

Emotional Intelligence: A Literature Review Of Its Concept, Models, And Measures

Anamika Singh¹, Dr Rajkiran Prabhakar², Jatoth Sai Kiran³

¹ Research Scholar, Institute of Management Studies, Banaras Hindu University

² Assistant Professor, Institute of Management Studies, Banaras Hindu University

³ Research Scholar, Institute of Management Studies, Banaras Hindu University

Email id : singhanamika.282@gmail.com¹, rajkiranprabhakar@fmsbhu.ac.in², jatothsai@gmail.com³

Abstract: Unprecedented interest has been shown in the notion of Emotional Intelligence (EI), both in the lay and scientific communities, and it has also quickly become a topic of study among academics and researchers. When compared to other less impressive traditional psychology concepts like IQ and personality, EI has emerged as one of the hottest buzzwords in today's corporate world. The current research aims to provide a synopsis of the existing literature on EI by exploring the development of the concept of emotional intelligence during the course of its existence. In it, the ideas and theories that led to the development of the theory of emotional intelligence are explored. It also defines EI by examining the numerous ways in which EI may be measured and the purpose of this paper is to investigate the concept of E.I. by analysing the existing models, evaluation tools, and connections between them. By comparing the models of EI on criteria such as their focus on emotions and emotional intelligence, the gaps in the three models, and the suggested need for designing and standardising EI scales, a contrast will be drawn between those that place an emphasis on intellectual ability and those that combine intellectual ability with personality attributes.

Keywords - Emotional Intelligence, History, Indian Context, Measures, Models.

Introduction

Organizations in both the public and private sectors face a formidable challenge in this environment: how to successfully navigate change. Managers and workers alike can benefit greatly from improvements in their Emotional Intelligence as they adapt to the ever-shifting nature of today's business world. The Intelligence Quotient (IQ) that we project to the world through our test scores, diplomas, and other credentials is widely believed to be a major factor in determining our professional success. To put it in another way, our academic credentials, such as performing well in school and college and achieving high IQ test scores, are regarded as indicative of our level of intelligence by the academic community. But how adept are you at handling life's challenges?

This situation calls for a distinct kind of intelligence: emotional intelligence. (Singh, 2015)

Emotional intelligence (EI) is the capacity to recognise, utilise, comprehend, and manage emotions and emotional information. Emotional intelligence plays a significant role in the contemporary environment, particularly in terms of its impact on the modern workforce. Businesses are fundamentally people oriented. Consequently, anything that affects the people's mental efficiency has an effect on the businesses they own or manage. Every business organisation is comprised of individuals with diverse abilities, personalities, and emotions, which can have a significant impact on their work performance. In fact, many professionals now think that one's EQ, or

emotional quotient, is more significant than one's IQ, and is a better predictor of success, quality of relationships, and happiness.

According to Dalip Singh (2001), emotional intelligence assists managers and employees in perceiving and understanding emotions. Self-control and social equilibrium are two further areas where emotional intelligence comes in handy. Emotional intelligence in the workplace can be used to foster individual growth, group productivity, and company growth.

Companies must mentor their employees in the development of their interpersonal skills in order for them to work well with other members of the organisation. Employees must improve their emotional intelligence in addition to their technical skills in order to boost their overall productivity at work. The team members' ability to control their emotions will help them become more sociable.

To be successful, organisations must invest in its employees by helping them develop their emotional intelligence skills so that they can work effectively within the organisation. (Wall, Bob, 2008)

Perspectives on the evolution of emotional intelligence

General intelligence tests, according to David Wechsler (1940), are insufficient because of the influence of extra-cognitive elements like personality on a person's intellectual

development. H. Gardner established the concept of social intelligence in 1983 and also distinguished between interpersonal and intrapersonal forms of intelligence.

Payne first used the term "emotional intelligence" in 1986, for the title of his doctoral dissertation. It was hypothesised in this qualitative study that showing courage in the face of adversity, such as a fear or a strong desire, would be beneficial for persons who have trouble with emotional functioning and regulation.

Reuven Bar-On (1997) coined the term "EQ" (Emotional Quotient) and provided a framework for assessing a person's emotional and social skills. The inventor of the Emotional Quotient Inventory, the first instrument of its kind, was this man (EQ-i). John Mayer and Peter Salovey, two psychologists, first introduced the concept of "Emotional Intelligence" in a 1990 essay for the journal *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*. In 1995, Daniel Goleman spread the idea of 'emotional intelligence' to the masses. He looked at the research of John Mayer and Peter Salovey, then developed his own theory of EQ.

Emotional intelligence is a relatively new field of study, but its roots can be traced back to the time of Charles Darwin, who asserted that emotional expression was necessary for survival.

Table 1 below illustrates briefly the history of Emotional Intelligence

Year	Author	Theory
1930's	Edward Thorndike	Associating with the ability to get along with others
1940's	David Wechsler	Suggested that affective aspects of intelligence may be necessary for social interaction

1950's	Abraham Maslow	Describes how individuals can develop emotional resilience
1975	Howard Gardner	Published a book titled "The Shattered Mind," which is notable for presenting the idea of multiple intelligences.
1985	Wayne Payne	He suggested that weakness in emotional functioning and regulation could be overcome by displaying courage in the face of fear or desire.
1990	Peter Salovey and John Mayer	The term Emotional Intelligence was first used in writing. Emotional Intelligence is defined as "A form of intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others feelings and emotions to discriminate among them and to use the information to guide one's thinking and actions "(Mayer, 1997)
1995	Daniel Goleman	In his book titled "Emotional Intelligence," Daniel Goleman outlined four key emotional constructs: "self-awareness, self management, social awareness, and relationship management".
1997	Bar-on	In 1997 Bar-on zeroed in on certain personality traits and social skills, such as self-awareness, -understanding, and -expression, as well as social-awareness, -understanding, and -relationship-building.(Bar-on, 1997)

Table:1 History of Emotional Intelligence

Shift from Intelligence to Emotional Intelligence

In 1920, psychologist Edward Thorndike came to the conclusion that humans possess numerous types and forms of intelligence. He defined social intelligence as the capacity to understand persons and act wisely in interpersonal relationships.

Wechsler (1958) defined intelligence as the capacity of an individual to be reasonable and effective in interacting with his environment.

Howard Gardner (1983) expanded the definition of intelligence to include two fundamental components: interpersonal intelligence and

intrapersonal intelligence. interpersonal intelligence is the ability to interact with others, while intrapersonal intelligence is the ability to comprehend oneself. Gardner asserted that these two intelligences were distinct from the several types of intelligence that may be tested with I.Q. testing.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) began their research on social intelligence and determined that their research on emotional intelligence substantially drew on the concept of "social intelligence" provided by the earlier researchers. They argued that both conceptions were similar in origin and founded on comparable human behaviour principles. They discovered that some

individuals are more adept than others in managing and regulating their emotions.

