



Conceptualizing Emotional Intelligence as 'Abilities' or 'Traits' and its Relevance in Managerial Performance:

A Perceptual Study of Managers in Selected Service Sector Companies

Shouvik Sircar

Assistant Professor

Department of Commerce

St. Xavier's College (Autonomous), Kolkata

Abstract: When researchers study Emotional Intelligence (EI) in an organizational context with the motive of examining its influence on employee performance they are invariably faced with the challenge of conceptualizing EI in a uniform and unambiguous manner. Given the 'people' element of the marketing mix for services, Emotional Competencies (ECs) are of particular interest to managers in the service sector. This study is based on the survey of the opinions and perceptions of 114 managers from four selected service industries (civil aviation, healthcare, banking, and hospitality) in India regarding (i) their preferred conceptual framework for EI and its derivative construct ECs and (ii) the relevance of EI and ECs to managerial performance. It was observed that practicing managers in the selected service sectors had a preference for a hybrid formulation of EI with a bias towards an 'ability' rather than a 'trait' based formulation. The overwhelming majority of managers perceived ECs to be highly relevant for managerial performance and effective leadership outcomes.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence (EI), Emotional Competencies (EC), Trait

INTRODUCTION

Emotional Intelligence (EI) as a theoretical construct is of considerable interest both in the fields of organizational behaviour as well as human resources management. It is of particular interest in service industries where interactions between frontline employees and customers, among frontline employees, both in front and behind of the 'line of visibility' and between superiors and subordinates can have significant influence on customer satisfaction, the efficacy of internal marketing efforts as well as the quality of superior-subordinate relationships. Goleman (1995) in his bestseller 'Emotional Intelligence: Why it can Matter More than IQ', was deliberately provocative when claiming that at higher echelons of organizational hierarchy the key differentiator between successful and unsuccessful managers was not cognitive intelligence but rather differences in emotional competencies (ECs). This hypothesis, if true, has major implications for key operative decisions taken by human resource managers such as recruitment, selection, training and development, performance appraisal, etc. The central problem that plagues the study of emotional intelligence in an organizational setting is related to the way in which emotional intelligence is theorized. EI when conceptualized as a theoretical construct covers a broad spectrum. From being equated purely with a collection of 'traits' on one end of the continuum to an acquirable set of 'abilities' or 'skills' on the other, competing models of EI cover considerable ground. Between these two extremes reside a plethora of hybrid formulations (the so-called 'mixed models') of EI that combine 'traits' and 'abilities' with a bias towards one or the other. The reason why the exact formulation of EI matters is because on it depends (i) how EI is measured and (ii) how EI can be integrated within the framework of organizational training and development programmes. Conte (2005) observe that measures of EI vary widely not only in terms of their content but also in terms of their assessment methods, ranging from a self-report personality-based approach, an informant approach or an ability-based assessment procedure. Ackley (2016) identified three most often used formulations to include the 'ability' based formulation of Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2002) as embodied in the 'Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test' (MSCEIT), the Emotional Competence inventory (ECi) based on ideas developed by Goleman (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000; Goleman, 1995; Sala, 2002) and the Emotional Quotient inventory (EQi) developed by Bar-On and Parker (2000). This study aims to throw light on the perceptions of practising managers from the civil aviation, healthcare, banking and hospitality sectors in India to the extent they have a definite preference for any of the above formulations of EI and the degree to which they regard ECs to be of relevance to the job of a manager.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Salovey and Mayer (1990) defined emotional intelligence as “the ability to monitor one’s own feelings, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and action”.

Goleman (1998) theorized a framework for emotional competence to combine ‘Personal Competence’ with ‘Social Competence’. Personal Competence is conceptualized to include 3 dimensions (i) Self-Awareness (Emotional awareness, Accurate self-assessment, Self-confidence), (ii) Self-Regulation (Self-Control, Trustworthiness, Conscientiousness, Adaptability, Innovation), (iii) Motivation (Achievement drive, Commitment, Initiative, Optimism). Social Competence is conceptualized to include (iv) Empathy (understanding others, developing others, service orientation, leveraging diversity, political awareness) and (v) Social Skills (Influence, Communication, Conflict management, Leadership, Change catalyst, Building bonds, Collaboration and cooperation, Team capabilities).

Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (2000) conceptualized emotional intelligence as a ‘set of skills’ or ‘competencies’ rather than personality traits. Thus viewed, emotions are considered as useful sources of information that enable an individual to make sense of, adapt and navigate through social environment.

