Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

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

Specifically, EI is the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997a). In an earlier conception, Gardner (1983) described what is now recognized as EI as being a deep awareness of one's own emotions and the ability to label and draw upon those emotions as a resource to guide behavior.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) categorized EI in five domains. Their domains include self-awareness, managing emotions, motivating oneself, empathy, and handling relationships. Goleman (1995) later developed his four dimensions of EI to include knowing and managing one's emotions, self-motivation, empathy toward others, and social deftness.

The benefits of EI are many and varied. A group of four-year old children - found to resist impulse - were tracked through high school and were found to be more self-assertive, socially skilled, independent, and persevering than their more impulsive peers. In addition, they achieved significantly higher SAT scores (Shoda, Mischel, & Peake, 1990). Harrington-Lueke (1997) found in her research that being emotionally intelligent is just as important to success in life as good grades. Essentially, people with high levels of EI experience more career success, build stronger personal relationships, lead more effectively, and enjoy better health than those with low levels of EI (Cooper, 1997).
Emotions & intelligence research

Although EI is promoted as a “new” construct, similar constructs have been circulating for over 80 years. Salovey and Mayer (1990) referred to EI as an aspect of social intelligence. Social intelligence was defined as the ability to understand and manage emotions (Thorndike, 1920). This type of intelligence was viewed as being a part of a multifaceted construction of intelligence.

Practical intelligence (Sternberg’s (1985) triarchic theory of intelligence classifies three types of intelligences: (1) Analytic Intelligence, which assesses one’s logical and mathematical ability; (2) Creative Intelligence, which measures one’s ability to cope with new tasks; and (3) Practical intelligence, which assesses one’s ability to adapt to their environment. Gardner (1983) also viewed intelligence as being multifaceted. Two types of socially-based intelligences are related to EI: interpersonal intelligence involves the ability to understand other people; successful in neither defining nor measuring social intelligence (Cronbach, 1960; Riggio, Messamer, & Throckmorton, 1991).

Current models of emotional intelligence

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

Ability-based model

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

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

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

**Trait-based model or ‘mixed-model’**

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

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

**Emotional intelligence model of present study**

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

Some researchers suggest that emotionally intelligent people may be believed to behave in rationally and emotionally balanced ways because they are in possession of certain attributes called EI competencies (Mayer et al., 2004; Salovey et al., 1999). These competencies can be classified into two broad categories:

1. personal competence in understanding and managing one’s “own self”; and
2. social competence in knowing and dealing with the “self of others” (Feist and Barron, 1996; Goleman, 1995; Mayer and Salovey, 1997 b; Sternberg, 1996; Van Rooy and Viswesvaran, 2004).
**Personal competence** is the ability of a person to sense one’s own internal mental moods and processes and regulate the operations of the mind in such a way that emotions do not disturb or deter the rational mind from executing its actions rationally and to the best of its intellectual capacity. Personal competence is divisible into two sub-competencies, namely, self-awareness and self-regulation.

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

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

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

Concepts related to personal competence have been discussed in psychology previously. For example, personal competence may appear similar to self-monitoring - a concept in psychology proposed by Snyder (1974). Self-monitoring theory refers to the process through which people regulate their own behavior so as to appear and “look good” so that they will be perceived by others in a favorable manner. Self-monitoring theory distinguishes between high self-monitors, who monitor their behavior to fit different situations, and low self-monitors, who are more cross-situationally consistent (Snyder, 1974). However, while self-monitoring takes care of one’s behavior and appearance in public/social situations, it does not fully enable a person to handle and regulate his/her deeper, disturbing internal feelings and emotions – a feat that EI can achieve. EI should, accordingly, be viewed differently from self-monitoring.
**Social competence** is the ability of a person to gain psychological insight into the emotional world of others and to use one’s empathic capabilities and “relationship skills” (such as leadership, assertiveness, and communication) to produce socially desirable and productive behavioral outcomes both for themselves and others. Social competence includes two distinct sub-competencies: social-awareness and social influence.

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

**Social influence** refers to the potential of a person to influence and effect positive changes and outcomes in others by using his or her interpersonal skills. The term social influence, as a component of EI, has received only rudimentary treatment in EI literature. In the classic EI models, the second component of social competence is represented by “social skills”. Social skills are a misnomer in the study and analysis of EI, so far. A review of 18 journal websites reveals that EI theorists and training specialists have bundled a large repertory of (historically known) interpersonal skills under the competence “social skills” – making it difficult to define as well as measure this competency.

