

The International Business Case: Emotional Intelligence Competencies and Important Business Outcomes

Fabio Sala
Millennium Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

The concept of emotional intelligence (EI) speaks to many business issues that managers/executives and practitioners/consultants face every day. Some issues are common across organizations, industries, and cultures; for example, How do I get my direct reports motivated around an initiative? How can I competitively reduce turnover? How can I be a more effective leader? What makes our top performers excel and how are they different from poor or average performers? How can we improve customer service and loyalty? How can we prepare our managers for future leadership roles? Although these issues are quite broad, their universal relevance to many business contexts may explain why emotional intelligence makes such intuitive sense to those in the business world. Emotional intelligence, applied to the workplace, is not a cure-all but rather a convenient way to conceptualize the dynamic impact of emotion on behavior and how understanding and managing emotion in the workplace can help address the previously mentioned issues and problems.

Although the term *emotional intelligence* was coined relatively recently, people have understood the value of these skills and abilities for a long time (Cherniss, 2000, outlined the long history of efforts to help workers improve their emotional intelligence). Today, we have seen a growth in programs that are designed to increase awareness of the value of emotional intelligence at work, assess managers' and executives' level of EI competence, and develop behaviors that are consistent with and characteristic of emotionally intelligent leadership. In fact, well-developed principles have been

identified to promote effective training and development of EI competencies (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001). Because the concept of emotional intelligence resonates in the business world, practitioners have been eager to implement it to resolve important workplace issues. During this period of growth in application, many have called for more research that (a) clearly conceptualizes emotional intelligence and (b) demonstrates a firm relation between emotional intelligence and actual workplace performance outcomes. Indeed, practitioners and applied researchers alike have called for more evidence demonstrating a link between emotional intelligence and performance-based assessments (Kaufman & Kaufman, 2001). To date, very little research has demonstrated criterion-related predictive validity with outcomes directly relevant to the workplace. This chapter attempts to address both concerns. Using a competency approach for the assessment of emotional intelligence (Boyatzis, 1982; Boyatzis & Sala, 2004; Spencer & Spencer, 1993), I clarify the EI competency framework, outline its theoretical foundation, and provide evidence for a relation between EI competency ratings and measures of performance in workplace contexts.

This chapter makes a case for the value of emotional intelligence competencies in the workplace. Findings are synthesized from three empirical studies that examined the relation between emotional intelligence competencies and work performance across a variety of functional, organizational, and cultural contexts. To assess emotional intelligence competence, the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI; Boyatzis, Goleman, & Hay Group, 1999) was administered to three samples: South African call center agents from a large life insurance organization, Bass Brewers sales agents covering the entire United Kingdom, and Turkish business school graduates working in a variety of fields for more than 11 years. Measures of workplace performance were obtained for all three groups. Results are synthesized and presented as evidence for the importance and role of emotional intelligence competence on work performance in a variety of roles, organizations, and cultural settings.

MEASUREMENT OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMPETENCIES

The ECI was used to assess EI competencies for each sample. The ECI is a multirater survey instrument that assesses self-ratings, manager ratings, direct report, peer ratings, and client ratings on a series of behavioral indicators of emotional intelligence competencies (Goleman, Boyatzis, & Hay Group, 1999). Previous research has demonstrated acceptable reliability and validity evidence for the ECI (Sala, 2002). From the competency perspective, emotional intelligence is defined as the capacity for recognizing

our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions effectively in ourselves and others. A competency is more generally defined as a characteristic of an individual that is causally related to criterion-referenced effective or superior performance in a job or situation (Boyatzis, 1982; Spencer & Spencer, 1993). An emotional intelligence competency, however, is an ability to recognize, understand, and use emotional information about oneself or others that leads to or causes effective or superior performance (Boyatzis & Sala, 2004). A more simple definition of emotional intelligence may be that emotional intelligence is the intelligent use of emotions. EI can also be defined as how people handle themselves and their relationships (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002).

The ECI measures 18 competencies organized into four clusters (see Appendixes A and B): self-awareness (emotional self-awareness, accurate self-assessment, self-confidence), self-management (emotional self-control, transparency, conscientiousness, adaptability, achievement, initiative, optimism), social awareness (empathy, organizational awareness, service orientation), and relationship management (developing others, inspirational leadership, influence, change catalyst, conflict management, teamwork & collaboration). See Goleman et al. (2002) for a more detailed description of this framework.

