

A Consultant's Guide to Understanding and Promoting
Emotional Intelligence in the Workplace

Shani Robins

Stanford University

Institute of Transpersonal Psychology

Running head: EI IN ORGANIZATIONS

Robins, S. (2002). A consultant's guide to understanding and promoting emotional intelligence in the workplace. In Lowman, R. (Ed), *Handbook of Organizational Consulting Psychology*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bio

Shani Robins, Ph.D. is a professor in Palo Alto, California. He was a faculty member in the College of Organizational Studies, at Alliant International University, and is now an instructor at Stanford University's Medical School where he teaches Emotional Intelligence and Wisdom Therapy as methods for resolving stress and conflict in the workplace. He is also a professor at the Institute of Transpersonal Psychology. He completed his B.A. in psychology and philosophy at UCLA, his M.A. and Ph.D. in cognitive experimental psychology at the University of California, Santa Barbara, a 2-year Postdoctoral National Institute of Mental Health Fellowship at the University of California, Irvine, was a visiting scholar at the University of California, Berkeley, and has additionally completed a Ph.D. respecialization in clinical psychology at the California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego. He has consulted and published extensively and has given numerous invited talks and international conference presentations on the topic of cognition-emotion interactions and

their applications to the workplace. He is currently investigating the influence of wisdom on emotions and has developed a wide variety of organizational programs and intervention workshops for dealing with anger, conflict, and stress. In addition to his academic research, teaching, and consulting, he also maintains a clinical practice at the Wisdom Therapy Institute which he founded in Palo Alto, California.

The primary goal of this chapter is to provide organizational consulting psychologists with the theoretical, empirical, and application tools necessary for understanding emotional intelligence (EI) and applying it to the workplace. This chapter will first provide a working definition of EI as well as a brief historical review of concepts closely related to EI that have emerged in the last century. The ubiquity of emotions in organizations will then be identified, making explicit the corresponding benefits of increasing EI. I will then discuss the strengths and weaknesses, on both scientific and practical grounds, of the major models and measures of EI, with special consideration of the implications to organizational consulting. Finally, I will describe an illustrative EI consulting intervention in detail. I conclude by suggesting that the consultant's own EI is a key factor in the consultation process itself.

DEFINING EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND ITS UTILITY

EI, I argue, constitutes a set of learnable skills that have cognitive, behavioral, physiological, and social components. These skills can help reduce conflict and facilitate both performance and satisfaction in the workplace (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Goleman, 1998). Included among EI skills are the abilities to use verbal and nonverbal cues, context, and knowledge of psychological dimensions to identify and regulate the emotions of self and others, to activate emotions at the right time and place and to the right degree, and to apply these processes adaptively in social interactions (Bar-On & Parker, 2000). By increasing EI, an

individual will have increased knowledge about such and greater facility for recognizing and regulating them when they occur in self and others.

Training in EI related skills is quite extensive in U.S. organizations. As an example, General Electric alone reportedly spent over \$1 billion a year on social and emotional competencies in leadership programs (Cherniss & Adler, 2000). Preliminary data suggest the value of EI training but empirically sound outcome studies are needed before definitive conclusions can be drawn. Using broad and preliminary findings, Cherniss & Goleman (2001) provided a cost-benefit analysis on the economic utility of selecting, training, and developing EI based competencies in organizational settings and estimate that training in emotional competencies can result in as much as 8 times the return on investment (ROI) compared with non-EI-based training. Cherniss estimated that American businesses each year lose between 5.6 to 16.8 billion dollars by not having appropriate EI training (Cherniss, Goleman, Emmerling, Cowan & Adler, 1998, p.2). Such variability in financial benefit estimations suggested by the wide dollar range may derive from the conceptual variability among the EI models and from the absence of sufficient outcome studies conducted in organizational settings. Nevertheless, even the low end of estimated benefits of EI training helps explain the extraordinary growth of interest in EI during the last decade, particularly in organizational settings.

Salovey and Mayer (1989) coined the phrase “emotional intelligence” in their original studies on EI. In 1995, the American Dialect Society (1999) selected EI (and its derivative term EQ, or “Emotional Quotient”) as being among the most useful new words or phrases of the year. It was also during this period that Goleman published his popular works (Goleman, 1995, 1998) that catapulted the interest in this topic across academic, organizational and lay circles. To more fully understand EI and its effects, it is useful to consider briefly the nature and functions of emotions.

The Nature of Emotions

Although there are numerous and diverse definitions of emotions (Ekman & Davidson, 1994; Lewis & Haviland-Jones, 2000), there is also some convergence among definitions. Many conceptualizations of emotion consider the concept to reflect a subjective state that has cognitive, behavioral, and physiological components, interdependent processes between those components, and likely activators and outcomes. Each emotion has a different but overlapping pattern of those components and processes as well as contextual and temporal patterns that are differentially associated with varied emotions (Lazarus, 1991).

Emotions as Adaptations. Whereas the Greeks viewed emotions as irrational animal passions that needed to be constrained, modern theories of emotions posit that emotions are adaptations that have important evolutionary functions that are critical to our survival (Buss, 1999; Darwin, 1872/1985; Lazarus, 1991; Tooby & Cosmides, 1990). The emotion of anger, for instance, serves the adaptive functions of focusing our attention on interpersonal antagonisms, social conflict, cheating and injustice, thus providing information to oneself for identifying priorities and expectations and modulating action (Schwarz & Clore, 1988). It additionally serves as a method of communicating threat to others (Ekman & Davidson, 1994). Fear, anxiety and stress, on the other hand, focus our attention towards risks and the necessity of precaution, motivates the decision to flee, and enables flight (Buss, 1999, p. 85-88). Evidence that emotions are evolutionary adaptations includes the observations that they appear in the earliest stages of infancy (Lewis, Alessandri, & Sullivan, 1990) and seem to be universal across cultures (Ekman, 1973; Ekman & Davidson, 1994).

Organizational consultants are often called upon to develop programs, workshops, and mediation strategies (Gleason, 1997; Moore, 1996) to help attenuate the effects of the

so-called negative emotions, particularly anger (Potter-Efron, 1998), an emotion that can result in workplace hostility, violence and conflict (Averill, 1982; Deutsch & Coleman, 2000; Goleman, 1998; Resnick & Kausch, 1995). Efforts by consultants to reduce the frequency and intensity of an executive's anger or an employee's aggression (Resnick & Kausch, 1995), need to be accompanied by recognition and respect that anger has evolved as an adaptive information processing mechanisms that may very well be serving important interpersonal functions within the present system (Robins & Novaco, 1999). As such, any reduction of its frequency and intensity, may require either a compensatory reduction of the need for its functions or finding alternative methods of adapting or satisfying those functions. EI presents a set of skills with the potential to accomplish both. For example, assertiveness in communication may enable grievances to be addressed directly, without the need to escalate to anger. Moreover, the need for anger may be reduced by changing one's cognitive appraisal to less conflict oriented perceptions (Robins, 1998). Such cognitive-based regulation of emotions is one of the primary components of all EI models (Bar-On, & Parker, 2000) and is briefly reviewed below.

Emotion-Cognition Interactions. Emotion regulation (Gross, 1998) dates back to the Greeks (Epictetus, A.C.E. 50-130) who compared emotions to a storm and considered reasoning to be the tool for calming its waters. In the 15th century monks described the need for even-temperedness and called for a careful balance of casualness and dignity through self insight (Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Zerbe, 2000, pp. 19-35). Gracian (1647) noted that the skilled expression and inhibition of emotion at appropriate times enables one to achieve social success in the royal courts, hence the term 'ingratiate' oneself.

