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Emotional Intelligence in Organizational Behavior
and Industrial-Organizational Psychology

Since the introduction of emotional intelligence by Salovey and Mayer (1990) and its subsequent popularization by Goleman (1995), the construct has garnered intense interest from both scientists and practitioners and, as illustrated in this volume, it has been broadly applied. Chapters in this volume examine its application in Health (Pennebaker), Education (Zins et al.), Clinical Psychology (Bagby), as well as its links to Artificial Intelligence (Picard). The area in which the emotional intelligence construct has really grown in popularity, however, is in its applications in the workplace. The growth of interest in emotional intelligence in the workplace can be attributed to two factors, (1) the desire of businesses to find new ways of gaining performance improvements, and (2) the desire of managers to be able to predict behavior in the workplace. A simple search in PsychINFO® for “emotional intelligence” and “organizational behavior” found 297 peer-reviewed journal articles and 59 books.¹ And, of course, this does not include the many books and articles published outside of the domain accessed by PsychINFO, especially in the popular management literature (e.g., Cooper & Sawaf, 1996; Goleman, 2001; Goleman, McKee, & Boyatzis, 2002).

¹ Search conducted on October 08, 2005.
In its relatively short existence, emotional intelligence has generated intense controversy in organizational behavior (OB) and industrial and organizational (IO) psychology, illustrated by the debates at international conferences (e.g., see Daus & Ashkanasy, 2003) and in leading journals (see Spector, 2005). So strong is the debate, the topic has even resulted in the publication of whole volumes dedicated to the controversy in general (e.g., Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2002) and in OB and IO Psychology in particular (e.g., see Murphy, in press). Indeed, in giving a Keynote address at the 2005 Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference in Australia, Kevin Murphy listed ‘Emotional Intelligence’ as one of the “big 10 misses of Industrial and Organizational Psychology over the last 10 years” (Myors, 2005) – and there is probably some justification in this assertion, particularly in relation to issues surrounding varying construct definitions and well discussed measurement problems. Critics of emotional intelligence (e.g., Landy, 2005; Locke, 2005) have focused in particular on the shortcomings of the more popular models of emotional intelligence. This includes some of the more extravagant claims made by advocates such as Goleman (1995) for the construct and perceptions that emotional intelligence is based in discredited theories of “social intelligence,” first advocated over 80 years ago by Thorndike (1920). Although initially strident in their criticism, we acknowledge that some of these critics have become more sanguine in their responses acknowledging that there is some merit in a scientific approach to research in emotional intelligence.
We argue that, although there is mixed evidence about the link between emotional intelligence and workplace applications, steadily maturing research in the field is providing increasing confidence regarding the predictive ability of emotional intelligence. In this chapter, we provide a broad overview of emotional intelligence in OB research and IO psychology, including a review of applications and coverage of some of the contentious issues in the field. We conclude by placing emotional intelligence research within the context of the wider framework of research on the role of emotions in organizational settings.

Constructs of Emotional Intelligence in the Workplace

Almost 6 years ago, Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2000a) identified a distinction between mixed and ability models of emotional intelligence. The mixed models include personality variables as a part of the emotional intelligence construct, while the ability models relate to specific abilities that link emotion and cognition. As indicated in Jordan, Ashkanasy, and Hartel (2003), we have concerns over evidence provided by researchers who use mixed models of emotional intelligence, on the basis that the efficacy of emotional intelligence research may be diminished if the construct is confounded with personality variables such as empathy, self confidence, or conscientiousness. Nonetheless, while we agree with Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) and Mayer, et al. (2000a) that the results of research using the mixed models may be open to question, we also
The emotional abilities associated with Mayer and Salovey’s (1997a) emotional intelligence model are not new. Rather, these authors drew together the previous literature about the link between emotion and cognition, and coalesced this knowledge into a comprehensive model that they called emotional intelligence. More specifically, the Mayer and Salovey model acknowledges that emotion and cognition are virtually inseparable in an individual’s reaction to situations and thus should not be separated in studies of human decision-making. As such, they identified emotional intelligence as the ability to be aware of emotions in self and others, and the ability to modify our reactions to situations accordingly. The four related emotion processing abilities (or “branches”) they identified are a) emotion perception, b) emotion facilitation, c) emotion understanding, and d) emotion management (Mayer & Salovey, 1997a). Each of these branches has been outlined in detail elsewhere in this volume. We thus examine specifically the application of emotional intelligence in the workplace within the reference framework of the Mayer and Salovey model.

