Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature is exactly that – a review, synthesis, or summary of literature on a research problem. A literature review is usually a highly synthesized critique of the status of knowledge on a carefully defined educational topic. Although the field of research on EI has broadened over the last decade, the relationship between EI and school life is yet to be fully discovered. Furthermore, personality theories and models have been around for quite some time in mainstream psychology but have been poorly understood or defined until recently. Very few studies have been conducted on the connections between well-being, achievement goals, academic achievement and the level of his or her EI. This review of literature includes (1) a framework for the context of the problem, (2) current understanding and research in the field of EI as related to the workplace and demographics, (3) connections between EI and well-being, (4) current understanding and research on Achievement goals, (5) the connections between EI and Achievement goals, (6) the relationship between academic achievement and EI, (7) the relationship between achievement goals and well-being, and (8) the value of this study.

Context of the problem

Despite the recent popularity of EI, there has yet to be a standard and universally-accepted definition. In the present research literature many models classified in two categories namely ability model and trait or mixed models are present. The EI models of Goleman and Bar-On are often referred to as mixed models. Salovey and Mayer (1993) are credited with the development of a model of EI that is separated from personality traits and focuses strictly on mental abilities. Such mental abilities include perception and expression of emotion, assimilation of emotion, analyzing emotions, and emotional regulation (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000b). They argue that separating personality dispositions from emotional abilities would allow them to analyze EI to the degree it independently contributed to a person’s behavior overall life competence (Mayer & Salovey, 1997 b). The adoption of this definition of EI allows it to be viewed as a true intelligence that meets three empirical criteria. First, an ability-based model allows for
right and wrong answers to emotional challenges. Second, mental abilities are measurable and can be correlated to other mental abilities. Third, absolute mental ability level tends to increase with age (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000b). The Mayer and Salovey model is built around four levels of EI, and each level contains a number of discrete emotional abilities. These levels are:

1. **Perception and expression of emotion** This level is the most basic and involves the identification and expression of emotions in one’s physical states, feelings, and thought in addition to recognizing emotional expression in other people.

2. **Assimilating emotion in thought** The ability allows people to weigh emotions against one another and allows emotion to direct and prioritize attention. At this level, emotions also aid in memorization by tying specific emotions with specific events.

3. **Understanding and analyzing emotion** This level addresses how people are able to label emotions, recognize why they occur, and how to reason with the complexity of emotions and simultaneous feelings. In addition, there is an ability to understand relationships associated with shifts of emotion.

4. **Reflective regulation of emotion** The highest level of EI, this level deals with the ability to stay open to feelings and reflectively monitor and regulate emotions that promote emotional and intellectual growth. (Mayer & Salovey, 1997 b, p. 11)

Largely due to the competing models of EI (mixed models developed by Goleman & Bar-On and the ability-based model developed by Mayer & Salovey), the key issue quickly becomes what part, if any, does personality play in predicting outcomes? For instance, Goleman (1995) referred to a study of Bell Laboratory engineers in which the top performers had a greater EI despite having the same IQ as lower performing engineers. This seems to be a great claim in support of EI being a predictor of success. Goleman also states that if IQ predicts 20% of personal success, then EI can fill the 80% gap. However, Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2000b) argue such extravagant claims “appear to fly in the face of our existing research base” (p. 104).

Due to a large overlap between personality types and EI in Goleman and Bar-On’s model, it is necessary to differentiate between the two in order to determine which factor has a greater influence in predicting success. In this case, success is defined by the principal’s ability to effectively implement and lead professional learning communities within his or her campus.
Current research on emotional intelligence

Since the inception of EI, the field has been applied to almost every imaginable situation that deals with human relationships and social situations.

The purpose of this section is to review those current studies that have yielded significant findings and have application to this study. Despite the popular nature of EI in mainstream psychology, there is sound evidence for its inclusion as an actual intelligence. However, some researchers claim that there can be no correct answers to EI tests, such tests only measure the conformity of a person to a social group, and EI does not qualify to be a real intelligence (Roberts, Zeidner, & Matthews, 2001). Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, and Sitarenios (2001) strongly argue against this claim and states that they were incorrect in their analysis. Viewing EI as a standard intelligence that is positively correlated to positive outcomes at school, home, and work is found in many other studies (Brackett, 2001; Formica, 1998; Rubin, 1999). One recent study suggested the level of EI, even after controlling for personality types and traits, played a significant role in predicting everyday behavior. Brackett, Mayer, and Warner (2004) found males with high levels of EI were less likely to exhibit harmful behaviors such as using illegal drugs, drinking alcohol excessively, and engaging in deviant behavior. Furthermore, the male subjects also had trouble establishing meaningful relationships and positive social interactions. People with high EI generally solve problems with less effort compared to those with lower EI (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000b). EI and verbal intelligence also seem to have a positive correlation (Barent, 2005).