Contemporary interest in emotions and their regulation through interactions with cognition pre-dates the last century of psychology and is found in the writings of its architects, William James (1884), Freud (1894), and Darwin (1872). Rigorous research on emotions and their treatment occurred in the second half of the 20th century in both experimental and clinical settings. Overviews of this work can be found in (Beck, 1995; Ekman & Davidson, 1994; Ellis, 1993; Lazarus, 1991; LeDoux, 1996; Lewis & Haviland-Jones, 2000; Mayne & Bonanno, 2001; Meichenbaum, 1990). This research established that how we perceive and interpret a situation will dramatically influence the emotions with which we respond to that situation, as well as the intensity of those emotions.

Our worldview, beliefs, attitudes, and values, are the cognitive categories we use to parse and interpret our environment and people's actions. Interpreted as a threat, an action or situation is likely to elicit fear, to be interpreted as an insult, and it will likely result in anger. If interpreted as a compliment, the same behavior may elicit pride or joy. Interpreted as a source of hopelessness, it will likely contribute to depression. (e.g., Beck, 1995; Dalglish & Power, 1999; Frijda, 1993; Ortony, Clore, & Collins, 1988; Scherer, Schorr, & Johnstone, 2001; Seligman, 1998; Triandis, 1997; Weiner, 1985). In organizations, being terminated may be interpreted as a conflict that activates a strong anger and fear response because of perceived unfairness and a perceived lack of future options respectively. Alternatively, someone else, or the same person a year later, may perceive that same occupational position as an obstacle that may have been blocking the expression of the person's development and consequently may interpret the ostensibly negative event as an opportunity to pursue interests. Neurologically, emotion and

cognitive systems that underlie these interactions are highly integrated (Damasio, 1994), providing further evidence as to the powerful influence of cognition on emotion. Indeed, our brain demonstrates considerable plasticity in rerouting its emotional connections and processes based on cognitive learning and behavioral experience (LeDoux, 1996).

Rather than perceive cognition, thinking, reasoning, or intelligence as being in conflict with emotion, leading researchers agree that it is more empirically realistic and useful to conceptualize emotions and cognitions as close, interactive partners. The term "EI" further highlights this fact and is thus in and of itself a contribution to both fields. High EI includes developing recognition about which beliefs and attitudes, in which contexts, lead to which frequency and intensity of particular emotions. Moreover, it includes the skills for using that knowledge in regulating emotions. Learning when to interpret events as nonconflictual and when behaviorally to shift from combative to cooperative communication styles for example, enables the more adaptive application of EI.

EMOTIONS IN ORGANIZATIONS AND THE NEED FOR EI

The industrial revolution and the advent of many people working together in close spaces within large corporations presented an emergent need to coordinate individual behavior and control idleness and antagonistic utterances (Tayler, 1911/1947). Whereas in our ancestral past, a fight/flight response likely saved our lives whenever it was activated (Cannon, 1932, Lazarus, 1991), in the industrial age, those same mechanisms have been directed to numerous innocuous events such as copier and computer breakdowns, not getting promotions or pay raises, and long commutes to work to name a few illustrative frustrations (Goleman, 1995).

Investigations regarding the roles, prevalence, and social and financial implications of emotions in the workplace have been conducted for over a century but have expanded dramatically in the last decade (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995; Ashkanasy, Hartel and Zerbe, 2000; Fineman, 2000; Grandey, 2000). A growing body of research culminated in 1998, with the meeting of the first annual conference of Emotions & Organizational Life in San Diego, California and more recently when a special issue of the *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (2000, Issue 21-2) was dedicated to emotions in organizations. Results indicate that the situations most relevant to positive emotions in the workplace are goal achievement, involvement in planning, receiving recognition, coping with a challenge, and acts of colleagues. Negative emotions seem to involve acts of management such as giving mixed messages, acts of colleagues such as lack of support or incompetence, acts of customers, and task problems, such as equipment breaking down or work overload (Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Zerb, pp. 36-48).

Among the negative emotions found in the workplace, anger and the consequent aggression present a ubiquitous example (Fitness, 2000). Novaco (1986) and The Center for Disease Control described workplace violence as a national epidemic (1992). It is estimated that approximately 18% of Americans have witnessed assaults at work, and another 18% worry about becoming victims themselves (Toufexis, 1994). The National Crime Victimization Survey (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1998) indicated that annually in the workplace, more than 2 million Americans were the victims of physical attacks, 6 million were threatened, and 16 million were harassed. The incidence of violent behavior among those who were laid off was nearly six times higher than that of their employed peers, even when the research controlled for psychiatric disorders and alcohol abuse.

These are worrisome findings given recent trends of budgetary cuts and economic downsizing. It also helps explain why consultants are so often called upon to help deal with anger, conflict, and violence in the workplace (Brown, Pryzwansky, & Schulte, 2000; Deutsch & Coleman, 2000). Particular forms of clinical dysfunctions such as narcissism or antisocial and borderline personality disorders have also been argued to be among the individual differences highly associated with workplace distress (Cavaiola & Lavender, 2000).

Despite the evolutionary adaptive nature of emotions to communicate information and motivate action, they can be dysfunctional if they reach pathological frequency and intensity. The cognitive processes that selectively activate emotions seem to have substantial influence over such 'hijackings'. Activating emotions at the right place, at the right time, and to the right extent to facilitate interpersonal and social adaptation thus seems to be a skill, and one that is distinct from the traditional intellectual skills defined as intelligence.

EI AND OTHER TYPES OF INTELLIGENCE

The study of intelligence developed throughout the 20th century and was driven largely by testing motivations rather than theoretical questions (Sternberg, 2000). This psychometric approach promulgated tasks that tested the scope of one's vocabulary, reading comprehension, general information, ability to complete number-series from memory and solve mathematical problems. The accumulated performance on verbal, visual, motor, and memory tasks and the ability to respond quickly were considered a general measure of intellectual capacity and one's ability to function and adapt. The extent to which these skills reflected everyday life performance began to be investigated

with emerging subfields such as Practical Intelligence (PI; Sternberg & Wagner, 1986). Focus began to shift to definitions of intelligence that had greater ecological validity such as the extent to which one adapts to social and interpersonal settings in everyday life, copes with conflict, and learns from experience. As the criticisms grew concerning the limits of the classical notions of intelligence, so did the favor grow regarding the notion of multiple intelligences (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987; Gardner, 1983, 1993; Sternberg, 1999a, 1999b) and other more inclusive constructs of functioning and adaptation, including wisdom (Baltes & Staudinger, 1996; Robins, 1998, 2000; Sternberg, 1990).

Multiple Intelligences. The notion of a myriad forms of intelligences across diverse domains has been suggested for close to a century (Hunt, 1928; Gardner, 1983, 1993; Sternberg, 1986, 1999a, 1999b, 2000; Thorndike, 1936) with Gardner (1983) actually coining the term "Multiple Intelligences." This list of multiple types of intelligences is by no means exhaustive, but does give a flavor of the intellectual history that subtends the emergence of EI.

