender significantly predicted organizational commitment of the workers.

Stein, Papadogiannis, Yip and Sitarenios (2009) examined the emotional intelligence scores of executives in relation to several organisational outcomes such as growth management, employee management and retention and net profit. The results showed that executives who possessed higher levels of self-regard, empathy, problem solving and reality testing were more likely to yield high profit earning enterprises and were also perceived as being easy with respect to managing others, managing growth, retaining and training employees.

Momeni (2009) examined the relation between the emotional intelligence of managers and the organizational climate that they create. Thirty managers from manufacturing car companies in Iran were randomly selected as a sample. Employees completed a modified version of the Organizational Climate Inventory which measured five dimensions that affect climate in the workplace: credibility, respect, fairness, pride, and camaraderie. Results revealed that the higher a manager’s emotional intelligence, the better the climate in the workplace. Among the emotional intelligence dimensions, social awareness and self-awareness have the greatest influence on organizational climate. The study proposed that organizations should focus on hiring managers with high emotional and social competence and also provide emotional intelligence training and development opportunities to managers to enable them create a positive organizational climate.

Deshpande (2009) investigated the impact of emotional intelligence, ethical behavior of peers, and ethical behavior of managers on the ethical behavior of 180 not-for profit hospital employees in the U.S. The results revealed that emotional intelligence, ethical behavior of peers and of managers had a significant positive impact on ethical behavior of employees. Employees with emotional intelligence skills like empathy and self-management are more likely to make ethical decisions. These are skills that can be tested for during the hiring process, maintained via training and development programs, and reinforced during performance appraisals. Overall, the study implied that emotional intelligence could create a better learning, working, and caring environment.
Wong, Wong and Peng (2010) empirically investigated the potential effect of school leaders’ (i.e., senior teachers) emotional intelligence, on teachers’ job satisfaction in Hong Kong. The results showed that school teachers believe that middle-level leaders’ emotional intelligence is important for their success, and a large sample of teachers surveyed also indicated that emotional intelligence is positively related to job satisfaction. The study indicates that the teaching profession requires both teachers and school leaders to have high levels of emotional intelligence. Practically, this implies that in selecting, training and developing teachers and school leaders, emotional intelligence should be one of the important concerns and that it may be worthwhile for educational researchers to spend more efforts in designing training programs to improve the emotional intelligence of teachers and school leaders.

2.6 EI Training and Development Interventions

Over the years, organizations have welcomed emotional intelligence in different ways and recently many are applying EI training programs with the hope of promoting organizational outcomes. Despite the increasing acceptance among practitioners who believe EI development to be possible, researchers fall into two contrasting groups as far as EI development is concerned. While devotees to EI field strongly argue that it is possible to help people in workplace become more emotionally intelligent and effective (Cherniss and Goleman, 2001), critics fundamentally doubt the possibility of EI development (Dulewicz and Higgs, 1999). In respond to the existing confusion over the possibility of EI development, Gowing (2001) suggests that it is useful to note the essential difference between the terms emotional intelligence and emotional competence. Emotional competence is “a learned capability based on emotional intelligence that results in outstanding performance at work” (Goleman, 1998, p. 24). With this respect, EI is capable of training and development among adults and particularly in workplace context. Cherniss and Goleman (2001, p. 214) state that “the question should no longer be whether organizations can teach EI skills but rather how they can teach them”.

Many scholars have written on EI; but there exist limited evidence on how to develop it (Grant, 2007; Riggio and Lee, 2007; Watkin, 2000, Wong et al., 2007). No international framework is available for those who seek to enhance EI. Previous EI training and development interventions are mostly based on one of the known emotional intelligence models ability, competency, or mixed models of EI. Clarke (2006) argues that “in relation to competency models and mixed models of EI there have been some positive findings
reported suggesting that training can have an impact on developing some of the key interpersonal and intrapersonal dimensions associated with the identified emotional competencies or traits” (p. 428). Though not published in peer reviewed journals, in one study EI levels of sample participants (two groups of 20 Brazilian managers and consultants and 19 participants from a large US accounting organization) were assessed using ECI-2. The sample then participated in two five-day EI workshops designed to educate them on EI competencies. Finally, after eight months for the first group and 14 months for the second group, participants’ progress was measured by another 360-degree ECI-2 test. Results showed significant improvement on 8 out of 20 EI competencies for the first group, and 19 out of 20 for the second (Sala, 2002).

In one study Groves et al. (2008), in order to test the possibility of deliberate EI development, chose to design their EI training program based on the Mayer and Salovey (1997) ability model. Their 11-week leadership development program focused on EI was provided for 75 fully-employed business students (having a control group of 60 from the same group). They designed Emotional Intelligence Self-description Inventory (EISDI) for EI measurement specifically for training applications the items of which was derived from Mayer and Salovey (1997) model. Data analysis showed that the treatment group had improved across each EI dimension (perception and appraisal of emotions, facilitating thinking with emotions, understanding emotion, and regulation and management of emotion) and the control group did not show any improvements.

In an interesting study Grant (2007) compared the results from a 13-week and a two-day EI training program. He showed that the former was more effective and enhanced EI and coaching skills of the participants, while the latter was not significantly effective in increasing EI scores. In the 13-week study, he conducted 13 face-to-face training seminars which was attended by 23 students studying goal-focused coaching as a part of a postgraduate degree program in management and psychology, and wished to learn coaching skills for use in workplace or professional development. The two-day “Manager as Coach” training program was attended by 20 middle-level managers as a part of professional development. In both cases a pre and post test design was utilized. Scores of EI abilities showed significant improvement following the 13-week program, while no improvement was gained over the two-day program (both captured by Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale). He concluded that perhaps longer training programs are more effective in improving EI. Latif (2004) conducted a management skills course that sought to
examine the impact of the management skills course on EI improvements of 65 first-year Doctor of Pharmacy students. Based on social learning theory and following skill assessment, skill learning, skill analysis, skill practice, and skill application steps, improvements were observed using pre-/post EI tests adopted from Weisinger’s (1998, as cited in Latif, 2004) work. Some scholars have dedicated time and effort to describe guidelines for delivering effective EI programs (Bagshaw, 2000; Cherniss, 2000; Cherniss and Caplan, 2001; Goleman, 1998; Orme and Langhorn, 2003). Bagshaw (2000) describes three factors necessary for the effectiveness of EI training programs: first, the participants must be ready, second, EI requirements for a job must be recognized, and finally, change must be continuously reinforced. Cherniss and Goleman (2001) provide an optimal process for promoting EI in work organizations including four steps: (1) contemplation and pre-contemplation; (2) preparation; (3) action; and (4) maintenance.

Workshop-based interventions are also found to be effective at improving emotional intelligence (Sala, 2002). Clarke (2006) argues alternative/different means other than training programs, most particularly through on-the-job or workplace learning methods. Results from these interventions provide evidence regarding the development efforts and effectiveness of emotional competence training; however they are relatively limited in number. Regardless of these facts, investigators on the emotional intelligence training and development interventions are challenged by critics. Clarke (2006) points to the difficulty in making an appropriate comparison or judgment concerning the effectiveness/usefulness of any emotional intelligence development interventions, which is due to the lack of coherence in conceptualizing EI, and the absence of consistency reflected within the literature analyzing the development of EI.

Along the same lines, Groves et al. (2008, p. 229) argue that the failures in the available EI interventions are limited by three general issues:

(1) EI conceptual and measurement concerns;

(2) Limited information concerning the training treatment and short duration of treatment; and

(3) Necessary statistical controls and/or absence of a control group.

There exist different measures for evaluating EI models. Emotional competence inventory (ECI-2) has a nearly one-to-one relationship with Boyatzis et al.’s (2000) competency framework (Gowing, 2001) and measures 18 competencies organized into four clusters. ECI-2 is a 360-degree assessment tool that gathers self, subordinate, peer and supervisory
ratings (Gowing, 2001) and it has been proved to be applicable to organizational development interventions. Gowing et al.’s (2005; as cited in McEnrue and Groves, 2006) study reports the use of the ECI-2 for the purposes of developing or updating the leadership competency models at some public and private American organizations. ECI-2 has been found a reliable and valid measure, with a reported Cronbach alpha of 0.87 and test-retest reliability of 0.78 (Boyatzis et al., 2000). “The internal consistency reliability of self-assessment ECI-2 ranges from 0.61 to 0.85 and for the peer and supervisor rating scales, internal consistency reliability ranges from 0.80 to 0.95” (Conte, 2005, p. 434).

At Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University, a set of longitudinal studies were conducted to evaluate the impact of MBA program on the development of cognitive, social, and emotional intelligence competencies during a required course entitled “Leadership assessment and development”. Boyatzis (2001) provides data on a series of longitudinal studies in which MBA students as a result of a competency-based, outcome-oriented MBA program (based on a self-directed change model), showed dramatic changes on videotaped and audio taped behavioral samples and questionnaire measures of EI competencies over two to five years. Full-time students graduating from the competency-based MBA program showed improvements in all EI competencies and part-time students in 93 percent of competencies. Also Professional Fellow Program participants at their forties or fifties showed improvement in 67 percent of competencies. In the same vein, at Weatherhead School of Management, and during the “Leadership assessment and development” course, Rhee (2008) also developed a longitudinal study. Based on a competency model of EI and using an interview-based methodology she found that students did not develop on all EI competencies at the same time. Certain types of competencies were developed earlier in the program (technology and quantitative) while other competencies were developed during summer break (help and relationship) or toward the end of the program (informational analysis, theory, and goals and action).

In one study Turner and Lloyd-Walker (2008) found moderate increase in emotional competencies as measured by ECI-2 (Pre-/six month post test), following an emotional competence training program developed by Talent Smart based on Goleman’s model of EI.

Slaski and Cartwright (2003) conducted a one-day per week EI development program for a total of four days. 60 retail managers as treatment group and 60 as control group attended
the program. Pre-/post tests of EI assessments (using the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory and the Dulewicz and Higgs Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire) for treatment group and six month later post test for control group (using the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory) showed that no significant difference existed between the training and the control group before the training. Treatment group EI scores increased significantly following the developmental EI training program (captured by two different measures) while the control group scores for EI remained constant.

A new workplace measure of EI (the SUEIT, Palmer & Stough, 2001), which is based upon existing models of EI, was also investigated. It was concluded that this measure of EI has shown some preliminary validity for use in organisational research. In one of the first investigations as to the utility of the SUEIT in the workplace Gardner and Stough (2002) examined the relationship between EI and leadership, measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2000) in 110 senior level managers. The authors found a strong relationship between transformational leadership and overall EI (r = 0.67, p<.01), as well as a negative relationship between laissez-faire leadership (a ‘do nothing’ style of leadership) and overall EI (r = -0.46, p< .01). From the sub-scales of the SUEIT, understanding emotions (external) and emotional management emerged as the best predictors of effective leadership, providing preliminary evidence for the utility of the SUEIT in leadership selection and in occupational research and for developing EI training & intervention programmes.

Application of the EI theories in a workstation stress management shows that the ability of employees to properly manage their and other employee emotions will not directly increase work performance, but its effect on work performance may increase if employees have sufficient abilities/skills to cope with psychological and physiological stresses in the organisation (Gillespie et al., 2001, Harrison, 1978, Karasek, Theorell, 1990, Lazarus, 1994, Slaski, Cartwright, 2002, 2003, Nikolau, Tsaosis, 2002).

2.7 Job Stress

Stress is an unwanted reaction individuals have to relentless demands or other types of pressures placed upon them. A urge and multi disciplinary literature points towards a lot of key elements such as workload, work environment and management support, in determining the stressful the job can be and its effect on employees mental and physical health, all life situations, even positive ones, cause/create a certain degree of stress
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Major causes of occupational stress have been recognized as role demand, task demand, and organizational structure (M.A Khanet al), (2007). A study conducted by Farooq and Fayyaz (2007) hinted that there are bear on over the impact of stress on the banking employees and productivity. The tremendous growth in communication and information technology has caused awareness of the global economy amongst the minds of the common masses.

A study conducted on Private and Public sector banks in Gwalior city by Shilpa Sankpal, Dr.Pushpa Negi and Jeetendra Vashishtha (Jan-July 2010) with objective to compare occupational role stress of managers of private and public banks. Sample size was 50 each from private and public banks. Result of the study was that there is a significant difference between role stress of private and public sector bank employees. It was found that private sector bank employees experienced higher occupational role stress than public sector bank employees.

Jamshed et al., (2011) proposed that “The place of work is potentially an important source of stress for banking employees because of the amount of time employees spent in their respective banks.” And that stress often decreases their work performance. Anna West (2006) in her research, “Management: Stress: coping strategies for employers, elucidated that since stress was very often caused by how a individual copes in the job, rather than the job itself, it was necessary to make certain that at the stage of recruitment an individual's abilities/skills are accurately matched to the job demands. The research also suggested on job training and increasing the control, an worker has, over the task may help to reduce the stress.

Research conducted by Meena Kumari (July 2008) with main objective to understand personality and job stress differentials of high school female teachers in Haryana. Sample size was 361 and was tested with Maslach Burnout Inventory. The high burnout group scored significantly high on neuroticism, psychoticism, lie scale, type-A behaviour, depersonalization, emotional exhaustion but low on job stress, extraversion and personal accomplishment. Conclusion of this research suggests that teachers should be frequently screened for their job stress and burnout, and if needed, be counseled to cope with the threat of job stress and burnout.

There is close relationship between employee’s mental job stress and health after privatization. Therefore, researchers suggested that organisation have to allow their
employee’s to participate in decision making processes concerning functional changes which can in turn reduce occupational stress of the workforce (A Aghaei, R Hasanzadeh, A Mahdad, SH Atashpuor, 2010). Michael S. Dahl (2010) studied correlation between employee health and organisational change. He studied stress related medical prescriptions of 92,870 employees working in 1,518 Danish organizations for the same. Findings of the study showed that workers received more stress related medical prescriptions for depression, anxiety, and insomnia if these employee’s are working with the organisations that undergo change. Psychological impact is on absenteeism and productivity. Mental health problem can increase turnover also reduce commitment and employees focus.

In an article entitled 'Stress in the workplace', Lisa(2004) makes the point that while a certain amount of stress is needed to motivate individuals into action, prolonged exposure to stress can have a huge impact on overall employees health. Work place stress is becoming a major anxiety for managers, employers and government agencies, owing to the Occupational Health and Safety legislations demanding employers to practice ‘duty of care’ by providing employees with safe working conditions which also cover the psychological wellbeing of their staff (Lisa, 2010).

Research on job stress has long emphasized the importance of recognizing the performance implications of decision under stress. Job stress has fuelled a significant, multifaceted literature. An important stream of literature starting with Beehr and Newman (1978) defined occupational stress as "A condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs/work and characterised by changes within people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning." Cobb (1975) was with belief that, "The responsibility load creates severe stress among managers and workers." If the individual employee/manager cannot cope with the increased level of responsibilities it may lead to several psychological and physical disorders among them. Brook (1973) stated that qualitative changes in the job creates adjustmental problem among workers. The interpersonal relationships between the departments and inside the department create qualitative difficulties within the workplace to a great extent. Miles and Perreault (1976) identified four different types of role conflict: 1. Inter sender role conflict. 2. Intra-sender role conflict 3. Role overload and 4. Person-role conflict. There is evidence that role incumbents with high levels of role ambiguity also react to their condition with anxiety, depression, physical symptoms, lower self-esteem or a sense of futility, lower levels of organisational commitment and job involvement, and perceptions of lower performance
on part of the supervisors, of organisation, and of themselves (Brief and Aldag, 1976; Greene, 1972). The presence of encouraging peer groups & supportive relationships with supervisors are negatively correlated with Role Conflict (Caplan et al., 1994).