To completely understand the current research on EI, one should have knowledge of the models and instruments used to assess it. There are three commonly used instruments that assess EI based on the two predominate theories on EI. Bar-On developed the EQ-i which is intended to measure his mixed-model of EI. The EQ-i is divided in five sections measuring intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, stress management, adaptability, and general mood. It is important to again note that this assessment measures both mental abilities and personality dispositions (Bar-On, 1997). Goleman has also developed a similar assessment based on his mixed-model known as the Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI) (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Hay McBer, 1999). Another assessment used to measure EI is the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso EI Test.
(MSCEIT). This assessment, like their model, measures mental abilities, not personality, and is based on the four components of the aforementioned model. The most recent edition, the MSCEIT Version 5.0, measures the four EI abilities designing questions that are either right or wrong. The authors of the MSCEIT assert that the instrument is objective, ability-based, correlates with existing intelligences, and scores increase with age (Mayer & Geher, 1996). By keeping EI limited to an ability-based definition, it is possible to analyze the degree to which an individual’s EI level contributes to his or her behavior. Research using the MSCEIT further suggests there is a notable difference between it and the EQ-i in that each instrument accurately reflects and measures their respectable models (Brackett & Mayer, 2003). More detailed information on the Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI) will be given in Chapter 3.

**Emotional intelligence in the workplace**

Linking EI to workplace performance is a leading area of research in worker productivity and effectiveness. 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 EQ-i was administered to the recruiters, and the results indicated the EQ-i instrument predicted 28% of the variance in the performance between the two groups. The EQ-i correctly classified 81% of the recruiters in the high-performing and low-performing groups. Furthermore, recruiters with high levels of EI had a greater ability to place recruits in positions that closely matched their knowledge and skills (Bar-On, Handley, & Fund, 2006).

EI, however, affects more than the individual’s performance and can be correlated to group productivity. Group EI can be analyzed in two ways – by examining each individual’s contribution to the team and the interaction within the team as a whole. By doing so, one can understand both the emotional resources available for teamwork and how teams manage the collective dynamics of the group’s members (Elfenbein, 2006). Teams whose members collectively have a higher-than-average level of EI score higher on tests of team psychological safety, collaborative decision making, team training and improvement, and lower on levels of group conflict. In contrast, teams that have a high
level of variability in EI suffer negative consequences such as conflict and member attrition (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002).

Some scholars' models on group performance seem to be in conflict with Elfenbien's framework and suggest that focusing solely on EI within a team is detrimental to performance. For instance Michel and Jehn (2006) claim that social intelligence, as defined as effective adaptation to the social context, is a better predictor of team effectiveness. Their study of two banks' employees revealed very different personal attributes in regards to social relations. Employees of the less-effective, first bank could elaborate extensively on their personal emotional abilities while employees of the highly-effective second bank had great difficulty at verbalizing their self-concept. However, the employees at the second bank were much more situational in their responses to the researcher's questions. They rarely used the term "I" or spoke of their strengths and weaknesses, unlike the employees of the first bank. Michel and Jehn claim that EI is only one part of a larger social intelligence model. Their model combines self-awareness with self-regulation in a concrete situation.

The development of a group-level EI model helps combine and compliment the findings Elfenbien's research with that of Michel and Jehn. This model, proposed by Druskat and Wolff (2001) is based on the assumption that teams are greater than the sum of its individuals, and member EI alone cannot manage group dynamics. They argue that the group as a whole must be aware of and effectively manage emotion within the established social norms. The team norms, nine of which are defined, provide an emotional structure for the group's interaction with one another (Wolff, Druskat, Koman, & Messer, 2006). In other words, a team's effectiveness and sustainability depends on the strength of the social norms developed by the EI contribution each member makes.

**Emotional intelligence, gender and age**

Bar-On (1997) suggests that there are "no significant differences between males and females in overall emotional intelligence" (p. 93) based on a correlational study between age and gender and scores on the EQ-i. However, Allen (2003) indicates female principals tend to slightly outscore male principals on the EQ-i by one-half of a standard deviation, but there is no significant difference between principals' age and EQ-i scores.
Other studies also suggest females score higher than males on tests of EI (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999; Mayer & Geher, 1996). Hoffman (1977; Hojat et al., 2001, van Rooy et al., 2005 also confirmed gender differences in EI and empathy. Women have been found to display more complexity and articulate their emotional experience more than men, even after controlling for verbal intelligence (Barrett, Lane, Sechrest, & Schwartz, 2000). Lopes, Salovey, and Straus (2003) confirm this finding and suggest higher EI in women may be linked to mother-child interactions where female children tend to receive greater emotional expression from their mothers than male children. The part of the brain designated for emotional processing may also be larger in women (Gur, Gunning-Dixon, Bilker, & Gur, 2002). However, women are more likely to be perceived negatively in the leadership role when compared to men when women do not use their emotional abilities and act as autocratic leaders, typically a male stereotype, rather than as democratic leaders (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). More interestingly, women more often underestimate their EI, whereas men overestimate (Petrides & Furnham, 2000).

Intrapersonal skills generally increase with age (Bar-On, 1997, 2002; Bar-On & Handley, 1999; Bar-On & Parker, 2000, Hartup & Stevens, 1997). Labouvie-Vief Dovoe & Bulka (1989) reported that emotional maturation is pronounced during the pre-adult years. Further, according to Bretherton, Fritz, Zahn-Waxler and Ridgeway (1986) the expression of emotions develops from external (i.e. actions, physical processes) to internal representations (i.e. linked to memories, wishes and other inner states).

