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Abstract
The commentaries on my target article expand on it in many useful and enlightening ways, and some provide a glimpse at important new research. The commentaries also point to a few issues raised in the original article that require clarification or elaboration. In this response, I begin by recalling the “big idea” that initially led to interest in emotional intelligence (EI) as a concept, which is that success in life and work depends on more than just the basic cognitive abilities measured by IQ tests. I then clarify what I mean by emotional and social competence (ESC): It is not a single, unitary psychological construct but rather a very broad label for a large set of constructs. After considering whether we really need the ESC concept, I discuss whether the single, comprehensive definition of EI that I proposed in the target article is the best one in light of alternatives suggested in some of the commentaries. Next, I return to the issue of measurement and note new ideas and suggestions that emerge in the commentaries. I conclude by considering the question of how much EI or ESC adds conceptually or predictively to IQ or personality.

Both good science and good practice depend on lively debate and criticism. So I was pleased that this journal provided an opportunity for both proponents and critics to exchange views on the topic of emotional intelligence (EI). However, I must confess that I approached the task of writing the target article with some trepidation. As Spector and Johnson (2006, p. 325) noted, “There is perhaps no construct in the social sciences that has produced more controversy in recent years than emotional intelligence.” I now see that I did not need to worry. The commentaries provide the healthiest kind of debate and criticism. Taken as a whole, the commentaries expand on the target article in many useful ways. Two of the commentaries (Harms & Credé, 2010; Newman, Joseph, & MacCann, 2010) provide insights based on new meta-analyses that had not appeared in print when I wrote my target article. They make it clear that there is a growing body of research that will continue to modify our understanding of EI in the years to come.

Every commentary makes interesting points, some of which I agree with and others with which I take issue. However, given the space limitations, I cannot discuss each commentary separately and in detail. Instead, I will discuss a few themes and issues that several different authors raised. First, I address the misunderstanding found in some of the commentaries concerning the meaning of the term “emotional and social competence.” I now see that I did not need to worry. The commentaries provide the healthiest kind of debate and criticism.
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best one in light of alternatives suggested in some of the commentaries. Next I return to the issue of measurement and note new ideas and suggestions that emerge in the commentaries. I conclude by considering the question of how much EI or ESC adds conceptually or predictively to IQ or personality. But first I set the stage by noting the “big idea” that led to interest in EI initially.

**The Big Idea Behind EI**

Before I consider the specific issues raised by the commentaries, it is helpful to remember the “big idea” that initially attracted attention to EI, both within psychology and among the general public. This big idea is that success in work and life depends on more than just the basic cognitive abilities typically measured by IQ tests and related measures; it also depends on a number of personal qualities that involve the perception, understanding, and regulation of emotion.

As Peter Salovey often notes when he gives talks on EI, he and Jack Mayer first began to think about the concept when they heard about what happened to Gary Hart, a U.S. presidential candidate in the 1988 election. Even though Hart seemed to be one of the smartest people ever to run for the office, his campaign fell apart when he denied that he had a mistress and then challenged the press to catch him in a compromising position with her. Shortly after he issued this challenge, he spent the night with the mistress, and when he left her house the next morning he was greeted by a group of reporters and photographers. His campaign quickly collapsed. According to Salovey, the notion that such a “smart person could do such a dumb thing” was what sparked his curiosity about those personal qualities other than cognitive intelligence that are important for success. Salovey and Mayer’s thinking eventually led to the formulation of a new concept, which they called EI (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

A growing number of psychologists now are interested in whether EI is a viable psychological construct. Debates and controversies over the concept have increasingly focused on this issue. This kind of scientific interest is both appropriate and useful. However, it sometimes has caused many in the field to lose sight of the initial notion that there are personal qualities other than traditional intelligence that are important for success. Debates over the meaning and measurement of EI are worthwhile, but they should not cause us to lose sight of that initial big idea.

**ESC: What Exactly Is It?**

In my target article, I devote considerable attention to the question, “What is EI and how is it related to similar concepts such as emotional and social competence (ESC)?” I used the term ESC to refer to those emotional abilities, social skills, personality traits, motivations, interests, goals, values, attachment styles, and life narratives that can contribute to (or detract from) effective performance across a variety of positions (McClelland, 1998). And I suggested that the so-called “mixed models of EI” or “trait EI” were really ESC models. In suggesting that we distinguish between EI and ESC in this way, I was trying to clarify the “confusion and loss of legitimacy of the field,” as one of the commentaries put it (Côté, 2010), that ensues when we refer to two unrelated concepts (e.g., ability EI and trait EI) by the same name. However, I was also trying to help the field return to the big idea behind EI. It seems to me that it is valuable to identify a set of personal qualities that are distinct from cognitive ability but that are also important for success in life, and the mixed models of EI or trait EI do just that.

Unfortunately, the authors of some commentaries seemed to misunderstand what I meant by ESC. Several of the commentaries depicted ESC as a unitary psychological construct, and they rejected it as too broad. Some commentaries also seemed to assume mistakenly that ESC is synonymous with personality or a “personality construct.” And some authors seemed to consider ESC...
as a new concept and nothing more than another name for the mixed models of EI. I am pleased to have this opportunity to correct these misperceptions.

The most significant misperception was that ESC is a single, unitary construct, and as such it is too broad. For instance, Gignac (2010) wrote that ESC is “too broad to realistically afford opportunities to develop meaningful theories of behavior or cognition, as well as too broad to realistically obtain the desired internal consistency reliability level for comprehensive application in industry.” It is a mistake to think of ESC as a single attribute that can be developed into a psychological construct. Rather, ESC refers to a large set of personal attributes, in the same way that the concept of “personality” represents a large set of personal attributes. ESC, like personality, is a domain label not a statistical construct.

Because ESC is an overarching concept, it may seem as though it includes “everything” or that it is a “grab bag” of attributes, as some critics complained (Newman et al., 2010). Harms and Credé (2010) in their commentary state that “ESCs are overinclusive and atheoretical”; and they rhetorically ask, “If competencies are simply defined by whether or not they relate to important outcomes, and emotional competencies are simply those competencies linked to the experience or perception of emotions, could any characteristic with an emotional component be described as an ESC?” The answer is, “Yes.” But ESC actually is less of a “grab bag” than is a concept like personality. In fact, personality is even more inclusive than ESC. Personality inventories seem to include almost every personal characteristic that isn’t a skill or ability (Mayer, 2005; Roberts, Harms, Smith, Wood, & Webb, 2006).

Even though ESC is similar to the concept of personality, it is not synonymous with personality, as some commentators suggested. For instance, Roberts, Matthews, and Zeidner (2010) asserted that “ESC measures share near complete empirical overlap with personality.” They go on to write, “Contrary to what is implicated in the lead article, the extent that ESC measures correlate with personality is very high.” As is often the case in debates about EI, one’s conclusions depend on which research one uses. Although it is true that there are some studies that have found very high correlations between particular measures of personality and particular measures of ESC, more comprehensive and systematic reviews find that the overlap is far from “complete.” A recent meta-analysis, just published in the highly selective Journal of Applied Psychology, found that “mixed-model EI” showed considerable incremental validity (15.7%) over personality (based on measures of the Big Five; Joseph & Newman, 2010).

Many personality traits do seem to be emotional and social competencies, but this does not mean that ESC and personality are synonymous. Research suggests, for instance, that the Big Five dimensions of Conscientiousness and Emotional Stability are often linked to measures of job performance and thus could be considered emotional and social competencies. However, the other three Big Five dimensions (Agreeableness, Extraversion, and Openness) do not seem to be consistently related to performance (although they may be related to performance in a few contexts) and thus should not be considered part of ESC (Barrick, Mitchell, & Stewart, 2003).

Furthermore, ESC ultimately includes more than just a set of personality traits. ESC is a large and diverse class of constructs, some of which are virtually identical with certain personality traits (e.g., self-confidence), and some of which are quite distinct, such as the kinds of nonverbal emotional perception skills discussed in Riggio’s (2010) commentary (e.g., communication of affect; recognition of deception in others).

Although some of the commentaries misperceived the distinction between personality and ESC, one seemed confused about the relationship between ESC and cognitive ability. Antonakis and Dietz (2010) seem to believe that any personal quality that has both cognitive and emotional aspects, such
as delay of gratification, cannot be considered an ESC as I have defined it. This view also represents a misunderstanding of the concept. Although some ESCs show almost no correlation with IQ scores (optimism might be an example), many ESCs do have a cognitive component. A trait such as the ability to delay gratification is an ESC because it involves management of emotions in order to achieve social goals. Also, as Antonakis and Dietz indicate in their commentary, the relationship between delay of gratification and cognitive ability, though positive, is not strong; and the causality probably is complex, with factors such as social class accounting for at least part of the observed correlation.

Some of the commentaries also seemed to consider the “mixed models of EI” as synonymous with ESC. This perception is understandable because I suggested that the most popular mixed models of EI were really models of ESC. However, I did not mean to suggest that ESC should be defined solely in terms of these particular models. ESC is not just another label for trait EI or the mixed models of EI. ESC includes many other, older models, measures, and personal qualities that are not included in Bar-On’s (2006) model of emotional and social intelligence or Petrides’s (2010) model of trait EI. Riggio’s (2010) commentary, in describing the long history of work on nonverbal and emotional communication, helps make this point.

Thus, ESC is not a new concept. I reframed the “mixed models of EI” and “trait EI” as models of ESC in part because the concept has a long and respectable history in psychology. There is a sizable body of research and theory on related concepts such as “affective social competence” (Halberstadt, Denham, & Dunsmore, 2001), “emotional competence” (Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998; Saarni, 1999), and “social skill” (Riggio, 1986). Developmental psychologists have been especially active in contributing to research and theory on ESC (e.g., Saarni, 1999). The Encyclopedia of Childhood and Adolescence defines social competence as “the social, emotional, and cognitive skills and behaviors that children need for successful social adaptation” (Welsh & Bierman, 1998). Another virtue of adopting the term ESC is that it links the work of many EI researchers to this other work.

ESC: Do We Really Need It?

Having clarified what I mean by ESC, there is still the question of whether it is a useful concept. Some commentaries suggest there is no need for the concept of ESC (Antonakis & Dietz, 2010). Joseph and Newman (2010) argued against using ESC models in practice, even though their meta-analysis demonstrated that measures of some of these models provide incremental validity over both personality and cognitive ability measures, because such models are characterized by both “unknown content and theoretical value.”

Rejecting a concept because it is criterion-based rather than theoretical seems to be a rather extreme position. Should physicians stop prescribing an effective medicine such as aspirin just because we do not have any empirically supported theory of why it is effective? As Kaplan, Cortina, and Ruark (2010) suggest, industrial– organizational (I–O) psychologists can begin with the question of performance, or they can begin with a theoretical question. ESC models begin with the former; EI models with the latter. The ESC models and measures associated with Bar-On (2006) or Boyatzis and Goleman (Boyatzis, 2009) were constructed by examining which personal qualities are most predictive of positive life outcomes, such as superior performance in the workplace. Although Kaplan et al. (2010) argued that I–O psychologists should ultimately be more interested in criterion-based concepts such as ESC, my own position is more pluralistic. I think there is room for both kinds of concepts in an applied discipline such as I–O psychology.

In addition, to reject ESC because it is not theoretically sound, without suggesting a replacement, leaves us with the current
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EI: Have We Found the Best Definition?

Another issue that I raised in my target article concerned the importance of finding a commonly accepted definition for EI. Once we have such a definition, we can decide whether a particular model or measure really involves EI or something else such as ESC. Based on the writing of the most prominent researchers and theorists, I proposed the following definition of EI: “the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others” (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000, p. 396). Although most of the commentaries seemed content with such a definition, there was some dissent.

Gignac (2010) wrote, “The Cherniss-endorsed definition of EI is not very abstract or general, as it describes precisely the number and nature of dimensions of EI measured by the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test.” Borrowing from Sternberg and O’Hara (1999), Gignac offers this as a better definition: “The ability to purposively adapt, shape, and select environments through the use of emotionally relevant processes.” Roberts et al. (2010) offer a more modest alternative. They propose that we drop the “assimilating emotion in thought” part of the definition because research up to now has not supported this as an independent factor.

I think it is fine to offer better alternatives to the definition I proposed; as I noted in the original paper, intelligence researchers continue to debate over what is the best definition of intelligence; and one can find over 20 different definitions in the literature (Neisser et al., 1996). However, in considering different definitions of EI, we should be cautious not to accept all definitions as equally valid or as representing the same thing. And once we select a meaningful definition, we should try to be consistent in the way we use the term when applying it to new models and measures.