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND SOUTH AFRICAN CALL CENTER AGENTS

Organizations that employ call center agents are faced with difficult challenges. Turnover and absenteeism are high in these positions, and therefore staff selection and training are imperative to success. The abilities to focus on customer needs, to handle oneself with frustrated customers, and to convey genuine enthusiasm for products and services are among the key attributes of successful call center agents.

Using the ECI, Heidemarie Nel (2001) conducted a study to examine the relation between emotional intelligence competencies and job performance with a sample of call center agents from a major life insurance agency in South Africa. These front-line professionals are in high-stress roles. The call center personnel have extensive customer contact with current clients (e.g., policyholders), police officers, physicians, and other health care professionals. Maintaining customer satisfaction and loyalty involves managing all these relationships smoothly. This role requires being aware of one's emotions, staying composed and poised in stressful situations, focusing on the customer's needs, and providing solutions and helping to solve clients' problems.

Aside from general computer skills, product knowledge, and policy procedures, success in this role is thought to be largely based on "people skills."

Agents are responsible for making sales proposals to both existing and new clients, providing ongoing customer relations with existing clients, and maintaining customer satisfaction. Agents are responsible for closing proposals and transactions, and to be successful they need to work effectively with other team members to provide fluid services to clients.

Nel (2001) administered the ECI to a sample of call center agents working at the headquarters of a major life insurance agency located in the Western Cape, South Africa. Participants were randomly selected from three call center functions: client services, sales, and administration. These roles are not independent: All three perform relatively similar functions (e.g., transaction services, technology support, customer service inquiries). Client services agents respond to existing policyholders; sales agents primarily work to generate new business by cross-selling; and administration agents focus on internal clients (e.g., health care professionals and physicians) and collections. One hundred fifty-three "self" versions of the ECI were administered, and 135 were completed and returned (response rate = 88.2%). Participants were also rated by 31 team leaders (4.9 participants per team leader). The call center agents were divided as follows: 33% ($n = 44$) client services, 34% ($n = 47$) sales, and 33% ($n = 44$) administration. Each agent was rated on the ECI by the team leader.

A major strength of this study is the quality of the performance measures—or how success was determined. An agent's job performance was an objective overall rating that was provided by the participating organization. Agents' performance ratings were based on the following computerized, objective assessments: (a) closing rate, which is the percentage of successful sales transactions in relation to the amount of decision makers they have spoken to within a specific time period; (b) lapse index, which is the amount of transactions processed within a period of time; (c) production time, the actual logged-in time whereby agents are ready to receive calls (agents are expected to be logged into the system for specific amount of time per day); and (d) quality of conversation, which is based on the blind content analysis of randomly recorded conversations. For the purposes of this study, only overall total performance ratings were available for each agent; individual scores for each assessment could not be obtained.

Table 6.1 reports the study results, which found significant correlations between agents' ECI ratings and measures of call center performance. Results suggest a strong relation between agents' competency ratings and performance within all three call center environments. Self-confidence, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, initiative, influence, change catalyst, and conflict management were strongly correlated with performance across all three groups. Consistent with what would be expected from proposed EI model, competencies from the self-management and social skills (relationship management) clusters seem most significantly related to performance.

TABLE 6.1
Correlations Between ECI 1.0 Scores and Performance
for Call Center Agents by Department (Nel, 2001)

<i>ECI Cluster</i>	<i>Emotional Intelligence (ECI) Competence Managerial Ratings</i>	<i>Call Center Department</i>		
		<i>Client Services (n = 44)</i>	<i>Sales (n = 47)</i>	<i>Administration (n = 44)</i>
Self-awareness	Emotional self-awareness	.23	.33	.46
	Accurate self-assessment	.38	.33	.46
	Self-confidence	.61	.47	.73*
Self-management	Self-control	.17	.26	.48
	Trustworthiness	.66*	.53*	.45
	Conscientiousness	.49*	.45	.57*
	Adaptability	.37	.31	.58*
	Achievement orientation	.64*	.35	.63*
Social awareness	Initiative	.58*	.42	.72*
	Empathy	.22	.42	.45
	Organizational awareness	.49*	.25	.48
Social skills	Service orientation	.27	.39	.46
	Developing others	.30	.30	.68*
	Inspirational leadership	.49*	.26	.62*
	Communication	.41	.32	.46
	Influence	.53*	.37	.63*
	Change catalyst	.57*	.43	.58*
	Conflict management	.45	.26	.59*
Building bonds	.35	.48	.55*	
	Teamwork & collaboration	.44	.41	.57*

Note. ECI = Emotional Competence Inventory.