**Emotional intelligence and education**

Educational administrators and policymakers have shown much excitement over the potential impact that the understanding and development of EI in students can have on academic achievement. For instance, a group of curriculum leaders proclaim that EI is the integrative concept underlying successful learning (Elias, Zins, Weissberg, Frey, Greenberg, Haynes, Kesseler, Schwab-Stone, & Shiver, 1997). Pool (1997) states that, "emotional intelligence predicts about 80% of a person's success in life" (p. 12). Stufft (1996) implies that low EI is directly related to disciplinary problems, and educators should target students with poor discipline in order to strengthen their EI. However, Mayer and Cobb (2000) caution educators on making the link between EI and
educational success too quickly. They point out that much of the research conducted on education and EI was based more on personality traits, or a broad mixed-model of EI, than on the ability-based model. Mayer and Cobb maintain the importance of viewing learners as both cognitive and emotional beings, but much research is yet to be done on education and EI.

**Emotional intelligence and academic achievement**

One new area of recent interest has been the impact of social and emotional competency on academic achievement. Early discussions on the relationship between EI and achievement in various educational contexts were quick to claim a strong association (Elias, Bruene-Butler, Blum, & Schuyler, 1997; Goleman, 1995; Pasi, 1997). As more recent writers have noted, however, these early claims were made largely on the basis of very preliminary data (see Matthews, Roberts, & Zeidner, 2003; Zeidner, Roberts, & Matthews, 2002). Although many educators were quick off the mark to develop or adapt intervention programs for EI (Elias et al., 1997), little was known about the efficacy of these types of interventions (Mayer & Cobb, 2000). Even less was known about how EI could be assessed using reliable and valid measures (Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts, 2001).

More recently, a small body of empirical research has emerged to suggest that there is merit to the idea that EI is associated with academic achievement—as long as careful attention is directed at the methodology for assessing EI and achievement variables (Parker, Summerfeldt, Hogan, & Majeski, 2004). Petrides, Frederickson, and Furnham (2004) examined the relationships among EI, cognitive ability, and academic performance in a British sample of 650 Grade 11 students. They found that EI moderated the relationship between academic performance and cognitive ability. Academic success was operationalized as the standardized test results from the General Certificate of Secondary Education (the principal means of assessing academic achievement at the end of compulsory secondary education in the UK). Petrides et al. (2004) also found evidence that EI was negatively associated with deviant school behaviors (unauthorized absences or being expelled from school) likely to influence academic performance. Trinidad and Johnson (2002) also found a negative association between EI and deviant behaviors (tobacco and alcohol use) in an American sample of adolescents.
In a longitudinal study examining the transition from high school to university, Parker et al. (2004) also found that various EI dimensions were predictors of academic success. They used a model of EI (Bar-On, 1997, 2000) that consists of four related abilities: “intrapersonal” abilities (consisting of related abilities like recognizing and labeling one’s feelings), “interpersonal” abilities (consisting of related abilities like identifying emotions in others or empathy), “adaptability” (consisting of abilities like being able to adjust one’s emotions and behaviors to changing situations or conditions), and “stress management” (consisting of abilities like delaying or resisting an impulse). At the start of the academic term (September) a large sample of 1st-year full-time students attending a small liberal arts university in central Ontario completed the short form of the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i:Short; Bar-On, 2002). At the end of the academic year (May) the EQ-i: Short data was matched with the students’ academic records and two groups were identified: academically successful (1st-year GPA of 80% or better) students and less-successful (1st-year GPA of 59% or lower) students. Consistent with expectations, the successful group scored higher than the less-successful group on several dimensions of EI: intrapersonal abilities, adaptability, and stress management. Students with higher levels of these abilities appear to be better able to cope with the social and emotional demands of making the transition to a post-secondary environment compared to students scoring low on these abilities.

Correlations between EI and grades are in the r = .20 to .25 range for college students (Barchard, 2003; Brackett & Mayer, 2003, Lam & Kirby, 2002) and r = .28 to .32 range for high school students (Parker, Summerfeldt, Hogan & Majeski, 2004; Newsome, Day & Catano, 2000; Aremu, Tella & Tella, 2006). Petrides et al., (2004) found that EI was differentially associated with educational subjects. EI is better for predicting success on English than for math or science. Larose and Roy (1995) found EI as a predictor of number of courses dropped or not completed, and whether a student withdraws from school. Gil-Olarte, Palomera Martin and Brackett (2006) reported the importance of EI in students’ academic and social development. Students with high EI tended to be more prosocial and perform better in school.

Newcomb et al. (2002) found that high school failure was directly predicted by earlier general deviance, poor academic competence, low family SES and tobacco use.
All ethnic and gender differences in high school failure were mediated by deviance and academic ability or accounted for by family SES discrepancies.

Coover and Murphy (2000) examined the relationship between self-identity and academic persistence and achievement in a counter stereotypical domain. The study revealed that the higher the self-concept and self-schema, the more positive the self-descriptions, the better the academic achievement at 18. The study also showed that self-identity improves through social interaction and communication with others, which would enhance achievement. Austin, Evans, Goldwater and Potter (2005) and Abisamra (2000) reported positive relationship between EI and academic success.

Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Lopes et al., 2003; O’connor & Little 2003 in their studies found that cognitive abilities were more closely related to ability EI than to self reported EI.

The present study sought to extend the Parker et al. (2004) study by examining the relationship between EI and academic achievement in younger respondents. Based on available research in the area of social and emotional competencies with post-secondary students, it is anticipated that high school students with higher levels of social and emotional competency will perform better academically. There is consistent empirical evidence that high school students, who exhibit behaviors consistent with social and emotional competency (e.g., regular class attendance, completing school work, and involvement in extracurricular activities) are more apt to be successful in school (Finn & Rock, 1997). To this end, the association between these variables was examined in a large group of students attending high school. Also, of interest is the potential developmental change in social and emotional competencies between grade 9 and 12. A significant developmental increase in social and emotional competencies from early adulthood to middle age has been established (Bar-On, 1997, 2000).

Emotional intelligence, well-being and goals

EI is associated with important social outcomes including social adjustment (Engelberg & Sjoberj, 2004), altruism and civic virtue (Charbonneau & Nicol, 2002) and leadership potential (Barlig, Slater & kelloway, 2000). Gasper and Bramesfeld (2006) reported a positive relationship between positive feeling, EI and well-being. EI ability is related to greater empathy (Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000), less negative interactions
with peers (Brackett, Mayer, & Warner 2004), higher-quality relationships, less conflict and antagonism with friends (Lopes, Brackett, Nezlek, Schutz, Sellin, & Salovey, 2004; Lopes, Salovey, & Straus 2003), and lower level of violence and drugs problems (Brackett et al. 2004; Gil-Olarte, & Guil, & Mester, 2004; Rubin, 1999; Trinidad & Johnson, 2002). Brackett & Mayer (2003) reported that self-reported indices of EI tend to correlate highly with measures of well-being. Mavroveli, Petrides, Sangareau and Furnham (2009) found that trait EI scores were positively related both to peer-related prosocial behavior and to overall peer-competence. They also predicted emotion perception accuracy beyond overall peer competence. Trait EI is largely independent of cognitive ability, but strongly predictive of emotional and social criteria. Brackett and Mayer (2003) reported that self-report indices of EI tend to correlate highly with measures of well-being.

According to Edigar (1997) the emotions, feelings and values are vital for a person’s well-being and achievement in life. He also states that science teachers should stress on the affective domain that cannot be separated from the cognitive domain. Quality emotions and feelings help students give their best potential in the classroom. The students, who are aversive and think negatively cannot concentrate for a long time and have more difficulty in reaching their potential than others.

Spence, Oades and Caputi (2004) argued that trait EI and adoption of congruent personal goals are related processes. Research has shown that when goals reflect a person’s developing interests and core values, they are more likely to act effectively (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998) and experience enhanced well-being (Kasser & Ryan, 1993; McGregor & Little, 1998; Sheldon & Kasser, 1995). Evidently, psychological health can be accounted for, in part, by one’s ability to set and work towards goals that are congruent with a sense of the self (goal self-integration), an ability that would seem to depend upon individual self-awareness.

In recent times emotional intelligence (EI) has been proposed as an important predictor of positive human functioning (Mayer & Salovey, 1997 b). The intention of the present study is to investigate whether the EI is required for goal self-integration and well-being. Given the reflective and evaluative nature of EI, an emotionally intelligent individual may also be capable of the self-awareness required to identify important
aspects of themselves. Thus, EI and goal self-integration may be related processes. In current study well-being will be a composite of positive and negative affect (Bradburn, 1969), which typically include a measure of positive and negative affect and life satisfaction (Diener, 1984) or PWB, which has been conceptualized as including components such as personal growth and purpose in life (McGregor & Little, 1998; Ryff, 1989).

Personal goals play an important role in the maintenance of well-being (Emmons, 1996). Whilst early subjective well-being models tended to locate well-being in the attainment of desired end states, or telic theories (Diener, 1984), recent models have recognized the importance of the movement towards desired end states, or autotelic theories (Omodei & Wearing, 1990). As Emmons (1996) observed, “goal attainment per se will not lead to subjectively satisfying long-term states unless these goals are intrinsically meaningful and integrated within an overall structure of the individual in his or her social context” (p. 333).

Several researchers have noted the importance of setting goals that reflect core aspects of the self and permit the integration of personality and goals. For example, Kasser and Ryan (1993) found that self-reported well-being was greatest for individuals who held intrinsically oriented goals (e.g., personal growth, satisfying relationships and community contributions) compared to external orientations (e.g., achieving wealth and financial success). Similarly, Sheldon and Kasser (1995) used coherence and congruence based measures of personality integration to test the proposition that greater psychological health is experienced when an individual’s goals are horizontally and vertically consistent (coherence) and pursued for intrinsically satisfying reasons (congruence). They found that when individuals strive for self-determined reasons or towards intrinsically motivated goals, these measures were possible predictors of well-being, concluding that “personality integration plays a causal role with regard to psychological health” (p. 541).