In his research on emotions, Daniel Goleman (1998) drew significantly from Salovey and Mayer's article on the emergence of the concept of Emotional Intelligence and tied it to "workplace success" His best-selling books on Emotional Intelligence raised public awareness of the idea. Goleman's Emotional Intelligence model has earned widespread acclaim and

serves as the foundation for other Emotional Intelligence-related studies.

Boyatzis and Sala (2004) defined Emotional Intelligence as the knowledge of emotional information necessary for effective and outstanding work performance. Table 2 below illustrates the evolution of emotions and intelligence during the last century is a summary and adaptation of Mayer (2001) Table 1.1 (pp. 5-6)

1900-1969	Intelligence and emotions are treated as two distinct subfields here	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intelligence Research • Improvements are made to the psychometric assessment of intellect. Examining Emotions • Argue about which comes first: the feeling or the physical reaction • A shift away from Darwin's idea of the heredity and evolution of emotional reactions toward the view that such responses are governed by culture. • The concept of "social intelligence" is presented
1970-1989	EI's predecessors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study of how thoughts and feelings interact is what led to the development of the discipline of cognition and affect. • The hypothesis of multiple intelligences proposed by Gardner addressed intrapersonal intelligence and interpersonal intelligence. • Based on empirical research, four components of social intelligence have been identified: social skills, empathy skills, prosocially oriented attitudes, and emotionality (sensitivity). • Brain research began to disentangle the link between emotion and cognition. • The concept of emotional intelligence began to be used occasionally.
1990-1993	The Development of EI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mayer and Salovey write an article series about EI. • The first EI ability scale appears in print. • Intelligence Journal editor presented an argument for EI's existence. • More progress in the field of neuroscience related to EI.
1994-1997	The Spreading Ahead and Popularization of EI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emotional Intelligence, written by Daniel Goleman (see References), becomes a runaway bestseller after its publication in 1998 • The concept of emotional intelligence (EQ) was

		<p>featured on the cover of Time Magazine</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emotional intelligence indices based on mixed-model theories have been released
1998- Present	Institutionalization of Emotional Intelligence Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to the EI framework; The introduction of new EI metrics. The publication of articles in reputable academic journals.

Table:2 Evolution of emotions and intelligence during the past century [24][25]

Models of Emotional Intelligence

EI models have received a lot of attention, and debate has arisen on the correct models as some models are based on a theoretical framework and others are not.

Models of Emotional Intelligence can be classified into two parts:

I. Ability Models of Emotional Intelligence: these models explain EI in terms of one's natural capacities and natural abilities that exist from birth.

II. Mixed Models of Emotional Intelligence: these models explain Emotional Intelligence as a mixture of abilities, personality traits and characteristics which over time can be developed towards Emotional Intelligence competencies in individuals.

(A) Ability Based EI

Salovey and Mayer's Model of Emotional Intelligence

Using the heuristic idea of EI, researchers were able to combine the literatures of emotion and intellect, two areas that are often left less connected (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Mayer and Salovey (1993) say that they could have chosen the word "emotional competence" rather than "emotional intelligence," but they preferred "intelligence" to connect their

framework to the historical literature on intelligence.

When designing the first framework for emotional intelligence, Salovey and Mayer (1990) incorporated Gardner's personal intelligence into the notion of emotional intelligence, stating that it was a "kind of social intelligence."

Since there is more to being successful in life than only IQ, the pioneers of emotional intelligence, Salovey and Mayer (1990), widened the definition of intelligence, as stated by Goleman (1995).

Although Mayer and Salovey (1993) claim that EI is distinct from IQ, they both agree that it requires the use of one's brain.

According to their definition, emotional intelligence is "the capacity to monitor one's own and others' moods and emotions, to differentiate between them, and to utilise this information to guide one's thoughts and actions" (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

Therefore, EI is a competency and a form of intelligence, as claimed by Salovey and Mayer (1990). In their original conceptualization of EI before developing their four-pronged model, Salovey and Mayer (1990) identified three foundational skills necessary for effective EI functioning: (1) evaluation and expression of emotion, (2) control of emotion, and (3) use of emotion.

Emotional evaluation and expression need for not only the use of verbal and nonverbal language, but also the capacity to recognise and articulate one's own and others' emotional states (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

An essential part of emotional intelligence (EI) is the ability to judge the emotions of other people, often known as empathy or "understanding another's feelings and re-experiencing them oneself" (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

The ability-based EI theory links emotion and cognition with the use of four constructs. These four constructs can be listed in a hierarchal manner and are characterised by progressive developmental stages. The higher part of the hierarchy gives cognisance to the conscience expression of emotions, whereas the lower part consists of preserving and expressing emotions. These levels are listed from the lowest to the highest part of the hierarchy:

i. Perceiving Emotions

Perceiving emotions is known as an individual's ability to perceive emotions in oneself and in others (Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 2000).

ii. Facilitating Thought

Facilitating thought is known as the development of a specific emotion in oneself, in order to transfer this emotion to someone else, and consequently changing their cognitive processes (Mayer et al., 2000).

iii. Understanding Emotions

Understanding emotions can be seen as the ability to understand emotions (personal emotions and relationship emotions) and utilising the emotional knowledge (Mayer et al., 2000).

iv. Managing Emotions

Managing emotions is seen as the ability to be open to any kind of feelings, and to cope with your own emotions and the emotions of others

so as to encourage a personal understanding and growth (Mayer et al., 2000).

Views about Mayer & Salovey Model of Emotional Intelligence

The "most scientifically rigorous model of EI" is the four-prong approach proposed by Salovey and Mayer (Zeidner et al., 2003).

Only Salovey and Mayer promote a more constrained conception of emotional intelligence within the context of the 'ability model', writes Weinberger (2002).

However, the model is not without its flaws, as Zeidner et al. (2003) point out, because abilities-based models impose more limitations on emotional intelligence than mixed-models do. These limitations include more narrow definitions and the exclusion of a number of personality qualities (Weinberger, 2002).

Because there are correlations between elements of emotional intelligence and personality traits like neuroticism and extraversion, Zeidner et al. (2003) asserted that a mixed-model is a better fit for the framework of emotional intelligence than an ability-based model. This was done in order to account for the fact that emotional intelligence is not solely determined by a person's innate abilities.

(B) Trait-based EI

According to Petrides and Furnham (2006), trait-based EI can be defined as "a constellation of emotion-related self-perceptions and dispositions". In other words it includes concepts such as emotion perception, managing emotions, empathy, and impulsivity. Petrides, Frederickson and Furnham, (2004b) posit that these traits are based on a mixture of concepts, and the term mixed model was brought forward. However, creating a trait-based EI instrument is cited as one of the most challenging aspects of mixed models by Pérez, Petrides, and Furnham (2005). This is mainly due to the fact that there is no solid theoretical or empirical basis for trait-based EI.