At this point, we need also to address measurement, on the basis that measurement has a direct impact on the application of emotional intelligence in the workplace. Although this issue is dealt with in some detail elsewhere in this volume (see
It is nonetheless important for us to point out that we take no firm stance on the debate between ability versus self-report measures. Although traditional intelligence research supports ability testing as the most appropriate approach, we note that emotions are generally very personal experiences. From this viewpoint, although we acknowledge the complications involved in self-assessment bias, we consider self-report can be an appropriate measurement method in particular contexts, especially in field and group applications (e.g., Jordan & Troth, 2004). For instance, research suggests that emotional awareness can be reasonably accurately assessed using self-report. Davis (1994), for example, found that individuals were able to identify their own emotional reactions to situations and place them in categories ranging from personal distress to perspective taking. More recently, Jordan and Ashkanasy (2006) reported that self- and peer-report measures of emotional intelligence could be combined to provide a measure of emotional self-awareness in teams. Consequently, at this relatively early stage of the development of emotional intelligence measures, and so long as a particular measure has been shown to be psychometrically validated, it seems reasonable to accept the legitimacy of self-report measures of emotional intelligence.
potential applications have not been extensively tested by empirical data owing to the infancy of emotional intelligence research. While more research has been published in the intervening years, it is clear that emotional intelligence research is still in its infancy when compared to the more established research in personality and intelligence. Furthermore, in many cases, data and claims have been based on models of emotional intelligence that are inconsistent with the construct of emotional intelligence described by Mayer and Salovey (1997a). In other cases, this research has incorporated personality variables that expand the potential impact of the construct beyond its original definition (Mayer et al., 2000a). Indeed, this is a major deficiency in the arguments of the detractors of emotional intelligence – insofar as their criticisms are generally about research conducted without a distinctive definition of emotional intelligence (see Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005). In this chapter, we report on research that includes measures of emotional self-awareness and emotional management, and we avoid conclusions that draw on broader personality variables such as conscientiousness or empathy.

In summary, and consistent with Ashkanasy and Daus (2005), we note three “streams” of research and application on emotional intelligence in organizations. Stream 1 comprises research that conforms closely to the model of emotional intelligence first proposed by Salovey and Mayer (1990), which was subsequently refined by Mayer and Salovey (1997a), and is measured using the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT: Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2001). Stream 2
includes research that, while based on the Mayer and Salovey model, uses measures other than the abilities-oriented MSCEIT to measure the construct, typically based on self-reports (e.g. Jordan, Ashkanasy, Härtel, & Hooper, 2002; Schutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden, & Dornheim, 1998; Wong & Law, 2002). Finally, Stream 3 includes conceptualizations and measures that differ from the Mayer and Salovey model but have some common ground. As a general rule, these include factors that tend to overlap with personality constructs, and have been characterized by Mayer et al. (2000a) as “mixed models” of emotional intelligence. Examples include research conducted using the EQi developed by Bar-On (1997), which is based in the idea that emotional intelligence is a form of psychological/emotional well-being; the Emotional Competency Index (ECI: Sala, 2002), which is founded in Goleman’s (1998) broadly-based construct of emotional intelligence as a form of social and interpersonal competence (see also Goleman et al., 2002); and other self-report measures including, for example, the measure developed by Dulewicz, Higgs, and Slaski (2003). In order to be comprehensive in this chapter we report on the broad range of research from streams 1, 2 and 3 but note that the results from Stream 3 may need further testing to make sure that the findings do not confound emotional intelligence with other personality variables. Additionally, we should point out that a number of the studies we use in this chapter report the relationship between dependant variables and total emotional intelligence, rather than exploring individual branches of emotional intelligence. In this chapter, we use these findings to
Emotional Intelligence and Workplace Applications