Social Intelligence and Social Competence. Early pioneers in the field of the traditional, academic, g-ability intelligence had already envisioned the need to address social ability as part of intelligence and conceptualized it as understanding others and acting or behaving wisely in relations to and in dealing with them (Thorndike, 1936; Hunt, 1928; Wechsler, 1940). For example, Hunt (1928) found that the scores of 98 sales employees on the George Washington Social Intelligence (SI) Test correlated significantly ($r=.61$) with ratings of the ability to get along with people. Others defined SI as the ability to recognize and judge the feelings and motivations of others with empathy (Marlowe, 1986) and to be able to do so from nonverbal cues (Sternberg &

Smith, 1985). In addition to making sense of and acting on their social environment in purposive ways, SI also meant the ability to adapt to that environment and achieve desired outcomes in important domains (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987). Goals and plans are considered in some models to be more important than the behavior itself (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987), whereas in models of Social Competence (SC), it is the adaptive outcome that is more central; "SC is the possession and use of the ability to integrate thinking, feeling, and behavior to achieve social tasks and outcomes valued in the host context and culture" (Bar-On & Parker, 2000, p. 32). Although the need for SC seems universal (Buss, 1999), some of the specifics of what constitutes SC seem to be culturally and socially specific (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1997). For example, extending a greeting to a potential customer or employee as a way of communicating intent to cooperate rather than threaten is quite universal. Whether one uses a handshake or a bow to do so however, is cultural specific.

Practical Intelligence. A model of Practical Intelligence (PI) was developed by Sternberg & Wagner (1986) in order to capture a person's analytic, creative, and practical abilities in everyday life. It is conceptually distinct from academic intelligence which is typically applied to problems that are well defined, are formulated by others, are complete in the information they provide, typically have one correct answer, one or few methods in getting to that answer, are different from ordinary experience and are likely to elicit little intrinsic interest. The everyday type problems attributed to PI, on the other hand, are usually intrinsically interesting but poorly defined. They need to be reformulated, lack the necessary information to be solved, and have multiple solutions as well as multiple methods for arriving at those solutions. PI is sometimes compared to SI

(Cantor and Kihlstrom, 1987), but Sternberg points out that although PI deals with everyday problems, and though many are social, they need not be necessarily so. PI includes a person's capacity to recognize and capitalize on their strengths while at the same time compensate for their weaknesses. It includes the ability to accomplish personally valued goals and find a more optimal fit between the individual and the demands of the individual's environment by adapting to the environment, shaping it, or selecting a new environment.

Personal Intelligence. Gardner (1983; 1993) conceptualizes Personal Intelligence as consisting of intrapersonal intelligence and interpersonal intelligence. The former involves self-awareness and self-regulation, whereas the latter involves social awareness and relationship management. Intrapersonal intelligence in this model involves having access to one's internal emotional states and being able to distinguish subtle differences between states. Interpersonal intelligence involves not one's own feelings, but rather the capacity to read the moods, intentions, and desires of others, sometimes called empathy, and potentially to act on this knowledge. Personal intelligence is correlated with both EI and psychological mindedness (McCallum & Piper, 1997)

MODELS AND MEASURES OF EI

EI has its direct roots in the literature on social, practical, personal and multiple intelligence spanning much of the 20th century. EI emerged more explicitly as a field with the emergence of the concept of Emotional Quotient (EQ) (Bar-On, 1997; Cooper & Sawaf, 1997). The phrase "emotional intelligence" was first used in 1989 (Salovey & Mayer, 1989) and skyrocketed to the public's attention and to organizational domains with the publication of the books titled *Emotional Intelligence* (Goleman, 1995) and

Working With Emotional Intelligence (Goleman, 1998) respectively. The field has developed considerably since those books' publication, as suggested by the recently published more scholarly *Handbook of Emotional Intelligence* (Bar-On & Parker, 2000), and has also been comprehensively applied to the workplace (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Weisinger, 1998). An overview comparing and contrasting several prominent models and measures of EI are presented in the following sections, along with their strengths and weakness.

The models and measures of EI can be divided into self-report measures and those based on performance. Examples of measures in the former category include those by Bar-On (1997), Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso (2000), Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee (2000) and Simmons (1997). Performance based assessment methodologies require test-takers to identify particular emotions from photographs of facial expression, videotaped monologues and written samples (Mayer, DiPaolo, & Salovey, 1990),

Goleman's Emotional Competence Inventory. Goleman presents a broad model and measure of EI that includes both self and others' report (Goleman, 1995, 1998; Boyatzis, Goleman, Rhee (2000). Goleman maintains that people's intelligence in solving academic problems says very little about their ability to succeed in solving practical problems in the "real world". Fox & Spector (1999) provide interview outcome evidence that job acquisition depends largely on EI rather than IQ. They demonstrate that IQ and EI are distinct and that the latter provides unique contributions to workplace success. These distinctions are supported through extensive research programs (Sternberg, 2000; Sternberg & Wagner, 1986) which have demonstrated that people adept at one may not

be so in the other (Sternberg, 2000; Rogoff & Lave, 1984), and that there exist individual differences in performance beyond I.Q (Murphy, 1996).

Consistent with the intelligence literature (Gardner, 1983; Sternberg, 2000) is Goleman's assertion that only 20% of the variance of people's professional, interpersonal, and social success is accounted for by cognitive intelligence tests. Within that literature, it is argued that the remaining 80% is explained by personality traits, motivations, and multiple interpersonal and social abilities, of which EI is only one (Bar-On & Parker, 2000; Sternberg, 2000). In contrast, Goleman concludes that most of that 80% remaining is explained entirely by EI. Specifically, the more globally encompassing components of Goleman's model of EI (1995) include the ability to monitor oneself and persist in the face of frustrations, to be able to control impulses and delay gratification, and to be able to regulate one's moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think. According to Goleman (1998), EI additionally emphasizes the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships.

Based on these competency categories, as well as those obtained from hundreds of validated performance studies of managers, executives, and leaders in North America (Spencer & Spencer, 1993), Boyatzis, Goleman & Rhee (2000) developed a comprehensive list of noncognitive competencies, which they factor and cluster analyzed. These results led to their empirically based list of five clusters (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000, p. 355). This list included a "Self-Awareness" cluster which is comprised of Emotional Awareness, Accurate Self-Assessment, and Self-Confidence; a Self-Management cluster which included the following dimensions: Self-Control,

Trustworthiness, Conscientiousness, Adaptability; Achievement Orientation (initiative); a Social Awareness Cluster which included Empathy, Organizational Awareness and Service Orientation; and a Social Skills cluster which included Leadership, Communication, Influence, Change Catalyst, Conflict Management, Building Bonds, Teamwork Collaboration, and Developing Others.

These categories comprised the latest version of the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) (Boyatzis & Burckle, 1999). This inventory claims to account for a great deal of the non-cognitive intelligence variance in organizational performance. Though research as to the validity of this conceptualization of EI is limited, a recent study by Boyatzis (1999) suggests that experienced organizational consultants that were ranked as superior along these EI competencies, contributed significantly more profit to the firm from their accounts, as compared to those whose performance ranked as average along these competencies. Moreover, McClelland (1999) demonstrated that the bonuses paid to top executives, associated with their division's financial performance, were highly predictive by whether they were in the superior rather than the average range of EI competencies as measured by this inventory. Whether the ECI is a useful measure in practical applications, however, may depend on whether the organizational context in which it is used is broad, complex, and varied. In such contexts, numerous and varied competencies are likely to be needed and tests like the ECI are more likely to be effective. A major disadvantage of using an all encompassing net such as the ECI is that it is unclear as to what is being measured, and thus the test may be likely to be less predictive when narrower questions regarding emotional regulation are evaluated.