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) signify that, “Lack of group cohesiveness may explain various physiological and behavioural outcomes in an employ desiring such sticks together”. Negative interpersonal relations and workplace interpersonal conflicts are prevalent sources of stress (Dewey, 1993; Lang, 1984; Long et al., 1992), and are existed with symptoms of ill health and negative mood depressions, (Israel et al., 1989; Karasek, Gardell and Lindell, 1987; Snap, 1992). Lack of effective consultation, lack of participation in the decision making process and communication, unjustified restrictions on behaviour, no sense of belonging and office politics are identified as potential sources of stressors. Lack of participation in work activity is associated with negative behavioural responses and psychological mood, including escapist drinking and heavy smoking (Caplan et al., 1975).

According to French and Caplan (1975), "Pressure of both qualitative and quantitative overload can result in the need to work excessive hours, which is an additional source of job stress”. Having to perform under time pressure in order to meet deadlines/targets is an independent source of stress. Studies revealed that levels of stress increase as difficult deadlines draw near. More often, Stress is developed when an individual employee is assigned a key responsibility without proper delegation and authority of power. Interpersonal factors such as group functional dependence, cohesiveness, communication frequency, relative authority and organisational distance between the focal persons and the role sender are important topics in organisational behavior (Vansell, Brief, and Schuler, 1981). Occupational stress is increasingly a significant source of economic loss and an important occupational health problem. Occupational stress may produce both physiologic and overt psychological disabilities. Nevertheless it may also cause subtle manifestation of morbidity that can affect productivity and personal well-being of an employee (Quick, Murphy, Hurrell and Orman, 1992). A stress arises when a person feels he is not competent/ capable enough to undertake the role assigned to him efficiently and effectively. The person feels that he lacks training, knowledge and skill on performing the role (conflict management, stress, and counselling, p.283). A job stressed person is probably to have greater job dissatisfaction, increased absenteeism, increase in negative psychological symptoms, increased frequency of drinking and smoking and self-esteem

A brief outline of the past research supporting the main variables and parameters used in this study are summarized in exhibit: (2.5.0). Stress does not have the same impact on every one. There are individual differences in coping with stressful situations. Some people go to pieces at the slightest provocation; while others seem unflappable even in extremely stressful conditions It is here Emotional Intelligence (EQ) come to our rescue and guide us to respond appropriately to different stressors.

**Exhibit 2.5.0: Overview of Empirical Studies on Job Stress and Burnout**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. no</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Strains</th>
<th>Stressors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.    | Brief and Aldag, 1976; Greene, 1972 | Supervisors & Workers | • job dissatisfaction  
• job stress  
• physical isolation | • Role ambiguity  
• Dealing with inmates  
• lack of a support network  
• lack of decision latitude |
| 2.    | Dewey, 1993; Lang, 1984; Long et al., 1992 | Industrial Executives | • Alienation  
• job stress | • Role definition problems  
• Interpersonal conflict |
• Burnout | • role ambiguity  
• high workload  
• negative direct inmate contact  
• lack of social support |
| 4.    | Schaufeli, Van den Eijnden, and Brouwers, 1994 | Managerial Staff | • job stress  
• job satisfaction  
• burnout | • role conflict  
• lack of social support  
• lack of participation in decision making  
• resource inadequacy |
| 5.    | Verhagen (1986a, b) | 250 Dutch COs | • job stress  
• job satisfaction  
• psychosomatic complaints  
• absenteeism | • high work load  
• poor management support  
• uncertainty about the future  
• role conflict |
| 6.    | Green and Walkey, 1988; Cherniss, 1980; Freudenberger, 1977, 1980 | Workers & supervisors | • burnout | • contact with inmates  
• job classification |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study Reference</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Whitehead et al. (1987)</td>
<td>258 USA COs</td>
<td>• job satisfaction</td>
<td>• interaction with inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• job stress</td>
<td>• punitive orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• burnout</td>
<td>• counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>role(rehabilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• lack of participation in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Brook (1973)</td>
<td>Workers &amp; Managers</td>
<td>• turnover</td>
<td>• poor opportunities to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>influence institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>policy decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• dissatisfaction with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Cobb (1975)</td>
<td>Workers &amp; Managers</td>
<td>• job stress</td>
<td>• high workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• burnout</td>
<td>• stressful job events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• poor health</td>
<td>• lack of social support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Prof. D. Kumar M (2005)</td>
<td>200 India Bank employees</td>
<td>• Job stress</td>
<td>• Role Ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Role overload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• job difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• feeling of inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ivancevich &amp; Matteson (1980)</td>
<td>350 executives</td>
<td>• Stress &amp; work</td>
<td>• Role Ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Role overload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cohesiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Caplan &amp; Jones (1975)</td>
<td>300 industrial employees</td>
<td>• Alienation</td>
<td>• Work overload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Job stress</td>
<td>• Role ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Personality traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cullen et al. (1990)</td>
<td>155 USA COs</td>
<td>• job satisfaction</td>
<td>• Role problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• life and work stress</td>
<td>• Perceived danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• lack of supervisory,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer, and family support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Miles and Perreault (1976)</td>
<td>250 industrial managers</td>
<td>• role conflict</td>
<td>• Intra-sender role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inter sender role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Person- role conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Role over load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Britton (1997)</td>
<td>2979 USA COs</td>
<td>• job stress</td>
<td>• institutional characteristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>(e.g. poor quality of supervision)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Emotional Intelligence and Job Stress among Bank Employees
Several specific stressful working situations, such as assembly-line work, repetitive work, electronic surveillance or monitoring, inflexible hours, involuntary overtime, deskill work, and arbitrary supervision, have been studied. From past 15 years, a new model of occupational stress (figure 2.5) established by Robert Karasek has underlined two key components of these stressors, and maintained by a growing body of proof. **Karasek's "job strain" model** states that the highest risk to mental and physical health from stress occurs to employees facing pressures combined with low control or high psychological workload demands or decision latitude in fulfilling those demands. Work demands are defined by queries such as "working very hard," "working very fast," and not "enough

| 16 | Tripplet et al. (1996) | 254 USA COs | • job stress • coping strategies | • role ambiguity • role conflict • quantitative/qualitative role overload • career development • underutilization of skills • overtime • safety concerns |
| 17 | Shamir & Drory, 1982 | Industrial Executives | • work-related stress | • management problems • dealing with inmates and co-workers • boredom |
| 18 | Holgate & Clegg (1991) | 106 UK COs | • burnout | • role conflict • role ambiguity • lack of participation in decision making • levels of client contact |
| 19 | Augestad & Levander (1992) | 122 Norwegian COs | • job stress • self-reported health • problems | • personality characteristics • coping strategies |
| 20 | Green and Walkey, 1988; Cherniss, 1980; Freudenger, 1977, 1980 | 150 industrial employees | • Job stress • burnout | • lower productivity • reduced motivation and job skills • increased accidents |
| 21 | Beehr & Newman (1978) | Workers & Managers | • job stress | • employee health • organisational effectiveness |
| 22 | Whitehead, 1989; Schaufeli et al., 1994 | Managers & Workers | • job stress • burnout | • role ambiguity • employee health • organisational effectiveness |
time to get the work done." Work decision latitude is defined as both the decision making authority available to the employee and the ability to use abilities/skills on the job.

In recent studies, **Karasek's "job strain" model** was extended to include a third factor - the favorable effects of organizational social support. While there are a number of models of "occupational stress, the "job strain" model highlights the inter-action between control and demands in initiating stress and objective-constraints on action in the work environment, rather than "person-environment fit" or individual perceptions. Karasek's job strain model underlines another major negative concern of work organisation; how the SHY & assembly line and the principles of Taylorism, with its attention on decreasing employees skill’s and influence, can produce lack of participation, learned helplessness, and passivity (at work, in the politics, and in community).

**Figure: 2.5**


In recent studies, **Karasek's "job strain" model** was extended to include a third factor - the favorable effects of organizational social support. While there are a number of models of "occupational stress, the "job strain" model highlights the inter-action between control and demands in initiating stress and objective-constraints on action in the work environment, rather than "person-environment fit" or individual perceptions. Karasek's job strain model underlines another major negative concern of work organisation; how the SHY & assembly line and the principles of Taylorism, with its attention on decreasing employees skill’s and influence, can produce lack of participation, learned helplessness,
and passivity (at work, in the politics, and in community). Karasek's job strain model (figure 2.5) has two constituents - increasing heart risk disease following arrow “A”, but increasing participation, activity, self-esteem, sense of accomplishment, and motivation to learn, following arrow B. Hence, Karasek's job strain model provides a public health and a justification foundation for efforts to achieve increased workplace democracy as well as greater employee autonomy.