The Problem of Measurement

Many of the commentaries shared my concern about the current measures of EI. Van Rooy, Whitman, and Viswesvaran (2010) spoke for many when they noted, “The bottom line is that more tests assessing the demonstration of emotional ability are needed.”

There is particular skepticism concerning the construct validity of self-report measures of EI, fueled in part by new research highlighted in two of the commentaries. In their just-published meta-analysis incorporating the most recent research, Joseph and Newman (2010) wisely distinguished between studies based on the Mayer et al. (2000) definition of EI but using a self-report measure such as the Wong–Law EI Scale and studies based on the same definition but using an ability test such as the MSCEIT. They found there was an even weaker relationship between “self-report EI” and “ability test EI” than between ability test EI and self-report measures of the mixed model of EI. And although ability test EI correlated with cognitive ability ($\hat{\rho} = .28$), self-report...
measures of EI showed virtually no correlation with cognitive ability. In another new meta-analysis, Harms and Credé (in press) found very low agreement between self-ratings and other ratings of EI ($\rho = .16$).

Fortunately, some of the commentaries also offer some useful insights that can guide the way forward. Riggio (2010) highlights many existing measures of important emotional and social abilities that have been studied for decades, such as the interpersonal perception task. He also proposes that we devote more time and effort to developing more narrow measures of particular emotional and social competencies. Such measures promise to be more useful than measures of very broad concepts such as EI or ESC. Not only are such measures likely to provide greater clarity in terms of construct validity, but they also are likely to be “more amenable to training and development.”

Other commentaries suggest some promising new measurement strategies that are just beginning to emerge. Measures such as video-based situational judgment tests of emotional regulation and emotional understanding (Newman et al., 2010; Roberts et al., 2010) appear to be better than either the self-report measures or the ability measures that have dominated the field up to now.

**The Power of Prediction: How Much Does EI or ESC Add to IQ or Personality?**

One other issue that attracted considerable attention in the commentaries involves the predictive validity of EI or ESC. This issue brings us back to the “big idea” on which interest in EI is based. Is it really important for success in life? Is it more important than the kinds of cognitive skills measured by traditional intelligence tests? I argue in the target article that there is a growing body of empirical research suggesting a link between EI or ESC and outcomes such as leadership effectiveness and job performance. However, I also predict that ESC will be a stronger predictor than EI in most cases, and I caution that context is important. EI and ESC should be more important in some situations than in others.

Several commentaries agreed with these views, and two presented new research supporting the notion that ESC is a better predictor of performance than EI. One recent meta-analysis found that “mixed-based EI measures” showed a considerably stronger relationship with job performance ($\hat{\rho} = .47$) than either self-report measures of ability EI ($\hat{\rho} = .23$) or performance-based measures of ability EI ($\hat{\rho} = .18$; Joseph & Newman, 2010). Job performance was based on supervisor ratings. This same study found that only the mixed models of EI show substantial incremental validity over both cognitive ability and popular measures of the Big Five personality traits. And another recent meta-analysis, which focused on transformational leadership and EI, found that “trait EI” was a better predictor than ability EI. Of all the measures they considered, the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) was the strongest predictor of transformational leadership (Harms & Credé, in press).

Recent research also supports the view that context will make a difference in how strong the relationship is between EI or ESC and performance. The Joseph and Newman (2010) meta-analysis found that both EI and ESC predicted job performance in high-emotional labor jobs but not for low-emotional labor jobs.

Even though the research supporting a link between EI or ESC and job performance continues to accumulate, a few commentaries indicate that some scholars remain unconvinced. For instance, Antonakis and Dietz (2010) assert that existing research at this point fails to support the notion that EI accounts for incremental variance in performance outcomes. In another commentary, Harms and Credé (2010) note that their meta-analysis of the link between EI and transformational leadership found little incremental validity for EI over personality traits or cognitive ability.

Before considering these more critical views on the relative importance of EI or ESC, it is good to keep in mind that
the reason psychologists have become interested in EI and ESC is that cognitive intelligence, narrowly defined, accounts for only a portion of the variance in outcomes. For instance, Judge, Colbert, and Illies's (2004) meta-analysis, published in the Journal of Applied Psychology, found that IQ and similar measures of cognitive ability accounted for only 7% of the variance in leadership effectiveness.

In considering the question of whether EI or ESC in fact contributes to leadership effectiveness, we should be careful not to over generalize from the research that has been done to date. First, context is important (Jordan et al., 2010). There may well be significant links between EI and leadership in some situations but not others. Second, existing research is based on current measures of EI, which just about everyone agrees need to be improved. Third, job performance usually is measured by supervisor ratings, which often are not highly reliable or valid indications of true performance. Supervisor ratings are good indicators of "success," but their relationship to true effectiveness is not clear. EI may prove to be especially important for aspects of behavior that are more critical for organizational effectiveness than for individual success, such as a person's ability to work effectively in a team or reach better joint solutions in a negotiation. For instance, one study found that individuals who scored higher in EI were more likely to come up with integrative, joint gains that "created value" in negotiations, but they were not as successful in claiming distributive, individual gains (Foo, 2005, p. 906).

When it comes to ESC as a predictor of performance, some commentaries focused on the lack of incremental validity when measures of the Big Five personality traits are included. However, as already noted, the most recent systematic meta-analysis showed that measures of the "mixed model of EI" showed substantial incremental validity (15.7%) when compared with the Big Five (Joseph & Newman, 2010).

Furthermore, we need to be cautious about how we use and interpret "incremental validity" when evaluating the role of ESC. The "big idea" that led to interest in EI initially was that ESC, which includes certain aspects of personality, accounts for considerable variance in important outcomes above and beyond what is accounted for by traditional measures of cognitive ability such as IQ tests. Thus, incremental validity is especially important in comparing EI or ESC with IQ measures. It is less relevant when considering the importance of ESC compared with personality as measured by the Big Five. In fact, the question of incremental validity when ESC is compared with personality has little meaning, given the nature of ESC. As noted above, ESC should overlap considerably with omnibus measures of personality, given that ESC by definition includes all personality traits that predict success. As for EI, incremental validity compared with personality is only important as an indication of an EI measure's discriminant validity.

In conclusion, I think it is safe to say that the jury is still out when it comes to the importance of EI or ESC for job performance. The most recent and extensive meta-analysis suggests that EI and especially ESC predict job performance, particularly in situations characterized by high-emotional labor (Joseph & Newman, 2010). Furthermore, although it is true that research at this point does not suggest that EI makes a larger contribution to outcomes such as leadership effectiveness than does cognitive ability, research does suggest that EI makes a unique contribution. And as advances are made in both conceptualization and measurement, the evidence may well become even stronger.

On the other hand, there still are relatively few studies on the EI–performance link. When Joseph and Newman (2010) conducted a PsycINFO keyword search of emotional intelligence, they found over 900 peer-reviewed journal articles, but only 22 of these studies measured real job performance. Clearly, we need more research on the topic.
But how much evidence is enough to decide the question ultimately depends on one's standards and how one is disposed to the question. Proponents of EI will look at the studies that suggest a positive link with performance and conclude there is enough evidence. Those who do not like the concept or favor the view that success is mainly a matter of general mental ability as measured by IQ tests will conclude that there is not enough evidence.

Psychologists have been perfecting measures of cognitive intelligence for over 100 years. The assessment of EI is less than 20 years old. Given that there still are those who question how strong the IQ—performance relationship really is after all of the research that has been done on the topic, it is not surprising that researchers disagree on the EI—performance link, and they will continue to do so for some time to come.
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Abstract
There has been much confusion and controversy concerning the concept of emotional intelligence (EI). Three issues have been particularly bothersome. The first concerns the many conflicting definitions and models of EI. To address this issue, I propose that we distinguish between definitions and models and then adopt a single definition on which the major theorists already seem to agree. I further propose that we more clearly distinguish between EI and the related concept of emotional and social competence (ESC). The second issue that has generated concern is the question of how valid existing measures are. After reviewing the research on the psychometric properties of several popular tests, I conclude that although there is some support for many of them, they all have inherent limitations. We need to rely more on alternative measurement strategies that have been available for some time and also develop new measures that are more sensitive to context. The third area of contention concerns the significance of EI for outcomes such as job performance or leadership effectiveness. Recent research, not available to earlier critics, suggests that EI is positively associated with performance. However, certain ESCs are likely to be stronger predictors of performance than EI in many situations. Also, EI is likely to be more important in certain kinds of situations, such as those involving social interaction or significant levels of stress. Context makes a difference.

During the last 2 decades, the topic of emotion has become popular once again in psychology (Barsade, Brief, & Spataro, 2003). Of all the areas related to the topic, one of the most popular has been “emotional intelligence” (EI). EI has been defined as “the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others” (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000, p. 396). Researchers have examined EI in a variety of contexts, including education, social adjustment, health, personal relationships, and work (Mayer, Roberts, & Barsade, 2008).

Interest in the topic was initially fueled by anecdotal evidence suggesting that mental ability by itself is not enough for success in life. Clinical experience also demonstrated in rather compelling ways that people could score high on traditional intelligence tests yet do poorly in areas such as self-regulation and social relations. Asperger’s syndrome represents a case in point. There were also vivid examples from the neurological literature, such as the case of a brilliant attorney who underwent surgery to remove a brain tumor. Following the surgery, his cognitive abilities were as strong as ever, but he could barely function at work, and his social relations substantially deteriorated. An MRI indicated that the neural pathways connecting the emotional areas of the brain to the prefrontal cortex had been
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damaged during the surgery, making it impossible for him to make even the simplest decisions (Damasio, 1994). Taken together, these examples suggested that emotional processing abilities are important for effective performance and adjustment.

The concept of EI is based on three premises. The first is that emotions play an important role in life. Second, people vary in their ability to perceive, understand, use, and manage emotions. And third, these differences affect individual adaptation in a variety of contexts, including the workplace. These basic premises seem self-evident. However, opinion about EI as a construct has varied greatly, especially in industrial–organizational (I–O) psychology (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005). In fact, as Spector and Johnson (2006) have observed, “There is perhaps no construct in the social sciences that has produced more controversy in recent years than emotional intelligence” (p. 325). Wild claims about the concept have led to a strong backlash of skepticism. On the one hand, some advocates have argued that EI is more important than IQ for individual and organizational effectiveness. On the other hand some critics have argued that EI is merely a new, catch-all label for constructs that have been around for decades, and that it makes little difference for a person’s success or well-being in life.

As is often the case, the truth about EI seems to be more complex than either of these extreme views suggest. After describing the most popular approaches to defining and measuring EI, I will consider three issues that have generated the most debate. The first concerns the many conflicting definitions and models of EI. I will suggest that one way to resolve this issue is to distinguish between definitions and models. There actually seems to be considerable agreement about what EI is. Once we adopt this common definition, it becomes relatively clear which models and measures are consistent with it. It also becomes clear that two different constructs are often included under the label of EI. One is emotional intelligence, and the other is emotional and social competence. Distinguishing between these two constructs can help clarify thinking and communication in the field.

The second issue concerns measurement. There now is some research supporting the construct validity of several measures, but most of the popular measures leave something to be desired, which is not surprising given that the field is still relatively young. Research on assessment in other areas could point the way to better measures of EI in the future.

The third issue concerns the significance of EI for important organizational outcomes such as leadership effectiveness and job performance. There is a growing body of research, published in respected, peer-reviewed journals, suggesting that EI does play an important role in work-related processes. Several studies also suggest that EI accounts for unique variance (incremental validity). And there is even more research suggesting that there is a link between emotional and social competence (ESC) and performance.

Definitions, Models, and Measures of EI

Although there are other models of EI, four models currently dominate the field. The first is Bar-On’s (1988) model of what he now calls “emotional and social intelligence.” Bar-On was interested in identifying the traits and skills that help people to adapt to the social and emotional demands of life. His research suggested that these personal qualities include the ability to be aware of, to understand, and to express oneself; the ability to be aware of, to understand and relate to others; the ability to deal with strong emotions and control one’s impulses; and the ability to adapt to change and to solve problems of a personal or social nature. The five main components in his model are intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, adaptability, stress management, and general mood (Bar-On, 1997, 2006). Bar-On’s model is connected with the emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i), a
self-report measure developed by Bar-On in the mid-1980s and widely used since the late 1990s.