Sternberg (1999) as well as Davies, Stankov, & Roberts (1998) argue that Goleman's conceptualization of EI is indeed too all-encompassing. They note that it is highly correlated with many areas of personality (e.g., extroversion) and motivation (e.g., achievement drive). Sternberg notes that, in addition to EI, Goleman's model also includes many aspects of social and PI such as interpersonal skills, flexibility, managing self, and managing others. For the construct of EI, Sternberg favors the considerably more restrictive model of Salovey & Mayer (1989) over that of Goleman. The implication of this distinction to consultation is that in organizational settings that are more clearly emotionally charged, wherein the ability to identify others' emotions and regulate one's own emotions are the paramount competencies needed, the broad brush of the ECI is likely to fall short (Sternberg, 1999b). Rather, a more restrictive model and measure of EI is warranted, which focuses primarily on the identification and regulation of emotion. Mayer & Salovey present the best known of such models.

Mayer & Salovey: Multifactor EI Scale (MEIS). Mayer & Salovey coined the term "emotional intelligence" over a decade ago (Salovey and Mayer, 1989) and defined it narrowly as the ability to perceive and understand emotional information, or more specifically 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" (Salovey and Mayer, 1989, p.189). More recently, Mayer & Salovey (1993) and Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso (2000) identified four components of EI: the accurate perception and adaptive expression of emotion; emotional facilitation of thinking; understanding and analyzing emotions; employing emotional knowledge; and the reflective regulation of emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth. Their Multifactor EI Scale (MEIS) (Mayer,

Salovey, & Caruso, 2000) was intended to reliably measure these four factors. Its four scales have internal consistency alphas ranging from .81 to .96 with a full-scale alpha of .96.

The MEIS (Mayer & Salovey, 1993) is based on a narrower model than the ECI (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000). This has the advantage of high construct and content validity in organizational contexts in which the identification and regulation of emotions are of paramount importance and need to dominate the consultant's conceptualization of EI. However, if contexts call for including other constructs (e.g., extroversion or personal motivation) as part of the EI measure, Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee's (2000) model has the advantage of being much broader in scope.

Secondly, the method by which the two tests gather information are qualitatively different. The ECI is based on how the person being evaluated is perceived by others, in contrast to the MEIS, which is based on a behavioral measure (the person's ability or performance on a EI related task such as identifying the emotion of a person in a story or photograph). Because it is performance-based, the MEIS is independent of the person's reputation, making it less susceptible to rater bias.

To elaborate, the methodology of the MEIS involves the person being tested viewing a picture of a face or reading a scenario using interactive multimedia on a computer screen. The person is then asked, "What emotion is the person in the story feeling?". This approach is thought to represent a person's actual EI capacity rather than someone else's opinion of that capacity (Mayer & Salovey, 1993). A correct answer is judged by normative consistencies within our culture as well as evolutionary cross-cultural universals regarding the categorization and labeling of emotions (Ekman, 1973).

This qualitative difference in how the data is acquired suggests that the MEIS is likely to have higher external or ecological validity than the ECI. Additional research is needed, however, fully to evaluate this possible difference.

One way of compensating for the limitations of the self-report approach is to incorporate into an assessment tool a set of validity scales. Such a mechanism was implemented in another prominent EI instrument developed by Bar-On (1997).

Reuven Bar-On: Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). The third prominent model and measure reviewed here are those developed by Bar-On (1997). Bar-On was the first to use the abbreviation EQ (Emotional Quotient) and defined it as "an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures" (Bar-On , 1997, p. 14). This conceptualization led to his developing a self report measure, the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i).

The advantage of the EQ-i is that it is quite comprehensive, which can also be a disadvantage. Like the ECI, the EQ-I also attempts to measure both personality and intellectual dimensions as well as emotional dimensions. The scale has 133 items organized within five categories, each of which has several subcategories. The category of *intrapersonal abilities* largely overlaps with the other models' dimensions of emotional perception and expression, and includes the subcategories of Emotional Self-Awareness, Assertiveness, Self-Regard, And Self-Actualization. The second category of *interpersonal abilities* Includes Interpersonal Relationships, Social Responsibility, and Empathy. This construct overlaps with Goleman's ECI category of social awareness but not with Mayer & Salovey's (1993) MEIS which does emphasize social interactions. The

category of Adaptability includes problem solving, reality testing, and flexibility. The category of stress management includes stress tolerance and impulse control. And the category of general mood includes happiness and optimism. The latter three categories are largely unique to the EQ model. The EQ-i's four scales have internal consistency alphas ranging from .69 to .89 with a full-scale alpha of .76 (Bar-On, 1997).

Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso (2000) criticized the EQ-i's inclusiveness, noting that the full scale correlates highly with measures of personality (e.g., optimism) and mental ability (e.g., problem solving), which is why they refer to it as a mixed model. Its inclusiveness however, may also account for its ability to predict occupational performance, job satisfaction, and the ability to cope with work-related stress (Bar-On, 1997). The contrast between Bar-On's general model of EI and Mayer & Salovey's narrower model may explain the modest correlation between them ($r=.36$, Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). A more detailed account comparing their subscales can be found in Bar-On, 1997 and Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi (2000). The fact that the EQ-i utilizes a self report measure whereas the MEIS utilizes an ability measure may additionally help explain the low correlation between them. The EQ-i does incorporate several validity scales, including those that assess the respondent's tendency to have exaggerated positive or negative responses. The score's adjusted based on those validity scores.

Implications for Organizational Consultants. The relatively weak relationship between these scales, which are supposed to be measuring something similar, suggests that they may be measuring somewhat different constructs or at least different aspects of the same construct. This conclusion has significant implications to both investigators and

organizational consultants. Academic researchers studying EI must conceptually and empirically reconcile weak correlations between existing instruments that are all ostensibly measuring EI (Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000). Either the models or measures need revising, or more apt names for what they are really measuring are needed.

Organizational consultants must therefore be careful not to assume that there is a single, universally accepted measure of EI. It is likely that the three measures of EI reviewed here are measuring divergent skills, and that the format which the measures utilize in data acquisition may impact the validity of that data. In particular, self-report measures of EI (e.g., ECI) are more likely to have poor criterion validity and have low relation to performance-based measures of EI (e.g., MEIS) (Janovics & Christiansen, 2001).

As a practical matter, in organizational settings in which report bias is more likely, performance based measures of EI are particularly warranted (Smither, 1998). For example, in the area of personnel selection (Cook, 1998), the ECI is likely to be more biased than the MEIS given the risk of self assessment distortion among job applicants (Jeanneret & Silzer, 1998). In organizational contexts in which more inclusive measures are useful, the ECI's self-report bias must be weighed against its comprehensive scope, which in this context is advantages. The EQ-i provides an option for measuring a more comprehensive conceptualization of EI with self-report methods, while at the same time using built-in validity scales to compensate for report bias.

Other models of EI. Davis (1996) and Marlow (1986) conceive of EI as social perspective taking and empathy- the ability to free oneself from one's own view and to

recognize and understand the thoughts, feelings, and motives of the self and others. Indeed EI, as measured by the MEIS, correlates with self-reported empathy ($r=.43$) (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). Additionally, Bar-On's (1997) conceptualization of EQ explicitly includes empathy among its list of interpersonal abilities, and is shown to be inversely correlated with antisocial characteristics ($r= -.52$) and aggression ($r= -.45$) (Bar-On, 1997). This suggests that the more empathy an individual has, the higher his EI and the less likely he is to act inappropriately or aggress in social situations. In terms of consulting, these measures of empathy are especially encouraged for implementation in organizational situations wherein frustration, anger, and aggression have historically been found to be frequent or intense. Which measure is most valid in which context has yet to be evaluated.