This study, however, assumes that there are prominent interpersonal skills that need to be focused and developed in individuals if EI is to produce desirable effects and impacts on their social environment. While the skills required for effectively influencing others could be many, a few could be rated as important, considering the significance attached to these skills in management development and career counseling circles. Chief among these skills that contribute to a person’s social influence are assertiveness, communication, and empowering leadership. Assertiveness helps a person in establishing a mutually respectful, win-win, I am ok-You are ok relationship with others. Communication skills enable the person to listen carefully to others as well as negotiate successfully to produce desirable outcomes in social transactions. Empowering leadership
equips the person with the abilities of guiding and motivating others in situations that involve leadership and group management.

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

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

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

The concept of well-being is a fuzzy concept; there is no as such well defined and acceptable definition. In the current research literature a person’s position on the dimension of well-being is seen as a resultant of the individual’s position on two independent dimensions - one of positive affect and the other of negative affect. An individual will be high in well-being in the degree to which he has an excess of positive over negative affect and will be low in well-being in the degree to which negative affect predominates over positive. Researchers are particularly interested in identifying individual difference in following feelings because this characteristic may be an indicator of general psychological functioning, and in particular an indicator of psychological well-being (i.e., life satisfaction, self-esteem, optimism, and depression).

Psychological well-being also is a complex notion with a variety of components that may contribute to it. Ryff (1989) extensively explored the meaning of psychological well-being and the definition closely paralleled with the Weil-Being. The dimensions of well-being those were focused and operationalized are: autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life and self-acceptance. All of these factors can be considered as key components that makeup the definition of psychological well-being. Therefore, adolescents who exhibit strength in each and every of these areas will be in a state of good psychological well-being, while adolescents who struggle in these areas will be in a state of low psychological well-being.

There are various factors that affect adolescents’ level of psychological well-being. Several studies have shown that the quality of relationship within families, especially with parents is a major determining factor of psychological well-being in adolescents (Shek, 1997; Sastre & Ferriere 2000; Van Wel, Linssen & Abma 2000). Some other key factors that may contribute to a higher or lower level of psychological well-being in adolescents are stress (Siddique & D’Arcy, 1984) physical health (Mechanic & Hansell, 1987) and both popularity and intimacy in peer relationships (Townsend, McCracken & Wilton, 1988). A focus on positive experiences and accomplishments is linked with optimism, self-esteem, and subjective well-being (Baumeister et al., 1989; Eronen and Nurmi, 1999; Fredrickson, 1998, 2001; Schimmack et al., 2002), whereas a focus on negative stimuli and experiences is associated with anxiety and depression (Carver, 1998; Eronen & Nurmi, 1999).
In the present study two dimensions are considered—general well-being refers to the emotional tone of the individual; how he finds himself related with the peers and his control over the impulses, and second is the school-related well-being refers to affect at school means how he feels in the classroom and about the school and his perception of academic efficacy.

**Achievement goals**

In the contemporary motivation literature, the achievement goal approach proffered by Dweck (1986), Nicholls (1984a), and others (Ames, 1984b; Maehr & Nicholls, 1980) has emerged as the most prominent account of individuals’ affect, cognition, and behaviour in competence-relevant settings. Within this tradition, achievement goals are conceptualized as the purpose (Maehr, 1989) or cognitive-dynamic focus (Elliot, 1997) of task engagement, and the type of goal adopted is presumed to establish the perceptual set for how individuals interpret and experience achievement settings. As such, achievement goals are viewed as important predictors of a host of achievement-relevant processes and outcomes (Ames, 1992a; Dweck, 1991; Harackiewicz, Barron, & Elliot, 1998; Urdan, 1997).

Most researches in the achievement goal tradition has attend to two types of goals: task goals (also labeled mastery goals or learning goals) and ego goals (also labeled performance goals or ability goals), which are focused on the demonstration of competence relative to others (Ames & Archer, 1987). Task and ego goals represent different conceptions of success and different reasons for approaching and engaging in achievement activity (Nicholls, Patashnick, Cheung, Thorkildsen, & Lauer 1989) and involve different ways of thinking about oneself, one’s task, and task outcomes (Butler, 1987, 1988; Corno & Rohrkemper, 1985; Nicholls, 1984a).