Significant evidence exists relating ‘job strain’ to coronary heart disease and hypertension. From over the last decade, more than 45 research studies on heart disease and "job strain" and 25 research studies on other disease risk factors and "job strain" have been published all over the world providing strong proof that "job strain" is a risk cause/factor for heart disease. The issue of occupational stress is of utmost importance to the working people and public health community. The economic costs of job/occupational stress in general (lost productivity, absenteeism) are hard to calculate but can be as high as more than a hundred-billions/per year (2, p. 167-8). Most significantly, there is the potential for preventing death and much illness. Heart disease probably due to "job strain" vary mostly between studies, Theorell and Karasek (5, p. 167) calculate that up to 24 percent of disease of heart could possibly be prevented (In the U.S over 150,000 deaths prevented per year), if we areabletoreduce the impact & level ofjob strain in jobs with the worst strain levels to the average of other occupations.

Research studies on job burnout found that, it is related to work over load and exhaustion factors in various organizations (Green and Walker, 1988; Cherniss, 1980; Freudenberger, 1977, 1980). Stress on the job is proving costly for organizations and employers, reflected in reduced motivation and job skills, lower productivity, and increased accidents. Since workers spend approximately one third of their lives working in an organizational objective & goal setting, worker mental health is of certain importance. If two people are exposed to the same threatening situation, they may differ substantially in the duration of stress responses & magnitude and stress related health problems might emerge in a number of contrasting ways both mentally and physically. Some of these variations result from differences in social resources, temperament, and the coping responses effectiveness that the person brings to bear on the stressful exchange or transaction.

There are usually four kinds of stress reactions that can be distinguished as: (1) Withdrawal behaviors; (3) psychosomatic diseases; (3) negative attitudes and (4) burnout. *Psychosomatic diseases* are more common among managerial level officers as compared
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To lower class employees (Cheek & Miller, 1983). Psychosomatic diseases include Hypertension, Heart diseases and Cardiovascular diseases (H’arenstam et al., 1988). Another kind of stress reaction is negative job-related attitudes and includes job dissatisfaction that is remarkably high compared to a dozen occupations that are quite similar with respect to levels of pay and education (Cullen, Link, Cullen, & Wolfe, 1990). It also includes alienation (Lombardo, 1981; Toch & Klofas, 1982), occupational tedium (Shamir & Drory, 1982) and powerlessness, characterized by cynicism, authoritarianism, skepticism, and pessimism (for a review see Philliber, 1987). Besides officers view their work as dull, tedious and meaningless. In one of research work respondent, one of the officers put it as “we are paid hostages”. Other kind of stress reaction is Burnout and is a continuous variable. The criterion for burnout is always arbitrary for example it occur at least once a week. It includes emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment. Burnout among officers is found are particularly characterized by feelings of depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment (Schaufeli, Van den Eijnden, and Brouwers, 1994). Previous studies suggest that, in comparison with other occupational groups, Managerial level officers experience more feelings of alienation, cynicism, pessimism, skepticism, and powerlessness (Philliber, 1987).

In sum: officers of the manager rank or CO’s are under stress. From the literature review this is illustrated by relatively high turnover, absenteeism, and disablement rates compared to other occupations or lower levels. Moreover, psychosomatic risk factors, negative feelings and attitudes, including job dissatisfaction, cynicism and burnout are the common types that invoke stress among the officers in the organisations.

2.7.1 Psychosocial Risk Factors of Stress

Based on earlier reviews of literature on job stressors (e.g., Warr, 1987; Kahn & Byosiere, 1994; Buunk, de Jonge, Ybema, & de Wolff, 1998), we distinguish between nine psychosocial risk factors for developing stress reactions. Each of these risk factors will be briefly discussed in relation to the employee’s job so that a particular psychosocial risk profile emerges. These include;

i. **High Workload**

Many studies indicate that the workload of managers is high than lower level employees (for reviews see Philliber, 1987; Huckabee, 1992). For instance, in several studies, between 65% and 75% of the Officers report that they feel under strain because of high workload (Kommer, 1990). More particularly, they complain about high peak load (i.e.,
having too much to do in too short a time), brief periods of recovery (i.e., intervals between peak hours are too short), and multiple workload (having to perform different tasks simultaneously). It is quite likely that the workload of managers has increased over the past years because of financial cutbacks and reduction of staff. Furthermore, it was observed that high absenteeism rates have a negative impact on Officers workload since more overtime has to be performed (Kommer, 1990). A study among Officers in the United States showed a positive relationship between workload and burnout: the higher the workload the more burnout symptoms were observed (Dignam, Barrera, & West, 1986). In a somewhat similar vein, Officers who report problems with shiftwork showed more burnout symptoms (particularly emotional exhaustion) than officers who did not report such problems (Schaufeli et al., 1994). Shamir and Drory (1982) found work-overload to be a significant predictor of tedium among Officers. Finally, a recent study among Australian Officers not only found that those who experienced high job demands reported more psychological distress, more job dissatisfaction, and more physical health symptoms, but also that these negative effects were aggravated when high job demands were accompanied by low control and lack of social support (Dollard & Winefield, 1998).

Obviously, a combination of high demands, poor control, and lack of social support constitutes a special risk for Officers health and well-being.

**ii. Role Problems**

Perhaps the most important job stressor managers are faced with are role problems of several kinds. After a thorough review of empirical studies Philliber (1987, p. 19), Basically two different kinds of role problems are observed among Officers: role ambiguity and role conflict. The former occurs when no adequate information is available to do the job well, whereas the latter occurs when conflicting demands have to be met. The role of the manager is problematic by its very nature since two conflicting demands have to be met simultaneously— handling and motivating the people for doing their task well and reporting to high authority. This typical role conflict is convincingly demonstrated by the results of a Dutch survey (Kommer, 1990) in which a large majority (80%) agrees with the statement that “keeping peace and order” is a crucial task for Officers. At the same time, however, a similar percentage (74%) agrees with the statement that “encouraging the inmate to understand himself better” is a crucial task as well. Clearly, to a large degree both tasks are incompatible. The former statement implies that rules are applied strictly, whereas the latter statement implies that the rules are interpreted rather smoothly. Role problems are aggravated because the objectives of rehabilitation are usually rather vaguely
described so that, in addition, role ambiguity is likely to result. That is, Officers hardly know what is expected of them when it comes to handling and managing the process. Not surprisingly, it has been argued that the emphasis on rehabilitation and the recent influx of other professionals have increased role problems of Officers (Philliber, 1987). Officers feel uncertain about their role, are doubtful about which services they have to provide, and blame their superiors for the lack of standardization of policies in dealing with inmates (Poole & Regoli, 1981; Toch & Klofas, 1982). It was demonstrated that such role ambiguity resulting from poor leadership is strongly related to job stress (Rosefield, 1981; Cheek & Miller, 1983). In a somewhat similar vein, Poole and Regoli (1980a) observed that changing correctional philosophies and institutional practices concerning the handling of inmates produced stress among Officers because they are associated with role conflicts. Similar direct relationships between role conflict and stress have also been found by Cullen, Link, Wolfe, and Frank (1985), Lindquist and Whitehead (1986), and Grossi and Berg (1991). However, interestingly, in another study of Poole and Regoli (1980b), a reverse pattern was suggested—namely, that stress increases levels of role conflict as well as conflicts between professional and nonprofessional staff. Despite claims for causality, all above-mentioned studies are cross-sectional in nature, so that a causal order between variables cannot be determined.