Cooper (1996) proposed another globally inclusive model of EI he calls the EQ-Map. He defined EQ as "the ability to sense, understand and effectively apply the power and acumen of emotions as a source of human energy, information, trust, creativity, and influence" (Cooper, 1996, p.1). He conceptualized EQ using five major dimensions with several subscales in each. Like most EI models, the model includes an Emotional Awareness dimension with the subscales of Self-Awareness, Emotional Expression, and Emotional Awareness of Others. However, like Goleman's ECI and Bar-On's EQ-i, Cooper's model is highly inclusive. Among its additional dimensions are Competencies that include Intentionality, Creativity, Resilience, Interpersonal Connections, and Constructive Discontent. The EQ-Map also includes a Values and Attitudes dimension that is composed of Outlook, Compassion, Intuition, Trust, Personal Power, and Integrated Self subscales. Unlike other EI models, it also aims to capture information on

the Current Environment of an individual who is attempting to adapt to that environment, operationalized by Cooper in terms of the Life Pressures and Life Satisfaction subscales. This makes it more consistent with systems theory models of emotions (Robins & Novaco, 1999). Also unique to the EQ-Map was Cooper's inclusion of a dimension of Outcomes which lists General Health, Quality of Life, Relationship Quotient, and Optimal Performance subscales. Given its highly inclusive and comprehensive structure, the EQ-Map is a good measure if more than emotional dimensions are the focus of study. In particular, if a consultant's aim is to also evaluate interpersonal and environmental dimensions, the EQ-Map is likely to be a better choice of comprehensive inventories as compared to the ECI and the EQ-i.

Davies, Stankov, and Roberts (1998) provided an even more limited conceptualization of EI than Mayer & Salovey. They conducted an empirical evaluation of the construct and discriminant validity of EI models using a wide variety of instruments of cognitive aptitudes, verbal abilities, social functioning, and personality variables. They concluded that once personality variables, traditional intelligence, and general cognitive abilities factors are accounted for, there is very little variance left for EI but the "the ability to perceive emotional information in visual and auditory stimuli" which is how they define and measure EI (Davies et. al., 1998, p. 1001). They consequently suggested that the current models of EI may be describing something other than a single, distinct construct. More details on these and other models can be found in Bar-On & Parker (2000, pp. 320-388) and Cherniss & Goleman (2001, pp.83-132).

CRITICISMS AND LIMITATIONS OF EI

Despite the exuberance regarding EI in both academic and organizational settings, there have also been those who have criticized the construct, due in some part to that very exuberance (Fisher, 1998; Shiller, 2000). Among those critics, Barrett, Miguel, Tan, & Hurd (2001) are perhaps the most ardent skeptics of both the construct of EI as well as its testing, which they perceive to be simply a subset of personality testing. Barrett et al. (2001) presented a comprehensive meta-analysis that they argued provided converging evidence that EI lacks both validity and reliability. They noted that Goleman's assertion that EI is more important than cognitive abilities was based on data that they contend supported exactly the opposite findings. Moreover, they argued that the construct validity and operational measurement of EI constructs is inadequate (Barrett 1992). In particular, they contended that a scale from one EI test which predicts job performance in one organization cannot be generalized to another test having a scale with the same name (Barrett et al., 2001). In this paper, the authors indeed present a comprehensive set of examples in which EI advocates seemed guilty of selectively reporting and excluding data, making of claims without empirical evidence to support those claims, and the convenient relabeling of phenomena to support their assertions (Barrett et al., 2001). In reporting these negative EI results from their prodigious meta-analysis however, they contrasted them from the positive results in which EI dimensions were shown to be highly relevant to predicting successes in the workplace. Thus, although they identified genuine weaknesses that future EI researchers need to address, the field of EI itself also presented a considerable set of positive results (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001) that need to be categorized, quantified, and standardized to better understand the conditions under

which those results occur and find a common language to communicate about them in the scientific and consulting literatures.

EI IN THE WORKPLACE

Despite the diversity among EI models and the heated debates regarding their validity and reliability, there is a growing body of evidence that suggests that whatever EI is, it seems to be relevant to the workplace, can be promoted through training, and potentially has significant implications to the bottom line (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001). A comprehensive review of the effects of EI in the workplace can be found in Goleman (1998), who asserts, e.g., that in leadership nearly 90 percent of the competencies necessary for success are social and emotional in nature including self-confidence, flexibility, empathy, and the ability to get along with others (Lusch & Serpkeuci, 1990; McClland, 1999; Rosier, 1996; Spencer & Spencer, 1993).

In their comprehensive volume regarding EI in the workplace, Cherniss & Goleman (2001) reported several key findings. Among sales representatives for a large American appliance manufacturer, those who were most *conscientious* (defined by EI related dimensions such as self-disciplined, careful, and scrupulous) had the largest volume of sales (Cherniss & Goleman (2001, p. 34). Concerning hiring, training, and managing performance, it appears that star performers do not have to be at ceiling on every EI measure in order to demonstrate superior performance, but rather only to pass a threshold on several of the measures across Goleman's four clusters (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001, pp. 159-181). In terms of hiring at the highest level of the organization, data from over 500 top executive hires across three continents, demonstrated that the usual process of just using technical skill and measures of cognitive ability are lacking.

Emotional competencies are reported to be better predictors of success (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001, pp. 182-206) and consequently are recommended to be counted more heavily than one's intellectual ability score as a method for improving senior-level hiring practices. Consultants advising applicants should note that EI predicts both the interviewer's affective response and their likelihood of hire (Fox & Spector, 1999).

Very recent work that is currently being published is beginning to shed light on team-based EI measures (Workgroup EI Profile, Version 3 (WEIP-3) (Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Hooper, 2002 forthcoming). These early findings suggest that high EI teams outperform low EI teams but only in the initial stage of their tasks. Over time, their performance seems to equalize. These results suggest that EI in the workplace provides a similar expertise and cohesiveness that emerges over time experientially. That savings of time for reaching proficient collaboration among group members may significantly enhance the bottom line.

Selecting for EI

Some studies (e.g., Harris Education Research Council, 1991) have suggested that more than half of employees lack the motivation to keep learning and improving in their jobs. It is also suggested that 40% are not able to work cooperatively with fellow employees, and only 19% of those applying for entry-level jobs have sufficient self-discipline in their work habits (Harris Education Research Council, 1991). This implies the need for careful selection of new hires.

An EI competency-based selection program was implemented by L'Oreal for hiring sales people (Spencer & Spencer, 1993). In an interview, applicants were asked to generate several positive and negative situations that they were then asked to resolve.

Their responses were analyzed for EI competencies and applicants scoring highest on those were hired. The competency based selected employees were estimated to have generated a total of \$2,558,360 more revenue annually than their counterparts who were selected by the traditional criterion of cognitive skills and technical knowledge. Such results support the use of EI instruments as screening tools for selecting employees. As is pointed out in other sections, given the weaknesses of any one tool, using multiple tools is likely to provide greater validity.

Consulting to Increase EI in the Workplace

American industry currently spends over \$50 billion each year on training and four out of five leading-edge companies report that EI is one of the areas they are trying to promote in that training (American Society for Training and Development, 1997; Cherniss & Adler, 2000). Burke & Day (1986) conducted a meta-analysis of the effectiveness of management training programs, many of which are the precursors of today's EI training. They found that human relations training programs were, on average, highly effective as evaluated by both objective measures such as performance and absenteeism or subjective measures such as self awareness and behavior ratings by coworkers and supervisors. Such training can result in more than a standard deviation of improvement in performance (Bar-On & Parker, 2000, p. 437; Latham & Frayne, 1989), an increase that “is worth between 19 percent and 48 percent of economic value added in nonsales jobs and results in a 48 to 120 percent increase in productivity in sales jobs (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001, p. 48).