* $p < .05$.

The self-awareness competencies (i.e., knowing oneself and knowing others) may lead to superior performance by providing a foundation for the appropriate use of self-management and relationship management competencies. For example, an empathic response to a problem that the customer is having may lead to higher satisfaction in a call center context. When a person calls because he or she is frustrated by the insurance company's lack of responsiveness, an empathic response might be, "I'm sorry about that, I can understand how you would be irritated and dissatisfied." A high-performing agent will "hear" the distress (empathy), care enough to do something (achievement or initiative), and then be able to reassure this person that he or she will handle the situation and not discontinue the business relationship (influence, conflict management).

For agents in this study, self-confidence and trustworthiness may be essential to establishing and maintaining rapport with clients—gaining their trust and confidence through the quality of phone conversations. Consci-

entiousness, initiative, achievement orientation, and influence may facilitate various aspects of performance. For example, initiative (i.e., acts on and creates opportunities) and achievement (i.e., concern with improving performance, setting challenging goals) may help agents increase production time and improve lapse indexes. These likely lead to better performance outcomes through high levels of customer satisfaction.

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND SALES PERFORMANCE

What does it take to be an effective salesperson? Are those who are good at closing sales higher in emotional intelligence competencies? Although some think of sales as a rational transaction of goods and services, it is very much an emotional and relational transaction. What are the characteristics that turn us off as clients and consumers? Aggressiveness, a self-interest orientation (i.e., the salesperson will put his or her sales targets above your interests), untrustworthy (e.g., distorting the truth or even lying to get you to buy), lacking integrity, and poor listening skills are a few characteristics that might undermine sales effectiveness. Perhaps a skilled salesperson adapts him- or herself to the perceived preferences of the audience. In professional services organizations, for example, we know that those who are good at sales gain the trust of their clients and deliver high-quality service (Maister, Green, & Galford, 2000).

Using the ECI 2.0 (see Sala, 2002), Lloyd (2001) conducted a study to determine whether emotional intelligence competencies were associated with various measures of performance for sales agents at Bass Brewers in the United Kingdom. The sample consisted of 33 area development manager (ADM) sales agents at Bass Brewers. Covering the entire United Kingdom, the Bass sales force consists of 54 ADMs who are organized into seven regional teams led by seven field sales managers (FSM). These teams are responsible for building volume and profit, implementing national promotional activity, and resolving customer service issues. Essentially, the job requires the ability to sell and deliver high-quality service.

Similar to the study previously discussed, the strength of this research rests in the care Lloyd took in assessing performance for these sales agents. His current role as national account director and his previous ADM position provided him with a thorough understanding of the metrics that identify success in this role at Bass. Understanding the influence of ADM area changes, position changes, market conditions, and centrally negotiated business delivered by national account managers, he argued, "One or two simple hard financial measures such as volume and profit could indicate variances/relationships not necessarily attributable to a particular ADM

and indeed their emotional intelligence" (Lloyd, 2001, p. 21). To address this issue, an overall performance measure (OPM) was developed that consisted of hard, soft, and personal development indicators. The OPM included the following measures (see Lloyd, 2001, for greater detail):

- A "ready for promotion" rating. ADMs were rated by FSMs on the following 5-point scale: (5) *ready for promotion*, (4) *promotion within 2 years*, (3) *lateral move next*, (2) *correct level and correct job*, (1) *wrong level*, and (0) *wrong job*.
- Average number of new brand installations per quarter per fiscal year. The ADMs are responsible for increased branding within their regions.
- Average number of new accounts gained per quarter per fiscal year. This is their hard sales targets. ADMs must increase the number of vendors who directly sell Bass.
- Customer service audit. Customer satisfaction surveys are randomly sent to customers every quarter by an independent telemarketing agency.
- Annual performance rating. This was based on mutually agreed appraisal targets that are updated quarterly. Using company performance appraisal policy, FSMs rate ADMs on a 5-point scale: (5) *superior performance*, (4) *commendable*, (3) *on-target*, (2) *improvable*, and (1) *unacceptable*.
- Number of job band changes. This is the number of job band changes (promotions) at Bass divided by the number of years served.