Petrides and Furnham (2001) observe that assessment and measurement of Emotional Intelligence follows two divergent paths. On one hand, it attempts to objectively identify ‘abilities’ which may be assessed through testing in a manner such that there are ‘correct’ and ‘incorrect’ responses to items on the measurement instrument or as subjective self-reported measures of ‘traits’ as indicated by one’s agreement or otherwise to propositions or statements.

Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2002) developed an instrument used to measure emotional intelligence, based on the Four Branch Ability Model. The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) is a 40-minute battery that seeks to test a person’s abilities on each of the four branches of the model and generates a score on each besides yielding a total score. The branches were (i) perceiving emotions, (ii) using emotions, (iii) understanding emotions and (iv) managing emotions.

Thingujam (2002) observe that any self-reported measure of emotional intelligence is plagued by validity inadequacies, conceptualization and operationalization ambiguities and biases and semantic confusion and makes a case for preferring a ‘test-based’ ability formulation of EI.

Bar-On, Handley and Fund (2006) developed the EQi (Emotional Quotient Inventory) that based on five composite scales along with their related sub-scales, viz., (1) Intrapersonal EQ, comprising of (i) Self Regard, (ii) Emotional Self Awareness, (iii) Assertiveness, (iv) Independence and (v) Self Actualization; (2) Interpersonal EQ comprising of (vi) Empathy (vii) Interpersonal Relationship and (viii) Social Responsibility; (3) Stress Management comprising of (ix) Stress Tolerance and (x) Impulse Control; (4) Adaptability which comprises of (xi) Reality Testing, (xii) Flexibility and (xiii) Problem Solving; and (5) General Mood comprising of (xiv) Optimism and (xv) Happiness.

Cote and Miners (2006) examined how emotional intelligence and cognitive intelligence were associated with job performance. They developed a compensatory model that hypothesized that the association between emotional intelligence and job performance became more positive as cognitive intelligence decreased. Measuring emotional intelligence and cognitive intelligence by conducting tests while measuring task performance through supervisor assessments, they found support for the aforementioned hypothesis.

Covazote, Moreno and Hickman (2012) investigated the effect of emotional intelligence on the effectiveness of the performance of managers as transformational leaders in the organizational context. While the study found emotional intelligence to be statistically related to transformational leadership when considered in isolation, the effect became non-significant when ability and personality were controlled for.

Batool (2013) explored the relationship between emotional intelligence and effectiveness in leadership to evaluate the tendency of emotional control of managerial employees in the Pakistani banking sector and found the relationship to be positive and significant.

RESEARCH GAP

Research in the Indian context is required to study way practicing managers in the service sector conceptualize emotional intelligence with respect to a preference for an ‘Ability Formulation’ versus a ‘Trait Formulation’. The extent to which emotional competencies are of relevance to the managerial performance outcomes require critical examination.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To examine the way practicing managers in selected service industries conceptualize emotional competencies to conform more closely to an ‘ability’ formulation or a ‘trait’ formulation of emotional intelligence or a combination thereof.
2. To study the perceptions of practicing managers in selected service industries with respect to their perceptions of the relevance of emotional competencies in as far as they contribute to superior managerial performance and prospects of promotion.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

SAMPLING DESIGN

The study consisted of a survey of 114 managerial personnel i.e., managers, executives, entrepreneur CEO, or by whatever name called, having a span of control of at least 5 subordinates. The respondents were selected based on a combination of convenience sampling and snowball sampling. Four service industries, namely, (1) Civil Aviation, (2) Healthcare, (3) Banking and (4) Hospitality were selected for the study and the quotas per industry was set to at least 20 respondents.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The survey was undertaken by means of a structured questionnaire with two focal areas of study. Firstly, the way practicing managers in the service sector conceptualized emotional intelligence and whether such conceptualization conform more closely to a 'trait' formulation, an 'ability' formulation, or a hybrid of the two. Secondly, the extent to which practicing managers perceived emotional intelligence to be of relevance to superior performance in a managerial position. As the degree of knowledge regarding the notion of emotional intelligence was likely to vary widely among respondents and since emotional intelligence is in its very essence multi-dimensional; respondents were offered ten emotional competencies as surrogates for emotional intelligence.

Respondents scored on a 5-point scale as to the degree of agreement or disagreement, frequency of observation, degree of relevance, etc., with respect to each of the ten ECs for each of the six propositions. A short description of each of the ECs were provided as a ready reckoner to respondents (Table 1.2).