In various studies, role problems such as role conflict and role ambiguity were found to be predictors of burnout (Shamir & Drory, 1982; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Dignam, Barrera, & West, 1986; Drory & Shamir, 1988; Whitehead, 1989; Schaufeli et al., 1994). Whitehead’s (1989) model of Officers burnout illustrates the crucial function of role problems in the burnout process. The model is based on survey data of over two hundred Officers and suggests that role problems have both a direct and an indirect effect on burnout. Indirect paths run through job dissatisfaction and job stress. In its turn, role problems are aggravated by lacking social support and by poor participation in decision making.

iii. Lack of Autonomy

As noted above, a recent test of the so-called Job Demand Control Support model (Karasek & Theorell, 1990) in Officers was successful in that its showed both significant main effects and interaction effects of job demands, job control (or autonomy), and social support on various measures of health and well-being (e.g., psychological distress, job dissatisfaction, physical health symptoms) (Dollard & Winefield, 1998). More
specifically, two aspects of job autonomy can be distinguished: skill discretion and decision authority (Karasek & Theorell, 1990). The former refers to the level of control the worker has in performing the task, whereas the latter refers to the level of social authority over making decisions. It appears that Officers who report low levels of skill discretion experience fewer feelings of personal accomplishment, compared to Officers who report higher levels (Schaufeli et al., 1994). In addition, Officers perceived influence on administrative supervisors (decision authority) appeared to be negatively related to cynicism (Ulmer, 1992), whereas lack of participation in decision making is positively associated with job stress (Lasky, Gordon, & Strebalus, 1986; Slate & Vogel, 1997). A possible explanation for these relationships is offered by Whitehead (1989) who showed that role problems play a mediating role between lack of participation in decision making and burnout. Because Officers do not sufficiently participate in decision making (i.e., lack decision authority), their role problems are not solved and as a result of that burnout might develop. On the other hand, Officers with supervisory responsibilities perceive less job-related stress and more job satisfaction than their colleagues who have less decision authority (Saylor & Wright, 1992).

iv. Underutilization of Knowledge and Skill

A job that requires the use of knowledge and skills is challenging and provides learning opportunities. However, a large majority (69%) of Officers indicate that only “every now and then” they have the opportunity to use the knowledge and skills they acquired during their training (Kommer, 1990). In other words, most Officers feel underutilized, particularly in custody-oriented institutions as compared to other institutions. In a survey, it was found that “under stimulation” of Officers was associated with higher sick-leave rates and higher levels of stress hormones, like plasma cortisol (H¨arenstam et al., 1988). Willett (1982) claimed that many Officers feel “trapped” because they are paid a disproportionately high salary for a job that requires a low level of education and few skills. Another study showed opposite results suggesting that the stereotype of Officers is incorrect (Hughes & Zamble, 1993): Officers felt neither undereducated, nor did they evidence exceptional stress, in fact they were content to stay in their job. (Since the authors do not present any rationale for their deviant findings, it may be speculated that these are due to sampling bias).
v. Lack of Variety

Typically, the Officers job is considered to be dull and routine (Philiber, 1987). In recent decades, task variety has been further reduced by the influx of other professional staff such as social workers and counselors who have taken over part of the traditional Officers job (Fry, 1989). Although this might make the Officers daily work even more tedious (Kommer, 1990). Moreover, skill variety was not significantly related to burnout, according to a study (Drory & Shamir, 1988). Hughes and Zamble (1993), however, found among Officers that boredom was the second source of stress after poor management. But as noted previously, they found Officers, in contrast to previous reports, to be reasonably effective and adaptive, with little evidence of job stress.

vi. Demanding Social Contacts

Intensive and emotionally charged contacts with inmates are the hallmark of the Officers job. The relationship between officer and inmate has been characterized as a situation of structural conflict (Poole & Regoli, 1981): the role of the officer fundamentally contradicts the role of the inmate. Recently, several changes in the population have intensified the stressful social contacts between Officers and inmates. Harenstam et al. (1988) found a high proportion in correctional institutions to be positively correlated with Officers symptoms of ill health, high sick-leave rates, and low work satisfaction. Moreover, inmates are more entitled than they used to be, whereas the authority of Officers has declined. The demanding nature of inmate contact is further illustrated by the positive relationship between the intensity of inmate contact and Officer burnout. The more hours per week Officers spend in direct contact with inmates, the more burnout symptoms are reported—particularly, diminished personal accomplishment (Whitehead, 1989).

A distinction should be made between positive and negative direct contact with inmates (Dignam, Barrera, & West, 1986). The former is positively related with Officers feelings of personal accomplishment, whereas the latter is positively related with both other dimensions of burnout (i.e., emotional exhaustion and depersonalization). Schaufeli et al. (1994) showed that the discrepancy Officers experience between their investments and outcomes in relationships with inmates is positively related to all three dimensions of burnout. That is, Officers who feel that they continuously put more into relationships with inmates than they get back from them in return tend to burn out. Social contacts of Officers are not restricted to inmates but include colleagues and superiors as well. It has been argued that group loyalty and collegiality among Officers are weakly developed
because they interact only occasionally (Poole & Regoli, 1981). The main reason for this is that the organization emphasizes individual responsibility rather than team responsibility. As a result, an individualistic culture develops in which asking for social support is considered to be an expression of incompetence. The Officer as a tough lonesome cowboy who is emotionally unaffected by his job, and who can solve his own problems without the help of others. As in many occupations (for overviews see Warr, 1987; Buunk et al., 1998), social support of colleagues and supervisor reduces stress among Officers (Dollard & Winefield, 1995). This was particularly the case among Officers with high levels of anxiety. However, results concerning social support are equivocal since other studies suggested that peer support increases rather than reduces Officers level of job stress (Grossi & Berg, 1991; Morrison et al., 1992). Similarly, a Dutch study showed that Officers social support does not unconditionally lead to positive affect (Peeters, Buunk, & Schaufeli, 1995): Officers perceived social support as a restriction of their personal freedom, which in turn induced feelings of inferiority to the donor of the support. Typically, Officers attribute much of their stress to poor communication with their supervisors (Cheek & Miller, 1983). Drory and Shamir (1988) found lacking management support to be positively related to burnout.

**vii. Uncertainty**

Two types of uncertainty can be distinguished among Officers: the threat of losing one’s job and uncertain career prospects. In many European countries such as the Netherlands, Germany, and Sweden, Officers are civil servants who enjoy strong legal protection against dismissal. It has been noted that such a high level of job certainty also has a negative side in that Officers tend to accept poor working conditions in exchange for a stable job (Kommer, 1990). It is quite likely that the present discussions in many countries about the uncertainties will enhance feelings of job insecurity among Officers. There is ample evidence that the psychological effects of anticipated job loss are at least just as serious, or perhaps even more so, than actual job loss (Hartley, Jacobsen, Klandermans, & Van Vuren, 1991). In a study, the majority of the Officers (54%) is quite uncertain about their future career prospects and many Officers (39%) indicate that they experience a career dead-end (Kommer, 1990).

**viii. Health and Safety Risks**

The situation of structural conflict between Officers and inmates may easily escalate and end up in a violent confrontation. Thus, the threat of violence is an important stressor for
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Officers. For instance, 75% of Officers considered potential violence as the most stressful aspect of their work (Shamir & Drory, 1982). Similar figures have been reported in the United States (see Philliber, 1987). Danger is reported as another major source of stress (e.g., Lombardo, 1981; Cullen et al., 1990; Triplett, Mullings, & Scarborough, 1996). A survey showed that many Officers complain about the physical climate in the institution (Verhagen, 1986b), most notably dry air (41%), lack of fresh air (74%), and draught (70%).

ix. Inadequate Pay

Research on pay shows that the experienced fairness of the pay level is related to the worker’s well-being, rather than absolute pay (Warr, 1987). Is the pay appropriate for the kind of job that is performed compared to other similar jobs? Indeed, a moderate negative relationship was observed between satisfaction with pay and burnout among Officers (Shamir & Drory, 1982). Rosefield (1981) found factors as low pay, slow promotions, and insufficient fringe benefits to contribute to work-related stress.