Another major model is based on the work of Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Coming to the topic with an interest in the psychology of emotions, personality theory, and mental abilities, they sought to develop a new, distinct type of intelligence. They consider their model to be a “mental ability” or “information-processing” approach, and measures based on it tend to correlate more highly with cognitive ability tests than with personality tests (Mayer, Roberts, et al., 2008; Van Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2004). The four components (or “branches”) of their model are: the ability to perceive emotions, the ability to use emotions to facilitate thought, the ability to understand emotions, and the ability to manage emotions (Mayer, Roberts, et al., 2008). Although a number of measures have been designed based on the model, the most recent one to be developed by the model’s creators is the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT). The MSCEIT is an ability test designed to measure EI by evaluating actual performance on a range of tasks. For instance, emotional perception is measured in part by having the test-taker rate the emotional expressions on a number of faces.

A third major model of EI is based on the work of Boyatzis and Goleman (Boyatzis & Sala, 2004). Although their model was inspired by the earlier thinking of Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso, it was designed to encompass the social and emotional competencies that are linked to outstanding performance in the workplace. The Boyatzis–Goleman model is strongly influenced by the work of McClelland (1973), Boyatzis (1982), and Spencer and Spencer (1993). The model consists of a number of specific competencies organized into four basic “clusters”: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management. The primary measures associated with this model are the emotional competence inventory (ECI) and the emotional and social competence inventory (ESCI). Both are multirater or “360 degree” instruments. Recently, Goleman (2006) has distinguished between EI and “social intelligence” (SI), and he has proposed that the last two components in the original model, which he now terms social awareness and social facility, be considered components of SI.

The most recent model to emerge is known as “trait emotional intelligence.” This might be considered a second generation model because it was designed to include many of the personal qualities included in earlier models (Petrides, Pita, & Kokkinaki, 2007). It is based on a content analysis of early EI measures and is meant to include all “personality facets that are specifically related to affect” (Petrides et al., 2007, p. 274). The model consists of four components: well-being (which includes self-confidence, happiness, and optimism), sociability (social competence, assertiveness, and emotion management of others), self-control (stress management, emotion regulation, and low impulsiveness), and emotionality (emotional perception of self and others, emotion expression, and empathy) (Petrides et al., 2007). The model is measured with a self-report instrument known as the trait emotional intelligence questionnaire (TEIQue) (Mikolajczak, Luminet, Leroy, & Roy, 2007).

The four models tend to be associated with different measurement strategies. Bar-On’s model and trait EI have been operationalized primarily through self-report measures. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso have used ability tests; and Boyatzis and Goleman have relied on a multirater instrument. However, Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) suggested in their discussion of the “three streams of research” on EI that a distinction should be made between theoretical models and measurement strategies. A particular theoretical model of EI can be measured in more than one way. For example, a number of researchers have developed self-report measures based on the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso model (Schutte et al., 1998; Wong, Law, & Wong, 2004).
Similarly, there is a multirater version of Bar-On’s EQ-i.

**Current Controversies and Some Possible Resolutions**

As noted above, the concept of EI has generated considerable controversy. Of all the criticisms that have been raised, the most fundamental involves the lack of agreement concerning what EI is. This issue needs to be addressed first because all of the other issues, such as how significant EI is for work-related performance, depend on how one defines EI.

**Lack of Consensus Concerning Definitions and Models**

Both critics and supporters of the EI concept have been concerned about the many different definitions and models that have emerged. Matthews, Emo, Funke et al. (2006) have complained that “the label ‘emotional intelligence’ has been rather haphazardly used to refer to a multitude of distinct constructs that may or may not be interrelated” (p. 8). Murphy (2006) notes that when we say someone is “emotionally intelligent,” it can mean many different things. Locke (2005, p. 428) was even more blunt when he wrote, “What does EI . . . not include?” Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2008, p. 503) wrote that the term “is now employed to cover too many different things.” And Daus and Ashkanasy (2003, pp. 69–70) argued, “These [different] models have done more harm than good regarding establishing emotional intelligence as a legitimate, empirical construct with incremental validity potential.”

Although critics of the EI concept have made much of the lack of agreement on definition, the problem is not unique to EI. There is still considerable disagreement about how to define general intelligence, even after 100 years of active research on the topic. Back in the mid-1980s, when a group of two dozen distinguished experts on the concept of intelligence were asked to define the concept, they gave two dozen different definitions (Sternberg & Detterman, 1986). Another large group of experts commissioned to consider the matter argued that “Such disagreements are not cause for dismay. Scientific research rarely begins with fully agreed definitions, though it may eventually lead to them” (Neisser et al., 1996, p. 77). If intelligence researchers are still saying this about standard intelligence after 100 years of study, the existence of several different models of EI should not be surprising. Nevertheless, the widely discrepant views of what EI is do seem to pose a real problem for both scientific legitimacy and progress in the field.

There have been several responses to the problem of multiple definitions and models. The first is to reject the concept of EI completely (Landy, 2005; Locke, 2005). Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) have responded by arguing that there are some important differences between the concepts of SI and EI. They believe that problems with particular definitions, models, and measures at this early stage of research should not lead us to abandon the concept entirely. They propose that we reject the unfounded claims and focus on the growing body of research that has appeared in refereed journals.

A second approach to the problem of multiple definitions and models is to accept the fact that there is a diversity in views and live with it, at least for the present (Bar-On, 2006; Emmerling & Goleman, 2003; Petrides et al., 2007). One problem with this solution is that because the models are so different from one another the concept of EI is in danger of becoming meaningless. In one study, for example, the correlation between two of the models (as represented by the MSCEIT and the EQ-i) was only .21 (Brackett & Mayer, 2003). It is fine to have different models of a particular construct, but when the most common measures of the two models share only 4% of the variance, it is hard to argue that they are measuring the same thing.

A third solution to the problem is to choose one of the existing models and
demonstrate convincingly that it is the best one. Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) have taken this approach in proposing that the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso model is the one that the field should adopt. It is tempting to choose one model and call it the only legitimate one, but all the current models have significant limitations, including the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso model. As Matthews, Emo, Funke et al. (2006, p. 7) pointed out, the model may be too restricted: “Several qualities commonly attributed to EI are excluded, such as emotional expressiveness, empathy, perspective-taking, and self-control.” Also, competing models have certain strengths. One virtue of the broader models is that they bring together many of the emotional and social abilities that are important for success in school, work, and life into one framework. Even Ashkanasy and Daus acknowledged that for those who wish to predict, understand, and manage human behavior in organizations, the broader, “mixed models” can be useful. But how can we label all of these models “emotional intelligence”?

Rather than try to put forth one model as the only correct one, it might be better to formulate a single definition of EI. This common definition can then be used to determine which collections of abilities and traits are true models of EI. Such an approach assumes that there can be a multiplicity of different models even though there is a single definition.

Distinguishing between “definitions” and “models” is an idea that was suggested by Salovey and Mayer in a somewhat different context when they made a distinction between intelligence and models of intelligence. Following Wechsler (1958), they defined intelligence broadly as the capacity to “deal effectively with the environment” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 187), and they suggested that many different types of intelligence, including EI, fit this basic definition. However, there are a number of different models of intelligence that differ considerably from one another. For instance, Spearman’s (1927) famous view that all intelligence ultimately is based on a single, underlying factor (“g”) is not a definition of intelligence but rather a model of intelligence. The concept of EI clearly is incompatible with Spearman’s model of intelligence, but it should still be considered a type of intelligence based on the common definition.

If we apply this way of thinking to EI research and theory, we would seek to establish a common definition of EI and then evaluate proposed models and measures in terms of that definition. Is it possible at this point to identify a common definition that most theorists and researchers seem to accept? Although there is no unanimous agreement, a review of the literature suggests that most researchers have accepted a basic definition proposed by Mayer et al. in their earlier writings. They defined EI as “the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others” (Mayer et al., 2000, p. 396). This early formulation led to their current model, which includes the four basic abilities of perceiving, using, understanding, and managing emotion.

Boyatzis and Goleman, Petrides, and Bar-On all seem to include this definition in their own work (Ciarrochi, Forgas, & Mayer, 2001; Daus, 2006). For instance, Boyatzis (2009) has defined an “emotional intelligence competency” as “an ability to recognize, understand, and use emotional information about oneself that leads to or causes effective or superior performance.” Petrides and Furnham (2003, p. 39) wrote, “Broadly speaking, the construct of EI posits that individuals differ in the extent to which they attend to, process, and utilize affect-laden information of an intrapersonal (e.g., managing one’s own emotions) or interpersonal (e.g., managing others’ emotions) nature.”

Bar-On’s conception is more expansive, but it does include the elements of Mayer et al.’s definition:

From Darwin to the present, most descriptions, definitions and conceptualizations of emotional–social intelligence
have included one or more of the following key components: (a) the ability to recognize, understand and express emotions and feelings; (b) the ability to understand how others feel and relate with them; (c) the ability to manage and control emotions; (d) the ability to manage change, adapt and solve problems of a personal and interpersonal nature; and (e) the ability to generate positive affect and be self-motivated (Bar-On, 2006, p. 3).

Mayer et al., in their more recent writings, also deviate to some extent from their original definition. They now define EI as “the ability to carry out accurate reasoning about emotions and the ability to use emotions and emotional knowledge to enhance thought” (Mayer, Roberts et al., 2008, p. 511). However, in their model and measure of EI they continue to retain the original four basic abilities of perceiving, using, understanding, and managing emotion. Thus, although there is no total agreement, most of the major theorists seem to accept as a common definition that EI is “the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others” (Mayer et al., 2000, p. 396).

Another virtue of this definition is that it seems to meet a basic requirement for a concept to be considered an intelligence: It consists of a set of conceptually related abilities, and these abilities involve reasoning, problem-solving, and the processing of information (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999).

If we adopt this common definition of EI and apply it to the various models that have been proposed, some models seem to fit better than others. The Mayer–Salovey–Caruso model, not surprisingly, is a good fit. However, other models also fit the definition. For example, Palmer, Gignac, Ekermans, and Stough (2008), beginning with the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso definition and model, found empirical support for a seven-factor model. The seven factors that emerged were (a) Emotional Self-awareness, (b) Emotional Expression, (c) Emotional Awareness of Others, (d) Emotional Reasoning, (e) Emotional Self-management, (f) Emotional Management of Others, and (g) Emotional Self-control. They have developed a multitrait measure based on this model, designed specifically for use in work contexts (Palmer, Stough, Hamer, & Gignac, 2009).

Although more than one model can fit the basic definition, some of the current models seem to go well beyond it. They include traits and other personal qualities (e.g., achievement motivation, flexibility, happiness, and self-regard) that do not seem to be consistent with the definition. Viewing these models as representations of EI poses serious problems for the field. Nevertheless, these broader models do serve a useful purpose, even if they don’t qualify strictly as models of “emotional intelligence.” They provide a useful catalog of the personal qualities, other than cognitive intelligence, that most strongly aid adaptation. But if these models are not to be considered models of EI, what are they?

One way of thinking about them is that they are models of ESC. A competency is any “characteristic of the person that leads to or causes effective or superior performance” (Boyatzis, 1982). Thus, ESC refers to those competencies that are clearly linked to EI (i.e., the perception, expression, understanding, and regulation of emotion in oneself and others). Another way of thinking about the distinction is that ESC involves those parts of the brain associated with emotion. Empathy is an ESC because it relies on the ability to accurately perceive how others are feeling. On the other hand, analytical ability is an example of a cognitive competency.

This distinction between EI and ESC can be found in Salovey and Mayer’s (1990, p. 199) original formulation. For instance, they referred to “charisma” as an example of how leaders use regulation of emotion (a component of EI) to “influence others” (a competency in the Boyatzis–Goleman model).
This distinction between EI, based on a common definition of the construct, and the various competencies associated with it is also consistent with the view of some critics of the EI construct. Matthews, Emo, Funke et al. (2006, pp. 4–5) argued that intelligence should be thought of as a “basic aptitude” and a “latent factor in a structural model of ability.” A competency, on the other hand, is a “more loosely defined capability for performing some physical or mental activity that may be influenced by learning and context as well as aptitude.” Other psychologists (Lichten & Wainer, 2000) have proposed an “aptitude-knowledge continuum,” with aptitude referring to “the capacity to learn” and knowledge referring to “what a person actually has learned” (Mayer, Roberts et al., 2008, p. 513). Based on this conception, one can think of EI as contributing to the aptitude necessary for developing ESC.

This view suggests that the core EI abilities, such as emotional perception, provide the foundation for emotional and social competencies such as “influence” or “stress tolerance.” For instance, those who are skillful in reading how others are feeling (emotional perception) can use this ability to develop more effective strategies for influencing others. Emotional and social competencies also can build on one another. Influence, for example, is a rather complex social competency that seems to be built on more basic emotional competencies such as self-regard and optimism.