(I) Bar-On's Model: Mixed Model of Emotional Intelligence

Reuven Bar-On researched on a mixed model of Emotional Intelligence and suggested that

Emotional Intelligence comprised of both, "ability" and "personality"; factors. He was the first researcher to use the word "Emotion Quotient", to measure one's Emotional Intelligence.

Intrapersonal	Interpersonal	Stress management	Adaptability	General Mood
Emotional Self awareness	Empathy	Stress tolerance	Reality testing	Optimism
Assertiveness	Social Responsibility	Impulse control	Problem solving	Happiness
Independence	Interpersonal Relationship		Flexibility	
Self-regard				
Self-actualization				

(a) Intrapersonal

The first metafactor is intrapersonal, and can be defined as the "ability to be aware of our emotions and ourselves in general, to understand our strengths and weaknesses, and to express our feelings and ourselves non-destructively". (Bar-on, 2007b)

(b) Interpersonal

The second metafactor is interpersonal and is defined as "our ability to be aware of others' feelings, concerns and needs, and to be able to establish and maintain cooperative, constructive and mutually satisfying relationships" (Bar-on, 2007b). Furthermore, Bar-on states that the interpersonal metafactor relates to empathy, social responsibility and interpersonal relationship as defined next.

(c) Stress Management

The third metafactor is Stress Management which is defined as "emotional management and control and governs our ability to deal with emotions so that they work for us and not against us" (Bar-on, 2007b). Furthermore, Bar-on (Bar-on, 2007b) indicates that Stress Management forms part of Stress Tolerance and Impulse Control as defined next.

(d) Adaptability

The fourth metafactor is adaptability. This is applicable as it takes into consideration how the employee copes during personal and interpersonal change and change in their immediate environment. Furthermore Bar-on states that adaptability comprises of reality testing, flexibility and problem solving as defined next (Bar-on, 2007b).

(e) General Mood

The fifth metafactor is General Mood and is defined as "our ability to enjoy ourselves, others and life in general, as well as influence our general outlook on life and overall feeling of contentment" (Bar-on, 2007b). Bar-on (2007b) states that this general mood therefore comprises of optimism and happiness as defined in the next section.

(II) Goleman & Boyatzis Model of Emotional Intelligence

Goleman defined emotional competence as, "a learned capability based on Emotional Intelligence that results in outstanding performance at work". He believed that there is a major role of emotional competencies in various professions that involve emotional labor, service

and relationship management. He affirmed that Emotional Intelligence competencies are capable of determining one's potential for learning the practical skills and job capabilities.

As Goleman started his research on Emotional Intelligence, he initially proposed two basic competencies which were; "personal" and "social competencies". Personal competencies included; Self-Awareness, Self Regulation, and Motivation and social competencies included Empathy and Social Skills.

(i) Self-awareness

The ability to accurately assess one's own emotions, motivations, strengths, and hunches is a key component of self-awareness. There are 3 skills that make up the self-awareness cluster (Goleman, 1998).

(ii) Self-regulation

The ability to control one's emotions in a productive way, to have strong principles and to defer gratification in order to achieve one's goals, and to be resilient are all aspects of self-regulation (Goleman, 1998).

(iii) Motivation

One definition of motivation is the use of one's own best judgement to direct oneself toward one's goals, which in turn encourages one to be creative, to seek out and implement improvements, and to go onward despite encountering obstacles (Goleman, 1998).

(iv) Empathy

The ability to empathise with others, to feel what they feel, to grasp their point of view, and to work harmoniously with those of wildly different backgrounds is commonly understood to be empathy (Goleman, 1998).

(v) Social Skills

In this context, "social skills" refers to the ability to engage, lead, negotiate, and persuade others within a group or for the sake of collaboration (Goleman, 1998).

Based on analysis of data from 600 working professionals, the EI abilities were reorganised into four primary clusters as follows.

- I. Self -Awareness
- II. Self-Management
- III. Social Awareness
- IV. Relationship Management.

The competencies of the framework can be described as follows

(I) Self -Awareness: Includes Emotional Self-Awareness, Accurate Self-Assessment, and Self-Confidence.

1. Emotional self-awareness

One definition of emotional self-awareness is the capacity to recognise one's own emotions with precision, including their origins and the circumstances that bring them on.

2. Accurate self-assessment

The ability to honestly evaluate one's own capabilities—strengths, weaknesses, and restrictions—is what is meant by "accurate self-assessment."

3. Self confidence

Self-confidence stems from an honest assessment of one's abilities and a firm grasp on one's own value.

(II) Self-

Management: Includes emotional self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, optimism, achievement orientation and initiative.

1. **Emotional self-control** One definition of emotional self-control is the capacity to manage upsetting feelings and resist impulsive behaviours
2. **Trustworthiness** is a person's consistent application of high moral and ethical standards.
3. **Conscientiousness** the ability to be conscientious means you can be

accountable for your own work.

4. **Adaptability** The capacity to adjust easily to new circumstances is the essence of adaptability, which is defined as the fourth talent in the list.
5. **Achievement orientation** refers to an optimistic effort to improve performance.
6. **Initiative** is the ability to take the initiative before you see a problem, impediment, or opportunity so that you can maximise your chances of success.

(III) Social Awareness: It includes empathy, organizational awareness, and service orientation .

1. **Empathy-** To have empathy, one must be able to recognise and share the emotions, wants, and worries of another person.
2. **Organizational awareness** is the ability of having an accurate read on the emotional current and an understanding of the political power connections inside a group are two essential components of organisational awareness.
3. **Service orientation** is the ability to identify feelings and needs of those around you, even if they are not expressed explicitly.
4. **Developing Others:** Sensing what other people need to grow and strengthening their skillsets is an essential part of development.
5. **Leadership:** Motivating and directing a group or a group of people

(IV) Relationship Management:

It includes helping others develop, inspirational leadership, influence, communication, catalyzing change, conflict management, fostering collaboration and teamwork . Assisting others in their development involves the ability to read others' developmental needs and foster their

abilities.

1. **Inspirational leadership** refers to the ability to motivate others to work together toward a common goal is at the heart of what we mean when we talk about inspirational leadership.
2. **Influence** is the ability to skillfully manage the emotions of other people.
3. **Communication** is the ability to listen openly, and send clear messages effectively to others.
4. **Changing catalyst** is the capacity to see the need for change and act on it.
5. **Conflict management** is the capacity to defuse hostile situations through diplomacy and strategy is at the heart of effective conflict management.
6. **Building bonds** refers to the ability to form and maintain strong and positive relationships with a wide range of people
7. **Teamwork and collaboration** is the ability to work together with others toward common goals

Views about Goleman's Model of Emotional Intelligence

Goleman was one of the original advocates of the emotional intelligence mixed-model (Weinberger, 2002).

According to Weinberger (2002), Goleman's research in the domains of psychology and neuroscience led him to identify emotional intelligence as a collection of attributes that culminated in a person's personality.