Given the widespread interest in emotional intelligence in OB and IO Psychology, it is not surprising that the construct has found application across a broad range of subtopics in the workplace. In Table 1 we provide a comprehensive overview of empirical research that has examined the links between emotional intelligence and workplace applications, categorized as Stream 1, 2, or 3 (see above). Of course, it is beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss the results of each and every one of these studies. Instead, we discuss in detail a selection of studies that have investigated the role of emotional intelligence in workplace settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>EI Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day &amp; Carroll (2004)</td>
<td>MSCEIT v1.1 Mayer, Salovey &amp; Caruso (2000b)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>Personality, performance and citizenship behavior</td>
<td>Some dimensions of EI are linked to experience and individual task performance, but not overall group performance or citizenship behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lopes, Salovey, Côté & Beers (2005) | MSCEIT v2.0 | 76 | Emotion regulation ability and quality of social interactions | Emotion regulation abilities are related to indicators of the quality of social interactions over and above variance accounted for by the Big Five personality traits and verbal and fluid intelligence. |
| Leban & Zulauf (2004) | MSCEIT v2.0 | 24 | Transformational leadership and performance | EI is linked to inspirational motivation idealized influence and individual consideration components of transformational leadership. |

**Stream 2**
(Based in Mayer & Salovey Model)

| Palmer, Walls, Burgess, & Stough (2001) | Trait Meta Mood Scale Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey & Palfai (1995) | 43 | Transformational leadership | Transformational leadership is linked with EI. However, transformational leaders are not necessarily higher in EI than transactional leaders. |
| Moriarty & Buckley (2003) | WEIP-5 | 80 | Team learning and team process | Undertaking a program in developing team-skills and being taught from the perspective of the process increased EI. |
| Jordan & Troth (2004) | WEIP6 | 350 | Team problem solving and conflict resolution | EI was linked with team performance and conflict resolution methods but not performance at an individual level. |
| Jordan & Troth (2002) | WEIP-6 | 139 | Conflict resolution and organizational change | Individuals with higher levels of EI are more likely, or more able, to engage in collaborative conflict resolution and reject forcefulness and avoidance. |
| Sue-Chan & Latham (2004) | WEIP-6 | 75 | Situational Interview, teamplaying behavior | Emotional intelligence mediated the relationship between the SI and teamplaying behavior. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Scale/Instruments</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Findings/Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foo, Anger Elfenbein, Tan, &amp; Aik (2004)</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Personality and subjective experience in negotiation</td>
<td>Individuals high in EI reported more positive experiences in negotiation and having a partner high in EI is related to better objective outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmeli (2003)</td>
<td>Schutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden &amp; Dornheim (1998)</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>Work outcomes, work behavior and work attitudes</td>
<td>Senior managers with high EI develop high affective commitment to their organisation, high commitment toward their career, report higher job satisfaction and perform the job better than senior managers with low EI. They also can effectively control work-family conflict and display higher levels of altruistic behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schutte, Schuettpelz, &amp; Malouff (2001)</td>
<td>Schutte, et al (1998)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Performance on cognitive tasks</td>
<td>Individuals with higher EI perform better on a cognitive task and are better able to ward off the detrimental emotional effects of the difficulties and persist at the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vakola, Tsaousis, &amp; Nikolaou (2004)</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (EIQ)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>EI and personality</td>
<td>There is a relationship between personality traits and employees’ attitudes toward change along with EI relating to positive attitudes to willingness toward change, turnover intentions and increased job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolaou &amp; Tsaousis (2002)</td>
<td>EIQ</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Gender, family status, educational background, job description, stress, and</td>
<td>EI linked to occupational stress, and organizational commitment. Workers higher in EI have significantly lower occupational stress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapisarda (2002)</td>
<td>Self-Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) Boyatzis (1982) Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) Boyatzis &amp; Goleman (1998)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Work team cohesiveness and performance. EI competencies were linked to the group’s self-reported cohesiveness and the self-reported study group cohesiveness showed a stronger relationship with EI than with study group performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langhorn (2004)</td>
<td>EQi</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Profit performance data, team satisfaction, team turnover, customer satisfaction, appraisal rating, gender and age. Managerial EI is positively related to employee satisfaction, customer satisfaction and profit performance, though profit performance is not related to gendered EI or age related EI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivanathan &amp; Fekken (2002)</td>
<td>EQi</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Moral reasoning, transformational leadership and effectiveness. Followers' evaluations of leaders' transformational behaviors were linked to leaders' self-reports of EI and followers' ratings on leadership effectiveness but not to self-reports of moral reasoning or supervisor ratings of leader effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandell &amp; Pherwani (2003)</td>
<td>EQi</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Transformational leadership. Transformational leadership style could be predicted from EI scores, but no gender differences were found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Barling, Slater, & Kelloway (2000) | EQi | 60 | Transformational leadership. EI is associated with three aspects of transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation and individualized consideration), and contingent reward. Active and passive management-by-exception, and laissez faire management,
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Gardner, &amp; Stough (2003)</td>
<td>SUEIT</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Personality and effective leadership. EI is higher in executive populations than those working in more general roles in organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferres &amp; Connell (2004)</td>
<td>EQ Index</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>Organizational change cynicism and dispositional trust. Employees would report less change cynicism if managed by leaders whom they rated as high in EI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent publications that have examined evidence of the links between emotional intelligence and workplace applications include Daus and Ashkanasy (2005), Druskat, Sala, and Mount (2006), Jordan, Ashkanasy, and Ashton-James (in press), and Zeidner, Matthews, and Roberts (2004). In assessing some of the major claims made for the emotional intelligence construct, Jordan and his colleagues (in press) examined the links between emotional intelligence and job performance, emotional intelligence and career progression, and emotional intelligence and leadership, and found mixed support for the substantial claims made in these areas. Zeidner et al. (2004) attempted to untangle the claims from empirical evidence and, while they were encouraged by the potential of emotional intelligence to add to our understanding of work encounters, they concluded that there is still a need for more scientifically validated studies to advance the area. Finally, Daus and Ashkanasy (2005) examined the links between emotional intelligence