This study was designed to assess the predictive criterion validity for the ECI and to find out whether emotional intelligence competencies might underlie some of the behaviors that lead to better performance in this role. Performance data were assessed 6 months after emotional intelligence competency ratings were obtained. ADMs provided self-ratings on the ECI, and they were also rated by their managers (i.e., FSMs). This helps to establish a causal connection between exhibiting emotional intelligence competencies and future performance; it also helps to reduce some of the common-source bias in the study.

Lloyd (2001) found strong relations between ECI self- and managerial ratings and sales agent performance; ADMs with higher overall competency ratings averaged across all competencies performed best. ECI self-ratings were positively associated with the OPM (which captures all performance indicators). In terms of the individual performance indicators, ECI self-ratings were also associated with the number of new distribution points achieved, the number of new accounts sold year to date, and career progression/band changes (promotions). Similar patterns were found for

managerial ratings (FSM): ECI ratings were significantly associated with overall performance and number of new accounts sold. Respectable effect sizes were found between ECI FSM ratings and number of new distribution points, customer service ratings, and annual performance ratings; however, ECI self-ratings were not predictive of customer service ratings and annual performance ratings.

These findings may be due to the nature of the performance indicators and limitations of self-assessments. For example, self-ratings have been shown to be less predictive of performance (Church, 2000; Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988; Sala & Dwight, 2002), and they typically demonstrate a leniency bias (Church, 1997; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986; Van Velsor et al., 1993). Therefore, self-ratings may have correlated more strongly with number of new accounts sold and number of new distribution points because those measures are more transparent—that is, people regularly track and monitor those indicators. Customer service ratings and annual performance ratings, however, are more elusive and subjective; it's harder to know whether your customers and your manager are satisfied with your work. This is the paradox of emotional intelligence: If people are not very good at assessing their own strengths and limits, it will be difficult for them to accurately rate themselves on the EI competencies against performance, and similarly, it will be more difficult for them to “see” themselves as others see them.

Interestingly, tenure at Bass and years of sales experience are not associated with performance or EI competency ratings. The data suggest a true performance culture at Bass with clarity between sales agents and managers. The strong relation between performance and EI competence suggests that individual effort, rather than tenure, leads to performance. Furthermore, the fact that self-ratings are correlated with managerial ratings suggests dialogue between agents and managers, because previous research has shown that ratings from these rater groups tend to diverge (Sala & Dwight, 2002). Indeed, quarterly updated appraisal targets for annual performance reviews likely contributed to superior performance management.

ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AFTER BUSINESS SCHOOL

Emotional intelligence competencies theoretically ought to be associated with all kinds of life outcomes. Mastery of emotional self-control, for example, should help people navigate a variety of social interactions as well as manage their own reactions to stress. It's been clearly documented that a higher experience of stress can have negative physical consequences. The focus of this chapter, of course, is on the relation between EI competencies and workplace outcomes. Levent Sevinc (2001), a researcher at Istanbul

TABLE 6.2
Correlations Between Bass Brewers (Lloyd, 2001) Sales Agents Overall ECI 1.0 Ratings and Measures of Performance ($N = 33$)

Bass Brewers Assessment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. ECI self-rating	—									
2. ECI manager rating	.59***	—								
3. Overall performance	.62***	.51***	—							
4. Number of new dist. pts.	.40**	.28	.85***	—						
5. Number of new accounts	.57***	.43**	.92***	.78***	—					
6. Customer service	.04	.25	.38**	.35**	.16	—				
7. Annual performance rating	.08	.23	.31*	.40**	.15	.58***	—			
8. Years Bass service	.09	.04	.04	.07	.07	.01	.26	—		
9. Career progression	.39**	.23	.51***	.32*	.33*	.01	.10	.20	—	
10. Years of sales experience	-.27	.07	.02	.04	.01	.04	.17	.73***	.13	—

Note. ECI = Emotional Competence Inventory.

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .01$.

University, was interested in broadening the conceptualization of workplace "performance" to include both objective and subjective measures of career success. He conducted a study using the ECI with a sample of Turkish business school graduates working in various industries and functions for more than 11 years after graduation. Participants were graduates of Istanbul University, Department of Business Administration in 1990; they were contacted in 2001 through a university alumni association.