Finally, McGregor and Little (1998) found that people feel better when they are doing well (efficacy) but report higher levels of meaning when their projects are more reflective of self-identity (integrity).

According to self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), people have an
organismic psychological need to function autonomously. Individuals share an innate desire to choose activities freely and to act in accordance with our developing interests or core values. de Charms (1976) used perceived locus of causality to account for individual differences in self-determined behaviour, explaining that an internal perceived locus of causality exists when a person’s interests are experienced as the initiating action, and an external perceived locus of causality when initiated by external events. In developing self-determination theory, Deci and Ryan expanded upon de Charms’ original notion of perceived locus of causality and identified four distinct motivations for acting: external, introjected, identified and intrinsic.

In the present context, the internal–external causality distinction does not exist at a physical, bodily level but according to the individual’s sense of self (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Thus, even though the striving to “achieve my sales target” occurs inside the person, if the primary motivation for this striving is some external reward (e.g., money) or internal compulsion (e.g., guilt), then it falls outside that individual’s sense of self and thus has an external perceived locus of causality. Existing goal theories typically provide an account of how people efficaciously pursue their personal goals, yet neglect the question of why they adopt particular goals over others (Ryan, Sheldon, Kasser, & Deci, 1996).

An aim of the current study is to explore the nature of the relationship between an individual’s self-generated goals and the influence that those reasons exert on the determination of emotional well-being. A person’s goals can be considered “personal” if they reflect important aspects of the self, and not “personal” when the motivation to act is directed by external pressures or internal compulsions. Sheldon and Elliot (1998) tested this idea using the perceived locus of causality methodology (Ryan & Connell, 1989; Sheldon & Kasser, 1995) and found that autonomous goals, which emanate from developing interests (intrinsic) or core values (identified), were more predictive of greater effort and greater goal attainment than controlled goals, which are presumed to arise from internal compulsions (introjected) or external enticements (external).

Mayer and Salovey (1997 b) defined EI as “the ability to perceive emotions, to assess and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional...
and intellectual growth'’ (p. 5). According to Bar-On (2001), individuals with high levels of EI have several advantages over individuals with low EI. These advantages include emotional self-awareness, stress management, problem-solving, mood regulation, empathy and the ability to prevent distress from swamping one’s ability to think clearly. These qualities are highly desirable and important for successfully living in the world, including striving for personal goals.

Whilst the relationship between personal goals and well-being is well documented (Emmons, 1996), EI research has tended to concentrate on an elucidation of the constructs hypothesized components (Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000; Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000) and psychometric investigations of its structure (Davies, Stankov, & Roberts, 1998; Petrides & Furnham, 2000, 2001) rather than its ability to predict important aspects of personal functioning, such as the adoption of personal goals and emotional well-being. This research seeks to bridge this gap in the literature by presenting a model of the relationships between trait EI, goal self-integration and emotional well-being.

Despite a lack of agreement over the validity of EI (Adams, 1998; Ciarrochi, Chan, Caputi, & Roberts, 2001a, 2001b; Davies et al., 1998; Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000; Mayer et al., 2000) studies have recently begun to focus on EI ability to predict social and psychological functioning, factors hypothesized as key consequents of EI (Mayer & Salovey, 1997 b). For instance, Martinez- Pons (1997) used path analysis techniques to test a model of hypothesized relationships between EI and areas of personal functioning such as goal orientation (task mastery/concern for competitive success), life satisfaction and depression symptomatology. As expected, EI correlated positively with task mastery and life satisfaction, but negatively with depression symptomatology.

It should be noted that, as the present study utilizes a self-report measure of EI, the EI to be discussed in this study is trait EI, rather than ability EI. Several researchers have already discussed the distinction between trait and ability EI (Davies et al., 1998; Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Saklofske, Austin, & Minski, 2003) and argue that self-reports are too closely related to established personality measures to fully represent the EI construct. For example, using two well-established personality measures, Petrides and Furnham (2001) found that the Bar-On Emotional Quotient inventory could be located as
a distinguishable trait EI factor within personality factor space. They concluded that trait EI "belongs to the lower-order stratum of established personality taxonomies" (p. 444) and recommended that researchers clearly distinguish between trait EI (i.e. behavioural tendencies and self-perceived abilities) and ability EI (i.e. cognitive ability). To date, however, most researchers in this area have tended to use self-report measures of EI, without reporting their findings in terms of the trait-ability separation. As such, the brief empirical review provided here refers exclusively to "general" EI, rather than the more specific, and recommended, trait EI.

It was concluded that individuals with high EI are more likely to work harder at perfecting tasks, report greater life satisfaction and less depression related symptoms than those with low EI. In addition, Taylor (2001) notes that several studies support a strong and inverse relationship between EI and alexithymia (the difficulty in identifying and communicating emotional experience). Alexithymics tend not to cope or relate well with others. Evidence suggests that they are prone to several common mental illnesses such as panic attacks, post traumatic stress disorder, depression and eating or substance use disorders (Taylor, 2001).