In sum, virtually all psychosocial risk factors that have been identified in the occupational stress literature apply more or less to the managerial job. However, the most prominent psychosocial risks that may lead to stress and burnout among Officers are: (1) role problems; (2) stressful social contacts with superiors, inmates, and colleagues; (3) work overload; and (4) poor social status. In addition, three risk factors seem to play a minor role: lack of participation in decision making, inadequate pay, and underutilization of knowledge and skills. It should be noted, however, that these conclusions are almost exclusively based on cross-sectional surveys that are conducted in relatively small and/or non-representative samples.

2.8 Negative and Positive Effects of Job Stress

Stress manifests itself in the form of several physical and psychological problems. For example, researchers have found that stress is associated with anxiety, depression, hopelessness, anger, and helplessness. It has also been reported that job stressed people are more likely to be psychologically distressed than those who are not (Dua, 1990, 1994 and Nowack, 1990). Stress has also been interrelated with various types of disorders or physical illness. Disorders such as hypertension, gastrointestinal disorders (e.g., irritable bowel syndrome and peptic ulcer), respiratory disorders (e.g., bronchial asthma), skin problems (e.g., eczema and acne), and cancer are said to be associated with stress (Matteson and Ivancevich, 1987). Individuals weakened by chronic workplace stress are
far more vulnerable to other illnesses terminal conditions such as job satisfaction, Role problems, superior interference etc, because when their metabolism is in a constantly stressed state, their immune systems are weakened. The most common symptom of stress is that people do not fell well and no clinical reason can be found by medical practitioners. In short, the negative effects of job stress can be highly evident such as absenteeism, illness, smoking, alcohol abuse, irritational behavior, etc., but also less visible in the form of negative internal politics, bad decision making, apathy and reduced creativity.

Stress is an inevitable part of human life but, contrary to popular belief, it can also have positive effects. Present day researchers and practitioners visualize the phenomenon of stress in a new perspective. As Kets De Viries (1979) had noted, each individual needs a moderate amount of stress to be alert and capable of functioning effectively in an organisation. Indian scholars like Pestonjee (1992) and Mathew (1995) also agreed with connection. Pestonjee (1992) has noted that the stress response has been often misunderstood due to lack of scientific knowledge about it. He opined that it is natural and healthy to maintain optimal levels of stress. Success, achievement, higher productivity and effectiveness call for job stress. However, when left unchecked or unmanaged, stress can cause problems in job performance and affect the health and well-being of the employee.

2.8.1 Stress and Creativity of Job

A number of studies have been conducted on stress and creativity dealing with them separately. Very few attempts have made to integrate the two, especially from the point of view of identifying the particular types of job stresses that a creative person may be encounter in an organisational situation. Mathew (1985) has gone to the extent of advocating that particular types of stresses are essential for being a creative manager. In his conceptual paper on role stress of a creative manager, he raised queries pertaining to the relationship between creativity and stressors. He noted that such queries are relevant for two reasons: first, creativity and innovation in organisations have become a top priority for organisational practitioners. Therefore a creative manager can be better equipped to cope with particular stressors which are identified as associated with creative activities. Second, creativity involves performance of unconventional tasks in the organisational setting by individuals. On the other hand, interaction among various sub-systems of organisations such as person, task, role behavior setting, physical and social environments are seen as casual actors of job stress. It is likely, therefore, that some kinds of stresses are associated with creative work.
Exhibit 2.6: Stress Potential of the Creative Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits of the Creative Individual</th>
<th>Types of Potential stress in the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Courage and independence</strong></td>
<td>Pressures of conformity, Interpersonal conflict, Loneliness, Social boycott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Risk-taking</strong></td>
<td>Uncertainty and ambiguity, Loneliness, Exposure to hazards, Material and psychological losses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Persistence and determination</strong></td>
<td>Interpersonal conflict, Exposure to hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Self-sufficiency</strong></td>
<td>Loneliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Inquisitiveness</strong></td>
<td>Result anxiety, Exposure to hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Complexity</strong> (intellectual, motivational and emotional)</td>
<td>Goal ambiguity, task differences, Emotional stress, Interpersonal problems, Boredom with routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Love of leisure and work at one’s own pace</strong></td>
<td>Time pressure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mathew (1985) reviewed the concept and theory of job stress and examined the stress potential with reference to the creative owner/ non-owner managers occupying creative/non-creative roles in creative/non-creative organisations. He has also reviewed some relevant studies focusing on the traits of a creative person conducted by Torrance (1965) and Petrosko (1983) and speculated on the type of potential stressors a creative person may encounter in an organisational situation. For example, his independence may involve him in interpersonal conflicts and loneliness, his risk taking nature may bring in problems of uncertainty tolerance or the complexity of his mind may lead to boredom in a structured situation. The particular types of organisational stresses associated with creative traits of the individual are summarized in exhibit: - 2.6;

2.8.2 Stress Potential of the Creative Process

Reviewing one of the earlier notions of the creative process, Mathew noted that the transitional stages of creative process are especially stressful. Creative process, according to earlier notions, is composed of four stages, namely, preparation, incubation,
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illumination and verification. During the initial and final stages, convergent thinking dominates, whereas divergent thinking occurs when the person gets deeply and even emotionally involved with the problem. Further, he briefly presented a recent notion of the creative process, conceived by Motamedi (1982). It includes seven stages which are summarized in exhibit:-2.7;

Exhibit 2.7: Stress Potential of the Creative Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passages</th>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>knowledge of phenomenon</th>
<th>Texture of phenomenon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framing</td>
<td>Attention getting, Calling, Relating, Labeling and giving meaning</td>
<td>Well – known and familiar, ordinary</td>
<td>Commonly objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probing</td>
<td>Sensing-resensing, Scanning, Tinkering, Quizzing, Investing</td>
<td>Relatively known</td>
<td>Moderately objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring</td>
<td>Data collection, Searching, examining, Investigating</td>
<td>Relatively known, and Unfamiliar</td>
<td>Objectives subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revealing</td>
<td>Learning, Unlearning, and relearning, becoming it, discovery, reincarnating</td>
<td>Intimate, Ambiguous, Unique</td>
<td>Deeply subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirming</td>
<td>Assessing, evaluating, Searching for validity, Reliability of revelation</td>
<td>Relatively known</td>
<td>Subjective and objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshing</td>
<td>Translating, relabelling, Reformulating meaning</td>
<td>Relatively known</td>
<td>Moderately objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realizing</td>
<td>Standardising, disseminating, Publishing, implementing</td>
<td>Well – known and familiar</td>
<td>Commonly objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent in Motamedi’s scheme that subjective and irrational aspects are important ingredients of the creative process. This issue of ‘irrationality of creativity’ has received empirical support in Brown’s (1977) study. Brown studies several scientific breakthroughs and found that each of them involved an irrational and illogical element, a suspension of reason together with a mental leap of creative insight. Mathew opined that this ‘tryst’ (or irrational) with the unknown or the unfamiliar on a personal basis is a major source of job stress for the creative individual.
An intuitive look at Motamedi’s model can further clarify Mathew’s contention. During the first two stages of farming and probing, the individual works with known tools and theories and the operations are largely objective. However, the third stage of exploring involves subjective and intuitive ways of experiencing together with the existing antithetical ideas and image of the phenomenon. Therefore, this stage encourages self-doubt and gives vent to a number of stresses such as (a) doubts about one’s abilities and perceptions, (b) feelings of puzzlement and uncertainty, and (c) fear of failure. Similarly, during the affirmation, refreshing and evaluation stages, a major stress is the anxiety of external evaluation. Other additional stresses such as ‘keeping up the group morale during the uncertainty phase’ may also be associated with the creative individual if he/she is a group leader or manager.