Applying the basic definition of EI, and the EI–ESC distinction, to the major models described above, it seems clear that the abilities found in the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso model represent EI, whereas the other three models consist primarily of emotional and social competencies. Having made this distinction, it should be noted that this does not make the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso model inherently “superior” to the others. As McClelland (1973) pointed out long ago, competence ultimately is more important for success in work and in life than is intelligence as traditionally defined and measured. However, the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso model is a model of EI, whereas the Bar-On, Boyatzis–Goleman, and Petrides models involve primarily ESC.

This distinction between EI, based on a common definition of the construct, and various competencies associated with it, seems to provide much needed clarity and consistency to the field. However, it is not a perfect solution; there always will be a gray area where it is difficult to reach consensus on whether certain attributes truly are part of EI. Nevertheless, focusing on a common definition of EI does provide a certain degree of coherence to the field without totally abandoning the broader models. It also allows us to more easily address the other controversies that have surrounded the concept of EI.

### The Problem of Measurement

A second area of controversy involves measurement. Critics have argued that all EI and ESC measures are inadequate in various ways. They question current tests on many grounds, including weak content validity, unstable factor structures, and lack of empirical support for either divergent or convergent validity (Conte, 2005; Matthews, Emo, Roberts, & Zeidner, 2006). Some critics have argued that the very nature of the EI concept makes it impossible to develop adequate measures (Matthews, Emo, Roberts et al., 2006; Murphy, 2006).

A consideration of the research now available for the most popular tests suggests a more mixed picture. There is some evidence in support of reliability and validity, but there are also some basic limitations and shortcomings. Effective assessment of EI and ESC is not impossible, but there do seem to be some basic limitations inherent in the most popular approaches.

### Ability measures of EI

Of all the major measures that explicitly propose to measure EI, the MSCEIT seems to have the strongest...
support for its content validity. Not only do its subtests conform closely to the basic definition of EI, but it is most like an IQ test also in which the test taker must answer a number of multiple-choice questions for which there is one correct answer for each question. Reliability of the MSCEIT also seems to be adequate, with split-half estimates for the whole scale of .91 and .93. Test–retest reliability has been estimated as \( r = .86 \) (Mayer, Roberts et al., 2008). Internal consistency reliabilities have not been quite as good, although they usually have been above .75 (Conte & Dean, 2006). Research on the measure’s factor structure has consistently supported both a single, underlying factor and the four-branch model on which the measure is based. As for divergent validity, the MSCEIT does correlate with tests of personality, but the correlations are low. For measures of the Big Five, the strongest correlations are with Agreeableness \( (r = .21 \text{ to } .28) \). Correlations with the other four factors are less than .20 (Mayer, Roberts et al., 2008).

Convergent validity for the MSCEIT is more problematic. There was virtually no correlation between the MSCEIT’s emotional perception scales and other tests of emotional perception such as the Japanese and Caucasian brief affect recognition test (JACBART), and the correlation between the MSCEIT and the levels of emotional awareness scale (LEAS) was only about \( r = .20 \) (Mayer, Roberts et al., 2008). On the other hand, the MSCEIT correlates with measures of verbal intelligence \( (r = .36) \) and with other kinds of intelligence \( (r = .10 \text{ to } .20) \) at the levels one would want from a form of intelligence that is supposed to be related to but distinct from other types of intelligence.

Critics of the MSCEIT have been especially concerned about the scoring process (MacCann & Roberts, 2008). Traditional intelligence tests are composed of items for which there is clearly one correct answer. However, in the case of a measure of EI, it is difficult to know whether the answer to a test item is right or wrong (Matthews, Emo, Funke et al., 2006). The MSCEIT’s developers have addressed this problem by utilizing two different approaches—consensus scoring and expert scoring. In the first approach, the correct answer is based on the choices made by the majority of those taking the test. In the second approach, the correct answer is determined by a group of emotion researchers. Fortunately, these two scoring methods have agreed almost perfectly \( (r = .96 \text{ to } .98) \). Nevertheless, concerns about scoring remain. As Murphy (2006, p. 348) pointed out, “it is unclear whether a person who thinks about the emotional domain differently from experts or from the average of several peers is low on that ability or whether that person simply has a new (and perhaps better) way of thinking.”

Another concern with the MSCEIT is that it is as much a measure of knowledge as a measure of ability, and knowledge tests do not provide a good assessment of a person’s actual ability. As Spector and Johnson (2006, p. 335) noted,

The assessment of knowledge in the abstract does not reflect the live performance of EI in the rich social situation of real life. ... One might understand that smiling at someone can be an effective means of producing a positive emotional reaction, but recognizing in a live encounter the moment to smile and doing so in a way that does not seem false or insincere may well be a different ability.

To their credit, Mayer and his colleagues have recognized the MSCEIT’s limitations. They have conceded that “the present version of the MSCEIT may be insufficient to validly assess a person’s accuracy in emotional perception” and that “its factor structure remains open for discussion” (p. 514). They concluded by noting, “there remains room for further understanding and substantial improvement in these and other areas” (p. 514). Fortunately, new ability tests are emerging that seem to address some of the limitations of the MSCEIT. Two notable examples are the situational test of emotional understanding (STEU) and the
situational test of emotional management (STEM) (MacCann & Roberts, 2008).

**Self-report measures of EI and ESC.** Data on the psychometric properties of self-report measures of EI also have been accumulating during the last decade. One of the most popular is Schutte’s self-report emotional intelligence test (SREIT). The SREIT, which is based on the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso four-branch model of EI, consists of 33 items. Internal consistency reliability is high ($r = .90$), and 2-week test–retest reliability is adequate ($r = .78$) (Conte & Dean, 2006). Many researchers have used just the total score for the measure, but one study did find support for both a one-factor and four-factor solution, confirming the intended factor structure (Saklofske, Austin, & Minski, 2003).

Research on discriminant validity has been more mixed. For instance, in an initial small study involving only 23 college students, the correlation with Openness to Experience from the Big Five was high ($r = .54$), but the correlations with the other personality factors were lower ($r = .21$ to .28) and statistically nonsignificant (Schutte et al., 1998). In a larger study, the correlations with the Big Five ranged from .18 for Agreeableness to .51 for Extraversion (Saklofske et al., 2003). The correlation between the SREIT and positive mood also proved high in one study ($r = .55$) (Schutte, Malouff, Simunek, McKenley, & Hollander, 2002). In another study, the correlation with a measure of psychological well-being was $r = .70$ (Brackett & Mayer, 2003). On the other hand, the SREIT accounted for variance in life satisfaction and depression proneness above and beyond that accounted for by the Big Five (Saklofske et al.). Finally, the SREIT seems to be unrelated to general intelligence as measured by the Wechsler (Saklofske et al.), which is troubling for those who believe that any construct that is supposed to be a type of intelligence should be correlated to some extent with other types of intelligence.

One of the most popular measures of ESC is Bar-On’s EQ-i. This self-report measure covers 15 different skills and traits, including emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, stress tolerance, empathy, and social responsibility. As a measure of EI, the EQ-i’s content validity is questionable because it includes personality traits that are not usually considered to be abilities, and it omits some of the core abilities of EI such as emotional perception and emotional understanding. On the other hand, as a measure of ESC, the content validity seems adequate given that it was “designed to examine... a conceptual model of emotional and social functioning” (Bar-On, 2006, p. 15). Internal consistency reliability ranges from .86 to .94, with an overall estimate of .97 (Bar-On, 2004) and a test–retest reliability of .79 after 3 months (Conte & Dean, 2006). The original factor structure, which consisted of five primary factors, has not been supported in some studies (Bar-On, 2006; Palmer, Manocha, Gignac, & Stough, 2003).

Evidence on divergent validity for the EQ-i is mixed. There appears to be very little overlap with measures of cognitive ability (Bar-On, 2006; Van Rooy, Viswesvaran, & Pluta, 2005), but some research has found a high degree of overlap with personality measures. For example, one study found that the correlation between the EQ-i and the anxiety scale on Cattell’s 16PF, a measure of trait anxiety, was $- .77$ (Conte & Dean, 2006). And in another study, the average correlation with a measure of the Big Five was .50 (Conte & Dean). Bar-On (2006, p. 16) has responded by noting that the overlap between the EQ-i and personality tests is “probably no more than 15% based on eight studies in which more than 1,700 individuals participated.” However, when the Big Five was used to predict EQ-i scores, the multiple $r$s ranged from .75 to .79 in two different studies (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Grubb & McDaniel, 2007). As for convergent validity, the EQ-i reportedly correlates well with other self-report measures ($r = .58$ to .69) (Bar-On, 2004).

Self-report measures of EI or ESC do have some distinct limitations. The most obvious one is that people often are poor judges of
their own abilities, especially when those abilities are highly valued. This seems to be a particular limitation when it comes to tests of emotional perception and understanding. The more lacking people are in these areas, the more suspect will be their judgments about those abilities. One might imagine, for example, a rather clueless person with an anger management problem indicating on a self-report inventory that he rarely gets angry about things that bother him. Baron has tried to correct for this problem by including “positive and negative impression indicators” in his EQ-i, but Grubb and McDaniel (2007) demonstrated that scores on the short form of the EQ-i can be shifted .8 standard deviations by having respondents fake effectively.

Alternative measures. A promising alternative to self-report measures is multirater or “360” assessment. Multirater measures such as the ECI, ESCI, or the Genos EI Inventory require others to rate the person rather than rely on the person’s own self-evaluations (Boyatzis & Sala, 2004; Palmer et al., 2009). Of course, ratings by others also can be subject to bias, but multirater assessment can balance out this bias by asking several people in different roles (boss, peers, subordinates, and customers) to rate the person. However, multirater assessment is more complex and expensive than either performance tests or self-report inventories, and its results can be distorted by the politics of the social settings in which it occurs. This may be one reason why there is less published research at this time on the psychometric properties of the leading multirater instruments.

In addition to the measures that explicitly identify themselves as tests of EI or ESC, there are a number of other instruments that measure the same abilities or traits. Some of these measures have been in existence much longer, and there is considerable research on their psychometric properties. An example is the diagnostic analysis of nonverbal accuracy (DANVA), which measures emotional perception, a major component of EI (Mayer, Salovey et al., 2008; Nowicki & Duke, 1994). An example of an ESC measure is the Seligman attributional style questionnaire (SASQ), which measures optimism and resilience (Peterson & Villanova, 1988). The SASQ seems to be a good predictor of how people will respond to setbacks, obstacles, and challenges, which in turn predicts performance in areas such as sales and athletics (Peterson, Maier, & Seligman, 1993). The DANVA and SASQ are just two of many well-established tests that could be used to measure EI or ESC.

In addition to the shortcomings already noted, most EI and ESC measures suffer from one other basic limitation: They ignore the role of context. We know from decades of research in social psychology that behavior can vary enormously depending on the situation and setting. Any formal test of EI represents a sample of behavior from just one highly contrived context. Both performance tests and self-report measures assess “respondent behavior”: The test taker is given a structured situation and must respond in a certain way. But in real life, people usually must respond to situations spontaneously without clearly defined options (McClelland, 1973). So most EI and ESC tests may be poor measures of how people actually behave in real-life situations.

Psychologists have been aware of these limitations for decades, and they have developed alternative strategies such as assessment centers (Lievens & Klimoski, 2001) and behavioral event interviews (McClelland, 1998). Although these alternatives can be challenging to develop and use, Spector and Johnson (2006) have suggested some promising approaches that could be utilized to assess at least some of the abilities associated with EI. For example, role play exercises could be used to test how well a person is able to comfort someone who is upset. These kinds of tests are more expensive than paper-and-pencil measures (or their online equivalent), but given the stakes involved when assessments are used in the workplace for selection or development, the cost may be worth it.
In summary, it is difficult at this point to reach any firm conclusions—pro or con—about the quality of the most popular tests of EI and ESC. Given that the field is still relatively new, several of the most popular tests seem to have more psychometric support than some critics have suggested. However, there may be inherent limitations to how good any traditional test can be when it comes to measuring EI or ESC. Hopefully, researchers and practitioners will broaden their horizons in the future and consider more ecologically valid, behavior-based assessment strategies. (More information about the tests can be found at the Web site of the Consortium for Research on EI in Organizations [www.eiconsortium.org], which provides descriptive information on the tests and links to measures of both EI and ESC for which there is a substantial body of published research.)