Goldstein and Sorcher (1974) pioneered a set of techniques that can be seen as being directly related to modern EI concepts. Their approach used modeling, role playing

practice, feedback, and reinforcement for training supervisors to be more effective in handling the interpersonal aspects of their jobs. Their methods included the use of training videos to simulate the appropriate behaviors for addressing problematic workplace situations. Once key aspects of those behaviors were discussed, the trainee would emulate those behaviors and be reinforced towards mastery level performance. This type of modeling training has been reported to be highly effective (Russ-Eft & Zenger, 1997).

A more recent trend involves that of executive coaching (Kilburg, 2002; Goldsmith, Lyons, & Freas, 2000), wherein a wide range of managers and executives' EI competencies are evaluated and individualized programs for improvement of those competencies are developed and implemented. Outcome studies of such programs indicate that the targeted competencies are significantly improved relative to nontargeted competencies in the same person (Cherniss & Adler, 2000; Peterson, 1996) but far more empirical research is needed (Kampa-Kokesch & White, 2002).

Given results of this kind, MBA programs such as that found in Case Western Reserve University's Weatherhead School of Management have begun to explicitly provide training for social and emotional competencies as part of their curriculum. As a result, compared to their counterparts who proceed through the more traditional program, there is evidence that students who are provided with the EI training, longitudinally demonstrate positive change in initiative, flexibility, achievement drive, empathy, self-confidence, persuasiveness, networking, self-control, and group management (Boyatzis, 1996).

Based on the existing research, the Consortium for Research on EI in Organizations has recently empirically identified the factors that most effectively lead to social and emotional learning in work settings (Cherniss, Goleman, Emmerling, Cowan, & Adler, 1998), and which constitute the modern EI training protocol. First, given the neural and behavioral entrenchment of emotional pathways, repeated practice is needed to facilitate change with the expectation that it will take time and there will be setbacks. Techniques for maintaining a client's motivation must be implemented regularly.

In the first phase of change using such approaches, a consultant evaluates the competencies that the organization demands and in which the client is apparently lacking (Spencer, McClelland, and Kelner, 1997) and must both enable the client to see the benefits of mastering those competencies as well as socialize him to the process of acquiring them through cognitive, behavioral, and physiological changes. For example, supervisors are more likely to work towards gaining empathy if they feel confident that increasing their empathic responses will produce more committed, motivated, and productive employees (Davis, 1996; Marlow, 1986). One must also evaluate whether the client is committed and realistic as to the requirements for change. If not, more time should be spent on increasing the client's motivation to change. Once the motivation is high, specific, meaningful, realistic goals are likely to maintain that motivation (Lock & Latham, 1990). These goals should be developed in collaboration with the client so that the consultant is not pursuing goals that are contrary to the client's objectives. Importantly, the organization should provide a supportive environment for developing, practicing, and encouraging the EI competencies. This includes having in place supervisors who will both model and reinforce those competencies (Manz & Sims, 1986).

In the second phase, the client attempts several changes. He seeks to improve his ability to identify his own emotions and to distinguish them from the emotions of others and improve his ability to use multiple and increasingly subtle cues to identify others' emotions. In this phase the client additionally attempts to increase his empathy in regarding others' emotions, improve his ability to identify contingencies between cognitive appraisals and emotions, and improve his ability to regulate his emotions. The client also learns to integrate thoughts, emotions, and physiological arousal and behavior to achieve social tasks, increase tolerance for ambiguity and complexity of emotional experiences, identify environmental cues that influence emotions, and develop reward contingencies for practicing higher EI.

Much of this work is quite interpersonal and a good relationship must therefore be established between the consultant and the client. Because emotional states have behavioral and physiological components and are thus highly experiential (Ekman & Davidson, 1994), a good deal of the EI training needs to be experiential (Robins & Hayes, 1993). This requires repeated practice and role playing, with feedback and homework between sessions to continue practicing the new emotional responses and behavioral techniques. A final step of this phase is to inform clients that setbacks are inevitable and should not be taken as a sign of failure. This can help prevent relapse, which adds considerable value to the training and which has been found among management to help increase transfer of skills to the job (Tziner, Haccoun, & Kadish, 1991).

Although clients are, in this model by this phase, able to implement EI competencies, that implementation is not necessarily fluent nor automatic. In the third

and last phase, therefore, clients need to be encouraged to form social support groups with similarly minded people who also want to practice their EI skills and will provide mutual reinforcement (Powell, 1994). As a last step of an EI intervention, the consultant should evaluate the outcome of that intervention. This includes not just using measures such as the ECI or EQ-i to assess EI competencies gained, but also evaluating the intervention's effectiveness with other measures of performance and productivity (Jeanneret & Silzer, 1998; Smither, 1998). Unfortunately, outcome measures are rarely taken and when they are, they are usually in the form of participants' opinions of the intervention (American Society for Training and Development, 1997).

As a point of caution, some EI intervention effects may be misleading. For example, American Express implemented an emotional competence program for its financial advisors (Hays, 1999). Although those in the program were reported to have experienced an 18.1% increase in business performance, it was only 1.9% higher than the 16.2% increase for control group members who did not participate in the training. Other EI effects, when promoted in isolation, may actually be detrimental to performance. Emotional regulation of anger, e.g., may result in reduced overall levels of functioning. In organizational systems in which anger serves a particular and necessary function (Robins & Novaco, 1999), the unilateral reduction of anger may cause the valuable part of the function no longer to be addressed. An executive's anger, e.g., may have come to be the instigating factor for increasing employees' motivation (Steers & Porter, 1991), and eliminating that anger may eliminate the motivation. It is therefore recommended that a systems analysis be conducted prior to undertaking EI interventions, predicting in

advance possible adverse perturbations that may result in that system, and address system-wide changes in congruence with the EI intervention.

The Consultant's Own EI

Consulting for EI often necessitates consulting with EI. The consultant must communicate information, not just with technical skill, but with positive role modelling of EI as well. For example, considerable empathy is often needed in assisting a client with the task of changing his perception of self and others. The general process of consulting involves going into a new domain that is often conflict ridden, trying to understand the dynamics of that domain, and attempting to facilitate positive outcomes (Hale, 1998). Inevitably, the consultant will run into internal politics, power struggles, animosity, group affiliation pulls and pushes, and the complex emotion currents of the organization (Brown, Pryzwansky, & Schulte, 2000). Although consulting is often interesting, curious, and satisfying, the nature of the job can also promote frustration, anger, and anxiety (Deutsch & Coleman, 2000). If that were not the case, the organization probably wouldn't need a consultant. In order to meet these consulting challenges, one must have the competency of identifying those emotions when they occur in others and self, and be able to regulate them (Deutsch & Coleman, 2000). Moreover, emotional responses from employees and executives, if perceived with EI, can provide information that speaks volumes (Brown, Pryzwansky, & Schulte, 2000; Schwarz & Clore, 1988).

