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Abstract

Emotional intelligence (EI) has been described as everything from a panacea to an invalid concept. This article focuses on recent research that clarifies what does and does not constitute EI, as well as its relationships with a variety of outcomes. We emphasize the role of EI in the workplace, and we distinguish between the positive outcomes that it facilitates, the negative outcomes to which it contributes, and the outcomes for which its role is unclear. We conclude by identifying specific issues that require further attention to advance our understanding of EI.

Emotional intelligence (EI) has a short but turbulent history. While it has risen to the heights of the cover of Time magazine, it has also been subjected to scathing criticism by its detractors. According to some, it is a panacea for industry’s and society’s ills. For others, it is an invalid concept. EI is a set of four interrelated abilities: the abilities to perceive emotions in the self and others, use emotions to facilitate performance, understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and regulate emotions in the self and others (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). The academic interest in EI started with the seminal work of Salovey and Mayer (1990). The widespread interest in it, however, is in large part the result of the popular books published by Goleman (1995, 1998). The argument that people could be intelligent in a way that is different from how ‘smart’ has commonly been understood seemed to have an intuitive appeal, and provocative claims about the importance of EI enhanced the appeal. For example, Goleman suggested that EI is twice as important as the combination of IQ and technical abilities and that it does not correlate highly with measures of personality traits (e.g., cognitive intelligence) and personality traits. This invited timely criticisms of the scientific status of emotional intelligence (e.g., Caruso and Goleman, 2005).

The early research on EI, however, yielded mixed results, even the most positive of which failed to live up to the provocative claims. There were multiple definitions of EI, and many of them were inconsistent with one another. There were also multiple measures of EI, but a number of them overlapped with measures of extant constructs. The imprecise definition and measurement of EI made it difficult to assert that it was a separate, unique construct and to demonstrate that it could predict important outcomes above and beyond other well-known abilities (e.g., cognitive intelligence) and personality traits. This invited timely criticisms of the scientific status of emotional intelligence (e.g., Landy, 2005).

We review the recent research to clarify the definition of EI and the nature of its relationships with a variety of important outcomes, with an emphasis on its role in the workplace. We start with an overview of the three streams of research that ostensibly focus on EI. We then review the positive outcomes that it facilitates, the negative outcomes to which it contributes, and the outcomes for which its role is unclear. We conclude by identifying specific issues that warrant further attention, including cultural variance in EI, its differential impact for men and women, the training of EI, and measurement and methodological issues.

Row, Row, Row Your Boat, Gently Down the (First) Stream

There are three streams of research on emotional intelligence (Ashkanasy and Daus, 2005), but just one of them captures a construct that can meaningfully use the moniker (Côté and Miners, 2006). It should be clear that any construct that purports to be EI should concern emotions and intelligence. It should also be clear that the construct should be measured in a way that captures what might reasonably be considered a form of intelligence.

Stream 1 is predicated on the work of Salovey and Mayer (1990). It conceptualizes EI as a set of four interrelated abilities: the abilities to perceive, use, understand, and manage emotions. Abilities reflect a person’s capacity to successfully complete a particular task or, in other words, a person’s maximum performance (Carroll, 1993). The way in which a person typically performs (i.e., across situations and over time) is the domain of personality traits, which are distinct from abilities (Sackett et al., 1988). Stream 1 therefore conceptualizes EI in a fashion that it is consistent with a form of intelligence.

Stream 1 employs performance tests to assess EI. Performance tests are comprised of questions, the answers to which are right or wrong, or more or less right or wrong. Intelligence concerns the capacity to solve problems (Neisser et al., 1996), hence it is important to employ measures that enable the identification of respondents who have a greater or lesser body of the relevant knowledge and a greater or lesser capacity to spontaneously solve relevant problems. Stream 1 employs omnibus measures of EI, the most popular of which is the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCET; Mayer et al., 2002), and performance tests that are specific to a branch of EI (see Roberts et al., 2010 for a description of the measures). Recent meta-analyses have demonstrated that the MSCET has a positive correlation with measures of other forms of intelligence, and that it does not correlate highly with measures of personality traits (Joseph and Newman, 2010; O’Boyle et al., 2011).