Boyatzis (2008) states that "Goleman's synthesis established the physiological level of this model by linking discoveries from neuroscience, biology, and medical studies to psychological states and subsequent behaviour."

Goleman's approach, according to Momeni (2009), placed a major emphasis on social ties.

Individuals, according to Goleman (1995), function with two brains, resulting in two distinct intelligences: rational and emotional. Individual existence is determined by both intelligences and both brains (Goleman, 1995). Individual and career advancement are influenced by a balance of intelligence (logical) and emotion (Goleman, 1995).

According to Dulewicz and Higgs (2000), Goleman believed that individuals with a healthy balance of IQ and emotional intelligence were more likely to achieve success in life.

According to Pfeiffer (2001), Goleman's writings are overly wide and comprehensive; yet, according to Boyatzis (2008), Goleman's concept of emotional intelligence is a superior framework for addressing EI than Salovey and Mayer's approach.

Dalip Singh: Emotional Intelligence in the Indian Context

Three psychological domains make up Dalip Singh's (2003) Emotional Intelligence construct: emotional sensitivity, emotional maturity, and emotional competence. Singh founded his model on the idea that the concept of EQ as it is understood in the Indian context differs from the current model of EQ developed by Daniel Goleman, which is more appropriate in the Western society. According to Singh the degree of Power Distance and Collectivism in Indian culture differs from that of Western society. While Westerners are educated to react emotionally, Singh contends that Indians are taught to understand emotions as an intellectual exercise (Singh, 2003).

The following are the three components of Dalip Singh's model of Emotional Intelligence:

1. Emotional maturity (EM): Among the many ways in which emotional maturity (EM) can be categorised are:

i. **Self Awareness:** Being in tune with one's own

emotions and cognizant of one's own strengths and flaws

ii. **Developing others:** Fostering the growth of others requires an awareness of, and an appreciation for, the value of other people's perspectives and input. Moreover, we should actively encourage their involvement.

iii. **Delaying Gratification** — the capacity for self-restraint, or the ability to refrain from acting on impulse. Patience and the ability to weigh options before acting are also required.

iv. **Adaptability and Flexibility:** Ability to read a situation and decide whether to lead or follow (Singh, D., 2003)

2. Emotional maturity (EM): The construct of emotional competence (EC) can be broken down into the following categories:

i. Tackling Emotional Upsets:

One's capacity to deal with emotional upsets, such as feelings of inferiority, disagreements, and frustrations, etc. It also stresses the need of being able to cope with stressful situations and avoid burnout.

ii. **High self esteem:** Positivity and an optimistic outlook are characteristics associated with high self-esteem.

iii. **Tactful response to emotional stimuli:** This refers to the capacity to deal practically with one's own and the surrounding environment's emotional cues.

iv. **Handling Egoism:** This refers to the ability to deal with ego issues by relinquishing self-interest in accordance with situational needs.

3. Emotional sensitivity (ES): Three types of emotional sensitivity (ES) have been identified

i. Understanding Threshold of Emotional Arousal:

Being sensitive to mild sentiments and cognizant of the connection between emotions and behaviour

ii. **Empathy:** It refers to the capacity to perceive and accept the emotions of others without allowing one's own emotions to interfere.

iii. **Improving Interpersonal Relations:** This

relates to the ability to build trusting, confident, and dependable interpersonal relationships.

iv. Communicability of Emotions: This refers to the capacity to communicate happy sentiments with others.

Measures of Emotional Intelligence

This section explains the various research instruments that have been developed as measures of Emotional Intelligence.

Researchers use a wide variety of methods to quantify EI's impact. Both the meaning and presentation of the word EI are interpreted differently across the many EI metrics. According to Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (2000), there are three techniques to assess EI:

Self-report instruments: Individuals are asked to indicate the extent to which a certain statement described them in the EI self-report measures. A person's level of introspection determines the method's credibility. Data gathered from self-report instruments tend to reflect an individual's sense of self rather than their true EI

Instruments based on information provided by others- Informant measures approach people who know the candidate to describe their impressions of that person

Instruments measuring actual performance: Measures of competence and performance constitute a third category of evaluation techniques.

Several reliable EI testing tools are discussed in the research literature. We will examine and review some of the most crucial ones here.

I. Measurement of the ability model

The current standard for gauging Mayer and Salovey's EI model is the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), which is built around a battery of items designed to elicit a range of emotions as inputs to a problem-solving process. To back up the

model's claim that EI is a form of intelligence, the test is based on traditional, ability-based IQ measures. By evaluating a person's abilities in four distinct areas of emotional intelligence, it generates a total score for that individual as well as scores for each of the four sub-domains.

2. Quantifying Mixed-Model Performance

a. Assessment of Goleman's Framework for Emotional Competence

The Goleman model is the basis for two different types of assessments:

(i) Two instruments, the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) from 1999 and the Emotional and Social Competence Inventory (ESCI) from 2007.

(ii) The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, a self-report and 360-degree assessment that has been around since 2001.

Though several instruments have been created using the Goleman model as inspiration, only the ECI and the ESCI were created by Goleman himself.

b. Bar-On Model of Emotional and Social Intelligence Measurement (ESI)

An individual's emotional and social intelligence can be estimated through the use of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i), a self-report measure of EI designed to assess emotionally and socially competent behaviour. The EQ-i is not designed to assess intelligence or character but rather the resilience of the mind in the face of adversity. From a pool of 133 items (questions or elements), we may calculate a Total EQ (Emotional Intelligence Quotient) and generate five composite scale scores (one for each of the five key components of the Bar-On model). The model's reliance on self-report measures of competence is a major flaw. Fake scores on the EQ-i tend to be very accurate (Grubb & McDaniel, 2007).

3. Measurement of the trait EI model

The Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire

(TEIQue) is a multilingual, comprehensive, and well-researched assessment of trait emotional intelligence.

The EI personality concept developed by Petrides and colleagues is operationalized by TEIQue. The test covers 15 different scales, all of which fall under one of four categories: health, self-regulation, emotions, or interpersonal skills.

There was a positive relationship between TEIQue scores and 4 of the Big Five personality traits (extraversion, agreeableness, openness, and conscientiousness), while the relationship with the fifth and sixth trait, neuroticism and alexithymia was negative.

The measurement techniques that are used by researchers in order to measure the extent of EI is as under:

(I) The Emotional Intelligence Test developed by Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (MSCEIT)

Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso's version 2.0 of their emotional intelligence test is known as the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT V2.0). It's a scientifically valid way to evaluate emotional intelligence. A total of 141 questions and visual prompts make up this instrument for gauging EI. Mayer and Salovey broke down EI into four subdomains: seeing emotions, using emotions to help with thinking, comprehending emotions, and effectively managing them. The MSCEIT measures EI on a whole, and it also measures EI on perception, facilitation of thought, comprehension, and management scales. According to the research of Mayer and Salovey (1997), there is a developmental evolution of skills across all four dimensions of emotional intelligence. The reliability of each metric can be established by a variety of approaches, such as expert scoring or consensus. The four subdomains for assessing EI are :

Branch one: Perception of emotion : it is assessed by the ability to read emotions from

visual cues, such as landscape photos and photos of people displaying a range of expressions.