The consultation processes themselves thus seem to demand at least a moderate amount of EI. A consultant, particularly if hired to train clients for EI, needs that much more of it as she is also serving as an example for the clients' observational learning. The

clients are acquiring EI both through factual information acquisition as well as through observing the emotional responses of the consultant (Russ-Eft & Zenger, 1997). This implies that consultants in the EI realm have a responsibility to continue to develop their own EI competencies and that organizations should use a consultant's level of EI as part of their process for selection.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Emotions and EI have been established as being highly relevant aspects of the workplace. The weak relationship between EI scales suggests that they may be measuring somewhat different constructs or at least different aspects of the same construct. This conclusion has implications to both investigators and organizational consultants. Academic researchers studying EI must reconcile the weak correlations among existing measures that are ostensibly measuring EI. They need to either converge on a few theoretical models and operationalized measures of EI that improve on those correlations or rename the existing instruments as to more accurately reflect the diverse constructs they are measuring. Concurrently, consultants must recognize the likelihood that present models and measures of EI are likely to be identifying divergent skills and thus must decide when and where to apply each scale. Empirical studies of the discriminant and convergent validity of scales based on the existing EI models have barely begun but already reveal that the comprehensive models of EI seem to include both emotional measures as well as reinvention of older concepts such as personality, whereas the narrower models may indeed be measuring a genuinely novel construct.

As a practical matter, whether or not the more inclusive models and scales are measuring constructs other than EI may be an issue of greater concern to the researcher

than to the organizational executive. EI, personality traits, and thinking abilities are all useful for the workplace and need to be measured, regardless of how they are parsed out linguistically. Although the narrower scales are more likely measuring just EI, it is likely rare that an executive would want a potential employee to have only high EI but not positive personality traits or high intelligence. The exception might be a case wherein emotional regulation skills are a specific priority and the employer does not want to dilute the effects of measuring it with other constructs. Otherwise, the worries about the construct and content validity of the various measures of EI should be left to the academics, whereas the practical usefulness of using multiple measures can be enjoyed by consultants and their clients.

REFERENCES

- American Dialect Society (1999). *American Dialect Society: Words of the year*.
Available: <http://www.americandialect.org/woty>.
- American Society for Training and Development. (1997). *Benchmarking forum member-to-member survey results*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Ashforth, B. E. & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48, 97-125.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Hartel, C. E. J., and Zerbe, W. J. (Eds.). (2000). *Emotions in the workplace: Research, theory, and practice*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Averill, J. R. (1982). *Anger and aggression: An essay on emotion*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Baltes, P. B. & Staudinger, U. M. (1996). *Interactive Minds: Life-span perspectives on the social foundation of cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bar-On, R. & Parker. J. D. A. (Eds.) (2000). *The handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Technical Manual*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Barrett, G. V. (1992). Clarifying construct validity: Definitions, processes, and models. *Human Performance*, 5, 13-58.
- Barrett, G. V., Miguel, R. F, Tan, J. A., Hurud, J. M. (2001). *Emotional intelligence: The Madison Avenue approach to science and professional practice*. Paper presented at the 16th Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA. April 2001.

- Beck, J. (1995). *Cognitive therapy: Basics and beyond*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1996). Competencies can be developed, but not in the way we thought. *Capability*, 2, 25-41.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1999). *The financial impact of competencies in leadership and management of consulting firms*. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University, Department of Organizational Behavior.
- Boyatzis, R. E. & Burckle, M. (1999). *Psychometric properties of the ECI: Technical note*. Boston: Hay/McBer Group.
- Boyatzis, R. E., D. Goleman, and K.S. Rhee. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI). In *Handbook of emotional intelligence*, R. Bar-On & J. D. Parker, editors. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown D., Pryzwansky, W. B., & Schulte, A. C. (2000). Organizational consultation. In *Psychological consultation: Introduction to theory and practice* (pp. 85-107). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. (1998, July). *Workplace violence, 1992-1996* (National Crime Victimization Survey, NCJ-168634). Washington, DC: Author.
- Burke, M., & Day, R. (1986). A Cumulative Study of the Effectiveness of Managerial Training. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 232-245.
- Buss, D. (1999). *Evolutionary Psychology: The new science of the mind*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Cannon, W. (1932). *The wisdom of the body*. New York: Norton.

- Cantor, N. & Kihlstrom, J. (1987). *Personality and social intelligence*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cavaiola, A. A. & Lavender, N. J. (2000). *Toxic coworkers: How to deal with dysfunctional people on the job*. Oakland, CA: New Harbinger Publications, Inc.
- Center for Disease Control (1992). *Homicide in the U.S. workplace: A strategy for prevention and research* (NIOSH Publication No. 92-103). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cherniss, C., Goleman, D., Emmerling, R., Cowan, K., & Adler, M. (1998). *Bringing emotional intelligence to the workplace*. New Brunswick, NJ: Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations, Rutgers University.
- Cherniss, C. & Adler, M. (2000). *Promoting emotional intelligence in organizations*. Alexandria: American Society for Training & Development.
- Cherniss, C. & Goleman, D. (Eds). (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations. From the Consortium for Research on emotional intelligence in Organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ciarrochi, J. V., Chan, A. Y. C., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 539-561.
- Cook, M. (1998). *Personnel Selection* (3rd Edition). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cooper, R. K. (1996). *EQ map interpretation guide*. San Francisco: AIT and Essi Systems.

- Cooper, R. K. & Sawaf, A. (1996). *Executive EQ: emotional intelligence in leadership and organizations*. New York: Grosset/Putnam.
- Dalgleish, T. & Power, M. J., (1999). (Eds). *The handbook of cognition and emotion*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Damasio, A. R. (1994). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain*. New York: Avon Books.
- Darwin, C. (1872/1962). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals*. New York: Appleton. (1965, Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Davies, M., Stankov, L., & Roberts, R. D. (1998). Emotional intelligence: In search of an elusive construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 989-1015.
- Davis, M. H. (1996). *Empathy: A social psychological approach*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Deutsch, M. & Coleman, P. T. (2000) (Eds). *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Ekman, P. (1973). Cross-cultural studies of facial expression. In P. Ekman (Ed.), *Darwin and facial expression: A century of research in review*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 169-222.
- Ekman, P., & Davidson, R. J. (Eds.). (1994). *The nature of emotion: Fundamental questions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, A. (1993). Reflections on rational-emotive therapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61, 199-201.

Epictetus (A.C.E. 50-130). *Handbook of Epictetus* (2nd printing, N. White, Trans.1985). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.

Fineman, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Emotions in organizations* (Vol. 2). London: Sage.

Fisher, A. (1998, October 26). Success secret: A high emotional IQ. *Fortune*, 293-298.

Fitness, J. (2000). Anger in the workplace: an emotion script approach to anger episodes between workers and their superiors, co-workers, and subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (Special Issue - Emotions in Organizations), 21, 147-162.

Fox, S. & Spector, P. E. (1999). Relations of emotional intelligence, practical intelligence, general intelligence, and trait affectivity with interview outcomes: It's not all just 'G'. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1-18.

Freud, S. (1894). The defence neuro-psychoses. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Sigmund Freud: Collected papers, Vol. 1*. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Frijda, N. H. (1993). The place of appraisal in emotion. *Cognition and Emotion*, 7, 357-388.

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

Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligence*. New York: Basic Books.