The Importance of EI for Performance in the Workplace

Another area of controversy involves the purported link between EI and important outcomes such as job performance or leadership effectiveness (Antonakis, Ashkanasy, & Dasborough, 2009). For many I–O psychologists, and for virtually all of their clients, this issue is especially important. In evaluating the evidence relating to this controversy, we again need to be clear about whether we are referring to EI or ESC. Those who have claimed that EI strongly impacts performance, and that it may be even more important than IQ, often have not been talking about EI but rather ESC. We probably should not expect EI, defined as the ability to perceive, use, understand, and manage emotion, to be as strongly related to performance as particular ESCs.

For instance, consider self-discipline or delay of gratification, which could be considered an emotional competency related to, but different from, EI. In the famous “marshmallow studies” at Stanford University, originally conducted in the late 1960s, 4-year olds were asked to stay in a room alone with a marshmallow and wait for a researcher to return. They were told that if they could wait until the researcher came back before eating the marshmallow, they could have two. Ten years later, the researchers tracked down the children who participated in the study. They found that the children who were best able to resist temptation had a total Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) score that was 210 points higher on average than those children who were unable to wait (Shoda, Mischel, & Peake, 1990). And this was not an isolated study. To take just one other example, Duckworth and Seligman (2005) found that self-discipline predicted grades twice as well as IQ scores in a sample of eighth graders.

EI also has been found to be related to academic achievement in children, but the strength of the association seems to be more modest. Research has found a significant but weak relationship between EI, as measured by the MSCEIT, and school grades, with correlations ranging between .14 and .23 (Brackett, Mayer, & Warner, 2004; O’Connor & Little, 2003). Thus, although EI does seem to predict achievement in children, more context-specific competencies seem to be better predictors.

Critics who question the predictive validity of EI usually are not considering these ESCs. For instance, in his critical review of the concept of SI, Landy (2006) examined only those studies that explicitly used the term “social intelligence.” He ignored the dozens of studies, like the ones on self-discipline and delay of gratification, that suggest a positive relationship between ESC and performance.

As for EI, if we look only at research appearing in peer-reviewed journals, we find that there have been 12 studies based on the MSCEIT or a related ability test (e.g., the DANVA) that have found a relationship between EI and performance (Côté & Miners, 2006; Day & Carroll, 2004; Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002; Elfenbein, Foo, White, Tan, & Aik, 2007; Feyerherm & Rice, 2002; Lam & Kirby, 2002; Lopes, Grewal, Kadis, Gall, & Salovey,
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2006; Matsumoto, LeRoux, Bernhard, & Gray, 2004; Mueller & Curham, 2006; Rosete, 2007; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005; Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005). Some of these studies have looked at individual contributor performance while others have focused on leadership. Dependent variables have included supervisor and peer ratings, organizational citizenship behavior, and more objective outcomes such as salary increases and negotiation outcomes. Although some of the findings were weak or mixed, some were quite impressive. For instance, one study found a correlation of .43 between company rank and EI, and a correlation of .35 between merit salary increase percentage and EI as measured by the MSCEIT in a group of analysts and clerical employees (Lopes et al., 2006). Another study found that EI as measured by the MSCEIT was correlated with ratings of “achieved business outcomes” (r = .26) and “effective personal behavior” (r = .50) in a group of executives employed by a large public service company (Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005).

In addition, there is research suggesting that EI is related to outcomes that are not direct measures of performance but seem to be important for effectiveness in many situations and roles. For example, several studies have found a link between EI, as measured by a performance test such as the MSCEIT or the DANVA, and the quality of social relations (Brackett, Rivers, Shiffman, Lerner, & Salovey, 2006; Carton, Kessler, & Pape, 1999; Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000; Lopes et al., 2004; Lopes, Salovey, Côté, & Beers, 2005). Research also has suggested a link between EI and psychological well-being (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Brackett et al., 2006; Ciarrochi et al., 2000; Mayer et al., 1999). Finally, there are several studies suggesting that people who are higher in EI manifest lower levels of depression, anxiety, alcohol use, and illegal drug use (Bastian, Burns, & Nettlebeck, 2005; Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Brackett et al., 2004; Carton et al.; Matthews, Emo, Funke et al., 2006).

When researchers have used self-report or multirater measures of EI, the results have been similar. At least 13 studies have found some relationship between EI, as measured by tests such as the SREIT or the Wong–Law emotional intelligence scale (WLEIS), and job performance (Carmeli, 2003; Foo, Elfenbein, Tan, & Aik, 2005; Jennings & Palmer, 2007; Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Hooper, 2002; Jordan & Troth, 2004; Law, Wong, Huang, & Li, 2008; Law, Wong, & Song, 2004; Rozell, Pettijohn, & Parker, 2006; Schutte, Schuettpelz, & Malouf, 2000; Semadar, Robins, & Ferris, 2006; Sue-Chan & Latham, 2004; Sy, Tram, & O’Hara, 2006; Wong & Law, 2002). For instance, Semadar et al. used the Swinburne University emotional intelligence test (SUEIT) with leaders in a division of a global manufacturing company and found that EI scores correlated with job performance as measured by annual performance appraisals (r = .25). Another study used the WLEIS with food service workers and managers and found that the correlation between EI scores and job performance, as assessed by managers, was r = .28 (Sy et al., 2006).

ESC, as measured by self-report measures such as the EQ-i and the TEIQue or multirater tests such as the ECI, also has been linked to work performance (Bachman, Stein, Campbell, & Sitarenios, 2000; Chia, 2005; Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000; Dulewicz, Higgs, & Slaski, 2003; Frye, Bennett, & Caldwell, 2006; Hopkins & Bilmoria, 2008; Iordanoglou, 2007; Koman & Wolff, 2008; Nikolaou & Tsousis, 2002; Offerman, Bailey, Vasilopoulos, Seal, & Sass, 2004; Petrides & Furnham, 2006; Petrides, Niven, & Mouskounti, 2006; Rapisarda, 2002; Slaski & Cartwright, 2002). One example was a study of debt collectors, which found that scores on the EQ-i were associated with job performance (Bachman et al.). In another study, dancing quality of ballet dancers as rated by a group of experts was correlated with the TEIQue (Petrides et al., 2006). And a study using the ECI with MBA students found a link between ESC and
team performance over a period of 2 years (Rapisarda).

Some studies show that EI or ESC predicts performance even when general mental ability and personality variables are controlled (“incremental validity”). For example, Rosete and Ciarrochi (2005) found that the perceiving emotion scores on the MSCEIT predicted how goals were achieved over and above personality characteristics and cognitive intelligence. In another study using the MSCEIT, EI predicted performance after controlling for scores on a measure of the Big Five personality model (Lopes et al., 2006). Two different studies using the WLEIS found that the positive correlation between EI and performance remained even after researchers controlled for personality with a measure of the Big Five (Law et al., 2004; Sy, Cote, & Saavedra, 2005). And a study using the ECI found that the positive relation between ESC and performance remained even after controlling for the Big Five (Offerman et al., 2004).

Thus, there is considerable support for the claim that there is a link between EI or ESC and work-related performance. However, these positive findings should be viewed with some caution for a number of reasons. First, the relationships tend to be modest, especially when general mental ability and/or personality are partialled out. Furthermore, some of the studies have been based on simulations with students; and in the case of field studies, the researchers sometimes used performance criteria such as supervisor ratings whose validity could be questioned. Also, many of these “positive” studies actually involved mixed or inconsistent findings. For example, some dimensions of EI in a study might not predict performance even though others do, and a dimension of EI might predict performance in one study while a different dimension predicted it in another. Also, EI might predict some measures of performance but not others.

These inconsistencies probably reflect the fact that much of the research has ignored the role of context. The importance of EI for performance probably will vary with the job, the specific situation, the outcomes, and the kind of people involved. EI will likely play a more important role in jobs involving much social interaction and influence, such as sales, politics, psychotherapist, and teacher (Antonakis et al., 2009). Similarly, EI should be more important for team performance than individual performance (Jordan et al., 2002; Jordan & Troth, 2004). EI also should play a greater role in situations high in stress (Antonakis et al.; Daus, 2006). And one study found that the EI-performance link was significantly stronger when the workers scored lower in cognitive ability (Côté & Miners, 2006). Future research on the EI-performance link needs to pay more attention to context. We also need to consider the differential effects of specific EI abilities. For example, emotional perception may be more important in some contexts than others, and emotion management may be more important than emotional perception in most contexts.

**Conclusion**

In considering the controversies surrounding the concept of EI, the most important conclusion is that we should make a distinction between emotional intelligence and emotional or social competence. EI should refer to the basic abilities of emotion recognition, reasoning, and regulation. Other personal qualities that contribute to positive work-related performance should be thought of as competencies, not a form of intelligence. Such a distinction can help clarify some of the thorniest issues that have confronted the field during its first 2 decades of active research.

The distinction between EI and ESC also can help us move past some of the most heated and unproductive controversies in the field. As one of the anonymous reviewers of an earlier draft of this paper wrote, “Having a common definition of EI may serve to unite [a] field . . . that is for the most part fragmented based on preference for a particular model . . .”. Rather than arguing
about whether certain models are legitimate, the EI–ESC distinction suggests that all of the major models are not only legitimate but potentially very useful. However, some of the most popular and important models are representations of ESC not EI. Such a conceptual and definitional shift does not, and should not, eliminate all controversy and conflict. But it changes the focus of the debate to questions that are ultimately more useful, such as, “How much of the variance in important outcomes is accounted for by EI and how much by ESC?”

The distinction between EI and ESC also points to important new areas for research in the future. One hypothesis to be explored further is that there will be a correlation between EI and ESC. In addition, certain ESC competencies should be stronger predictors of certain outcomes than EI. Another hypothesis is that people who score high in EI will be able to develop ESC more quickly, and use it more effectively, than people who score low in EI.

The proposed distinction also has implications for practice. It suggests that ultimately it might be more helpful to focus on selecting and developing certain emotional and social competencies related to EI than to concentrate just on EI by itself. For example, helping future executives to become more resilient in the face of stress (an ESC) may be more useful than teaching them how to identify better the emotional tone of an abstract painting or landscape (which is one of the eight subtests of the MSCEIT).

Ability measures of EI such as the MSCEIT have their place, as do self-report measures of ESC such as the EQ-i and TEIQue. However, I have suggested that we have decades of research and practice on assessment suggesting that there probably are better ways of measuring both concepts. The challenge is to find new approaches that are both more effective and economical. Perhaps new, computer-assisted simulations can be used to help us meet this challenge.

Furthermore, I have suggested that in the future we focus more on how the social context moderates the relationship between EI or ESC and human functioning. The EI–performance link undoubtedly will be stronger in some situations than in others. And the same person will act more emotionally intelligent in some situations than in others. EI, like other aspects of the person, can account for only a relatively small portion of the variance in important outcomes. Situational factors often play an equally large, if not larger role, and they sometimes are more amenable to modification. Certain work settings will encourage emotionally intelligent behavior more than others. We need to study emotionally intelligent contexts as well as emotionally intelligent people.
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**Personal Competence**

**SELF - AWARENESS**

*Emotional awareness:* Recognizing one’s emotions and their effects. People with this competence:

- Know which emotions they are feeling and why
- Realize the links between their feelings and what they think, do, and say
- Recognize how their feelings affect their performance
- Have a guiding awareness of their values and goals

*Accurate self-assessment:* Knowing one’s strengths and limits. People with this competence are:

- Aware of their strengths and weaknesses
- Reflective, learning from experience
- Open to candid feedback, new perspectives, continuous learning, and self-development
- Able to show a sense of humor and perspective about themselves

*Self-confidence:* Sureness about one’s self-worth and capabilities. People with this competence:

- Present themselves with self-assurance; have “presence”
- Can voice views that are unpopular and go out on a limb for what is right
- Are decisive, able to make sound decisions despite uncertainties and pressures
SELF - REGULATION

Self-control: Managing disruptive emotions and impulses. People with this competence:

- Manage their impulsive feelings and distressing emotions well
- Stay composed, positive, and unflappable even in trying moments
- Think clearly and stay focused under pressure

Trustworthiness: Maintaining standards of honesty and integrity. People with this competence:

- Act ethically and are above reproach
- Build trust through their reliability and authenticity
- Admit their own mistakes and confront unethical actions in others
- Take tough, principled stands even if they are unpopular

Conscientiousness: Taking responsibility for personal performance. People with this competence:

- Meet commitments and keep promises
- Hold themselves accountable for meeting their objectives
- Are organized and careful in their work

Adaptability: Flexibility in handling change. People with this competence:

- Smoothly handle multiple demands, shifting priorities, and rapid change
- Adapt their responses and tactics to fit fluid circumstances
- Are flexible in how they see events

Innovativeness: Being comfortable with and open to novel ideas and new information. People with this competence:

- Seek out fresh ideas from a wide variety of sources
- Entertain original solutions to problems
- Generate new ideas
- Take fresh perspectives and risks in their thinking