2.8.3 Stress Potential for Creative Managers

Mathew has observed that the organisational context in which a creative manager operates may either enhance or mitigate the stresses arising from both traits of the creative person and the creative processes. However, the type of stress experienced by a creative manager will depend upon whether the person performs creative/non-creative roles in creative/non-creative organisations. Further, he has noted that one aspect of managerial creativity, namely, the ideational process is largely an individual process and, therefore, it involves all the stresses associated with the creative process. A review of literature revealed size-related bureaucratic barriers to innovation in large corporations (i.e., non-creative organisations) as well as the characteristics of the creative organisations. It also provided cues to identify stresses associated with creative managers in these organisations. Furthermore, reviewing Boyd and Gampert’s (1983) survey pertaining ‘benefits and costs’ associated with owner-managers (i.e., small business owners), Mathew has identified the following particular stresses associated with owner-managers: as summarized in exhibit:-

It is important to note that this list of organisational stressors associated with creative owner-managers (or non-managers) are not empirically validated but simply Mathew’s speculation in the light of characteristics of the creative person, the nature of the creative process and the requirements of the organisational context.
2.9 Emotional Intelligence and Occupational Stress

Most employees undergo stress as a usual or normal part of their jobs. However, some individuals experience stress more sternly than others, to a point where employees may need time off from work. Stress can be defined as an imbalance between an individual’s perceived environmental demands and their perceived ability to deal with these demands, and is generally thought to be subjective in nature rather, than objective (Cox, 1978; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; McGrath, 1970). Thus, the experience of job stress occurs with a person’s appraisal of their ability to deal with exposure to physical and psychosocial conditions at the workplace (Cooper et al., 1999).
The area of occupational stress has rapidly grown over the last two decades, to the extent that there are now two international journals devoted entirely to its study (Spector & Goh, 2001). The incidence of occupational stress in India has steadily increased over the past decade with ComCare reporting psychological injury as a key contributor to the increase in premiums in 2003/04. Although in 2003/04 only 7% of claims were for psychological injury, these claims accounted for 27% of the total cost of workers’ compensation claims (ComCare Annual Report, 2003–2004). ComCare forecast that claims for psychological injury in Government agencies will increase by an additional 38% in 2004/05. The Victorian (Australia) Work Cover Authority, in their annual Statistical Summary (2003–2004), show that the number of claims for mental disorders (the category for occupational stress) has increased from 1,329 claims made in 1994/95 to 2,912 made in 2003/04, accounting for 9% of total compensation claims. Work Cover in Victoria has paid out over $936 million dollars in compensation for mental disorders from September 1985 to June 2004. In the United Kingdom (UK), the Health and Safety Executive (2005) reported that half a million employees experience work-related stress in the UK at a level they believe is making them ill; also, up to 5 million workers in the UK feel ‘very’ or ‘extremely’ stressed by their work. Finally, the Health and Safety Executive (2005) reported that in 2003/4 12.8 million working days were lost due to stress, depression and anxiety. The increasing incidence of occupational stress in the Indian and international workforce makes it a key construct for researchers to evaluate and understand, leading to the development of specialized intervention strategies to attempt to reduce the incidence of stress in the workplace.

To date, empirical evidence supports relationships between high levels of occupational stress and poor psychological health, decreased job satisfaction, decreased organisational commitment, increased job insecurity, increased work-family conflict and poor physical health (Baker, 1985; Beeha, Walsh, & Taber, 1976; Burke, 2002; Evans & Steptoe, 2002; Ganster & Schaubroeck, 1991; Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984; Jimmieson, 2000; Knussen & Niven, 1999; Quick, Murphy & Hurrell, 1992; Sverke & Hellgren, 2002; van Dick & Wagner, 2001; Whitener, 2001). Currently relatively little research has examined the role emotions may play as a moderator in these relationships.

In an earlier theoretical research paper, Spector and Goh (2001) examined the role of emotion in job stress. They employed a slender definition of job stress as “any condition or situation that elicits a negative emotional response, such as frustration/anger or
anxiety/tension” (p.196) in an effort to overcome the broadness of previous stress definitions and focus on negative emotional responses. The authors suggested that emotions influence how the work/working environment is perceived, that is, whether a particular situation or condition is appraised as a occupational stressor or not. They further suggested that these appraising emotions may lead to psychological and physical strains. Psychological strain might result from continual negative emotional experiences and may lead to decreases in job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Physical strains (for example, suppression of immune system, heart disease) may result from the physiological components of experienced emotions that can adversely affect health. In support of this theory it seems suitable to propose that an individual’s ability to manage and control their emotions (particularly negative emotions) in the workplace will influence the outcome of stress.

Emotional intelligence was originally conceptualised by Salovey and Mayer (1990) and was revised by the same authors in 1997. According to their model, EI involves four main abilities: identifying emotions, using emotions, understanding emotions and managing emotions. It has been put forward that there are individual variances in EI relating to differences in our ability to appraise our own emotions and those of others, and that individuals/employees higher in EI might be more open to internal experience and are better able to label and communicate those experiences (Mayer & Salovey, 1993). As emphasized by Mayer (2001) there are largely two types of EI in the published literature, the more popular EI which is said to be easily learnt and acquired, out predicts traditional or old measures of general intelligence, and is among the best predictors of life success. The second ‘type’ of EI is the more scientifically based construct, which is constructed around the belief that EI abilities or competencies are intercorrelated but distinct from general intelligence. Despite the different approaches to EI, empirical research tends to be based on the second ‘type’ of EI which, as suggested by Mayer, has the most potential to contribute to scientific psychology.

Previous literature has examined the role of workplace EI in leadership, performance and life satisfaction (Barling, Slater, & Kelloway, 2000; Dulewicz, 2000; Gardner & Stough, 2002; George, 2000; Goleman, 1995; 1998; Miller, 1999; Palmer et al., 2001; Sosik & Megerian, 1999; Watkin, 2000). However, the relationship between EI and occupational stress and outcomes of stress (including health, job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work-family conflict) has been relatively under investigated, and
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attempts that have been made to examine these relationships have been largely inconsistent in their findings.

In one of the first studies to examine the relationship between EI and stress, Slaski and Cartwright (2002) investigated EI, stress and health in a group of managers. These authors assessed stress by asking respondents to indicate on a single scale the extent to which they perceived their life to be stressful at that time. Slaski and Cartwright reported that there were significant relationships between EI, stress and health and that EI may play a role in moderating the stress process and increasing an individual’s resilience to stress.

The paper by Slaski and Cartwright (2002) was limited in two ways. Firstly EI was not measured using a tool that was designed specifically for use in the workplace, and therefore the questions were not workplace oriented. Also, this particular tool (EQ-i; Bar-On, 1997) has been described previously to be an assessment of ‘not only emotional ‘abilities’ but also a number of non-ability characteristics that relate to personality, chronic mood, and character’ (Ciarrochi et al., 2000; p.541), raising the problem that such a test may not have shown high discriminant validity nor may it be measuring EI abilities alone. Secondly, stress was measured by respondents being asked to indicate on a single scale the extent to which they believed their life to be stressful at that point in time. The construct of occupational stress is highly complex, and to assess it using a single question may result in a loss of important information relevant to the construct and potentially distort its relationship with other variables. We know from the work of researchers such as Cooper and Marshall (1978) that stress is multi-faceted and can arise from many sources in the workplace (such as factors intrinsic to the job, relationships at work, career development) and so a more appropriate and useful way to examine the role of stress in this study would have been to utilise a more comprehensive measure of occupational stress.

Slaski and Cartwright (2002) suggested that EI may play a role as a moderator in the stress process, a hypothesis which Ciarrochi et al. (2002) examined. Ciarrochi and colleagues examined the role of EI in understanding the correlation between stress and mental health (measured by prevalence of depression, hopelessness and suicide ideation). In a sample of university students these authors examined objective (meaning there are ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ answers determined by consensus) emotional perception (measured by the stories test; Mayer & Geher, 1996), subjective (based upon individual beliefs and to which there are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers) emotional perception (measured using the Schutte et al. EI measure; 1998), life stress, daily hassles, suicide ideation, depression and hopelessness.
Ciarrochi et al. report no significant correlations between life stress and their measures of EI. There were also no significant relationships between emotional perception (the objective EI measure) and stress or health. Daily hassles showed a significant relationship with managing one’s own emotions (the subjective EI measure), as did suicide ideation, depression and hopelessness. These correlations indicate that university students who report being able to manage their own emotions, also reported fewer daily hassles, less suicide ideation, depression and hopelessness compared with those students reporting lower levels of managing emotions. Further analysis revealed that the objective measure of EI moderated the relationship between daily hassles and the three mental health variables, which the authors interpreted as meaning that emotionally perceptive people are more impacted by stress and express higher levels of poor health (compared to people lower in emotional perception). Results for the subjective measure of EI revealed that managing the emotions of others significantly moderated the relationship between daily hassles and mental health, which was explained by the authors as meaning that students high in managing others’ emotions respond less to stress with feelings of suicide ideation than other individuals who are low in managing emotions of others.