Table 1.1: Internal Consistency Reliability Statistics for Scales and Composite Scales

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Propositions/Constructs</i>	<i>Reverse Coding</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>No. of Items</i>
Scale 1	ECs are inborn	Yes	0.908	10
Scale 2	ECs have the potential to develop with job experience	No	0.828	10
Scale 3	ECs can be developed through training	No	0.891	10
Composite Scale 1 (Includes all items of Scales 1, 2 and 3)	EI Conceptualization Scale	NA	0.728	30
<i>Scale</i>	<i>Propositions/Constructs</i>	<i>Reverse Coding</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>No. of Items</i>
Scale 4	Potential for ECs to contribute towards better managerial performance	No	0.875	10
Scale 5	How often it is observed that ECs are present in managers promoted to positions of leadership?	No	0.918	10
Scale 6	How often managers not possessing ECs are observed to fail as leaders	No	0.910	10
Composite Scale 2 (Includes all items of Scales 4, 5 and 6)	EI Relevance Scale	NA	0.790	30

Table 1.2: List of ECs and short descriptions thereof, provided to respondents.

	<i>Emotional Competencies</i>	<i>Descriptors</i>
1	Self-assessment	Being able to make a realistic assessment of one's own emotional strengths and weaknesses.
2	Self-regard	A strong sense of one's self worth and capabilities.
3	Self-control	Being able to keep disruptive (negative) emotional and impulsive behaviour under control.
4	Emotional awareness (of self)	Being able to recognize one's own felt emotions and their effects on oneself and others.
5	Emotional expression	Being able to effectively and constructively express one's emotions and oneself.
6	Emotional awareness (of others)	Being able to understand emotions in others from verbal and non-verbal cues.
7	Empathy	Being able to view things from another person's perspective.
8	Stress tolerance	Being able to remain calm and act rationally under stressful situations.
9	Flexibility	Being able to adopt and adjust one's feelings to changing situations.
10	Functional optimism	Persistence in pursuing goals despite obstacles and setbacks.

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

In Table 1.2 for each scale as well as the two composite scales internal consistency has been measured by Cronbach's Alpha. Scores on all the items for each of the scales have been summed to compute the scale score. The scale scores (for each of the six scales and two composite scales) were, thereafter, divided by the number of items in the scale to obtain the mean scale score. The proportion of respondents with mean scale scores in the following ranges (Table 1.3) have been interpreted to draw conclusions regarding the degree or intensity of their agreement or disagreement with the aforementioned set of propositions.

Table 1.3: Range of Mean Scale Scores for Interpretation of Responses

<i>Mean Scale Score Range</i>	<i>Descriptors</i>
1 - 2	High Disagreement (High Agreement, if Reverse Coded)
2 - 3	Moderate Disagreement (Moderate Agreement, if Reverse Coded)
3 - 4	Moderate Agreement (Moderate Disagreement, if Reverse Coded)
4 - 5	High Agreement (High Disagreement, if Reverse Coded)

INFERENTIAL STATISTICS**Tests for Normality of Mean Scale scores**

The mean scale scores obtained (for each scale and composite scales) have been tested for normality using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and the Shapiro-Wilk Test to determine whether parametric or non-parametric tests would be appropriate.

Tests for Equality of Mean Scale Scores

The mean scale scores of each scale and composite scale have been tested for equality across all grouping variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**Respondents' profile based on grouping variables.**

Table 2.1: Respondent Profile based on Age.

<i>Grouping Variable</i>	<i>Groups (Levels)</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Age	18-25	2	1.8
	26-35	31	27.2
	36-45	40	35.1
	46-55	41	36
	Total	114	100

Table 2.2: Respondent Profile based on Gender.

<i>Grouping Variable</i>	<i>Groups (Levels)</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Gender	FEMALE	41	36
	MALE	73	64
	Total	114	100

Table 2.3: Respondent Profile based on Organizational Work Experience.

<i>Grouping Variable</i>	<i>Groups (Levels)</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Organizational Work Experience	<=5	36	31.6
	06-Oct	28	24.6
	Nov-15	23	20.2
	16-20	11	9.6
	>20	16	14
	Total	114	100

Table 2.4: Respondent Profile based on Total Industry Work Experience.

<i>Grouping Variable</i>	<i>Groups (Levels)</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Total Industry Experience	<=5	12	10.5
	06-Oct	15	13.2
	Nov-15	34	29.8
	16-20	12	10.5
	>20	41	36
	Total	114	100

Table 2.5: Respondent Profile based on Academic Qualifications.