A task goal is a belief that effort and outcome covary, and it is this attribution belief pattern that maintains achievement-directed behavior over time (Weiner, 1979, 1986). The importance of long-term view is underscored by those (Eccles, Midgley, & Adler, 1984; Maehr, 1984; Paris & Newman, 1990; Pascarella, Walberg, Junker, & Haertel, 1981; Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990) who argue that researchers and educators should focus on quality of involvement and a continuing commitment to learning as consequences of different motivation patterns. The focus of attention is on the intrinsic
value of learning (Butler, 1987; Meece & Holt, 1990; Nicholls, 1984b), as well as effort utilization. One’s sense of efficacy is based on the belief that effort will lead to success or a sense of mastery (Ames, 1992a, Ames & Archer, 1988). With a task goal, individuals are oriented toward developing new skills, trying to understand their work, improving their level of competence, or achieving a sense of mastery based on self-referenced standards (Ames, 1992b; Brophy, 1983b; Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988; Nicholls, 1989). Compatible with this goal construct is Brophy’s (1983b) description of a “motivation to learn” whereby individuals are focused on mastering and understanding content and demonstrating a willingness to engage in the process of learning. When individuals engage in an activity with the purpose of developing skills, gaining competence, and promoting understanding – task goal – they are more likely to invest in the task. More importantly, when they invest they are likely to invest in a qualitatively different fashion. Briefly, they use more adaptive learning strategies and go about the task while self-regulating their behaviour. There is also evidence that when engaged under a task goal, students will more likely exhibit thoughtful and creative engagement.

An ego goal is focus on one’s ability and sense of self-worth (Covington, 1984; Dweck, 1986; Nicholls, 1984b), and ability is evidenced by doing better than others, by surpassing normative-based standards, or by achieving success with little effort (Ames, 1984b; Covington, 1984). Especially important to an ego orientation is public recognition that one has done better than others or performed in a superior manner (Covington & Beery, 1976; Meece et al., 1988). As a result, learning itself is viewed only as a way to achieve a desired goal (Nicholls, 1979, 1989), and attention is directed towards achieving normatively defined success. When a person adopts an ego goal, a perceived ability-outcome linkage guides his or her behavior so that the person’s self-worth is determined by a perception of his or her ability to perform (Covington & Beery, 1976; Covington & Omelich, 1984). As a consequence, the expenditure of effort can threaten self-concept of ability when trying hard does not lead to success, and in this way, effort becomes the double-edged sword (Covington & Omelich, 1979). Engagement in an activity while pursuing self-enhancing social comparison-ego goals has been associated with maladaptive learning strategies, lack of venturesomeness in learning, a focus on quick solutions rather than reflective reasoning, as well as a more negative view of the task to
be done. These associations, however, were found mostly for students with low perceived ability. For students with high perceived ability, ego goals seem to be associated with some negative (e.g., passing opportunities) but some positive outcomes (Dweck & Legget, 1988). The breadth and depth of this literature is impressive as also is the degree of convergence around the fundamental learning patterns associated with these two basically different purposes in approaching learning tasks (Ames, 1992-c; Dweck & Legget, 1988; Pintrich, Marx & Boyle, 1993; Urdan, 1997).

Although task and ego goals have been described as representing two forms of “approach tendencies” (Nicholls, Patashnick et al., 1989), they are elicited by different environmental or instructional demands and result in qualitatively different motivational patterns. Research has identified patterns of cognitive-based, as well as affective-based, processes that are “set in motion” when a particular goal is adopted over the short or long term (Elliott & Dweck, 1988). Considerable research linking mastery and performance achievement goals to different ways of thinking about oneself and learning activities suggests that a task goal elicits a motivational pattern that is associated with a quality of involvement likely to maintain achievement behavior, whereas an ego goal fosters a failure-avoiding pattern of motivation (Covington, 1984; Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Legget, 1988; Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Nicholls 1984b, 1989; Nicholls, Patashnick, & Nolen, 1985).

Research evidence suggests that a task goal is associated with a wide range of motivation-related variables that are conducive to positive achievement activity and that are necessary mediators of self-regulated learning. Of particular importance is evidence (Ames & Archer, 1988; Nicholls et al., 1985) that links task goals to an attribution belief that effort leads to success, supporting an effort-outcome perception that is central to the attribution model of achievement directed behavior (Weiner, 1979). When task goals are adopted, pride and satisfaction are associated with successful effort (Jagacinski & Nicholls, 1984, 1987), and guilt is associated with inadequate effort (Wentzel, 1987, cited in Wentzel, 1991). Task goals have also been associated with a preference for challenging work and risk taking (Ames & Archer, 1988; Elliott & Dweck, 1988), an intrinsic interest in learning activities (Butler, 1987; Meece et al., 1988; Stipek & Kowalski, 1989), and positive attitudes toward learning (Ames & Archer, 1988; Meece et al., 1988).
Emotional intelligence and well-being