and leadership, job performance, and emotional labor and came to a conclusion similar to that reached by Zeidner and his associates.

In terms of performance, authors such as Goleman (1998) argue that emotional intelligence predicts a broad spectrum of work performance. Jordan et al. (in press), however, examined the extant research and concluded that, despite these sweeping claims, the empirical evidence only points to links between emotional intelligence and performance for tasks where there is a clear emotional skill required for successful task completion. For instance, Brotheridge (2003) found emotional intelligence measured using the MSCEIT was linked to deep acting in individuals undertaking emotional labor. Her data, however, revealed that only emotional awareness of emotions was linked to surface acting.

In the area of leadership, Daus and Ashkanasy (2005) discussed recent Stream 1 research that found evidence of links between emotional intelligence and leadership emergence and transformational leadership. Jordan et al. (in press), on the other hand, who looked at the broad spectrum of emotional intelligence measures and definitions, suggested caution in interpreting any broad assertions made about the link between emotional intelligence and leadership. They did nonetheless acknowledge that there is an emotional element to leadership (see Humphrey, 2002), and point to theoretical research that supports links between emotional awareness and transformational leadership. Jordan and his co-authors concluded that the links between emotional intelligence and specific
forms of leadership require more rigorous theoretical development, followed by appropriate tests to establish the veracity of these claims.

Leban and Zulauf (2004), in a Stream 1 study that examined the links between transformational leadership and emotional intelligence, found that emotional intelligence was linked to idealized influence and individual consideration. Sivanathan and Fekken (2002) found links between a Stream 3 (EQi: Bar-On, 1997) measure of emotional intelligence and followers’ evaluations of transformational leadership behaviors as well as evaluations of leader effectiveness. In another study using the EQi, Mandell & Pherwani (2003) reported that transformational leadership style could be predicted from scores gained on an emotional intelligence test.

In relation to research into claims that individuals with high emotional intelligence will have better career paths, Jordan et al. (in press) found no evidence to support this claim. They do acknowledge, however, that, if an employee’s workplace performance is contingent solely or largely upon social skills, it may be that emotion perception and emotion management (two branches of the Mayer-Salovey model of emotional intelligence) can contribute to higher levels of performance, and thus to career success. Jordan et al. comment also that emotional intelligence is only one of many predictors of career success. Given the proven track record of alternate predictors such as intelligence and conscientiousness, it is unlikely that emotional intelligence alone can

play the sort of role in career success predicted by Goleman (1998) and others (e.g., Cooper & Sawaf, 1996).