<i>Grouping Variable</i>	<i>Groups (Levels)</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Academic Qualifications	HIGHER SECONDARY (CLASS 12 LEVEL)	13	11.4
	GRADUATE	54	47.4
	POST-GRADUATE AND HIGHER	47	41.2
	Total	114	100

Table 2.6: Respondent Profile based on Industry.

<i>Grouping Variable</i>	<i>Groups (Levels)</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Industry	AVIATION	21	18.4
	BANKING	37	32.5
	HEALTHCARE	30	26.3
	HOSPITALITY	26	22.8
	Total	114	100

Part – I: The Conceptualization of Emotional Competencies by Practicing Managers in in Selected Service Industries

Descriptive statistics:

Table 3.1: Frequencies and Proportions for Scale 1.

Scale 1: ECs are inborn		
<i>Levels of agreement</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>
High agreement (strong trait bias)	34	29.8
Moderate agreement (moderate trait bias)	50	43.9
Moderate disagreement (moderate ability bias)	28	24.6
High disagreement (strong ability bias)	2	1.8
Total	114	100.0

The overwhelming majority of practicing managers (73.7%) can be observed to be supportive of the notion that ECs are ‘inborn’ rather than ‘learned’ or ‘acquired’. Significant differences were found among the respondents when comparing the mean scale scores ‘gender’, ‘organizational work experience’ and ‘industry’ (Table 3.6).

Table 3.2: Frequencies and proportions for Scale 2

Scale 2: ECs have the potential to improve with job experience		
<i>Levels of agreement</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>
High agreement (strong trait bias)	1	0.9
Moderate agreement (moderate trait bias)	6	5.3
Moderate disagreement (moderate ability bias)	70	61.4
High disagreement (strong ability bias)	37	32.5
Total	114	100.0

There appears to be near consensus among practicing managers that ECs do indeed develop with job experience (93.9%), however, the vast majority of managers (61.4%) agree that the impact is only moderate at best. Significant differences were found among respondents based on their mean scale scores across 'total industry experience' and 'industry' (Table 3.6).

Table 3.3: Frequencies and proportions for Scale 3.

Scale 3: ECs can be developed through training		
<i>Levels of agreement</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>
High agreement (strong trait bias)	2	1.8
Moderate agreement (moderate trait bias)	16	14.0
Moderate disagreement (moderate ability bias)	72	63.2
High disagreement (strong ability bias)	24	21.1
Total	114	100.0

An overwhelming majority of managers are of the opinion that ECs can be developed through training (84.3%), however, most of them (63.2%) believed that the impact of training on EC development were at best modest. Significant differences were not found in the mean scale scores among respondents across any of the grouping variables (Table 3.6).

Table 3.4: Frequencies and proportions for Composite Scale

Composite Scale 1: EI Conceptualization Scale		
	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Strong preference for trait formulation	0	0
Preference for mixed model with trait bias	22	19.3
Preference for mixed model with ability bias	88	77.2
Strong preference for ability formulation	4	3.5
Total	114	100.0

There appears to be a widespread support for a hybrid formulation of ECs with an emphasis on abilities (77.2%). While no respondent was in favour of a purely 'trait' formulation and very few (3.5%) respondents favoured a purely 'ability' formulation. A small minority of respondents (19.3%) favoured a hybrid formulation with a 'trait' bias. Significant differences were not found in the mean scale scores among respondents across any of the grouping variables (Table 3.6).

Inferential statistics:

Tests of Normality of Mean Scale Scores:

Table 3.5: Tests for Normality of Scale Score Means for Scales 1, 2 and 3 and Composite Scale 1

	Tests of Normality					
	<i>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</i>			<i>Shapiro-Wilk</i>		
	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p Value</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p Value</i>
ECs are inborn	0.078	113	0.086	0.973	113	0.022
ECs have the potential to improve with job experience	0.139	113	0.000	0.799	113	0.000
ECs can be developed through training	0.122	113	0.000	0.967	113	0.006
EI Conceptualization Scale	0.075	113	0.164	0.977	113	0.044

In Table 3.5, since all p values < 0.05 (at 5% level of significance), we infer that the mean scale scores are not normally distributed and therefore non-parametric tests for equality of means would be appropriate.

Tests for Equality of Mean Scale Scores:

The hypotheses for each scale and composite scale may be generalized as follows:

Null Hypothesis: Mean Scale Scores across all levels (groups) of the grouping variable are equal.