The question of whether individuals with high levels of EI also have a greater sense of self can be addressed by studies that examine the relationship between EI and self-actualization. Given that EI relates to effective human action and self-actualization relates to optimal human action (Bar-On, 2001), it is surprising that few studies have examined the relationship between these two constructs. However, Bar-On (2001) has reported that EI can predict our overall ability to self-actualize. Using the subscales of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i), Bar-On concluded that self-actualization is dependent on factors such as a well developed sense of identity (self-regard), the ability to know what one is feeling and why (emotional self-awareness) and the capacity for thinking and acting in a self-reliant manner (independence). Thus, the realization of one’s full potential seems to require an understanding of the things that are naturally interesting to us. By knowing ourselves, we are capable of setting self-motivated goals which, when supported by good emotional regulation, allow us to approach the self-actualized state.

This study is exploratory in nature and tried to find does a positive and significant relationship exist between EI and well-being? Whilst this relationship has been noted by
Martinez-Pons (1997), there is no further empirical evidence supporting of this claim. However, Taylor (2001) reports that alexithymia is strongly related to several mental disorders (such as posttraumatic stress disorder, panic disorder and depression) and is inversely related to EI. It follows that a relationship between EI and well-being may exist. Second, does a positive and significant relationship exist between EI and personal goals? Bar-On (2001) has reported consistently high correlations between EI and self-actualization. If EI is important for self-actualization, and autonomy and the ability to set and achieve goals are important characteristics of self-actualized people (Bar-On, 2001) then this suggests the possibility of a relationship between EI and goal self-integration.

**Current research on achievement goals**

Research on achievement motivation has long emphasized the cognitive bases of behavior, but the recent literature has advanced an achievement goal framework that integrates cognitive and affective components of goal-directed behavior (Ames & Archer, 1987, 1988; Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Elliott, 1983; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliott & Dweck, 1988; Maehr, 1984; Maehr & Nicholls, 1980; Nicholls, 1979, 1984b, 1989). An achievement goal concerns the purposes of achievement behavior. It defines an integrated pattern of beliefs, attributions, and affect that produces the intentions of behaviour (Weiner, 1986) and that is represented by different ways of approaching, engaging in, and responding to achievement type activities (Ames, 1992b; Dweck & Leggett, 1988). Elliott and Dweck (1988) defined an achievement goal as involving a "program" of cognitive processes that have "cognitive, affective, and behavioural consequences" (p. 11).

Two contrasting achievement goal constructs have received the most attention in the research literature. These two goals have been differentiated by their linkage to contrasting patterns of motivational processes and have been alternatively labeled learning and performance goals (Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliott & Dweck, 1988), task-involvement and ego-involvement goals (e.g., Maehr & Nicholls, 1980; Nicholls, 1984a), and mastery and performance goals (Ames & Archer, 1987, 1988). Conceptually, learning, task-involvement, and mastery goals can be distinguished from performance and ego-involvement goals; I have adopted the mastery and performance labels. Mastery and performance 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).

Central to a mastery goal is a belief that effort and outcome covary, and it is this attributional belief pattern that maintains achievement-directed behavior over time (Weiner, 1979, 1986). The importance of this long-term view is underscored by those (Eccles, Midgley, & Adler, 1984: Maehr, 1984; Paris & Newman, 1990; Pascarella, Walberg, Junker, & Haertel, 1981; Pintrich & De Groot, 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 mastery 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.

Central to a performance goal is a 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 a performance 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 toward achieving normatively defined success. When a person adopts a performance 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
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).

Although mastery and performance 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, p. 11). Considerable research linking mastery and performance achievement goals to different ways of thinking about oneself and learning activities suggests that a mastery goal elicits a motivational pattern that is associated with a quality of involvement likely to maintain achievement behaviour, whereas a performance goal fosters a failure-avoiding pattern of motivation (see, e.g., Covington, 1984; Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett. 1988; Elliott & Dweck. 1988; Nicholls 1984b, 1989; Nicholls, Patashnick, & Nolen. 1985).

Research evidence suggests that a mastery 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 & Arrcher, 1988; Nicholls et al., 1985) that links mastery goals to an attributional belief that effort leads to success, supporting an effort-outcome perception that is central to the attributional model of achievement-directed behavior (Weiner, 1979). When mastery 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). Mastery 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).

Mastery goals increase the amount of time children spend on learning tasks (Butler, 1987) and their persistence in the face of difficulty (Elliott & Dweck, 1988) but
more importantly the quality of their engagement in learning. Active engagement is characterized by the application of effective learning and problem-solving strategies, and students' use of these strategies is dependent on a belief that effort leads to success and that failure can be remedied by a change in strategy (Garner, 1990; McCombs, 1984). Of course, students' ability to use self-regulatory strategies is also related to their awareness and knowledge of appropriate strategies and knowing when and how to apply them (McCombs, 1984; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990; low-achieving children may lack knowledge of these strategies to the degree that they are unwilling to make a commitment to effort utilization (Covington, 1983, 1985). Nevertheless, these effort-based strategies are more likely to occur when students are focused on mastery goals (Diener & Dweck, 1978); when students are focused on the task. "How can I understand this?" (Nicholls, 1979) "How can I do this?" (Ames & Ames, 1984) or "How can I master this task?" (Elliott & Dweck, 1988); and when students are willing to apply effort in the interest of learning (Carr, Borkowski, & Maxwell, 1991; Corno & Mandinach, 1983; Corno & Rohrkemper, 1985; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990). Indeed, students endorsing mastery goals have reported valuing and using those learning strategies that are related to attending, processing, self-monitoring, and deep processing of verbal information (Ames & Archer, 1988; Meece et al., 1988; Nolen, 1987, 1988; Nolen & Haladyna, 1990a). Because self-regulatory strategies are so important to students' performance on many classroom tasks, the contributing role of a mastery goal orientation to strategic thinking (Covington, 1985), as well as "failure tolerance" (Clifford, Kim, & McDonald, 1988), is especially important.