Overall, while Jordan et al. (in press) and Daus and Ashkanasy (2005) concluded that emotional intelligence does indeed provide additional explanatory power regarding behavior in organizations, they agree with Zeidner and his colleagues (2004) that additional and more focused research is required to extend this knowledge and to explain the processes that underlie emotional intelligence and its effects.

In the remainder of this chapter, we focus on the link between emotional intelligence and three areas in which other major claims regarding workplace applications have been made: (1) positive organizational behaviors such as organizational commitment, reduced turnover, and organizational citizenship behaviors; (2) dealing with others in the organization and outside the organization (customers and clients), and (3) the ability to deal with conflict in the workplace.

Emotional intelligence and positive organizational behaviors

We define positive organizational behaviors as those actions in the workplace that benefit working relationships and contribute to a positive working climate. In particular, there is a broad range of literature that predicts a link between high emotional intelligence and positive organizational behaviors. Abraham (2005) argues that both organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment are enhanced by emotional

Jordan, Ashkanasy & Härtel (2002) suggest that organizational commitment is moderated by emotional intelligence, so that individuals with high emotional intelligence are going to be more likely to generate high affective commitment even during times of stress and instability. Cherniss (2001) contends that emotional intelligence contributes to organizational effectiveness though increased commitment, improved morale, and better health of individuals. In an empirical study of some of these variables, based on a Stream 2 model of emotional intelligence, Carmeli (2003) found that emotional intelligence was positively linked to altruistic behavior, career commitment, job satisfaction, and affective commitment to the organization. He also found that emotional intelligence and was negatively related to work/family conflict and intentions to withdraw from the organization (turnover intention). Discussing his findings, Carmeli (2003) noted that emotional intelligence can augment contextual performance (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997), and is therefore a valuable commodity to the organization.

Wong and Law (2002) conducted a Stream 2 study that examined the emotional intelligence of leaders and followers, and found that results depended on whether the individual studied was a leader or a follower. For followers, Wong and Law (2002) found that emotional intelligence was linked to job satisfaction. Emotional intelligence also was linked to the satisfaction of leaders but was also linked to their propensity to do extra role activities that supported their employees. Their data also provided support for
relationships between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment and reduced turnover intention for followers. An interesting outcome of the Wong and Law (2002) study was that individuals with high emotional intelligence were found to be more likely to turnover if they were in jobs that did not allow them to utilize their emotional intelligence.

Vakola, Tsaousis and Nikolaou (2004) examined links between emotional intelligence and change attitudes, and found emotional intelligence relates to positive attitudes to willingness to change, turnover intentions, and increased job satisfaction. While this study showed interesting results, the findings need to be viewed with caution, however, as the measure of emotional intelligence, while conforming to the stream 2 Mayer and Salovey (1997a) model of emotional intelligence, also had a high correlation to the Big Five Personality Dimensions. The authors noted, however, that their measure of emotional intelligence did appear to provide incremental validity over the effect of personality (Vakola et al., 2004).

In a series of Stream 2 studies of emotional intelligence training, Murray, Jordan, and Ashkanasy (2005) found that participants not only experienced an increase in overall emotional intelligence, but that there was a commensurate rise in organizational citizenship behaviors. These finding were similar to those of Slaski and Cartwright (2003), who found, using the EQi (Stream 3), an increase in morale and perceptions of the quality of work life, and a decrease in distress following emotional intelligence
Emotional intelligence and working with others

Abraham (2005) argues that individuals with high emotional intelligence are more likely to have harmonious relationships in the workplace. While this may be seen as an overly optimistic and altruistic statement, according to Mayer and Salovey (1997a), the skills associated with emotional intelligence enable individuals to recognize, to understand, and to manage emotions in themselves and others and this in turn may contribute to better relationships in the workplace. Cherniss (2001) contends in particular that, based on these skills, emotional intelligence contributes to organizational effectiveness though improved teamwork.