Branch two: Facilitation of thoughts: how sensation and facilitation might gauge how well your thoughts are facilitated.

Branch three: Understanding emotions – It is evaluated by seeing an individual's proper response to change and blending.

Branch four: Management of emotions : It is evaluated by seeing how well a candidate can influence the emotions of others to get what they want in hypothetical situations (Mayer et al, 2004).

As reported by Mayer et al. (2003), the reliability of the MSCEIT is .01 for expert scoring and .93 for general agreement about overall EI. The MSCEIT V2.0 has been found to have satisfactory levels of content validity (Mayer et al., 2001), discriminating validity (Mayer et al., 2004), and factorial validity across a number of empirical research (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso & Sitarenios, 2001). Since EI is considered a type of intelligence, Mayer et al. (1999) presume that performance-based measurements are the best technique to measuring it. However, this method is not without its flaws. Due to the lack of agreed-upon definitions for what constitutes an appropriate response, ability EI cannot be measured in an objective fashion (Perez, Petrides & Turnham, 2005).

(II) EMOTIONAL QUOTIENT INVENTORY (EQ-i)

The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) is a test designed to assess test-takers' quotients of EI. Author Reuven Bar-On is responsible for its creation. Its basic structure is made up of 133 elements distributed among 5 main scales and 15 smaller ones (Bar-On, 2004). The Bar-On model of emotional intelligence serves as the basis for the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-

I), a self-report assessment. The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-I) was developed to assess how well a person deals with typical, everyday stresses. Following is a rundown of the five composite measures:

- Intrapersonal (self-regard, emotional self-awareness, independence, assertiveness, and self-actualization);
- Interpersonal (empathy, interpersonal relationship, and social responsibility);
- Adaptability (reality testing, problem solving, and flexibility);
- Stress management (impulse control and stress tolerance); &
- General mood (optimism, happiness)

People aged 16 and up are welcome to take the EQ-I. The first commercially available and extensively acknowledged and studied EI measure. Evidence from a wide range of studies shows that the EQ-I is a valid and dependable tool for assessing quality of (Bar-On, 2000; Bar-On, 2006). The EQ-i has an internal consistency coefficient of .97 in the investigation with the American population. To mitigate the effects of response bias, it has an in-built corrective mechanism (Bar-On 2007b).

(III) EMOTIONAL COMPETENCY INVENTORY (ECI)

Goleman, Boyatzis, and Mckee (2002) developed the EI Inventory (ECI) to measure respondents' EI. A 360-degree evaluation tool for assessing an individual's or an organization's level of emotional competence, the Emotional Competence Inventory was developed after the groundbreaking research of Daniel Goleman (1998). The ECI has 110 items to measure 20 different factors in the four domains of self-awareness, self-management, social skills, and social-awareness. One reports their own results on this scale. The Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) is a tool for assessing an organization's or person's level of emotional intelligence. Emotional Competence Inventory-

3 (ECI-3) is the most recent instrument for evaluating the Goleman model of EI. It's a set of 12 skillsets that cover areas that focus upon knowing oneself, learning to control oneself, understanding others, and interacting effectively with others. The number of components in ECI-2 is drastically lower than in ECI-1. According to Emmerling & Goleman (2003), ECI is meant to evaluate an individual's emotional competence in the workplace.

(IV) THE ASSESSING EMOTIONAL SCALE

From the original EI concept proposed by **Salovey & Mayer (1989)**, Schutte et al. (1998) developed a scale to quantify EI (1990). It's built on the four pillars of emotional intelligence, which are self- and other-awareness and appraisal, expression, regulation, and problem-solving through emotion. The Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test, the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale, and most recently, the Assessing Emotions Scale, are all well-known examples of this type of measurement tool (Schutte et al., 2009). The questionnaire had 33 items used to evaluate different aspects of personality.

(V) The Emotional Intelligence Test developed at Swinburne University (SUEIT)

Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test was developed by Palmer & Stough (2001) to assess EI in the workplace. The SUEIT is a self-report questionnaire designed to assess how individuals deal with their emotions on the job. It pooled the measures of EI into a five-factor model by isolating the characteristics of EI that were shared among instruments model. There are 65 parts to it. It has five scales that each represent one of the model's five components of emotional intelligence:

- (1) Emotional recognition and expression
- (2) Understanding emotions
- (3) Emotions direct cognition
- (4) Emotional management &

(5) Emotional control.

The overall scale has a high reliability, with an alpha between .88 and .91. The subscale's reliability coefficients range from $r = .70$ to $r = .91$. Leadership behaviour and emotional expression were examined by Downey, Papageorgiou, and Stough (2005), who compared the SUEIT to the TMMS. The SUEIT (a workplace measure of EI) outperformed the TMMS in predicting successful leadership behaviour, according to research by Downey et al (general measure of EI). The study authors think that, when it comes to predicting outcomes in the workplace, job-specific measures of EI are more useful than general measures of EI.

(VI) The WONG-LAW Emotional Intelligence Scale

Based on the four-factor model of EI published by Mayer and Salovey, Wong and Law (2002) created a scale to assess workplace EI (1997). Self-reported EI can be assessed with the help of the WLEIS. WLEIS was created because there was a need for an EI assessment tool that satisfied these criteria while also being easy to use and reliable in its psychometric properties (Wong & Law, 2002). When it comes to organisational studies, the WLEIS is the sole publicly available measure of EI. Using a 7-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree Nor Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, and Strongly Agree), the WLEIS assessed responses to 16 statements. The World Learning and Educational Improvement System (WLEIS) evaluates EI along four dimensions:

1. Self-Emotion Appraisal and Expression,
2. Other's Emotion Appraisal and recognition,
3. Regulation of emotions in the self, &
4. Use of emotions to facilitate thoughts.

The internal consistency reliability of this scale is excellent, as stated by Wong & Law (2002) (

$= 0.94$). Two other measures of EI, the Trait Meta Mood Scale (Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey, & Palfai, 1995) and the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i), show good convergence with the Wong & Law Emotional Intelligence Scale.

WLEIS showed less connection with the big five personality factors than the EQ-I did, indicating that it is more discriminant. When compared to the Trait Meta Mood Scale, this one explained more variance when it came to predicting people's happiness beyond the big five factors. In this analysis, we adopt the following definitions of EI dimensions:

1. Appraisal and expression of emotions in oneself

Identifying and articulating one's own feelings. It's the capacity to perceive and openly communicate one's own range of feelings. People that are gifted in these areas will be more attuned to their feelings than others.