Alternate Hypothesis: Mean Scale Score of at least one level (group) of the grouping variable is not equal.

Table 3.6: Asymptotic Significance (p vales) for tests for equality of means for Mean Scale Scores for Scales 1, 2 and 3 and Composite Scale 1

Grouping Variable	ECs are inborn	ECs have the potential to improve with job experience	ECs can be developed through training	EI Conceptualization Scale	Non-Parametric Test for Equality of Means
Age	0.051	0.208	0.980	0.440	Kruskal Wallis H
Gender	0.003*	0.170	0.817	0.170	Mann Whitney U
Organizational Work Experience	0.002*	0.107	0.092	0.281	Kruskal Wallis H
Total Industry Work Experience	0.440	0.020*	0.224	0.059	Kruskal Wallis H
Academic Qualifications	0.072	0.798	0.578	0.178	Kruskal Wallis H
Industry	0.000*	0.002*	0.069	0.281	Kruskal Wallis H

*Null hypothesis rejected.

Part – II: Perceived Relevance of Emotional Competencies in Managerial Jobs

Descriptive statistics:

Table 4.1: Frequencies and Proportions for Scale 4.

Scale 4: Potential for ECs to contribute towards better managerial performance		
Potential for positive contribution	Frequency	%
Very low	34	29.8
Moderately low	50	43.9
Moderately high	28	24.6
Very high	2	1.8
Total	114	100.0

Nearly three-quarters of respondents (73.7%) opined that the contribution of ECs towards superior managerial performance was not high. A quarter of respondents (24.6%) believed while ECs did contribute towards superior managerial performance, the impact of such contribution was at best modest. Very few respondents (1.8%) were convinced that ECs had a strong influence on superior managerial performance. Significant differences in mean scale scores among respondents were found across 'gender', 'organizational work experience' and 'industry' (Table 4.6).

Table 4.2: Frequencies and Proportions for Scale 5.

Scale 5: How often it is observed that ECs are present in managers promoted to positions of leadership?		
Frequency of occurrence	Frequency	%
Very low	0	0.0
Moderately low	12	10.5
Moderately high	53	46.5
Very high	49	43.0
Total	114	100.0

The overwhelming majority (89.5%) of practising managers opined that they had observed the presence of ECs among managers who are promoted to positions of leadership. However, the opinions were somewhat evenly split among those who had strong agreement with the proposition (43.0%) and those with moderate agreement with the proposition (46.5%). Significant differences were found among the mean scale scores of respondents across 'organizational work experience' (Table 4.6).

Table 4.3: Frequencies and Proportions for Scale 6.

Scale 6: How often managers not possessing ECs are observed to fail as leaders		
Frequency of occurrence	Frequency	%
Very low	0	0.0
Moderately low	12	10.5
Moderately high	53	46.5
Very high	49	43.0
Total	114	100.0

The overwhelming majority (93.9%) of practicing managers feel that the lack of requisite ECs is indeed the reason why managers fail as leaders. However, the opinions were somewhat evenly split among those who had strong agreement with the proposition (47.4%) and those with moderate agreement with the proposition (46.5%). Significant differences were found among the mean scale scores of respondents across 'age', 'organizational work experience' and 'industry work experience' (Table 4.6).

Table 4.4: Frequencies and Proportions for Composite Scale 2.

Composite Scale 2: EI Relevance Scale		
Level of relevance	Frequency	%
Highly irrelevant	0	0.0
Moderately irrelevant	3	2.6
Moderately relevant	58	50.9
Highly relevant	53	46.5
Total	114	100.0

There was near consensus (97.4%) among practicing managers that ECs are indeed relevant to managerial jobs. Opinions were somewhat evenly divided as to whether ECs are 'highly relevant' (46.5%) or whether ECs are only moderately relevant (50.9%). Significant differences in mean scale scores were found respondents across 'organizational work experience' (Table 4.6).

Inferential statistics

Tests for Normality of Mean Scale Scores:

Table 4.5: Tests for Normality of Scale Score Means for Scales 4, 5 and 6 and Composite Scale 2

	Tests of Normality					
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	p Value	Statistic	df	p Value
Potential for ECs to contribute towards better managerial performance	0.089	113	0.029	0.970	113	0.013
How often it is observed that ECs are present in managers promoted to positions of leadership?	0.091	113	0.021	0.972	113	0.019
How often managers not possessing ECs are observed to fail as leaders	0.099	113	0.008	0.962	113	0.003
EI Relevance Scale	0.066	113	0.200	0.976	113	0.036

In Table 4.5, since all p values < 0.05 (at 5% level of significance), we infer that the mean scale scores are not normally distributed and therefore non-parametric tests for equality of means would be appropriate.