SELF - MOTIVATION

Achievement drive: Striving to improve or meet a standard of excellence. People with this competence:

- Are results-oriented, with a high drive to meet their objectives and standards
- Set challenging goals and take calculated risks
- Pursue information to reduce uncertainty and find ways to do better
- Learn how to improve their performance
**Commitment**: Aligning with the goals of the group or organization. People with this competence:

- Readily make personal or group sacrifices to meet a larger organizational goal
- Find a sense of purpose in the larger mission
- Use the group’s core values in making decisions and clarifying choices
- Actively seek out opportunities to fulfill the group’s mission

**Initiative**: Readiness to act on opportunities. People with this competence:

- Are ready to seize opportunities
- Pursue goals beyond what’s required or expected of them
- Cut through red tape and bend the rules when necessary to get the job done
- Mobilize others through unusual, enterprising efforts

**Optimism**: Persistence in pursuing goals despite obstacles and setbacks. People with this competence:

- Persist in seeking goals despite obstacles and setbacks
- Operate from hope of success rather than fear of failure
- See setbacks as due to manageable circumstance rather than a personal flaw

---

**Social Competence**

**SOCIAL AWARENESS**

**Empathy**: Sensing others’ feelings and perspective, and taking an active interest in their concerns. People with this competence:

- Are attentive to emotional cues and listen well
- Show sensitivity and understand others’ perspectives
- Help out based on understanding other people’s needs and feelings

**Service orientation**: Anticipating, recognizing, and meeting customers’ needs. People with this competence:

- Understand customers’ needs and match them to services or products
- Seek ways to increase customers’ satisfaction and loyalty
- Gladly offer appropriate assistance
- Grasp a customer’s perspective, acting as a trusted advisor
Developing others: Sensing what others need in order to develop, and bolstering their abilities. People with this competence:

- Acknowledge and reward people’s strengths, accomplishments, and development
- Offer useful feedback and identify people’s needs for development
- Mentor, give timely coaching, and offer assignments that challenge and grow a person’s skills.

Leveraging diversity: Cultivating opportunities through diverse people. People with this competence:

- Respect and relate well to people from varied backgrounds
- Understand diverse worldviews and are sensitive to group differences
- See diversity as opportunity, creating an environment where diverse people can thrive
- Challenge bias and intolerance

Political awareness: Reading a group’s emotional currents and power relationships. People with this competence:

- Accurately read key power relationships
- Detect crucial social networks
- Understand the forces that shape views and actions of clients, customers, or competitors
- Accurately read situations and organizational and external realities

SOCIAL SKILLS

Influence: Wielding effective tactics for persuasion. People with this competence:

- Are skilled at persuasion
- Fine-tune presentations to appeal to the listener
- Use complex strategies like indirect influence to build consensus and support
- Orchestrate dramatic events to effectively make a point

Communication: Sending clear and convincing messages. People with this competence:

- Are effective in give-and-take, registering emotional cues in attuning their message
- Deal with difficult issues straightforwardly
- Listen well, seek mutual understanding, and welcome sharing of information fully
- Foster open communication and stay receptive to bad news as well as good
Leadership: Inspiring and guiding groups and people. People with this competence:

- Articulate and arouse enthusiasm for a shared vision and mission
- Step forward to lead as needed, regardless of position
- Guide the performance of others while holding them accountable
- Lead by example

Change catalyst: Initiating or managing change. People with this competence:

- Recognize the need for change and remove barriers
- Challenge the status quo to acknowledge the need for change
- Champion the change and enlist others in its pursuit
- Model the change expected of others

Conflict management: Negotiating and resolving disagreements. People with this competence:

- Handle difficult people and tense situations with diplomacy and tact
- Spot potential conflict, bring disagreements into the open, and help deescalate
- Encourage debate and open discussion
- Orchestrate win-win solutions

Building bonds: Nurturing instrumental relationships. People with this competence:

- Cultivate and maintain extensive informal networks
- Seek out relationships that are mutually beneficial
- Build rapport and keep others in the loop
- Make and maintain personal friendships among work associates

Collaboration and cooperation: Working with others toward shared goals. People with this competence:

- Balance a focus on task with attention to relationships
- Collaborate, sharing plans, information, and resources
- Promote a friendly, cooperative climate
- Spot and nurture opportunities for collaboration

Team capabilities: Creating group synergy in pursuing collective goals. People with this competence:

- Model team qualities like respect, helpfulness, and cooperation
- Draw all members into active and enthusiastic participation
- Build team identity, esprit de corps, and commitment
• Protect the group and its reputation; share credit
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Context and Background

Emotions influence ministry leadership in many ways, including how persons plan their work, make decisions, solve problems, innovate, and interact with each other and with parishioners. Ministers who use their emotional competence skills to strengthen the congregation and achieve mission goals are an asset. Ministers and leaders with fewer emotional skills degrade performance and limit the church’s effectiveness. In extreme cases less competent emotional leaders can cause major damage to the Christian witness in the world.

Salovey & Mayer (1990) define emotional intelligence as the ability to appraise one’s own and others’ emotions, manage one’s own and others’ emotions, and to use one’s emotions intelligently and adaptively in problem solving. A more accurate designation for emotional intelligence is emotional competence (EC) emphasizing that one’s emotional characteristics are rooted in both nature and life experiences and can be modified to some extent.

Extreme behaviors that militate against good clergy behavior are described in the United Methodist Church Behavioral Health Guidelines that identify twelve problematic areas for pastors, churches, and church administrators. These areas are: Alcohol Abuse/Dependence, Chemical Abuse/Dependence, Divorce or Infidelity, Family Violence, Legal (General), Legal...
Temptations for misconduct sap time and energy from religious leaders and may lead to acting out behaviors that damage relationships with family and parishioners and cause them to focus on plans to act out misconduct. As a result act out behaviors that damage relationships with family and parishioners. These persons may become more defensive, guarded, and secretive further degrading constructive ministry (Doolittle, 2008, Barnard & Curry, 2011). Ignoring these stress factors may lead to personal burnout (Miner, 2007).

For these reasons, assessment and mentoring of ministers and candidates for the ordained ministry continues as a major concern for many denominations and churches around the world (Hunt, Hinkle, & Malony, 1990). In Christian traditions, clergy assessment is a relatively modern expression of efforts by the church to identify, select, and train its clergy and other leaders, as demonstrated by surveys conducted by Richard Niebuhr (1956) and by Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson (1956) in the middle of the last century. Similarly, Pietrofesa and Splete (1975) and Holland (1997) explore relationships between vocational interest patterns and careers. Hunt, Hinkle, and Malony (1990) brought many of these research perspectives together. Most of the basic theoretical issues concerning assessment are still relevant as Dittes stated (Bier, 1970; Hunt et al., 1990, chap. 2) where he reiterated current issues to those of the past and challenged his readers to address them better.

Hartung (2011) and Tischler, et al. (2002) explore relationships between emotional intelligence and career choice. The research reported here focuses on the relationships between ministry interests and emotional competence (EC).

The United Methodist Church Procedure for Assessing Ministry Candidates

Currently there are three ordained ministry tracks in the United Methodist Church – elder, deacon, and local pastor. Usually persons in the elder or deacon ordained ministry tracks are expected to complete a seminary degree and, in some cases, additional specialty study in such fields as music, business, or other areas. Lay persons who feel called to serve as a pastor can follow the local pastor track.

Since 1977 the United Methodist Church’s (UMC) Division of Ordained Ministry (DOM) has operated a Clergy Candidate Assessment program. Each year in the U.S. approximately 1,500 candidates from about 62 United Methodist annual conferences participate in this candidacy process. Two central components for every candidate person in this program are (1) receiving mentoring by experienced ordained ministers, and (2) completing a battery of psychological inventories (which includes the 16PF) and receiving feedback from a qualified psychologist.

As part of the United Methodist Church candidacy process candidates complete the Inventory of Religious Activities and Interests (IRAI), a self-report instrument to aid mentors by providing information about a candidate’s perceived interests, skills, demographic and family background, values, and attitudes. The IRAI is used primarily as a basis for discussion between the candidate and his/her mentor. Candidates also complete the 16PF which is a widely used personality inventory with 16 basic scales plus a variety of specialized composite scales.

Hypothesis

The general aim of this research was to investigate the ways in which interest in various components of ordained ministry may alert counselors, administrators, coaches, and interview committees to EC characteristics and potential emotional and behavioral health concerns. The primary hypothesis predicted that IRAI scale scores will be differentially related to 16PF EC measures. If higher measured interests in specific areas of ministry are related to EC patterns, then religious leaders can encourage candidates and clergy to seek ways to increase their emotional competence as needed and appropriate to their situations.
Research Design

Instruments

Two self-report instruments were included in this study: the IRAI and the 16PF. The IRAI was originally developed by Sam Webb in the 1950s to measure persons’ interests in a variety of church related activities and interests. The original IRAI version has 240 questions with a Likert type five choice answer format with a range from “Do Not Like” to “Like Enthusiastically.” These items form ten interest scales – Counselor, Administrator, Teacher, Scholar, Evangelist, Spiritual Guide, Preacher, Reformer, Priest, and Musician, plus a Check Scale. These scales were originally developed by having ministers who specialized in each topic answer a pool of items. Answers were then subjected to factor analyses for select items that clustered together and differentiated between specialty areas to form 20 items on each scale.

The current research used these eleven scales which have reliabilities from .87 to .94. Since some respondents tended to answer all items more favorably than other respondents, differential scores on each IRAI scale for each person were created by adding the eleven scores for each individual to obtain the personal mean score for that person and dividing by eleven (the number of scales). This differential score procedure enabled ranking order of interests for each participant independent of that person’s overall raw scores on the eleven IRAI scales.

The 16PF (Sixteen Personality Factors) fifth edition has 185 questions that measure 16 basic personality traits from which five global scores, often known as the "Big 5" or "5 Factor Model." The 16PF Fifth Edition is a widely used measure of basic personality traits based on a systematic sampling of the English language so that the factors would cover all of the constructs of personality in a parsimonious manner. Reliabilities range from .68 to .87 for all 16 scales. Test-retest reliabilities over a two week span range between .56 and .79 (Conn & Rieke, 1994).

The 16PF included seven EC scores that are estimates of how a person would perform on the Emotional Judgment Inventory (EJI, Institute for Personality and Ability Testing) that is a more precise measure of the EC concepts independent of the 16PF item set.

Subjects

In June 2010, IPAT provided 16PF data for 1,183 UM candidates who were tested in 2008 and 2009. From this pool there were 447 candidates for whom IRAI data were also available. These cases comprised the research data analyzed for this research.

The 16PF data were provided by the publisher, IPAT, Inc., under the direction of its Chief Psychologist HR/OD. It included all of the 16PF profiles from UM candidates as part of a plan for the UM-DOM process to have a feedback procedure to use as ministry effectiveness criteria for validating the 16PF among UM candidates and ministers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under age 30</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30 – 42</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 43 – 52</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 53 and older</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Procedure

Data from these 447 candidates were analyzed using UniMult which provides correlations and factor analyses.*

Seven emotional competence composite scores were obtained from the 16PF data using the following equations:

**Aware of Emotions (AINO)** → \((+ A + I + (11- N) + O) / 4\)

This scale combination indicates a person who tends to be warm, sensitive, forthright, and apprehensive (guilt proneness).

**Identify Own Emotions (CO)** → \((+ C + (11- O)) / 2\)
This scale combination indicates a person who tends to be emotionally stable and self-assured.
Identify Others Emotions (A) → basic factor A only.
The basic A scale indicates a person who tends to be warm and extraverted.
Managing Own Emotions (CLOQ4) → \((+ C + (11-L) + (11- O) + (11- Q4)) / 4\)
This scale combination indicates a person who tends to be emotionally stable, trusting, self-assured, and relaxed.
Managing Others Emotions (ACH) → \((+ A + C + H) / 3\)
This scale combination indicates a person who tends to be warm, emotionally stable, and socially bold.
Using Emotions in Problem Solving (AI) → \((+ A + I) / 2\)
This scale combination indicates a person who tends to be warm and sensitive.
Expressing Emotions Adaptively (AEHNQ2) → \((+ A + E + H + (11- N) + (11- Q2)) / 5\)
This scale combination indicates a person who tends to be warm, dominant, socially bold, forthright, and group oriented.
The IRAI scale scores were then correlated with these EC composite scores.