One hundred twenty graduates were contacted and 71 returned self-scored ECI surveys (response rate = 59%). Participants were 58% (41) male and 42% (30) female and were between the ages of 31 and 36. The majority (97%) worked for private organizations, whereas only two (3%) worked in the public sector. As you might imagine, graduates were working in a variety of fields and functions. The majority (62%) were in finance (i.e., banking, insurance, securities, etc.), and others were in service industries (14%), manufacturing (14%), and other industries (10%). Sales positions, marketing, general management, accounting, and finance were represented. Participants also were provided with two copies of the ECI-360 to be completed and returned by either a peer, direct report, or manager. Forty participants returned ECI-360 ratings (response rate = 44%), and the majority (90%) of those returned were completed by one rater.

For each participant, Sevinc also obtained several measures of self-reported objective and subjective indicators of career success. Self-reported objective measures of success included current salary, managerial level (first-, mid-, and senior-level management), and number of promotions. Subjective career and life satisfaction was reliably assessed with a self-report survey (Chay, Aryee, & Tan, 1994; Gattiker & Larwood, 1986) that included the following components: financial satisfaction (e.g., I am earning as much as I think my work is worth, I am satisfied with progress toward meeting goals for income); hierarchical satisfaction (e.g., I am pleased with the promotions I have received so far, I am satisfied with success achieved in career or line of work); interpersonal satisfaction (e.g., I am respected by my peers); job satisfaction (e.g., I am in a job which offers me the chance to learn new skills); and life success (e.g., I am happy with my private life, I am happy with life overall).

Results showed a relatively consistent pattern between career success and ECI ratings for both rater groups (i.e., self and other). As one might expect, significant relations between self-reported career satisfaction and self-reported ECI ratings were more frequent and robust than those between self-reported career satisfaction and ECI other-ratings. Table 6.3 shows correlations between ECI self-rating cluster scores and work/life career success/job satisfaction and measures of objective career success. Those who rated themselves high in emotional intelligence competencies also reported the following:

TABLE 6.3
Relation Between ECI 1.0 Self-Ratings and Objective
and Subjective Career Satisfaction With a Sample
of Turkish Business Professionals (Sevinc, 2001)

<i>Self-Reported</i>		<i>Emotional Intelligence Clusters (Self-Rating)</i>			
		<i>Self-Awareness</i>	<i>Self-Management</i>	<i>Social Awareness</i>	<i>Social Skills</i>
Objective	Salary (<i>n</i> = 68)	.43**	.37**	.37**	.41**
career	Managerial level (<i>n</i> = 71)	.15	.16	.10	.22*
success	Number of promotions (<i>n</i> = 59)	-.13	-.14	-.12	-.17
Subjective	Job satisfaction (<i>n</i> = 71)	.32**	.37**	.28**	.43**
career/life	Financial satisfaction (<i>n</i> = 71)	-.04	-.07	-.01	.01
satisfaction	Hierarchical satisfaction (<i>n</i> = 71)	.14	.21*	.16	.24**
	Interpersonal satisfaction (<i>n</i> = 71)	.48**	.47**	.40**	.53**
	Life satisfaction (<i>n</i> = 71)	.24**	.29**	.14	.35**

Note. ECI = Emotional Competence Inventory.
p* < .10. *p* < .05.

- Higher salaries.
- Higher job satisfaction: They felt more supported by management in their work, and they felt challenged, responsible, and accountable in their work.
- Higher hierarchical satisfaction: They were more satisfied with career goals, promotion, and achievements.
- Higher interpersonal satisfaction: They felt more respected and accepted by peers and superiors.
- Higher life satisfaction: They reported being happier and more satisfied with their private life.

Table 6.4 shows correlations between ECI other-rating cluster scores and work/life career success/job satisfaction and measures of objective career success. Significant correlations were less frequent with total other-ratings than with ECI self-ratings. Although significant correlations between total other-ratings and success measures were less frequent, these findings may be more informative and reliable because the sources of data (i.e., self-reported success/satisfaction and ECI ratings by others) are independent from one another. Those who were rated by others as high in emotional intelligence reported having higher salaries, higher job satisfaction, and higher life satisfaction.