In the last decade, a group of studies have focused on analyzing the role of EI in students’ psychological well-being. The Mayer and Salovey model provides us with a suitable framework for understanding basic emotional processes which underlie the development of adequate psychological balance, and helps us better understand the mediating role of certain emotional variables in students and their influence on psychological adjustment and personal well-being. Studies carried out in the United States show that university students with higher EI report fewer physical symptoms, less social anxiety and depression, greater use of active coping strategies for problem solving, and less rumination. Furthermore, when these students are exposed to stressful laboratory tasks, they perceive stressors as less threatening, and their levels of cortisol and blood pressure are lower (Salovey, Stroud, Woolery & Epel, 2002), and they even recover better from experimentally-induced mind states (Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey & Palfai, 1995). Research carried out with Spanish adolescents shows that when they are divided into groups according to their level of depressive symptomatology, students with a normal state differ from those classified as depressive by greater clarity about their feelings and greater ability to regulate their emotions (Fernández-Berrocal, Alcaide, Extremera & Pizarro, 2006; for a more extensive review see Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2007). Another important objectives for any person is to maintain the best possible relations with the people around him or her. Strong EI helps us to be able to offer those around us adequate information about our psychological state. In order to manage the emotional state of others, it is first necessary to manage well one’s own emotional states. Emotionally intelligent persons are not only skillful in perceiving, understanding and managing their own emotions, they also are able to extrapolate these skills to the emotions of others. In this sense, EI plays a basic role in establishing, maintaining and having quality interpersonal relationships. Some studies have found empirical data that support the relationship between EI and adequate interpersonal relationships (Brackett et al., 2006; Extremera & Fernández-Berrocal, 2004; Lopes, Salovey, Cote, Beers, 2005).
Emotional intelligence and academic performance

The ability to pay attention to their emotions, experience feelings with clarity and be able to recover from negative states of mind will be a decisive influence on students’ mental health, and this psychological balance in turn is related to and ultimately affects academic performance. Persons with limited emotional skills are more likely to experience stress and emotional difficulties during their studies, and consequently will benefit more from the use of adaptive emotional skills that allow them to cope with these difficulties. EI may act as a moderator of the effects of cognitive skills on academic performance (Gil-Olarte, Palomera & Brackett, 2006; Pérez & Castejón, 2007; Petrides, Frederickson & Furnham, 2004).

Emotional intelligence and disruptive behaviors

EI skills are a key factor in the appearance of disruptive behaviors based on an emotional deficit. It is logical to expect that students with low levels of EI show greater levels of impulsiveness and poorer interpersonal and social skills, all of which encourage the development of various antisocial behaviors (Extremera & Fernández-Berrocal, 2002; 2004; Mestre, Guil, Lopes, Salovey & Gil-Olarte, 2006; Petrides et al., 2004). Some researchers suggest that people with lower EI are more involved in self-destructive behaviors (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Brackett, Mayer & Warner, 2004; Canto, Fernández-Berrocal, Guerrero & Extremera, 2005; Trinidad & Johnson, 2002; Trinidad, Unger, Chou & Johnson, 2004a; Trinidad, Unger, Chou & Johnson, 2004b; Trinidad, Unger, Chou & Johnson, 2005). Adolescents with a greater ability to manage their emotions are more able to cope with them in their daily life, facilitating better psychological adjustment, and so they present less risk for substance abuse. Specifically, adolescents with a wider repertoire of affective competencies based on the understanding, management and regulation of their own emotions do not require other types of external regulators (e.g., tobacco, alcohol and illegal drugs) in order to recover from negative states of mind provoked by the wide range of stressful life events which they are exposed to at this age (Ruiz-Aranda, Fernández-Berrocal, Cabello & Extremera, 2006).
Goals and well-being

While the role of goals has been primarily demonstrated in the realm of learning and achievement, there is a preliminary basis for suggesting that task and ego goals influence a wide range of action, thought and affect, including those associated with general well-being – general self-evaluations and patterns of behaviour, coping, and emotion. First, as goals affect learning and achievement they are likely also to contribute to adolescents’ well-being. Schools and school achievement are obviously important, at least in a general way, to adolescents’ self-evaluations and well-being. Less immediately obvious is that holding task and ego goals is likely to trigger different behavioral, coping and emotive processes. Specifically, ego goals differ from task goals in the degree to which students appraise events in relation to the self - in particular, to one’s perceived competence. In achievement situations this may result in cases where students construct an objective of outperforming or besting others. Success, therefore, is evaluated in social comparison terms. In terms of developing self-esteem, this is a decidedly hazardous situation. By definition, success is a limited commodity. Only a few, at best can win a competitive game. Most end up “losers,” a factor that not only influence their attitude toward school but probably also their sense of self-esteem. Even “winners,” to remain winners, may engage in cognitive and behavioral strategies that are counter to long-term growth and wellness (Covington, 1992). The risk of making mistakes publicly deters those individuals from taking advantage of opportunities to increase competence (Elliott & Dweck, 1988).