* For information about UniMult go to [www.unimult.com](http://www.unimult.com)

**Results**

Relationships between 16PF Emotional Competence Combinations and IRAI Ministry Interests:

Of 84 possible correlations of the IRAI mean and eleven IRAI scales with the seven emotional competence scales there were 31 correlations that were significant at p<.001 level or more, far more than the four that would be expected by chance at p<.05 or one that would be expected by chance at p<.01. An overall multivariate significance test (Pillai’s V) was computed, which resulted in F = 2.72 (45/1736) with p < .0001. This confirms the fact that these two sets of scales are definitely related.

Of the 84 possible correlations of IRAI scales with the 16PF EC scales there are 31 instances (37%) of r= +/- .11 and higher that are significant p<.001 or more. There are 24 instances (29%) of r= .12 and higher that are significant p<.0001 or more. Correlations expected by chance at the p<.05 level would be about 4, and at p<.01 about 1.

1. Persons with higher awareness of emotions (AINO, warm, sensitive, forthright, and cautious/apprehensive) tend to have higher interests in counselor (r=.20 ) and spiritual guide (r=.12 ) with lower interests in scholar (r= -.20 ).
2. Persons who can identify their own emotions (CO, emotionally stable and self-assured) tend to have higher interests in administrator (r=.15) and evangelist (r=.18 ) with lower interests in scholar (r= -.12).

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF Emotional Competence Combinations and IRAI Ministry Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AINO Aware of emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AINO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOQ4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEHNQ2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Persons who can identify others’ emotions (A, warmth) tend to have higher interests in counselor (r= .24) and higher mean scores (r=.13) with lower interests in scholar (r= -.25).

4. Persons who can manage or cope well with their own emotions (CLOQ4, emotionally stable, trusting, self-assured, relaxed) tend to have higher interests in counselor (r= .13), priest (r= .12) evangelist (r= .11) and higher mean scores (r= .11) with lower interests in scholar (r= -.12).

5. Persons who can manage or cope well with others’ emotions (ACH, warm, stable, socially bold) tend to have higher interests in evangelist (r= .16), administrator (r= .14), counselor (r= .11) and higher IRAI mean scores (r=.15) with lower interests in scholar (r= -.23), and musician (r= -.11).

6. Persons who use emotions in problem solving (AI, warm, sensitive) tend to have higher interests in counseling (r= .19) and priest (r= .12) and lower interests in administration (r= -.17) and evangelist (r= -.16).

7. Persons who can express emotions adaptively (AEHNQ2, warm, dominant, socially bold, forthright, group oriented) tend to have higher overall IRAI mean scores (r= .16) and higher interest in counselor (r= .16), administrator (r= .11), evangelist (r= .12) and lower interests in musician (r= -.15) and scholar (r= -.14).

The overall average multiple correlation (R) is R=.28 and R=.30, p<.0001. As each of the EC composite variables is partialled out of the list of EC variables the remaining partial correlations range from .14 (p< .01) to .45. Of these all but two are significant at the p< .0001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>C.I. lower</th>
<th>C.I. upper</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>df1 / df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall average R =</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>84 / 3038</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AINO</td>
<td>Multiple R =</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>12 / 434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>12 / 433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A only</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>12 / 431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOQ4</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>12 / 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>12 / 424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>23.56</td>
<td>12 / 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEHNQ2</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>12 / 413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In interpreting these multiple regression results it is important to keep in mind that EC is a multidimensional construct, so the EC measures overlap and some have the same 16PF basic
scale included in more than one EC measure. The partialled R values suggest how the IRAI scales relate to the EC composite scales when each EC measure is in turn removed from the partial correlation.

Table 2b
Multivariate Hierarchical (Sequential) Regression Analysis for the EC composite variables, with AI entered first and 16PF C added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>C.I. lower</th>
<th>C.I. upper</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>df/df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall average R =</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>96/3472</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Multiple R =</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>12/434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>12/433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A only</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>27.06</td>
<td>12/431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C only</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>12/428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AINO</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>12/424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOQ4</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>12/419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>12/413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEHNQ2</td>
<td>Partialled R =</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>63.30</td>
<td>12/406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: C.I.’s are the lower and upper bounds for approximate 95% confidence intervals (uncorrected for number run and for other variables). With df1 > 1, effect size is multiple correlation / eta.

Correlations among IRAI scales

Higher general religious interests tend to indicate greater interest in spiritual guide (+.26), priest liturgical (+.11) and atypical interests (+.19). Interests in pastoral counseling are positively associated with spiritual guide (+.21), and priest (+.20), and negatively related to scholarly interests (-.30), administration (-.15), preaching (-.17), and music (-.29). Higher interests in administration and atypical interests correlate +.33. Interests in scholarship and evangelism are negatively related (-.42).

Interests in social reform are negatively correlated with administration (-.27) and evangelism (-.28). Atypical religious interests correlate negatively with spiritual guide (-.37) and counselor (-.11) but positively with administration (+.33).

Discussion

The goal of this research was to investigate whether interests in various components of ordained ministry (as measured by the IRAI) are related to EC patterns (as measured by the 16PF EC scales). Our primary hypothesis predicted that IRAI scale scores will be differentially related to 16PF EC measures. Out of 84 possible correlations (Table 1) we found 31 significant correlations between specific IRAI measures and seven 16PF EC measures.

Table 3
Correlations among IRAI scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAI-Mean</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor 01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator 02</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar 04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelist 05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Guide 06</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preacher 07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformer 08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest 09</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician 10</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check Scale 11</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations above r = .12 are significant at p< .001.
Since higher measured interests in specific areas of ministry are related to EC patterns, then leaders have opportunity to encourage candidates and clergy to seek ways to increase their emotional competence as needed and appropriate to their situations.

It is clear that ministry interests are differentially related to emotional competence (Tables 2a and 2b). Although there are many significant correlations between these measures of emotional competence and ministry interests, such relationships are not precisely measured by self-report techniques. However, we now know that these self-report results can provide broad hypotheses for counselors and coaches to follow up through direct observation techniques.

Since correlation does not imply causation, the relationships between 16PF measures and IRAI interest measures could also suggest that personality factors are reflected in levels and intensity of interest patterns, but not necessarily causing these patterns. Understanding these relationships in more detail could enable mentors, counselors, recruiters, and others involved in the choice of clergy careers, and specialties could offer more effective guidance to those in the process of entering ministry and continuing (or leaving) a clergy career.

The correlations between 16PF measures of EC and IRAI measures of religious interests are statistically significant, yet they are low because EC is probably only one element influencing (or being influenced by) interests. Other important elements may include values and personal experiences in a particular area. Self-reports of EC characteristics and ministry interests are helpful in enabling ministers to increase their emotional competence. More research on these relationships is needed.

Among interventions that could be helpful in understanding a person’s EC levels could be direct observation of the person in real time and/or simulated work situations, open exploration with the candidate or clergy about self-perceptions of interactions in social settings, and feedback from others who work with the clergy person.

Emotional Competence is one model to understand the relationships between total personal functioning and ministry performance. Research as described in this report provides a way for supervisors, evaluators, and interviewing committees to access the emotional competence (EC) of ministers and candidates for ordained ministry, yet they only serve as a starting point.

Self-reports such as the 16PF and IRAI are helpful, yet they should be supplemented with additional information. Especially important is direct observation of the candidate or minister by trained observers (supervisors, counselors, and mental health professionals) and by committees that are responsible for evaluating how the candidate or minister manages her/his own emotions and works along emotional dimensions with parishioners and colleagues. Letters of reference generally seem to be more a function of the letter writer than of the candidate. However, a direct contact with the respondent can be an open-ended query about areas of ministry for which the candidate is best suited is a data source worth pursuing.

Committees and supervisors considering the emotional competence (EC) of candidates and ministers can ask their psychological consultants to answer specific EC questions. Evidence from self-report profiles (such as a psychological assessment report) can be used as hypotheses to check out as a starting place for discussions with the candidate. The psychological consultant can be asked to answer questions such as these about a candidate or minister.

1. How much is this person aware of her/his own emotions? (AINO)
2. In what ways does this person identify his/her own emotions? (CO)
3. In what ways does this person identify others’ emotions? (A)
4. How well does this person manage her/his own emotions? (CLOQ4)
5. How well does this person manage others’ emotions? (ACH)
6. How do these emotions influence his/her problem solving? (AI)
7. How does this person express emotions in adaptive, healthy ways? (AEHNQ2)
8. Where are her/his emotional blind spots? ...emotional strengths? (basic 16PF scales)
Although a psychological consultant with access to the 16PF profile for a minister or candidate may not have the EC composite scales easily available, consultation can provide added attention to the person’s standard 16PF scales used in this research, as reported above. A lay person who has worked directly with the candidate often has more insight than a limited psychological evaluation provides because such workers spend more time with the candidate in a wide range of situations. It will be very helpful to ask these workers to answer reference letters and to give input about the minister’s or candidate’s actual performance in parish situations.

One important step in this direction is the use of case studies, preferably using video clips, followed by questions and discussion about ways to improve the focus person’s responses and interactions with others.

In settings that request reference letters from persons who know the candidate well the candidate can also be asked to answer the same reference letter about self. If these responses are via internet or other electronic media then the candidate’s self-views can be compared to the reports of these references as observers who have known the candidate in various real life situations. Doing so mirrors the format of a 360 feedback procedure.

Effective coaching (mentoring, supervision, clinical pastoral education, etc.) in any situation involves observing the candidate or minister in actual situations, then discussing with the candidate how his/her responses can be improved, then practice with feedback, more observation and practice with feedback, and even more as each individual grows in emotional competence. At the least supervisors and mentors can explore through personal interviews and observations the motivations of ministers and candidates for being interested in specific types of ministry interests. Such understanding can enable appropriate steps to cope with any potential behavior health concerns.
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Emotional Intelligence (EI) vs Emotional Social Competence (ESC)

→ EI is the trait or cognitive component that overlaps with.....

→ ESC which is the social skills application component and is part of one’s...

→ Personality – the composite of all that makes us who we are
Best ways to Measure Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Emotional Social Competence (ESC)

Self-Report measures → helpful but inadequate

Observer report measures -- such as the DOM reference letter 360 → Better but limited

Observation measures → trained coach observes the candidate/minister in Simulated situations, Actual real life situations

BEST when observations are the basis for feedback/coaching to the candidate/minister
Can we blame a pastor’s failures on a Lack of Emotional Competence?

Can we blame the lack of E.I. / ESC for our “problem” of being ineffective?

Who or what is the hero we imagine whom we want to take responsibility for our emotional competence?

Feedback with coaching for Emotional and Social Competence can help us all to achieve and express the fruits of the Spirit.

Romans 5 thru 8, 12 – Four freedoms that God’s grace gives: Free from fear, sin, law, death - now act on basis of God’s love

Gal. 5:22 – Love, Joy, Peace, Patience, Kindness, Goodness, Faithfulness, Gentleness, Self-control

Based on the book: *Scapegoat: A History of Blaming Other People*  
By Charlie Campbell  2011 Duckworth  [www.ducknet.co.uk](http://www.ducknet.co.uk)
KEY QUESTION for effective ordained ministry issues:

**TRAIT:** Which social relationship patterns can be improved with mentoring, coaching, counseling, other interventions

**VS**

**SKILLS:** patterns not likely to change with any interventions that are typically available to BOM, supervisors (SPRC, D.S., Bishop, etc.).
Wesley’s Criteria for Effective Ministers:

UM 2008 Discipline, ¶¶304, 310

**GRACE:** Know God as pardoing, loving?
Calling → Healing → Nurturing → Sending

**GIFTS:** Evidences of God’s grace?
Person’s talents, traits, patterns.

**FRUIT:** Are believers edified, others converted?
Results, usefulness, effectiveness
1. Emotional Competence → a system of total personal functioning

Sherrod & Phyllis Miller: Awareness Wheel
1. Emotional Competence → a system of total personal functioning

(continued)

Five levels of emotional competence in relation to others in our congregation, in our own marriage and family, with our colleagues

**Context** - Experiences - what we bring to a situation

**Personal** - Inner secret thoughts known only to me

**Private** - What happens between me and others

**Public** - What others see by observing us

**Journey** - How this affects our future
1. Emotional Competence → a system of total personal functioning (continued)
The Emotional Competence Inventory 2.0 (ECI) measures 18 competencies -- four clusters:

**Self-Awareness**: knowing one's internal states, preferences, resources, and intuitions.
- Emotional Awareness: Recognizing one's emotions and their effects
- Accurate Self-Assessment: Knowing one's strengths and limits
- Self-Confidence: A strong sense of one's self-worth and capabilities

**Self-Management**: managing one's internal states, impulses, and resources.
- Emotional Self-Control: Keeping disruptive emotions and impulses in check
- Transparency: Maintaining integrity, acting congruently with one's values
- Adaptability: Flexibility in handling change
- Achievement: Striving to improve or meeting a standard of excellence
- Initiative: Readiness to act on opportunities
- Optimism: Persistence in pursuing goals despite obstacles and setbacks

**Social Awareness**: how people handle relationships & awareness of others' feelings, needs, and concerns.
- 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' needs

**Relationship Management**: skill or adeptness at inducing desirable responses in others.
- Developing Others: Sensing others' development needs and bolstering their abilities
- Inspirational Leadership: Inspiring and guiding individuals and groups
- Change Catalyst: Initiating or managing change
- Influence: Wielding effective tactics for persuasion
- Conflict Management: Negotiating and resolving disagreements
- Teamwork & Collaboration: Working with others toward shared goals; Creating group synergy.

www.eiconsortium.org

Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) Technical Manual by the Hay Group; McClelland Center for Research and Innovation
BarOn EQ-i SCALES The EI Competencies and Skills Assessed by Each Scale
Designed to be a 360 multi-rater assessment  www.eiconsortium.org

Intrapersonal Self-awareness and self-expression:
→ Self-Regard -- Accurately perceive, understand and accept oneself.
→ Emotional Self-Awareness To be aware of and understand one’s emotions.
→ Assertiveness To effectively and constructively express one’s emotions and oneself.
→ Independence To be self-reliant and free of emotional dependency on others.
→ Self-Actualization To strive to achieve personal goals and actualize one’s potential.