The consistent relation between salary and ECI self- and other-ratings suggests that EI competencies are associated with financial success. It was

TABLE 6.4
Correlations Between ECI 1.0 Total Others Ratings and Objective
and Subjective Career Satisfaction With a Sample
of Turkish Business Professionals (Sevinc, 2001)

<i>Self-Reported</i>		<i>Emotional Intelligence Clusters (Total Others Ratings)</i>			
		<i>Self- Awareness</i>	<i>Self- Management</i>	<i>Social Awareness</i>	<i>Social Skills</i>
Objective	Salary (<i>n</i> = 38)	.30*	.37**	.43**	.40**
career	Managerial level (<i>n</i> = 40)	.09	.10	.19	.29*
success	Number of promotions (<i>n</i> = 29)	.03	-.06	-.17	-.10
Subjective	Job satisfaction (<i>n</i> = 40)	.12	.33**	.26*	.34**
career/life	Financial satisfaction (<i>n</i> = 40)	-.21	-.07	-.16	-.15
satisfaction	Hierarchical satisfaction (<i>n</i> = 40)	-.02	.16	.05	.01
	Interpersonal satisfaction (<i>n</i> = 40)	.00	.17	.01	.10
	Life satisfaction (<i>n</i> = 40)	.29*	.46**	.38**	.46**

Note. ECI = Emotional Competence Inventory.

p* < .10. *p* < .05.

concluded that those who are successful in Turkish finance and service industry organizations must possess certain analytical skills; however, it is believed that those who excel (vs. those who are average) also possess certain interpersonal skills that help them work more effectively with others. The ability to persuade someone to invest their money in mutual funds at your bank is not wholly related to your ability to demonstrate your technical competence in investment funds. Most customers have no way of evaluating these skills (much like you don't know if your auto mechanic is going to cheat you based on your evaluation of his or her technical skill—which you may also have trouble evaluating). So, in part, we make decisions based on the interpersonal and largely emotional dynamic and subtle nonverbal interaction with the service provider.

CONCLUSIONS

The research in this chapter provides evidence for the association between EI competency ratings and workplace performance. The results reveal that emotional intelligence competency behaviors are linked to performance in a variety of jobs, organizations, and cultures. Competencies that demonstrate the ability to manage one's emotions and the emotions of others were found to be an important determinant of success at work in a variety of situ-

ations and cultures. Emotional intelligence competencies helped African call center agents be more effective in their role; important indicators of performance were linked to how well they were able to understand and manage emotions. Bass sales agents' hard performance measures were linked to their emotional intelligence competence ratings. Finally, important objective and subjective measures of career success and satisfaction were found to be linked to emotional intelligence competencies for Turkish business school graduates.

The world of work is emotional—our emotions influence how we perceive and interpret information and how we respond to others. Many of the implicit and deliberate decisions we make are largely based on emotion. Connecting and establishing rapport with colleagues and clients, being comfortable in one's own skin, understanding the dispositions of others and adjusting one's approach accordingly, and engaging and energizing ourselves and others are all in part influenced by our emotions. As shown by the studies presented in this chapter and those presented in the chapters throughout this volume, there is increasing evidence that learning to become more aware of our ourselves and our emotions, more accurate at perceiving and interpreting emotion in others, and better at managing emotion in ourselves and others can have a significant positive influence on our work effectiveness.

Future Research

There are a number of methodological limitations to the research presented in this chapter. Because the research is mostly empirically based, future work might establish a clear link between the theoretical foundation of EI competencies and performance within each organizational domain. For example, hypothesis testing may help us better understand exactly how competencies drive performance in the workplace. The studies discussed here are largely descriptive; a more detailed understanding of the demands of each role presented might further explain why EI competencies drive performance and how they lead to better outcomes. Rich qualitative research might also uncover greater detail about how the emotional competencies in which superior performers engage actually lead to superior results.

The design of the South African call center study may have inflated correlations between ECI ratings and performance metrics. Call center agents' managers likely had some knowledge of each agent's performance, which may have influenced a tendency toward more desirable ratings. Although ECI rating by team leaders is probably the most important vantage point,

using ratings only from this group limits the reliability of ECI assessments. Future work might include assessments from clients and might also attempt to ensure that rater groups are blind to agents' performance. Also, for both the South African call center and the Bass studies, performance measures were not independent. Future work might increase sample sizes and use independent assessments—in other words, managers in these studies rated more than one participant in the study.