Tests for Equality of Mean Scale Scores:

The hypotheses for each scale and composite scale may be generalized as follows:

Null Hypothesis: Mean Scale Scores across all levels (groups) of the grouping variable are equal.

Alternate Hypothesis: Mean Scale Score of at least one level (group) of the grouping variable is not equal.

Table 4.6: Asymptotic Significance (p vales) for tests for equality of means for Mean Scale Scores for Scales 4, 5 and 6 and Composite Scale 2

Grouping Variable	Potential for ECs to contribute towards better managerial performance	How often it is observed that ECs are present in managers promoted to positions of leadership?	How often managers not possessing ECs are observed to fail as leaders	EI Relevance Scale	Non-Parametric Test for Equality of Means
Age	0.184	0.100	0.037*	0.052	Kruskal Wallis H
Gender	0.040*	0.783	0.327	0.382	Mann Whitney U
Organizational Work Experience	0.001*	0.021*	0.025*	0.003*	Kruskal Wallis H
Total Industry Work Experience	0.379	0.116	0.047*	0.086	Kruskal Wallis H
Academic Qualifications	0.702	0.481	0.206	0.365	Kruskal Wallis H
Industry	0.029*	0.334	0.597	0.481	Kruskal Wallis H

*Null hypothesis rejected.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

1. There appears to be a strong preference among practicing managers for a more pragmatic and less abstract formulation of emotional intelligence to the extent it can (i) positively impact managerial performance and (ii) discriminate between effective and ineffective leaders. This is in congruence with a 'mixed model' or 'emotional competency' formulation of the Emotional Intelligence construct. It is recommended that:
 - a) Further research be undertaken so as to reinforce or refute the above conclusion.
 - b) For its application in (i) functional areas of Human Resource Management and (ii) particularly in the application of Emotional Competencies related to Emotional Management by frontline employees during service interaction, it is desired that 'industry specific' Inventories of Emotional Competencies be developed.
2. There is overwhelming support among practicing managers to Emotional Competencies being highly relevant to superior managerial performance and efficacy of leadership. It is recommended that HR managers, HR departments and independent HR consultants, take cognizance of the relevance of Emotional Competencies (as described above) and incorporate the same while designing Management Development Programmes (MDPs) and Organizational Development (OD) programmes.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ackley, D. (2016). A Practical review of Models, Measures and Applications. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, Vol. 68(No. 4), 269-286.
- [2] Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). In R. Bar-On, & J. D. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 363-388). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [3] Bar-On, R., Handley, R., & Fund, S. (2006). Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Performance. In V. U. Druskat, F. Sala, & G. Mount, *Linking emotional Intelligence to Performance at Work: Current Research Evidence with Individuals and Groups*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- [4] Batool, B. F. (2013). Emotional Intelligence and Effective Leadership. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, Volume 4(Number 3), 84-94.
- [5] Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. S. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence. In R. Bar-On, & J. D. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, and assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace* (pp. 343-362). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [6] Conte, J. M. (2005). A review and critique of emotional intelligence measures. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*(26), 433-440.
- [7] Cote, S., & Miners, C. T. (2006). Emotional Intelligence, Cognitive Intelligence and Job Performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 51(No. 1), 1-28.
- [8] Covazote, F., Moreno, V., & Hickman, M. (2012). Effects of leader intelligence, personality and emotional intelligence on transformational leadership and managerial performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*(23), 443-455.
- [9] Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.
- [10] Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why it Matters More than IQ*. New York: Batman.
- [11] Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2000). Emotional Intelligence meets Traditional Standards for an Intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27(4), 267-298.
- [12] Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2002). *The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)*. Toronto, Ontario: Multi Health Systems.
- [13] Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait Emotional Intelligence: Psychometric Investigation with Reference to Established Trait Taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, 425-448.
- [14] Sala, F. (2002). *Emotional Competence Inventory: Technical Manual*. Philadelphia, PA: McClelland Centre For Research, Hay Group.
- [15] Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185-211.
- [16] Thingujam, N. S. (2002). Emotional Intelligence: What is the Evidence? *Psychological Studies*, Vol. 47(No. 1-3), pp. 54-66.