Interpersonal Social awareness and interpersonal relationship:
→ Empathy To be aware of and understand how others feel.
→ Social Responsibility To identify with one’s social group and cooperate with others.
→ Interpersonal Relationship To establish mutually satisfying relationships and relate well with others.

Stress Management Emotional management and regulation:
→ Stress Tolerance To effectively and constructively manage emotions.
→ Impulse Control To effectively and constructively control emotions.

Adaptability Change management:
→ Reality-Testing -- Objectively validate one’s feelings and thinking with external reality.
→ Flexibility To adapt and adjust one’s feelings and thinking to new situations.
→ Problem-Solving To effectively solve problems of a personal and interpersonal nature.

General Mood Self-motivation:
→ Optimism To be positive and look at the brighter side of life.
→ Happiness To feel content with oneself, others and life in general.
Emotional Competence Dimensions estimated from 16PF Basic Scale scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Sten Factor</th>
<th>Left Meaning</th>
<th>Low 1,2,3</th>
<th>Mid 4,5,6,7</th>
<th>High 8,9,10</th>
<th>Right Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warmth (A)</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning (B)</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Stability (C)</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>Emotionally Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance (E)</td>
<td>Deferential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liveliness (F)</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Lively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule-Consciousness (G)</td>
<td>Expedient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>Rule-Conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Boldness (H)</td>
<td>Shy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>Socially Bold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity (I)</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilance (L)</td>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vigilant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstractedness (M)</td>
<td>Grounded</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abstracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privateness (N)</td>
<td>Forthright</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehension (O)</td>
<td>Self-Assured</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Change (Q1)</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open to Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance (Q2)</td>
<td>Group-Oriented</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Reliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism (Q3)</td>
<td>Tolerance Disorder</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perfectionistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension (Q4)</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In chart the number of "++" signs shows number of times this factor appears in 16PF E.I. composites.
### Emotional Intelligence Dimensions estimated from 16PF Global scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Factor</th>
<th>Left Meaning</th>
<th>Low 1,2,3</th>
<th>Mid 4,5,6,7</th>
<th>High 8,9,10</th>
<th>Right Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EX - Extraversion</td>
<td>Introverted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High warmth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX - Anxiety</td>
<td>Low Anxiety</td>
<td>Low Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM - Tough-Minded</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>Aware of Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tough-Minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN - Independence</td>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC - Self-Control</td>
<td>Unrestrained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Controlled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MMPI and 16PF Big Five Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic 5 Dimensions</th>
<th>Emotional Stability</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16PF Second Order</td>
<td>High Independence</td>
<td>High Extraversion</td>
<td>Low Anxiety</td>
<td>Low Tough-Mindedness</td>
<td>High Self-Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPI-2</td>
<td>Low Negative Emotion</td>
<td>Low Introversion</td>
<td>Low Psychoticism</td>
<td>Low Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Low Disconstraint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emotional Competence is ALWAYS involved in Basic Leadership Dimensions

**Leadership**

- Leadership style
  - Assertive
  - Facilitative
  - Permissive
- Leadership Potential
- Dominance

**Initiative**

- Independence Q1
- Openness to Change G
- Rule-Consciousness Q3
- Perfectionism
- Self-Control

**Personal adjustment**

- Anxiety C
- Emotional Adjustment L
- Emotional Stability O
- Vigilance Q4
- Apprehension
- Tension

**Interacting with others**

- Extraversion A
- Warmth F
- Liveliness H
- Social Boldness Q2
- Self-Reliance
- Privateness N

**Making decisions**

- Reasoning B
- Creativity
- Tough-Mindedness
- Sensitivity I
- Abstractedness M

---

Manual for the 16PF®
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cattell</th>
<th>Watterson</th>
<th>Borowka</th>
<th>Newhouse</th>
<th>Hermann</th>
<th>IPAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warmth (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning (B)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability (C)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance (E)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liveliness (F)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule Consciousness (G)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Boldness (H)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity (I)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilance (L)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstractedness (M)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privateness (N)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehension (O)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Change (Q1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reliance (Q2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism (Q3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension (Q4)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Signs indicate whether high factor scores (+) or low scores (-) are a predictor. Original Cattell study findings for military team leadership are presented for reference.
Emotional Intelligence / Competence

includes several interrelated dimensions.

Aware of Emotions
  Identify Own Emotions
  Identify Others’ Emotions
Managing Own Emotions
Managing Others’ Emotions
Using Emotions in Problem Solving
Expressing Emotions Adaptively

E-motion → motivate → move us to action
Emotional Competence (Intelligence) and Vocational Choice among Candidates for the Ordained Ministry (Hunt, et al., 2013, JPCC)

Persons who....

1. **Have higher awareness of emotions** (AINO, warm, sensitive, forthright, and cautious)
   higher on counselor and spiritual guide lower on scholar.

2. **Identify their own emotions** (CO, emotionally stable and self-assured)
   higher on administrator and evangelist lower on scholar.

3. **Identify others’ emotions** (A, warmth)
   higher on counselor and higher ministry interests lower on scholar.

4. **Manage own emotions** (CLOQ4, emotionally stable, trusting, self-assured, relaxed)
   higher on counselor, priest, evangelist and higher ministry interests lower on scholar.

5. **Manage or cope well with others’ emotions** (ACH, warm, stable, socially bold)
   higher on evangelist, administrator, counselor, lower on scholar and musician.

6. **Use emotions in problem solving** (AI, warm, sensitive)
   higher on counseling and priest lower on administration and evangelist.

7. **Express emotions adaptively** (AEHNQ2, warm, dominant, forthright, group oriented)
   higher on counselor, administrator, evangelist; IRAI mean scores lower on musician and scholar.
2. Emotional Competence ➔ Ask your MAS consultant to answer these questions about a candidate or minister:

1. How much is this person aware of her/his own emotions?
2. In what ways does this person identify his/her own emotions?
3. In what ways does this person identify others’ emotions?
4. How well does this person manage her/his own emotions?
5. How well does this person manage others’ emotions?
6. How do these emotions influence his/her problem solving?
7. How does this person express emotions in adaptive, healthy ways?
8. Where are her/his emotional blind spots? ...strengths?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus person</th>
<th>Observed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Emotionally Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferential</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Lively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedient</td>
<td>Rule-Conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>Socially Bold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>Vigilant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounded</td>
<td>Abstracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthright</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assured</td>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Open to Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-Oriented</td>
<td>Self-Reliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerates Disorder</td>
<td>Perfectionistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Case studies with questions and discussion.

Example: As pastor you have received a call from a well known man in the community asking her to come to his home to help him cope with his depression. He and his family are active members in your church.

His wife is away from home attending a week long workshop. No one else is living in their home since their children are grown and living on their own. He asks the pastor to keep this visit confidential. He does not want to meet the pastor at the church where others might know he is asking for help. He is a major contributor to the church budget. He usually expects to get his way in church matters.

Some questions:
1. As pastor what feelings arise in you as you consider this request?
2. Does it matter whether the pastor is a woman or a man?
3. What emotions may underlie this man’s request?
4. What do you consider to be the standard of pastoral care in this situation?
5. What will you do next?
4. Observation (360) reports

Try this with your own committee...

Copy the rating slide and paste it on a sheet of paper. As the “Focus Person” for each rating line mark the “O” to show where you are on each dimension. Ask others on committee to be “Observers” and do the same as they see you.

Rotate this procedure through all committee members. (If a large committee, do this in subgroups of 3 to 5 persons)

Compare the ratings. Ask feedback in this order:
1. How well do your ratings capture your own emotional competence, skills, “intelligence”?
2. Compare your self-ratings with the observers’ ratings of you. Where are the similarities? …Differences?
3. How do you feel about your own perceptions?...about the others’ perceptions of you?
4. What would you like to do about these comparisons?
5. How would you respond if your appointment were based on these ratings?
6. Would your ratings change if you were in different situations? ....such as family, work, leisure?
What we can do in the context of self-report limits:

1. See Emotional Competence as a system of total personal functioning.

2. Ask MAS consultant to answer specific Emotional Competence questions. Use reports as hypotheses to check out – starting place for discussion.

3. Case studies with questions and discussion.

4. Observation (360) reports from focus person and observers – such as the DOM reference letters from persons who know the candidate well.

5. Coaching (supervision, mentoring, CPE, etc.) -- coach observing candidate or minister in actual situations and then exploring improved responses, actions.

Self-report measures (16PF, MMPI-2, etc.) → subject to biases from:

- Language and word meanings
- Self-image distortions
- Own self perceptions
- Verbal vs. interactive behaviors
5. Coaching questions about any case:

1. What do you see happening in this situation? Being aware of emotions in others.

2. What emotions arise in you as you work with this person/couple/family/case? Being aware of emotions in one self.

3. How do you manage your own reactions to this situation?

4. How will you use this information about emotions to respond to this problem or situation in healthy positive ways?

5. What impact will this have on others involved? Yourself, the persons involved, your own family, your congregation, your church image/dynamics?

6. In this process with whom, if any, will you consult? Which of your ethical standards apply in this situation? What is your clergy code of ethics or standard of care?
Best ways to Measure Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Emotional Social Competence (ESC)

Self-Report measures → helpful but inadequate

Observer report measures -- such as the DOM reference letter 360 → Better but limited

Observation measures → trained coach observes the candidate/minister in Simulated situations, Actual real life situations BEST when observations are the basis for feedback/coaching to the candidate/minister
Take Away summary ....

E I is part of ESC, ESC is part of personality

Self-reports are helpful – such as 16PF which we already have BUT NOT ENOUGH

Need 360 observer reports – try the form in this PP with colleagues

Need real life situations with personal feedback and coaching follow up
End
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By Richard A. Hunt

Thanks for Listening
W. VICTOR MALOY

The Virginia Institute of Pastoral Care, Inc.
2000 Bremo Road
Suite 105
Richmond, Virginia 23226
804-282-8332
vmaloy@vipcare.org

PRESENT POSITIONS

• Executive Director – Virginia Institute of Pastoral Care, Inc.
• Consultant and Executive Coach – Bon Secours Health Care System
• Facilitator Bon Secours Ministry Leadership Formation Program
• Adjunct Faculty – Garrett Evangelical Theological Seminary

CLINICAL STANDING

• Licensed Professional Counselor – Virginia
• Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist – Virginia
• Certified Group Psychotherapist – The National Registry of Certified Group Psychotherapists
• Certified Diplomate – American Association of Pastoral Counselors
• Certification, Leadership Circle Profile

MINISTERIAL STANDING

• Ordained Elder – The United Methodist Church
• Endorsement, Chaplains and Related Ministries – The United Methodist Church

EDUCATION

• Vanderbilt University Divinity School – Doctor of Ministry
• Emory University – Master of Divinity
• Florida State University – Bachelor of Arts
• Virginia Institute of Pastoral Care, Inc. - Certificate of Residency Training in Clinical Pastoral Counseling

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

• Advisory Committee on Candidacy and Clergy Assessment – The United Methodist Church
• Past President – American Association of Pastoral Counselors
• Author – Reflections on the Journey & Night Musings
• Author – Variety of Published Articles