It also seems reasonable to suggest that a mastery goal can influence more global perceptions of the self (e.g., the variable) "belongingness" as noted by Weiner, (1990, p. 621). In the area of sports, Chambliss (1989) discussed the importance of the belief "I belong here; this is my world" to the development and commitment of the athlete. A sense of belongingness has, affective and cognitive components, but it is not a self-locus; or task focus. It represents an integration of self with task and others. In the classroom, a sense of "I belong here" is more than a feeling of acceptance by one's peers; it is a belief that one is an important and active participant in all aspects of the learning process. It is identification with the purposes of schooling, and this self-perception ought to be more
easily attained under those conditions in which the focus is not on the adequacy of one's ability.

In contrast to a mastery goal, a performance goal orientation has been associated with a pattern of motivation that includes, for example, an avoidance of challenging tasks (Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliott & Dweck, 1988); negative affect following failure, accompanied by a judgment that one lacks ability (Jagacinski & Nicholls, 1987); positive affect following success with little effort (Jagacinski & Nicholls, 1984); and use of superficial or short-term learning strategies, such as memorizing and rehearsing (Meece et al., 1988; Nolen, 1988; Ryan & Grolnick, 1986). When a performance goal is adopted, self-concept of ability becomes an important determinant of students' achievement-related behaviors (Dweck, 1986). Because the focus is on ability and normative performance, students with low self-concept of ability are less likely to choose challenging tasks or use self-regulatory strategies (Dweck, 1986; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990). Self-concept of ability, then, is a significant mediator of cognitive, affective, and behavioral variables when students are focused on doing better than others but not when they are focused on trying and learning, as a mastery goal orientation (Covington & Omelich, 1984; Dweck, 1986).

Thus, research evidence suggests that it is a mastery goal orientation that promotes a motivational pattern likely to promote long-term and high-quality involvement in learning. How and when is a mastery goal orientation evoked in the classroom? What aspects of classroom structure influence the salience of a mastery or performance goal, and as a consequence, elicit qualitatively different motivational patterns in children? Although the particular goal a student adopts may be influenced by certain prior experiences, achievement history (Wentzel, 1991), or parents' goals and beliefs (Ames & Archer, 1987), a guiding premise of this study is that classroom structures can influence the salience of a particular goal and hence its adoption. These questions are worth attention both because they contribute to understanding of the ways in which achievement orientations develop and change and because they can contribute to practice.

Classroom and other learning environments have frequently been described in terms of the ways in which certain kinds of instructional demands, situational constraints,
or psychosocial characteristics relate to various cognitive and affective outcomes in students. However, there has been little systematic analysis of actual classroom structures examining how certain structures within the classroom can make different goals salient. In an attempt to move in this direction, it is argued for an approach that places emphasis on identifying (a) salient structures in the classroom environment that can contribute to a mastery goal orientation, (b) the ways in which these structures relate to each other and how they are experienced by individual students, and (c) interventions that focus on modifying or changing these structures.

In addressing these issues, the first question is, what are the structures of the classroom environment that lead to a mastery goal orientation and what characteristics of these structures affect how students approach and engage in learning? Converging in the research literature (Brophy, 1987; Epstein, 1988; Marshall, 1988; Marshall & Weinstein, 1984, 1986; Mac Iver, 1987, 1988; Meece, 1991; Rosenholtz & Rosenholtz, 1981; Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1984; Stipek & Daniels, 1988) is an identification of certain structures that have been found to impact a range of motivational variables, especially how students view their ability and the degree to which ability becomes an evaluative dimension of the classroom. These structures include, but are not limited to, the design of tasks and learning activities, evaluation practices and use of rewards, and distribution of authority or responsibility. They are described in the following sections.

A central element of classroom learning is the design of tasks and learning activities. Students' perceptions of tasks and activities not only influence how they approach learning; these perceptions also have important consequences for how they use available time (Good, 1983). Embedded in tasks is information that students use to make judgments about their ability, their willingness to apply effortful strategies, and their feelings of satisfaction.

What characteristics of tasks foster willingness in students to put forth effort and become actively engaged in learning? Tasks that involve variety and diversity are more likely to facilitate an interest in learning and a mastery orientation (Marshall & Weinstein, 1984; Nicholls, 1989; Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1984). Moreover, students are more likely to approach and engage in learning in a manner consistent with a mastery goal when they perceive meaningful reasons for engaging in an activity; that is, when
they are focused on developing an understanding of the content of the activity, improving their skills, or gaining new skills and when task presentations emphasize personal relevance and meaningfulness of the content (Brophy, 1987; Corno & Rohrkemper, 1985; Lepper & Hodell, 1989; Meece, 1991; Nicholls et al., 1985).