In support of these theoretical models, Lopes, Salovey, Cote, and Beers (2005) found that Stream 1 emotional intelligence was positively linked to interpersonal sensitivity and pro-social tendencies. They also asked participants in their study to rate their peers, and found that emotional intelligence was linked to more positive peer nominations and the identification of reciprocal friendships. These findings were still
significant even after the researchers controlled for personality and intelligence. Based on this study, it seems reasonable to conclude that interpersonal skills and relationship management are skills that are linked to emotional intelligence. Consequently, it is also reasonable to predict that these skills can be linked to better working relationships and better team performance.

One area that has attracted a good deal of research is the links between emotional intelligence and team performance – from both a theoretical and an empirical perspective. Jordan, et al. (2002), for example, examined the links between Stream 2 emotional intelligence and team performance in a longitudinal study. Performance in this study was measured in terms of independent raters’ scores on two variables: (1) team process effectiveness and (2) team goal focus. Results were that average team emotional intelligence predicted team performance before training, but that the low emotional intelligence teams were performing at the same level as the high emotional intelligence teams after nine weeks of training. The implications of their findings are that high emotional intelligence teams are able to perform at a high level without training, but that low emotional intelligence teams need specific training programs to be able to reach the same levels of performance.

In a separate Stream 2 study, Jordan and Troth (2004) found that emotional intelligence did not predict individual performance during a cognitive problem-solving task but did predict team performance in the same task. Clearly, from this study there is
Later published as (2007) Emotional intelligence in organizational behavior and
industrial-organizational psychology. In G. Matthews, M. Zeidner, M., & R. D. Roberts
(eds.), The science of emotional intelligence (pp.356-375). New York: Oxford University
Press

an indication that the nature of a task changes at the team level when group decisions are
required. Jordan and Troth (2004) suggest that there is an emotional element in team
decision-making that results in teams with high emotional intelligence having an
advantage over teams with low emotional intelligence. In a similar study, but using a
Stream 3 measure of emotional intelligence, Offermann, Bailey, Vasilopoulos, Seal, and
Sass (2004) found emotional intelligence was not linked to individual performance but
was linked to group performance (the results of a group written assignment). In another
Stream 2 study, Moriarty and Buckley (2003) found that, by using an experiential
learning methodology, they were able to increase some aspects of emotional intelligence
and improve group outcomes thereby preparing individuals for working with others in the
workplace. Based on these studies, the evidence seems to support the idea that emotional
intelligence does have an effect on team performance.

In looking beyond the effect of emotional intelligence on relationships in teams,
there is also evidence that the emotional intelligence plays a role in service provider
interactions with customers, and therefore plays a role as a determinant of customer
satisfaction. While some of this research is in the early stages of development, Rozell,
Pettijohn, and Parker (2004) report significant relationships between Stream 2 emotional
intelligence and customer orientation and sales performance.
Emotional Intelligence and Conflict in the Workplace

Following the popularization of emotional intelligence by Goleman (1995), there have been a number of authors who have claimed that individuals with high emotional intelligence have superior conflict resolution skills. Weisinger (1998), for example, identified emotional management as a prime ability required to manage conflict in the workplace and improve relationships in organizations. Goleman (2001) subsequently listed conflict management as a core competency in his model of emotional intelligence, noting that effective conflict management is critical for maintaining business relationships. Lubit (2004) stated that emotional intelligence is a competence that enhances the individual’s ability to deal with “toxic” managers through enhanced conflict resolution skills. The empirical evidence to support these strong assertions, however, is less than voluminous.

Nonetheless, there is growing evidence of the positive impact of emotional intelligence on conflict resolution in organizations. To date, researchers have typically categorized conflict in organizations into task, affective (relationship), and process conflict (Jehn, 1995). Task conflict focuses on conflict over work content or task. Within this literature, task conflict is typically resolved using “rational” argument (Jehn, 1995). Relationship (affective) conflict, on the other hand, refers to an emotional disagreement between individuals that generates strong negative emotions such as anger or hostility, which must be dealt with before ‘rational’ arguments can be employed (Dick, 1984).
Finally, process conflict refers to disagreements over the team's approach to the task, its methods, and its group processes.