Another limitation of the Bass study is that two of the measures (ECI and annual performance rating) were directly assessed by the manager. Also, managers likely had knowledge of ADMs' scores on customer service audits, their career progression, and their number of new accounts and distribution points. This common source bias may have inflated the correlations between ECI manager ratings and performance. A future study might improve on the current design by using 3 years worth of performance data, by assessing EI competencies from other perspectives, or by using stronger predictive designs where the manager is blind to any past performance. The current study was partially predictive (performance was assessed 6 months after ECI ratings were collected), but there is likely some inflation.

Analyses were conducted to explore the extent of this bias. First, manager ECI ratings were not significantly correlated with annual performance ratings ($r = .23$, $p =$ not significant). This suggests that the common source bias may not be very strong. Furthermore, the ECI manager rating was only significantly correlated to one measure (i.e., number of new accounts). Partial correlations were run between ECI manager ratings and the overall performance measure and number of new accounts while controlling for the ADMs' annual performance rating as rated by their manager. The correlations remained significant and were only slightly reduced. All this suggests that the relations found between ECI ratings and performance are robust and not compromised by common source bias.

Although direct report ECI ratings could not be obtained in the Bass study (ADMs do not have subordinates), 61% (33 of 54 ADMs) of the population was sampled. Lloyd (2001) also used excellent measures of performance. His role and solid understanding of sales and production at Bass Brewers allowed him access to data that are not often obtained in applied behavioral research. The intercorrelations reveal relatively independent performance indicators. Future work might increase sample size and attempt to understand the complex causal relations among all variables using structural equation modeling.

The relations among emotional intelligence competency behaviors, work satisfaction, and objective outcomes in the study of Turkish business school graduates need further exploration. For example, consistent with the results, we would not expect to find a relation between managerial level and

ECI ratings. Raters tend to calibrate their ratings within levels. In other words, raters' judgments are based on, and calibrated against, the standards and expectations within the target role they are rating. Therefore, we would not expect that higher level managers receive higher ratings than lower level managers because they are not judged on the same criteria. For example, on a 360 instrument, senior executives and CEOs might get similar absolute competency scores as did those working in the mailroom. Why? Because it would be inappropriate and unfair to rate the behavior of the mailroom person against the expectations and standards of the executive. Similarly, number of promotions during their 11-year careers was not associated with current ECI ratings. This finding may be due to variance in organizational size; no relation was found between salary and number of promotions ($r = -.03$, $p = .85$).

To better study the relation between promotion and EI competence, future work might look at individuals who have recently been promoted against those in similar situations who were not promoted. What did those who got promoted do differently than those who did not? I imagine that emotional intelligence competencies play a role. Similarly, with managerial level, what are the expectations between levels that lead to success? That is, what kinds of emotional intelligence behaviors lead to success for the same role at different levels?

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND IMPLEMENTATION

The research evidence here and throughout this book suggests the need to select wisely and invest in employee development. Selection instruments and procedures can be used to help better predict which candidates will likely be outstanding performers. Structured interviews, situational judgment tests, role playing exercises, and assessment center simulations can be used to aid in selection. In compliance with adverse impact laws, these tools and methods can help organizations make more informed hiring decisions. Of course, an organization would first start with identifying the competencies (i.e., create a competency model) that lead to outstanding performance for the particular job it is hiring. Research-based and performance-driven methods can greatly ensure that new hires are successful. Once people are hired, a number of developmental tools exist for increasing emotional intelligence competence. Multirater survey instruments can be used to assess strengths and areas for improvement. Managers can also work closely with subordinates to create plans for long-term development that are consistent with the requirements of the job.