2. Appraisal and recognition of emotions in others

Empathy is the capacity to identify with and respond appropriately to the feelings of those around you. Those that excel in this area are highly attuned to and able to anticipate the feelings of those around them.

3. Regulation of emotions in oneself

Ability to control one's feelings is assessed along this dimension. The capacity to regulate one's feelings and avoid losing one's temper would be strengths of a person who scores highly in this area. In addition, they are capable of maintaining a healthy mental state.

4. Use of emotions to facilitate performance :

It implies using Emotional support for optimal performance. This is a gauge of the individual's capacity to channel

negative feelings into positive outlets. A high scorer on this level has control over their feelings and uses them in constructive ways.

(VII) Genos EI

Australia's Dr. Ben Palmer and Professor Con Stough of Swinburne University of Technology created the Genos EI model. This is a cutting-edge, modern tool with a practical bottom-up design, making it ideal for use in professional settings. Genos's workplace samples include more than 3,000 common workplace norms and more than 1,000 executive norms. Five scholarly papers based on this concept have been accepted for publication.

"Emotional Intelligence" (EI) is "the ability to sense, express, understand, and manage one's own and other people's emotions in a suitable, professional, and effective manner at work," as defined by The Genos.

The Genos test consists of 70 questions and takes around 20 minutes to complete online. It is a full 360 and includes ratings by self, management, peers, direct reports, and customers/clients. Genos's latest feedback report is straightforward, with alternatives for improvement on a single page that are tailored to the workplace. Genos may be modified quickly and simply to fit the needs of each group or individual using it.

The latter is crucial for groups that seek input from constituents beyond their immediate department. Genos gives a 20-page, colour report with user input that Only the Genos EI suggests conducting evaluations both before and after an intervention. Evaluation of alterations and enhancements in behaviour is supported by the intervention. In addition to 3–4 months of intensive, personalised developmental coaching, each client receives a full manual featuring participatory insight and behavioural rehearsal activities for corporate systems, processes, and action plans. In line with the

client company's demands, goals, objectives, and outcomes in role competencies, the coaching provides assistance for a cognitive-behavioral restructuring technique based on the developmental possibilities presented in the initial report. In fact, the Genos EI is the only model that places such an emphasis on measuring the 7 dimensions of behaviour that have been established as the fundamental tenets of EI through extensive study.

1) Emotional self-awareness: It is the capacity to recognise and comprehend one's own feelings. Subjects are evaluated based on how frequently they report being cognizant of their own feelings, moods, and emotions at work; how well they understand the origins of their own emotions; and how effectively they manage the effects of their emotions on their own thinking, decision-making, and behaviour.

2) Emotional Expression : Second, we have the ability to express one's feelings, which is the primary focus of the second dimension. Subjects are rated based on how often they report feeling different emotions when thinking about their jobs. Feelings like joy, anger, the effect of praise, and so on will all be quantified. This article provides a clear explanation of how to express the proper emotions at the right moment, in the right amount, and to the right people.

3) Emotional Awareness of Others : Thirdly, one's ability to recognise and comprehend the feelings of those around them is emphasised. This takes into account the perspectives of others in the workplace, in contrast to subjective analysis. It aims to investigate thoroughly what makes people experience feelings like worry, rage, or optimism.

4) Emotional Reasoning : Using one's feelings to guide one's reasoning, planning, problem-solving, and decision-making in the workplace has clear utilitarian value. The focus here is on determining whether or not personal and social feelings will be factored into policymaking. We

will use empathy and clear communication to help the stakeholders feel more invested in the project.

5) Emotional Self-management :The fifth and final dimension is emotional self-management, the evaluation and control of one's own feelings. The only benefit of adhering to this approach is that it encourages participants to focus on things that help them feel good while at work and forget about the bad.

6) Emotional Management of Others : Sixthly, the capacity to manage the feelings of other people is evaluated here. Each participant is graded on how often they contribute to a pleasant workplace for others. In addition, it evaluates the candidate's abilities to aid others in developing healthy coping mechanisms in the

face of traumatic situations and in overcoming obstacles to peak performance.

7) Emotional Self-control :It Measures the ability to keep negative emotions at bay while on the job. Employees are given a mark based on how often they are able to maintain concentration despite experiencing workplace anxiety. Their stress and anger management skills will be evaluated.

There are three methods in which emotional intelligence can be assessed: through self-report measures, through informant measures such as how others view an individual, and through ability or performance tests . Some academics favour evaluating subjects based on their abilities and performance instead.

Measures of Emotional Intelligence

The most popular Emotional Intelligence measures are summarised in Table 3.

S No.	Frequently Used Metrics for Emotional Intelligence	Measurement Model	Concise Description	Principal Theorist
1	Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)	Performance based	Each component of emotional intelligence is evaluated through the use of distinct tasks.	Mayer and Salovey
2	Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i)	Self-Report	Total EQ and the five subscales defined by the BarOn model are assessed with 133 self-report items.	Bar-On
3	Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI)	Self-Report And Other-Report	A multi-rater tool that provides ratings on a number of emotional intelligence behaviour indicators.	Goleman
4	Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (EIA)	Self-Report And Other-Report	A 7-minute test designed to measure the presence of Goleman's four emotional intelligence components.	Goleman

5	Work Profile Questionnaire- Emotional Intelligence Version (WPQei)	Self-Report	Examines the seven Goleman skills widely regarded as crucial to high performance in the workplace.	Goleman
6	Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test (SREIT)	Self-Report	The Emotional Quotient Index (EQ-i) is a 33-item scale based on the work of psychologists Salovey and Mayer.	Mayer et al.
7	The Levels of Emotional Self Awareness Scale (LEAS)	Self-Report	Self-report assessment based on the hierarchical generalisation of emotional intelligence, such as bodily sensations, action tendencies, single emotions, and combinations of these emotions.	Lane and Schwartz
8	The Genos Emotional Intelligence Inventory (Genos EI)	Multi - Rater or Self Assessment	(Genos EI) is a 360-degree assessment of emotionally intelligent behaviour in the workplace. It assesses the frequency with which employees demonstrate emotionally intelligent workplace behaviour	Benjamin Palmer and Con Stough

Table 3: Emotional Intelligence measures

An overview of Emotional Intelligence Models

There are two main conceptual models to explain before delving into the specific approaches taken by Salovey and Mayer, Goleman, and Bar-On. The EI construct "addresses individual traits, values, and behaviours," as stated by Dulewicz and Higgs (2000). EI, as described by Goleman (1995), is a skill and a trainable quality. Competencies, abilities, and skills are all part of EI, according to Bar-On (1997). EI, as proposed by Salovey and Mayer (1990), is competency-based.

Ability-based models restrict the concept to smaller, more specific definitions and leave out more subjective factors, as Weinberger (2002) puts it more succinctly. Weinberger (2002) argues that mixed-method models take a more humanistic approach, emphasising more on personality traits. The three main theorists' models will be addressed in the following sections, along with a detailed comparison and contrast of the ability-based and mixed-method approaches.