Malone and Lepper (1987; see also Lepper & Hodell, 1989) described challenge, interest, and perceived control as factors that should be embedded in the structure and design of learning tasks. They argued for tasks that offer personal challenge, give students a sense of control over either the process or product, and tap students' interest over time. Lepper and Hodell found that when tasks are enriched or involve these "motivational embellishments" (p. 89), they are more likely to create an intrinsic purpose to learning. Others (Marshall & Weinstein, 1984, 1986; Rosenholtz & Simpson, 1984) have shown that with a diverse and varied task structure, students have less opportunity or need to engage in social comparison, and as a consequence, performance differences within the classroom are less likely to translate into perceived ability differences.

Students' beliefs that they can accomplish a task with reasonable effort, and their willingness to apply the effort can be enhanced when tasks are defined in terms of specific and short-term goals (Schunk, 1984, 1989). As children make these judgments about tasks, they are also involved in meta-cognitive appraisals about the utility of planning, organizing, and monitoring strategies (Corno & Mandinach, 1983; Corno & Rohrkemper, 1985). The application of these self-regulatory skills, to a great extent, is dependent on whether students feel enabled to manage their own learning (Paris & Winograd, 1990). When students are focused on the task or on skill improvement and value the learning, they are likely to feel "empowered" in their pursuits (Paris & Winograd, 1990, p. 43), to exhibit active engagement (Brophy, 1987; Brophy, Rohrkemper, Rashid, & Goldberger, 1983), and to feel more satisfied with school learning in general (Nicholls et al., 1985).

Tasks also have social components, as they are embedded in the social organization of the classroom (Blumenfeld & Meece, 1987). Student engagement, therefore, is shaped by the structure of the task, as well as by how the task is delivered by the teacher and how it interacts with other structures in the classroom.
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The discussion thus far may lead one to believe that the classroom learning environment provides a common experience for all students when, in fact, research on teacher effectiveness shows that there is considerable variation in teacher behavior within classrooms (Good, 1983). Just as expectancy effects occur in some classrooms but not others (Brophy, 1983b; Brophy & Good, 1974), children in the same classroom are treated differently and therefore have different experiences. Brophy's (1981) analysis of teacher praise provides a good example of how praise and verbal rewards are not evenly distributed in the classroom, but equally important is Brophy's point that praise can be interpreted quite differently by students, as a function of their prior experiences.

Similarly, Marshall and Weinstein (1986; see also Weinstein, 1989; Weinstein, Marshall, Brattesani, & Middlestadt, 1982) found that certain grouping practices and evaluation methods make differential treatment salient to high- and low-achieving students, but Marshall and Weinstein also found considerable within-class variability in how students perceived opportunities for making choices, feedback from the teacher, and the general work orientation of the classroom.

The importance of student perceptions in depicting classroom climate is well-recognized and evidenced by the shift away from observational approaches to studying classroom processes. However, more recently attention has been directed toward the role of individual student perceptions and interpretations (Ames & Archer, 1988; Ryan & Grolnick, 1986). Maehr (1984) referred to this as the personal meaning of classroom events and later suggested that classroom climate may be more appropriately conceived of as "psychological environment" (Maehr & Midgley, 1991, p. 405). Students have different classroom experiences, but because they also bring different prior experiences with them, they may interpret a teacher-student interaction or event quite differently (Meece et al., 1988).

Thus, to predict and examine motivated cognitions, affect and behavior of a student, it is necessary to attend to how that student perceives and gives meaning to classroom experiences. Ryan and Grolnick (1986) argued effectively for attending to the "functional significance" (p. 550) of the environment, referring to the meaning children give to their own experiences. This is consistent with a cognitive mediation model of motivation, which focuses on the active role of the individual student in constructing
meaning (Meece et al., 1988; Weinstein, 1989). Students' thoughts, perceptions, and interpretations mediate the effects of teacher behavior. At the same time, however, it is important to note that there are patterns in how judgments are made. The developmental changes in children's understanding of the compensatory relationship between effort and ability (Nicholls, 1984a), along with developmental changes in properties of perception, attribution, and interpretation, suggest that children's conceptions about their role in the classroom follow certain patterns (Wentzel, 1989).

This notion of subjective experience and meaning has important implications for examining the effects of classroom environments or structures on student motivation outcomes. The goal orientation of structures cannot be studied through behavioral checklists or observations. Although we can describe the structures in terms of principles and exemplary strategies, assessment involves students' perceptions. Specific treatments or interventions may have different effects on different students, depending on the students' prior experiences and the meaning they give to their current experiences. Focusing on how students change with regard to their perceptions and progress in other ways may provide a meaningful approach to evaluation (see Good & Weinstein, 1986).

The researches discussed have produced a mixed type of results and some of them have produced contrary results. Moreover, no such study has taken place in Indian context, thus, there is a scope to carry out this study.