Stream 2 also conceptualizes EI as a set of interrelated abilities, but it employs self- and peer-reports to assess it. The measures often ask respondents to indicate the extent to which they (or another focal individual) successfully engage in various behaviors. There are a number of problems with using...
self-reports to assess a form of intelligence. The common thread among them is that people tend to make inaccurate estimates of their own abilities (e.g., Dunning et al., 2004). Peer-reports are also problematic for a number of reasons. For example, the respondents may not have observed the employee in a wide enough range of emotionally demanding situations to determine whether his or her behavior is the manifestation of one level of EI or another (Côté and Miners, 2006). For these reasons and others, it is difficult-cum-impossible to assert that Stream 2 captures EI. The results of a number of meta-analyses bolster this argument: the measures employed in Stream 2 do not correlate with the measures of other forms of intelligence, and they have a stronger correlation with measures of a number of personality traits (Joseph and Newman, 2010; O’Boyle, Jr. et al., 2011).

Stream 3 does not conceptualize EI as a set of interrelated abilities. Instead, it conceptualizes EI in terms of a series of behavioral outcomes. For example, Bar-On (1997) conceptualized EI as a set of noncognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that concern (successfully) dealing with environmental pressures. Other researchers explicitly conceptualize it as a personality trait (e.g., Petrides and Furnham, 2001), resulting in the oxymoronic ‘trait emotional intelligence.’ All of the above conceptualizations incorporate elements that are not abilities and thus, by definition, cannot capture a form of intelligence. Stream 3 also relies on the use of self- and peer-reports. The results of the same meta-analyses and research, unsurprisingly, yield a similar pattern of results to those for the measures that are used in Stream 2: a relationship to other forms of intelligence that is conspicuous by its absence, and a relationship to personality traits that is conspicuous by its presence.

A review of the literature, therefore, shows that Stream 1 captures EI, whereas Streams 2 and 3 do not capture it. Streams 2 and 3 capture important, often highly predictive individual differences, but individual differences for which the moniker ‘emotional intelligence’ is inappropriate. We believe that the seemingly inauspicious start to research on EI was, at least in part, due to the use of multiple definitions and measures, a number of which were (and are) unfit for purpose. The remainder of this article focuses on Stream 1, and hereafter ‘EI’ should be understood as such.

The Good, The Bad, and The Ugly

The relationships between EI and a wide variety of important outcomes have been examined, ranging from the quality of social relationships to job performance. The strength of these relationships varies, and while EI is often beneficial (The Good), it can also be harmful to individuals and organizations (The Bad), or it can occupy an as of yet unclear role (The Ugly). Contrary to its (early) reputation as a panacea to organizational and societal problems, a high level of EI is not always the solution to a problem.

The Good

**Interpersonal Relationships**

EI facilitates interpersonal interactions, such that people with a high level of EI establish and maintain strong relationships. Expressions of emotion contain important information about (other) people’s goals, attitudes, and intentions (Frijda and Mesquita, 1994). The abilities to decode emotional expressions, understand the impact of specific emotions on decision-making processes, and manage other people’s emotions therefore provide an important means of anticipating and responding to other people in a socially appropriate manner (Côté et al., 2006).

Past research has shown that men with a high level of EI are more likely to be rated as socially competent by the people with whom they interact and by independent observers than men with a low level of EI (Brackett et al., 2006). Furthermore, men and women with a high level of emotion regulation, a branch of EI, are more likely to exercise interpersonal sensitivity and prosocial tendencies, and to be viewed in favorable terms by their peers (Lopes et al., 2005). Past research has also shown that the association between EI and the quality of social relationships remains intact, even when cognitive intelligence and the Big Five personality traits are entered into the analyses (Rossen and Kranzler, 2009).