Review of the three EI theories based on their emphasis on the concept of emotion and emotional intelligence.

The four primary tenets of Goleman's theory seem to centre on EI, yet the theory's submission makes no mention of the measurement of emotional hijack that he proposed in his book (Goleman, 1995). Nonetheless, the 'Self Control' subdomain of the 'Self Management' domain may be able to capture this crucial sign of emotional intelligence. Goleman's EI model, like Bar-On's, expanded beyond the measuring of emotion and emotional intelligence upon closer inspection. Components include: social-awareness (including organisational awareness and a service orientation); self-management (including initiative, conscientiousness, trustworthiness, adaptability, and an achievement drive); relationship management (including developing others, being a catalyst for change, collaborating and leading effectively), and conflict management. As a result of these discoveries, the content validity of Goleman's assessment of EI is likely called into question.

The EI ability-based approach was proposed by Mayers, Salovey, and Caruso (2002) as a means of gauging an individual's logical or cognitive proficiency to deal with emotional inputs.

While Mayers et al. did indeed centre their research on the concept of emotion, the difficulty lies in their conceptualization of EI as cognitive processes. It is well known that emotions precede logical thought, and for some highly emotional people, these emotions can completely block or divert the stimulus before it reaches the cerebral cortex, the brain's processing hub for higher-level thinking. The phrase "emotional hijack" was coined by psychologist Daniel Goleman in 1995. Many people's momentary bad behaviour can be attributed to the emotional hijacking experience (Farooqi, 2019). Oddly enough, some people may find that the emotional hijacking event lasts longer than others. It's possible that some people's feelings won't fully subside for years.

That phenomenon defies all explanation. In fact, while under the impact of such a powerful feeling, such persons can no longer be reasoned with (s). The point is that even those who do well on the MSCEIT may not be good at keeping their emotions in check, especially when provoked unexpectedly. We argue that the concept of emotional intelligence should place more emphasis on the ability to control emotions, whether they are pleasant emotions like love or negative emotions like rage, without allowing them to overpower rational thought. This operational definition of EI is used to evaluate the three theories presented herein for their content validity

In the proposals based on Bar-On's theory, it was stated categorically that "it is a hybrid model that incorporates social, cognitive, emotional, and personality characteristics." Emotional and social skills can be gauged with the help of the Emotional Quotient Inventory, as suggested by Bar-On (2000). Evidently, the scope of Bar-On went much beyond emotions and emotional intelligence. If we apply the rules of content validity, we have some doubts about this. The problem is not solved by simply calling the concept an Emotional-Social Intelligence model. So, how about the Personality and Cognitive components?

Mayer & Salovey's (1997) EI ability-based model, Bar-(1997) On's Emotional-Social Intelligence Model, and Goleman's (2000) EI model all have gaps some of which are discussed here.

Despite its assessment technique focusing entirely on cognitive processing, the Mayer-Salovey model appears to be the most focused on EI among the three theories of EI assessed in this study. The inclusion of characteristics that are plainly beyond emotion, such as leadership, conscientiousness, initiative, organisational awareness, service orientation, trustworthiness [and the like], presents a challenge to the content validity of Goleman's theory. Models that also take into account emotional hijacking are more comprehensive and thus better able to evaluate

emotional intelligence. This is considered to have been achieved via Goleman's model. More effective methods of measuring people's immediate reactions to emotionally distressing stimuli are required.

However, as was indicated before, only the Mayer-Salovey model of EI (of the three considered) employed the cognitive ability test format. As a result, the model presupposed correct and incorrect responses.

This presupposes, without proving it, that people everywhere share a set of universal, unchanging feelings and reactions. This is obviously not the case in the real world. Reactions that at first glance appear unpleasant, such as wrath, might actually be useful in some circumstances. Emotional responses are always based on the circumstances. Although both the Goleman and Bar-On theories advocate for self-reports, this means that there are no definitively right answers. As it should be.

Even if the method of measuring is cognitive, the Mayer-Salovey and Goleman's theory of EI tends to place more emphasis on emotion than the other two theories compared in this article.

There is a lack of measures of EI that focus firmly on emotions and their influence on human behaviour; there is a lack of measures that use a battery of assessment instruments [self-report, gaming technique, and covert observation with anecdotal recordings] to measure EI. Last but not least, while being able to recognise one's own and others' emotions is important, the degree and breadth to which one's

emotions are hijacked is a more reliable sign of emotional intelligence.

It is important to remember that there is no one, absolute metric for measuring a person's innate cognitive capacity or IQ. It's possible that quantitative measurement fails to adequately capture many aspects of cognitive processes. Emotions like happiness, sadness, rage, love, and hatred are even more examples where this statement holds true. This suggests that judging these emotional traits is typically subjective, as it is the result of a combination of environmental and hereditary influences, and that there are thus no universally correct responses to questions about them. The efficacy of the Mayer-Salovey ability-based EI model is called into question by these arguments.

Conclusion

This paper compared and contrasted the three most popular and frequently referenced models of EQ: Bar-On's, the Mayer-Salovey Model, and the Goleman Model. A close examination of the three models revealed that the Mayer-Salovey model put more emphasis on emotion than the other two, with the exception of the cognitive ability assessment method. The reliability of its contents is so bolstered. Nonetheless, the review's results indicate that a battery of assessment tools, with an emphasis on emotional hijacks, is likely to provide a more reliable measurement of emotional intelligence. Therefore, it is suggested that when designing and standardising EI scales, new measurements take into account the aforementioned factors.

References:

1. Bar-On, R. (1997). Bar-On emotional quotient inventory: A measure of emotional intelligence: Technical manual. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
2. Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and Social Intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory. In R. Bar-On & J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), Handbook of Emotional Intelligence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
3. Bar-On, R. (2004). The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Rationale, Description and Summary of Psychometric Properties, In G. Geher (Ed.), Measuring Emotional Intelligence: Common Ground and