Gleason, S. E. (1997). *Workplace dispute resolution: Directions for the twenty-first century*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Goldsmith, M., Lyons, L. & Freas, A. (2000). *Coaching for leadership: How the world's greatest coaches help leaders learn*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

- Goldstein, A. P., & Sorcher, M. (1974). *Changing supervisory behavior*. New York: Pergamon.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Gracian, B. (1647). *Oraculo manual yarte de prudencia*. [Tranlated in Dutch]
- Grandey, A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1*, 61-75.
- Gross, J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology, 2*, 271-299.
- Hale, J. (1998). *The performance consultant's fieldbook: Tools and techniques for improving organizations and people*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
- Harris Education Research Council. (1991). *An assessment of American education*. New York.
- Hays, S. (1999, July). American Express taps into the power of emotional intelligence. *Workforce, 78*(7), 72-74.
- Hunt, T. (1928). The measurement of social intelligence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 12*, 317-334.
- James, W. (1884). What is an emotion? *Mind, 9*, 188-205.
- Janovics, J. & Christiansen, N. D. (2001, April). *Emotional intelligence in the workplace*. Paper presented at the sixteenth Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, California.

Jeanneret, R. & Silzer, R. (Eds.) (1998). *Individual psychological assessment: Predicting behaviors in organizational settings*.

San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jordan, P. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., Hartel, C. E. & Hooper, G. S. (2002 forthcoming).

Workgroup emotional intelligence: Scale development and relationship to team process effectiveness and goal focus. *Human Resource Management Review*.

Kampa-Kokesch, S., & White, R.P. (2002). The effectiveness of executive coaching:

What we know and what we still need to know. In R.L. Lowman (Ed.),

Handbook of organizational consulting psychology [***ED:

ADD PAGES IN FINAL***. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kilburg, R.R. (2002). Individual interventions in consulting psychology.

In R.L. Lowman (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational consulting psychology* [***ED: **ADD PAGES IN FINAL*****. San

Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Latham, G. P. & Frayne, C. A. (1989). Self-management training for increasing job

attendance: A follow-up and a replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 411-416.

Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion & adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

LeDoux, J. (1996). *The emotional brain: the mysterious underpinnings of emotional life*.

New York: Touchstone.

- Lewis, M., Alessandri, S. M., & Sullivan, M. W. (1990). Violation of expectancy, loss of control, and anger expressions in young infants. *Developmental Psychology, 26*, 745-751.
- Lewis, M., & Haviland-Jones, J. M. (2000). *Handbook of emotions* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Lock, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lusch, R. F., & Serpkeuci, R. (1990). Personal differences, job tension, job outcomes, and store performance: A study of retail managers. *Journal of Marketing, 54*, 85-101.
- Manz, H. P., & Sims. (1986). Beyond imitation: Complex behavioral and affective linkages resulting from exposure to leadership training models. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 571-578.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.
- Marlow, H. A. (1986). Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78*, 52-58.
- Mayer, J. D., DiPaolo, M. T., & Salovey, P. (1990). Perceiving affective content in ambiguous visual stimuli: A component of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 54*, 772-781.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence, 17*, 433-442.

- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, E. (2000). Emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (2nd ed., pp. 396-421). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayne, T. J. & Bonanno, G. A. (2001). *Emotions: Current issues and future directions*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- McCallum, M. & Piper, W. E. (Eds.). (1997). *Psychological mindedness: A contemporary understanding*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McClelland, D. C. (1999). Identifying competencies with behavioral-event interviews. *Psychological Science*, 9, 331-339.
- Meichenbaum, D. (1990). Evolution of cognitive behavior therapy: Origins, tenets and clinical examples. In J. Zeig (Ed.), *The evolution of psychotherapy: II* (pp. 96-115). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Moore, C. W. (1996). *The mediation process: Practical strategies for resolving conflict* (2nd edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Murphy, K. R. (1996). *Individual differences and behavior in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Novaco, R. W. (1986). Anger as a clinical and social problem. In R. J. Blanchard & D.C. Blanchard (Eds.), *Advances in the Study of Aggression* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-67). New York: Academic Press.
- Ortony, A., Clore, G. L. & Collins (1988). *The cognitive structure of emotions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Peterson, D. B. (1996). Executive coaching at work: The art of one-on-one change. *Consulting Psychology Journal*, 48, 78-86.

- Potter-Efron, R. T. (1998). *Working anger: Preventing and resolving conflict on the job*. Oakland, CA: New Harbinger Publications.
- Powell, T. J. (1994). *Understanding self-help: Frameworks and findings*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Resnick, P. J. & Kausch, O. (1995). Violence in the workplace and the role of the consultant. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 47, 213-222.
- Robins, S. (2000). *Wisdom therapy: The application of an interdisciplinary concept to organizational and clinical interventions*. Invited talk given at the Colloquium Series at the California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.
- Robins, S. (1998, June). *Wisdom, adaptation, & automaticity as mediating links in the causal chain of cognitive appraisal and emotion*. Presentation at the 10th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Society, Washington, D.C.
- Robins, C. J., & Hayes, A. M. (1993). An appraisal of cognitive therapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61, 205-214.
- Robins, S. & Novaco, R. (1999). A systems conceptualization and treatment of anger. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 55, 325-337.
- Rogoff, B. & Lave, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Everyday cognition: Its development in social context*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rosier, R. H. (Ed.). (1996). *The competency model handbook* (Vol. 3). Boston: Linkage.
- Russ-Eft, D. F., & Zenger, J. H. (1997). Behavior modeling training in North America: A research summary. In L. J. Bassi & D. F. Rus-Eft (Eds.), *What works* (pp. 89-109). Alexandria, VA: American Society of Training and Development.

- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1989). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9, 185-211.
- Scherer, K. R., Schorr, A. & Johnstone, T. (2001). *Appraisal processes in emotion: Theory, methods, research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shiller, R. J. (2000). *Irrational exuberance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schwartz, N., & Clore, G. L. (1988). How do I feel about it? The informative function of mood. In K. Fiedler & A. Forgas (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and social behavior* (pp. 44-62). Toronto: Hogrefe.
- Seligman, M. (1998). *Learned Optimism: How to change your mind and your life* (2nd ed.). New York: Pocket Books.
- Simmons, S. M. (Ed.) (1997). *Measuring emotional intelligence*. Arlington: Summit publishing group.
- Smither, J. W. (1998) (Ed.). *Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Spencer, L. M.J., McClelland, D. C., & Kelner, S. (1997). *Competency assessment methods: History and state of the art*. Boston: Hay/McBer.
- Spencer, L. M., Jr., & Spencer, S. (1993). *Competence at work: Models for superior performance*. New York: Wiley.
- Steers, R. M. & Porter, L. W. (Eds.), *Motivation and work behavior* (5th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1990). *Wisdom: Its nature, origins, and development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sternberg, R. J. (1999a). *Handbook of creativity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1999b). *The nature of cognition*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2000). *Handbook of intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. & Smith, C. (1985). Social intelligence and decoding skills in nonverbal communication. *Social Cognition*, 3, 168-192.
- Sternberg, R. J. & Wagner, R. K. (1986). *Practical intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911/1947). *Scientific management*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1936). Factor analysis of social and abstract intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 27, 231-233.
- Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (1990). The past explains the present: Emotional adaptations and the structure and ancestral environments. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 11, 375-424.
- Toufexis, A. (1994, April 24). Workers who fight firing with fire. *Time*, 143, 36.
- Triandis, H. C. (1997). Cross-cultural perspectives on personality. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 439-464). San Diego, California: Academic Press.
- Tziner, A., Haccoun, R. R., & Kadish, A. (1991). Personal and situational characteristics influencing the effectiveness of transfer of training improvement strategies. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 64, 167-177.

Wechsler, D. (1940). Nonintellective factors in general intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 37, 444-445.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92, 548-573.

Weisinger, H. (1998). *Emotional intelligence at work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.