**Leadership Emergence**

The same mechanisms that link EI to (positive) social relationships also help us to understand its relationship with leadership emergence. Leadership emergence is the degree to which a person who is not in a formal position of authority influences the other members of a group (Taggar et al., 1999). For example, if a person is able to decode (other) people’s expressions of emotion, then he or she can determine their reactions to a proposed course of action. The ability to manage emotions, in turn, can help the person to change the other people’s reactions if it becomes necessary to build further support for the proposed course of action (see Huy, 1999).

Recent research has shown that EI does, in fact, predict leadership emergence, even when controlling for cognitive intelligence and the Big Five personality traits (Côté et al., 2010). Walter et al. (2012) obtained a similar pattern of results. Their studies demonstrated that a branch of EI, emotion recognition, had a positive relationship with leadership emergence through its effects on task coordination, at least for people who also had a high level of extraversion. Recent research by Emery (2012) has shown that the abilities to perceive and manage emotions facilitate the emergence of relationship-oriented leaders, and that the abilities to use and understand emotions facilitate the emergence of task-oriented leaders.

**Job Performance**

The (positive) relationship of EI with job performance is likely to be a complex function of the indirect benefits of social capital and the direct benefits of successfully incorporating emotions in (or excluding them from) decision-making processes. EI should help employees to establish a high level of social capital that, in turn, will provide greater access to valuable information and other resources that facilitate job performance (Sparrowe et al., 2001). EI might also facilitate job performance more directly, by enabling employees to create or up-regulate the emotions that facilitate a particular task and down-regulate the emotions that interfere with it. A
person with a high level of EI is aware of the associations between emotion and cognition, and capable of changing the former to facilitate the latter. This, in short, will help the person to make the best possible decisions and help other people to do the same, which is likely to be reflected in their level of job performance (see Côté and Miners, 2006).

There are a number of individual studies and, now, meta-analyses that confirm EI can facilitate job performance. For example, with respect to the former, Klucemer et al. (2013) found that the ability to manage emotions can facilitate task performance and organizational citizenship behavior directed at the individual, and reduce the likelihood of workplace deviance. The pattern of results held even when a proxy for cognitive intelligence and a measure of the Big Five personality traits were entered into the analyses. The most recent meta-analysis was conducted by O’Boyle Jr. et al. (2011), who used dominance analyses to estimate the relative contributions of EI, cognitive intelligence, and the Big Five personality traits to job performance. They found that EI demonstrated substantial, relative importance even in the presence of these other, robust predictors.

Studies conducted by other researchers have shown that it may be helpful to consider the role of other individual differences to understand the relationship between EI and job performance. Côté and Miners (2006) found that the relationship between EI and job performance becomes increasingly positive as cognitive intelligence decreases. EI, in other words, compensated for lower levels of cognitive intelligence in helping to achieve a high level of job performance. EI also interacts with other individual differences in a similar fashion, such that its role becomes more prominent if other means of achieving a high level of job performance are absent, or present but in an insufficient quantity. For example, Doucet and Oldham (2006) found that EI had a stronger relationship with job performance for employees at a telephone service center who possessed low levels of agreeableness and conscientiousness, both of which should facilitate a high level of job performance when present to a greater extent.

The results of recent research also suggest that the role of situational characteristics and job characteristics, in particular, should be considered to better understand the relationship between EI and job performance. For example, Farh et al. (2012) found that EI predicted job performance for employees whose work entailed a high level of managerial demands (i.e., the extent to which a particular job involves the management of diverse individuals, functions, and lines of business), but not for employees whose work entailed a low level of such demands. A meta-analysis by Joseph and Newman (2010) provides further impetus for considering situational characteristics. Their results showed that EI had a much stronger, positive correlation with job performance among jobs with a high level of emotional demands, at least when EI was conceptualized and measured as a set of abilities.