- Controversy, 115–145. New York: Nova Science.
4. Bar-On, R. (2005). The Bar-On Model of Emotional-Social Intelligence (ESI). Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations.
 5. Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On Model of Emotional-Social Intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, 18, Supl., 13-25.
 6. Bar-On, R. (2007). How important is it To Educate People to Be Emotionally Intelligent, and Can It Be Done? In R. Bar-On, J. G. Maree, & M. J. Elias (Eds.), *Educating People to Be Emotionally Intelligent* (pp. 1-14). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
 7. Bar-On, R. (2007a). Theoretical foundations, background and development of the Bar-On model of emotional intelligence. Retrieved from <http://www.reuvenbaron.org/bar-on-model/essay.php>. [accessed on September 25, 2022]
 8. Bar-On, R. (2007b). How Important is it to Educate People to be Emotionally Intelligent, and Can it Be Done? In R. Bar-On, J.G. Maree & M.J. Elias (Eds.), *Educating People To Be Emotionally Intelligent*. Johannesburg: Heinemann.
 9. Bar-On, R. (2007b). The 5 meta-factors and 15 sub-factors of the Bar-On model. Retrieved from <http://www.reuvenbaron.org/bar-on-model/essay.php?i=2>. [accessed on September 25, 2022]
 10. Boyatzis R.E. 2008, Competencies in the 21st century. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(1), 5-12.
 11. Boyatzis, R. E., & Sala, F. (2004). Assessing emotional intelligence competencies. The measurement of emotional intelligence, 147-180.
 12. Brown, F. W., Bryant, S. E., & Reilly, M. D. (2006). Does emotional intelligence—as measured by the EQI— influence transformational leadership and/or desirable outcomes?. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.
 13. Caruso, D. R., Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (2002). Relation of an ability measure of emotional intelligence to personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 79(2), 306- 320.
 14. Crowne, K. A. (2009). The relationships among social intelligence, emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence. *Organization Management Journal*, 6(3), 148-163.
 15. Downey, L. A., Papageorgiou, V., & Stough, C. (2005). Examining the Relationship between Leadership, Emotional Intelligence and Intuition in Senior Female Managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(4), 250-264.
 16. Dulewicz, V., & Higgs, M. (2000). Emotional intelligence: A review and evaluation study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(4), 341-368.
 17. Emmerling, R.J. & Goleman, D. (2003). EI: Issues and Common Misunderstandings [Online]. Available From: http://www.eiconsortium.org/research/ei_issues_and_common_misunderstandings.htm. [Accessed March 2022].
 18. Farooqi, Saif (2019). ‘Emotional Hijacking: The Trigger to an Unhealthy Mind’. Retrieved online: <http://www.lifeandpsychology.com/2008/11/emotional-hijacking.html> [accessed on 24.09.2022]
 19. Gardner, H. (1975). *The shattered mind: The person after brain damage*.
 20. Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
 21. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
 22. Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence: Why it matters*

- more than IQ. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
23. Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R.E. & Mckee, A. (2002). *Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of EI*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
24. Grubb, W. L., & McDaniel, M. A. (2007). The Fakability of Bar-On's Emotional Quotient Inventory Short Form: Catch Me If You Can. *Human Performance*, 20, 43-59.
25. Maslow, A. (1950). *Social Theory of Motivation*. Inshore, M.(Ed), *Twentieth-century mental Hygiene*.
26. Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R. D. (2003). *Emotional intelligence: Science and myth*. MIT press.
27. Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence*, 17(4), 433-442.
28. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychology Inquiry*, 15(3), 197-215.
29. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence as a standard intelligence. *Emotion*, 1(3), 232-242.
30. Mayer J. D., Salovey P., Caruso D., Sternberg R. J. (2000). *Models of Emotional Intelligence*, ed Sternberg R. J. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 396-420.
31. Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring Emotional Intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. *Emotion*, 3, 97-105
32. Momeni, N. (2009). The relation between managers' emotional intelligence and the organizational climate they create. *Public Personnel Management*, 38(2), 35-48.
33. Nourizade, F. & Mohseni, M. (2014). A review of the emotional Intelligence Literature.
34. Palmer, B., & Stough, C. (2001). *Workplace SUEIT: Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test - Interim Technical Manual*. Au: Organizational Psychology Research Unit, Swinburne University.
35. Payne, W. (1985). A study of emotion: Developing emotional intelligence; self-integration; relating to fear, pain and desire.
36. Payne.W.L.(1986) A Study of Emotion, Developing Emotional Intelligence, Self integration relating to fear, pain and desire. *Dissertation Abstracts, International*, 47 (01) P 203A (University Microfilms No AAC 8605928).
37. Pérez, J.C., Petrides, K.V., & Furnham, A. (2005). Measuring Trait Emotional Intelligence. In R. Schulze & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *International Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*. Cambridge, MA: Hogrefe & Huber.
38. Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2006). The Role of Trait Emotional Intelligence in a Gender-Specific Model of Organizational Variables. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 552-569.
39. Petrides, K. V., Frederickson, N., & Furnham, A. (2004b). The role of trait emotional intelligence in academic performance and deviant behavior at school. *Personality and individual differences*, 36(2), 277-293.
40. Petrides, K.V., Frederickson, N. & Furnham, A. (2004a). Emotional Intelligence. *The Psychologists*, 17(10):574-577.
41. Pfeiffer, S. I. (2001). Emotional intelligence: Popular but elusive construct. *Roeper Review*, 23(3), 138-142.
42. Rohr, A. B. (2005). *Emotional Intelligence Correlates with Exercise Attitudes*. Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Saskatchewan: Saskatoon.
43. Salovey, P. and Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination*,

- Cognition and Personality, 9 (3), 185-211
44. Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1997). Emotional development and emotional intelligence. New York, NY: Basic Books.
45. Salovey, P., Mayer, J.D., Goldman, S.L., Turvey, C., & Palfai, T.P. (1995). Emotional Attention, Clarity, and Repair: Exploring Emotional Intelligence using the Trait Meta-Mood Scale. In J.W. Pennebaker (Ed.), *Emotion, Disclosure and Health*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
46. Schutte et al. (1998), Development and Validation of a Measure of Emotional Intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, P. 167-177.
47. Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., & Bhullar, N. (2009). The Assessing Emotions Scale. In C. Stough, D. Saklofske, & J. Parker (Eds.), *The Assessment of Emotional Intelligence* (pp. 119-135). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.
48. Singh, D. (2001) *Emotional Intelligence at work* (1st ed.). New Delhi: Response Books. (Chapter 2)
49. Singh, D. (2015). *Emotional Intelligence at work : A professional Guide*. Sage Publications, India.
50. Singh, Dalip. (2003). *Emotional Intelligence at work : A professional guide*. Second edition. New Delhi. Sage Publications
51. Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Magazine*, 140, 227-235.
52. Wall, B. (2008). *Working relationships: using emotional intelligence to enhance your effectiveness with others*. Davies-Black Publishing.
53. Wechsler, D. (1958). *The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence* 4th ed. The Williams & Wilkins.
54. Wechsler. D. (1940) Non intellectual factors in general intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin* , 37, 444-445.
55. Weinberger, L. A. (2002). Emotional intelligence: Review & recommendations for human resource development research and theory. *Proceedings of the Annual Academy of Human Resource Development Conference*, 1006-1013.
56. Wong, C.S. & Law, K.S. (2002). The Effects of Leader and Follower Emotional Intelligence on Performance and Attitude: An Exploratory Study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 243-274.
57. Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., Roberts, R. D., & MacCann, C. (2003). Development of emotional intelligence: Towards a multi-level investment model. *Human Development*, 46(2-3), 69-96.