The emotive aspect triggered by goals is most apparent when confronting a stressful event. Dweck (1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988), for example, found that students who adopted ego goals and especially those with low perceived ability, tended to manifest a “helpless” pattern when they encountered failure. These students reported negative self-evaluations, displayed negative affect, and disengaged from the task. In contrast, students who pursued task goals manifested a “mastery” pattern. These students viewed the situation as a challenge, maintained an optimistic orientation and positive affect, and attempted to change their problem strategies. Importantly, as the focus in task goals is not on the self, task-oriented students manifested the mastery pattern regardless of their level of perceived ability. It is reasonable to assume that, in the long term, such
differing experiences of failure would influence students’ well-being more generally, beyond the situational affect in a particular classroom. The focus on social comparison for self-enhancement has in fact been found to be associated with a number of coping strategies that may be maladaptive not only for achievement but general well-being. (Covington, 1992).

**Needs and significance of the study**

Researchers have described the benefits of possessing a high EI. Such individuals are found to be healthier and more successful than their less emotionally intelligent peers (Cooper, 1997). Many characteristics owned by emotionally intelligent people coincide with the characteristics desired in leaders. Emotionally intelligent individuals are found to have strong personal relationships (Cooper), monitor and evaluate others' feelings (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), empathize with others (Kelley & Caplan, 1993), and excel in interpersonal skills (Goleman, 1998a). Review of existing literature suggests that EI plays an important role in formation of self-concept, setting of goals and their achievement and adjustment. Moreover, researchers are attracted towards the role of EI in leadership and decision making. No significant study has been conducted on EI of students except Lopes et al. who studied relationship of EI with personality and the perceived quality of social relationship. Such a gap in the existing scene of research in the field of EI provides motivation to carry out this study.

**Statement of the problem**

“A study of relationship among emotional intelligence, well-being and achievement goals at secondary level in Haryana” this study seeks to explore links between emotional intelligence, measured as a set of abilities, well-being, achievement goals and academic achievement, as well as effect of socio-demographic variables on emotional intelligence, well-being, achievement goals and academic achievement of students at secondary level in Haryana.

**Operational definitions of terms used**

i. **Emotional Intelligence** is the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thoughts; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to
regulate emotions to promote educational and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 10).

ii. **General Well-being** is a condition of happiness or prosperity and welfare of adolescents in society or surrounding environment in which they live. In the present study General Well-being is comprised of (i) Emotional Tone (i.e. a predominating disposition; especially a frame or condition of adolescent’s emotions), (ii) Peer Relationships (i.e. the extent the adolescent is satisfied with his/her relations to his/her peer group) and (iii) Impulse Control (i.e. the control an adolescent have on his/her sudden or transient mental urge resulting in undeliberated action, caused by the feeling or by some objective stimulus).

iii. **School-related Well-being** is a condition of happiness or prosperity and welfare of adolescents in school in which they are studying. In the present study School-Related Well-being is comprised of (i) Affect at school (i.e. liking or aptitude of adolescents towards activities of school), (ii) Academic efficacy (i.e. the ability of an adolescent that he/she thinks he/she posses to produce the results that they wanted to produce in academics).

iv. **Personal Performance Goals** are the Objectives set by the students about their performance in the class during teaching and in form of marks they want to score in examination.

v. **Personal Mastery Goals** are the Objectives set by the students to achieve mastery over skills and subject contents in a particular class.

vi. **Disruptive Behaviour** refers to the behaviour of students such as teasing, talking out of turn, getting out of one’s seat, disrespecting others, violence and vandalism, engagement in which annoys the teacher and interrupt the normal teaching process in the classroom.

vii. **Perception of School Emphasis on Performance** is a belief or an image the students have, that in the school the teacher put emphasis in the class on performance in the examination and in the classroom teaching.

viii. **Perception of School Emphasis Mastery** is a belief or an image the students have, that in the school the teacher put emphasis in the class on mastery of the skills and subject content.

ix. **Academic Achievement** is the percentage of marks scored in final examination of previous class.