The Bad

Counterproductive Work Behavior
EI was presented as a panacea by some of its proponents. It can, however, be harmful to individuals, and it can be used to help other people or to harm them, depending on the ambitions of the particular person. There is now some research that seeks to redress the balance by presenting a more complete picture of the ways in which EI can be used. Elfenbein and Ambady (2002), for example, found that people who are skilled at recognizing emotions can be distracted by even low-level, subtle displays of negative emotion that should pass unnoticed. The distraction consumes resources (i.e., attention) that could otherwise be used on the task at hand, and performance suffers as a result of it. Côté et al. (2011) demonstrated that EI can be leveraged to increase people’s level of prosocial behavior, and to facilitate deviant behavior that harms other people. Kilduff et al. (2010) have put forward an agenda for future research to examine the strategic deployment of EI or, in other words, to consider when it is used to advance personal interests, even at the expense of other people’s success and well-being.

The Ugly

Negotiation
EI should facilitate creating and claiming value during negotiations (Fulmer and Barry, 2004). People with a high level of EI should be able to learn about a negotiation partner’s preferences by decoding the information that the partner provides through his or her displays of emotion. Furthermore, they should be able to prevent strong, negative emotions from impacting the exchange of information, and to generate positive emotions that facilitate creative problem-solving, reciprocal positive actions, and frank discussion that will help both parties to move beyond positional bargaining (Adler et al., 1998; Kopelman et al., 2006). This should help to create value in negotiations. A high level of EI should also help people to generate or at least display emotions that beget concessions (and to hide emotions that require making them; e.g., Côté et al., 2013). A high level of EI should also help people to detect when a negotiation partner has reached the reservation point for a particular issue or set of issues (i.e., the lowest value that is still acceptable), and, therefore, to prevent unnecessary concessions (see Elfenbein et al., 2007). This should help to claim value in negotiations.

In spite of the above arguments, the evidence linking EI to negotiation outcomes is mixed. Elfenbein et al. (2007) found that the ability to perceive emotions helped dyads who completed the negotiation exercise to create more joint value (i.e., to increase the size of the outcomes that would ultimately be claimed by the individual members of the dyad). The same ability, however, helped the negotiators who occupied just one of the two roles in the exercise to claim value: the ability to perceive emotions facilitated claiming value for the participants in the role of seller but not in the role of buyer. Other research has focused on the subjective outcomes of negotiations. For example, Mueller and Curhan (2006) have shown that the negotiation partners of people with a high level of EI feel better about the negotiation outcomes, even after controlling for their positive affect and the objective outcomes that they claimed.

The above research suggests that EI may be of limited help with respect to claiming value in a negotiation, but it remains...
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A number of theoretical arguments link EI to desirable leader behaviors and leadership effectiveness. George (2000), for example, argued that EI should facilitate five core elements of leadership effectiveness, such as creating and maintaining enthusiasm, confidence, optimism, cooperation, and trust. Arguments about the role of emotional aperture in leadership (i.e., the ability to recognize the composition of diverse emotions in a collective) further suggest that the abilities associated with EI should facilitate organizational processes that can provoke strong emotions in employees (Sanchez-Burks and Huy, 2009).

There are, however, arguments to the contrary. Some have argued that a high level of EI will not contribute to leadership or, perhaps, that it might even work against it. For example, Antonakis has argued that condition-action scripts (i.e., mental if-then representations of how to behave in certain situations) are sufficient to explain effective leadership, and to prevent EI from usurping the explanatory power of cognitive intelligence and well-known personality traits (Antonakis et al., 2009). He further argued that a high level of the abilities that constitute EI, such as emotion recognition, may even be harmful, because they may result in unnecessary distraction and prevent leaders from making decisions that will benefit the organization, because even the best possible decisions are unlikely to please everyone.

The empirical research reflects this disagreement among various authors, and suggests that EI can but does not always predict leadership effectiveness. Rubin et al. (2005) showed that leaders with a high level of emotion recognition obtain higher ratings of transformational leadership from their employees than leaders with a relatively low level of this branch of EI, but only if they also had a high level of extraversion. Rosete and Ciarrochi (2005) found a positive relationship between EI and leadership effectiveness, indexed by 360° feedback about the achievement of organizational goals. In contrast, Fællesdal and Hagtvet (2013) found that none of the branches of EI or overall EI predicted employees’ ratings of their leader’s transformational behavior. A meta-analysis yielded a correlation of .24 in 10 studies that examined the relationship between EI and self-assessed transformational leadership, but the correlation dropped to .05 in the four studies in which subordinates rated the transformational leadership of their supervisors (Harms and Credé, 2010).