The results of the two different measures of EI (one objective, one subjective) in the paper by Ciarrochi et al. (2002) appear contradictory but are explained by the authors via two hypotheses. The insensitivity hypothesis proposed that people low in emotional perception repress or ignore the hassles in their life. Whilst the confusion hypothesis proposed that although participants who are low in emotional perception are susceptible to stress they do not realise the adverse effects and so are confused about what they are feeling. Ciarrochi et al. suggest that the reason for being high in managing others emotions (the subjective measure of EI), which led to a better response to stress and less suicide ideation, was because the factor ‘managing others emotions’ measures the extent to which an individual assists others in positively regulating their moods and the extent to which they try to establish intimacy with the individual. These authors further suggest that this behaviour leads to closer friendships and increased social support which is of benefit to the individual during times of stress. Although Ciarrochi et al. examined two different facets of EI (emotional perception and managing others emotions), the results are still somewhat unclear. It appears that these authors suggest that being lower on particular aspects of EI results in ignorance and confusion in recognising stress and its consequences, and that being high on a different aspect of EI fosters strong bonds between people giving them the social support they need to deal with stress.
The paper by Ciarrochi et al. (2002) is limited in methodology and is unclear in its explanation of the results. These authors utilised a student population and assessed their daily hassles (such as troublesome neighbours and financial insecurity) and life experiences to measure stress. It would be most unusual for these students (the mean age reported was 20 years) to have experienced a range of these hassles and life events, which might have influence the results of this paper. Secondly, the specific subjective measure of EI utilised by Ciarrochi et al. has been criticised by Petrides and Furnham (2000) as having “many psychometric problems” (p.317) and they “would caution further research with it” (p.318), which suggests that a different measure of EI may produce different outcomes in relation to stress and health. Although there are some difficulties in interpreting the findings of this paper it was the first attempt of researchers to examine the role of EI as a moderator in the stress–outcomes relationship and provides a foundation for further research into this area.

Donaldson-Feilder and Bond (2004) attempt to clarify the role of EI in terms of its ability to predict workplace well-being (well-being operationally defined and measured as psychological health, physical health and job satisfaction). These authors did not find evidence to suggest that EI predicts well-being over other variables (acceptance and job control) and surmised that the theory that EI regulates emotion as a mechanism for generating positive well-being is not supported. Again the methodology of this paper makes it difficult to support this conclusion. In this paper these authors used the shortened version of the Trait Meta Mood Scale (TMMS; Salovey et al., 1995) however they provide just one ‘summed’ score of EI and not the scores on the three-subscales of this test (Attention, Clarity and Repair). In the original paper on the TMMS, Salovey et al. always reported on the three subscales and do not suggest combining these sub-scales to produce an overall score of EI. It would have been more useful to examine the three subscales of the TMMS independently and may have resulted in different outcomes between EI and well-being due to the fact that the three sub-scales of the TMMS are purported to measure theoretically different processes (see Salovey et al).

A research paper by Tsaousis and Nikolaou (2005) also explored the relationship between EI and physical and psychological health. These authors hypothesised that high levels of EI would be related to better psychological and physical health, and that EI would correlate negatively with frequency of smoking and drinking and positively with improved quality of life. Tsaousis and Nikolaou report that both hypotheses in their paper were
supported and that high levels of EI were associated with better health and improved quality of life. These results are similar to the findings of Slaski and Cartwright (2002) but in contrast to those presented by Ciarrochi et al. (2002) and Donaldson-Feilder and Bond (2004). The disparity in findings from the four studies presented makes it difficult to understand the role of EI in health and well-being. Both Slaski and Cartwright and Tsaousis and Nikolaou report a significant relationship between EI and health, suggesting that higher levels of EI are related to better health outcomes, whereas Ciarrochi et al. and Donaldson-Feilder and Bond both report no significant relationship between EI and health, suggesting no direct relationship between EI and health. Each of these papers used a different measure of EI which could contribute to the differences in the results obtained. However, regardless of the methodology employed by each research paper there still exists uncertainty as to the relationship between EI and health variables.

Two additional research papers examining the role of EI and outcomes of stress both focused on job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Abraham, 2000; Carmeli, 2003). Abraham hypothesised that the social skills component of EI is related to positive interpersonal relationships and would increase feelings of job satisfaction and decrease occupational stress. She further hypothesised that these social skills would foster networks of social relationships which in turn would increase an employee’s commitment to the organisation. Using the self-report Schutte et al. (1998) EI measure in a group of 79 employees Abraham reported that EI predicted a large amount of the variance in job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Carmeli used the same measure of EI in his paper which examined the relationship between EI, job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work-family conflict. He suggested that EI is a competency that drives positive outcomes and behaviours. Carmeli hypothesised that high levels of EI would result in positive moods and feelings which would generate high levels of job satisfaction, that EI would augment a higher level of organisational commitment as employees would be able to maintain positive affective states, and finally he hypothesised that employees high in EI are more able to balance work-family conflict as they recognise and manage feelings of conflict as they occur. Ninety-eight senior managers participated in Carmeli’s research and he reported a significant relationship between EI and job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work-family conflict. He suggests that his paper goes “beyond the simple premise of the importance of emotional intelligence to demonstrate the extent to which the latter augments favourable attitudes and outcomes” (p.806) and that emotionally intelligent senior manager have an emotional attachment to their organisation.
making them more committed and satisfied. Carmeli concludes that the emotionally intelligent manager is more sensitive to the emotions produced by the conflict that may arise between the work life and the home and therefore is more able to deal with this conflict, thereby lessening it, compared with managers with lower levels of EI.

As mentioned above, the measure of EI used in both Abraham (2000) and Carmeli (2003), has been heavily criticised in the literature (see Petrides & Furnham, 2000), therefore implications from studies employing this measure may be somewhat limited. However, these studies greatly advance current knowledge in this area (as they are the first to examine EI and these workplace variables) and so provide a useful foundation on which to continue and improve research.

2.10 Research gap

From the above review of literature it reflects that many studies have been conducted in the area of emotional intelligence and job stress, both at at national and international level. These studies have covered both goods as well as service sector and have found strong relationship between job stress, EI, job performance, job satisfaction and role stress. Given the relative lack of EI and occupational stress literature and the lack of research into the development of EI training programs, the approach adopted in this study will be twofold. Firstly, an exploratory study will be undertaken to establish the links between EI and the occupational stress process. Secondly, based on the links established in this Study, an EI training program can be developed from EI theory, stress management programs and from other programs deemed to be relevant due to their focus on training and developing emotions. This twofold approach can help to thoroughly establish the link between EI and occupational stress and provide a strong rationale for the development of the EI training program.

However, there is lack of a specific study to find the relationship between job stress and emotional intelligence, there impact on job satisfaction and to prevent the stress in job particularly in banking sector in Jammu and Kashmir. In the light of the above facts little has been done to undertake and to address specific problems of bank employee to EI & occupational stress. Very little has been done to the pathogenesis of various problems related to occupational stress and its link to EI among banking employees. Keeping this in view the current study focuses on contributing to the present body of knowledge to bridging this gap in literature. In order to fill in this vital gap, present study will be carried
out in the the state of Jammu & Kashmir. The study will aim at to ascertain the link between EI and stress of the bank employees in the Jammu & Kashmir in the selected Banks.

The next chapter focuses on the methodology and to investigate antecedents and consequences of job stress for banking employees. A framework for proposed model is presented. The chapter begins with a description of the research setting, scope and need of the study and sample characteristics. Next, a proposed model of EI & job stress is discussed; an explanation of the measures used and data collection procedures are presented. The chapter concludes with a description of the analytical techniques.