APPENDIX A

<i>Cluster</i>	<i>Competency</i>	<i>Sample Item</i>
Self-awareness	Accurate self-assessment	Acknowledges own strengths and weaknesses
	Emotional self-awareness	Knows how one's feelings affect one's actions
	Self-confidence	Presents self in an assured manner
Self-management	Achievement orientation	Seeks ways to improve performance.
	Adaptability	Handles unexpected demands well
	Emotional self-control	Gets impatient or shows frustration
	Initiative	Initiates actions to create possibilities
	Optimism	Stays positive despite setbacks
	Transparency	Acts on own values even when there is a personal cost
Social awareness	Empathy	Listens attentively
	Organizational awareness	Understands the organization's unspoken rules
	Service orientation	Matches customer or client needs to services or products
Relationship management	Change catalyst	Is reluctant to change or make changes
	Conflict management	Avoids conflicts
	Developing others	Recognizes specific strengths of others
	Influence	Gets support from key people
	Inspirational leadership	Articulates a compelling vision
	Teamwork and collaboration	Does not cooperate with others

APPENDIX B

<i>Competency</i>	<i>Brief Explanation</i>
Accurate self-assessment	Knowing one's inner resources, abilities, and limits
Emotional self-awareness	Recognizing how one's emotions affect performance
Self-confidence	A strong sense of one's self-worth and capabilities
Achievement orientation	Striving to improve or meeting a standard of excellence
Adaptability	Flexibility in handling change
Emotional self-control	Keeping disruptive emotions and impulses in check
Initiative	Readiness to act on opportunities
Optimism	Persistence in pursuing goals despite obstacles and setbacks
Transparency	Maintaining integrity, acting congruently with one's values
Empathy	Sensing others' feelings and perspectives and taking an active interest in their concerns
Organizational awareness	Reading a group's emotional currents and power relationships
Service orientation	Anticipating, recognizing, and meeting customers' or clients' needs
Change catalyst	Initiating or managing change
Conflict management	Negotiating and resolving disagreements
Developing others	Sensing others' development needs and bolstering their abilities
Influence	Having impact on others
Inspirational leadership	Inspiring and guiding individuals and groups
Teamwork and collaboration	Working with others toward a shared goal; creating group synergy in pursuing collective goals

REFERENCES

- Boyatzis, R. (1982). *The competent manager: A model for effective performance*. New York: Wiley.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Hay Group. (1999). *The Emotional Competence Inventory*. Boston: Hay Group.
- Boyatzis, R. E., & Sala, F. (2004). Assessing emotional intelligence competencies. In G. Geher (Ed.), *The measurement of emotional intelligence*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- Chay, Y. W., Aryee, S., & Tan, H. H. (1994). An examination of the antecedents of subjective career success among a managerial sample in Singapore. *Human Relations*, 47(5), 487–509.
- Cherniss, C. (2000). Social and emotional competence in the workplace. In R. Bar-On & J. D. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (2001). Training for emotional intelligence. In C. Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Church, A. H. (2000). Do higher performing managers actually receive better ratings? A validation of multi-rater assessment methodology. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 54(3), 166–172.
- Gattiker, U. E., & Larwood, L. (1986). Subjective career success: A study on managers and support personnel. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1(2), 78–94.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gowing, M. K. (2001). Measurement of individual emotional competence. In C. Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harris, M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 43–62.
- Kaufman, A. S., & Kaufman, J. C. (2001). Emotional intelligence as an aspect of general intelligence: What would David Wechsler say? *Emotion*, 1(3), 258–264.
- Lloyd, M. (2001). *Emotional intelligence and Bass Brewers Ltd*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nottingham Business School, The Nottingham Trent University.
- Maister, D. H., Green, C. H., & Galford, R. M. (2000). *The trusted advisor*. New York: Free Press.
- Nel, H. (2001). *An industrial psychological investigation into the relationship between emotional intelligence and performance in the call centre environment*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Stellenbosch, Department of Industrial Psychology, South Africa.
- Podsakoff, P., & Organ, D. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems & prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12, 86–94.
- Roberts, R. D., Zeidner, M., & Matthews, G. (2001). Does emotional intelligence meet traditional standards for an intelligence? Some new data and conclusions. *Emotion*, 1(3), 196–231.
- Sala, F. (2002). *Emotional Competence Inventory: Technical manual*. Hay Group. Retrieved December 9, 2002, from <http://www.eiconsortium.org/>.
- Sala, F. (2003). Executive blind spots: Discrepancies between self-other ratings. *Journal of Consulting Psychology: Research and Practice*, 54(4), 222–229.
- Sala, F., & Dwight, S. A. (2002). Predicting executive performance with multi-rater surveys: Whom you ask makes a difference. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 54(3), 166–172.
- Sevinc, L. (2001). *The effect of emotional intelligence on career success: Research on the graduates of Business Administration Faculty of Istanbul University in 1990*. Unpublished master's thesis, Istanbul University.