The connection between EI and leadership effectiveness is intuitive, but the empirical evidence that is currently available is sparse and not entirely supportive of the connection. As EI has multiple dimensions and leadership effectiveness can be indexed in more or less instrumental or affiliative terms, it will be interesting to clarify the role that EI plays in each domain of outcomes, and to explore any negative impact that it might have on leadership.

Discussion

The evidence reviewed in this article suggests that EI can be helpful to individuals and organizations. It also suggests that we should be wary of the bold claims made by some of its proponents. People should also be attentive to the ways in which EI can be harmful, and mindful of the fact that there are likely to be outcomes to which it does not contribute. EI appears to be beneficial to interpersonal relationships, leadership emergence, and job performance. EI, however, also appears to facilitate the achievement of less salubrious goals. It will be exciting to further explore its dark side and, in turn, to present a more balanced view of it that gives due attention to its virtues and its vices. The role of EI in other outcomes, including negotiations and leadership, if nothing else, requires further research. The current review is not meant to be exhaustive, but instead representative and suggestive of the broader literature. Even so, it is clear that Stream 1 could do with greater breadth and depth to fulfill its potential.

Future Directions

In this section, we discuss areas of research that have not yet received attention in this article or in previous reviews of literature (e.g., Côté, 2014). The main controversies raised in previous reviews relate to the definition and measurement of EI. As we have argued, we believe that future research should employ an ability model of EI and the corresponding performance tests. We now move beyond these issues to provide novel directions for future research.

Cultural Variability

Many of the current definitions and measures of EI have been developed in Western cultures, and thus reflect the values rooted in them. There is, however, a rich body of cross-cultural research shows that there is variability in the perception, expression, and regulation of emotions. For example, past research has shown that people from collectivistic cultures (e.g., Japan) value and encourage the open expression of emotions less than people from individualistic cultures (e.g., United States), because the expression of (negative) emotions can be detrimental to maintaining social harmony (Markus and Kitayama, 1991).

The lack of integration of culture into current models and measures of EI is problematic. For theory, it means that our current models of EI may not be correctly specified, and that the effects of EI on a range of organizational outcomes may be moderated by culture. For example, the consequences of poor emotion regulation may be more severe in collectivistic cultures that value emotion suppression than in individualistic cultures.
that encourage the open expression of emotion. For practice, it means that a number of the available measures of EI may have an adverse impact on (potential) employees. If the current measures identify correct answers based on what is appropriate in Western cultures, then they may discriminate against non-Westerners. Indeed, research by Moon (2011) has shown that East Asians score lower on the MSCEIT than Westerners do, and that this effect was due, in part, to the incongruence between East Asians’ preference for interdependence and answers that are based on the value of independence.

Given the theoretical and practical challenges of the current research on EI and the rapid globalization of the workplace, we encourage researchers to incorporate the role of culture into their investigations of EI. It would also be helpful to show a similar level of sensitivity to this issue as the next generation of measures is developed, so that researchers can explore the role of EI in a wider variety of cultures with confidence, and practitioners can reduce the likelihood of adverse impact.

**Differential Impact for Men and Women**

Discussion of the role of gender in the literature on EI has been sparse and, for the most part, focused on the variability in EI test scores that shows women often score higher than men (see Joseph and Newman, 2010). A more substantive integration of gender into the research on EI is a curious omission, given that EI could be seen as a stereotypical feminine skill and, as such, it may have different consequences for men and women, especially in the workplace.