Relationship conflict is consistently differentiated from task conflict and process conflict (e.g., see Pelled, Eisenhardt, & Xin 1999). While relationship conflict is seen as inherently emotional, task and process conflict have been portrayed as cognitive rather than emotional processes. Jordan and Troth (2002, 2004), on the other hand, argue that all conflict is inherently emotional, because it involves the perception of threats to individual or group goals. They argue that the emotional management skills of individuals in a group will determine if task conflict remains beneficial and whether the group’s inability to resolve such conflict degenerates into relationship or process conflict and subsequently poor performance. This opinion has been supported in the development of a theoretical model by Yang and Mossholder (2004) who argue the beneficial nature of task conflict is influenced by the extent to which negative emotionality is constrained in the group. Based on this evidence, it is appropriate to conclude that emotional awareness and emotional management skills contribute to better conflict resolution.

Researchers have also provided evidence of a link between emotional intelligence and preferred conflict resolution styles of individuals. For example, Jordan and Troth (2002) showed that individuals with higher levels of (Stream 2) emotional intelligence were more likely to seek collaborative solutions when confronted with conflict and prefer not to avoid. They argued that, for the emotionally intelligent individual, collaboration in
the appropriate circumstances may be a sign of their ability to recognize and regulate emotions. Consequently, collaboration serves to enhance employees’ relationships with their fellow workers and serves to achieve their goals during times of change. Indeed, in advancing their research, Jordan and Troth (2004) showed that groups with higher levels of emotional intelligence were more likely to report using collaborative conflict resolution behavior to resolve an actual decision-making task. On the other hand, those teams with less ability to deal with their own emotions were more likely to engage in greater use of avoidance tactics resulting in lower performance.

In examining the links between (Stream 2) emotional intelligence and negotiation, Foo, Anger Elfenbein, Tan, & Aik (2004) found that individuals with high emotional intelligence were able to establish a more positive affective tone in negotiations. In particular, Foo et al. concluded that emotional intelligence was a significant factor in reaching an integrative negotiation outcome. Somewhat surprisingly, however, they also found that individuals with high emotional intelligence actually ended up with lower performance in the negotiation. This was apparently because these individuals conceded ground to achieve an integrative solution. Foo and his colleagues noted, however, that these findings need to be approached with some caution as the study was conducted using student groups in a simulated negotiation.
Discussion

Based on the evidence discussed in this chapter, we can only agree with Ashkanasy and Daus (2005), that the death of emotional intelligence has been prematurely announced by some critics. Particularly with regards to applications in the workplace, we have demonstrated that emotional intelligence has a range of positive applications across the three stream of research we identified. While certainly not a comprehensive list, we have argued that emotional intelligence can be linked to positive work behaviors such as organizational citizenship behaviors, higher morale, lower turnover, higher job satisfaction, higher affective commitment to organizations and lower work/family conflict. Similarly, in relation to working with others, we have discussed research linking emotional intelligence to better customer relations, higher levels of customer orientation, higher levels of customer satisfaction, better working relationships in teams, more effective processes and more harmonious relationships within organizations. Finally, with respect to conflict, the research evidence suggests that individuals with high emotional intelligence not only prefer to use collaborative solutions, but actually use this technique in negotiating outcomes. The research also reveals less use of avoidance techniques by those with high emotional intelligence. An important point to note here is that we have drawn our conclusions from a broad range of research. In line with Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) we note that this is drawn from research using ability models of emotional intelligence (Stream 1), models based on
Conclusion

In linking back to our introduction, we noted some sympathy for the opinion expressed by Kevin Murphy that emotional intelligence was one of “the big 10 misses of Industrial and Organizational Psychology” (Myors, 2005). From the research outlined in this chapter, Murphy seemed to be referring to a substantial amount of research linked to what Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) referred to as “Stream 3” models of emotional intelligence. Clearly, there is a growing body of evidence, and importantly in Stream 1 and Stream 2 research, to suggest that emotional intelligence does have an important role in workplace research. Research has shown that emotional intelligence contributes incremental validity beyond a broad range of existing constructs in both areas of individual differences and intelligence that enables academics to better understand human behavior at work. Nonetheless, and in line with Jordan, et al. (2003), we see emotional intelligence research in the workplace to be at a watershed. There needs to be some convergence of emotional intelligence research particularly in the area of construct development.
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