Past research on gender roles and stereotypes has shown that women are often expected to be warm, affectionate, empathetic, sensitive to others’ needs, and good listeners (Eagly and Karau, 2002). Furthermore, it has shown that women who violate gender norms (i.e., who do not display stereotypical feminine traits) are punished (e.g., Rudman, 1998). There appears to be a substantial overlap between EI and stereotypical feminine traits, so it is possible (even probable) that women who do not display a high level of EI may be punished, whereas women who display a high level of EI may not gain very much (especially compared to men). In other words, possessing and displaying a high level of EI may not help to advance women’s careers, but a low level of EI (or the failure to display a high level of EI) may hinder them.

This discussion also raise a question about men: would men who display a high level of EI be punished because they are violating the expectations that are associated with stereotypical masculine traits? Past research has shown that men and women incur penalties when they violate their respective gender roles (e.g., Rudman, 1998). Thus, if we construe EI as a feminine set of abilities, men who display a high level of EI may be more likely to be punished than men who display a low level of EI. At the same time, past research has shown that men who display stereotypical feminine traits (e.g., empathy) coupled with stereotypical masculine traits (e.g., ambition) are perceived favorably (Prentice and Carranza, 2002). In other words, a high level of EI may present a unique advantage for men who aspire for leadership positions.

We have outlined a number of possible ways in which EI might differentially influence the careers of women and men, and whether our specific conjectures are right or wrong, we believe that this issue warrants further investigation.

**Training**

There is a lot of interest in training EI in organizational and educational contexts, but the research on it has been sparse and inconclusive. Some past research suggests that branches of EI can be improved, such as emotion recognition (Elfenbein, 2006). Other research on developing EI, however, has used self- or peer-report measures of EI, rather than a performance test (e.g., Kotsou et al., 2011), hence it is difficult to attest to much more than an improvement in declarative knowledge. Other research still has questioned whether or not to develop EI, especially if EI is defined as a form of intelligence (see Côté, 2014 for a discussion of the trainability and heritability of EI). Furthermore, even if EI can be developed, there is another problem that needs to be solved. Sheldon et al. (2014) found that the people who need the training the most are the least motivated to take it!

If one overlooks the (academic) debate about whether EI itself can be developed, then it appears to be possible to develop skills that help people to behave in ways that could be described as ‘emotionally intelligent.’ Returning to the debate in question, current research has not provided conclusive evidence that EI can, in fact, be trained. As such, we believe that more systematic research on this issue is warranted, particularly given that there is already a large demand for such services.

**Measurement and Methodological Considerations**

Our review, among other things, has outlined an agenda for advancing our understanding of EI. We would be remiss, however, not to outline some important methodological considerations that should be in place before the research is conducted. The first consideration relates to the measurement of EI. The MSCEIT is the most widely used and extensively validated performance test, but some important concerns have been raised regarding its psychometric properties and its scoring system (e.g., Conte, 2005). To this end, other measures of EI have been developed, and should also be given due consideration (see Roberts et al., 2010 for a review of the available measures).

Furthermore, most research on EI has focused on overall EI rather than on the effects of its specific branches. Past research, however, has shown that different branches may be more or less helpful (or harmful) in one situation or another (e.g., Elfenbein et al., 2007). Assessing overall EI therefore may provide an incomplete or even inaccurate picture of its role. We therefore encourage researchers to continue developing branch-specific hypotheses, and to be mindful not just of which individual branch(es) matter(s) the most, but also of the way in which configurations of multiple branches might affect various outcomes (e.g., a high score on perceiving emotions and a low score on managing emotions might be especially detrimental to an individual’s job performance).

**Conclusion**

EI is popular, but its popularity has done at least as much harm as good. The unrealistically high expectations set by some of its proponents, ironically, were not and are not endorsed by the very people who introduced the concept (i.e., Salovey and Mayer; see Mayer, 2004). These expectations, coupled with the
inconclusive early research, resulted in criticism that was overly pessimistic. We hope that this article has found the middle ground, somewhere closer to the truth: EI can be beneficial to individuals and organizations, but it can also be harmful to them, and its role in a number of outcomes will only be clarified through further research.
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