

Emotional Intelligence: towards a generic framework for the 21st century

Chris Wakeman

Staffordshire University

Correspondence: cew2@staffs.ac.uk

Abstract:

Emotional Intelligence (EI) has become an important concept in the Higher Education (HE) setting, particularly in the context of the ongoing debate regarding assessment and how students with differing levels of EI may respond to a range of assessment methods. This paper explores the evolution of the Emotional Intelligence concept as we move towards a generic framework that will hopefully characterise the scope, dimensions and clusters that define the EI structure. The evolution of EI forms the focus during the early stages of the work, which later explores seven key frameworks that have been influential in guiding current thinking. The final outcome from the paper is a generic framework which establishes the parameters of EI and defines the current position.

Key words: *Intelligence, social intelligence, emotional intelligence frameworks, dimensions, clusters*

Introduction

The current interest in Emotional Intelligence (EI) has resulted in a growing number of texts and papers on the subject and some reconsideration regarding the scope, dimensions and clusters that comprise the EI framework. The American psychologist Daniel Goleman has been a key figure in raising the profile of EI and alerting employers and educationalists to the fundamental importance of the EI concept. Goleman's work has been influential in developments across Europe and North America and many organisations and theorists who are concerned with EI and the related concept of Emotional Competence (EC) acknowledge his contribution to their own models and frameworks. This desktop study, which is based largely on documentary analysis, aims to examine and summarise current thinking on the scope, dimensions and clusters that underpin work by the major organisations and theorists in the area of EI. A generic table, which draws on the frameworks of key players in the area of EI, will be the principal output from the work providing an inventory of contemporary thinking for those with an interest in EI and associated concepts.

The evolution of the EI concept

Early attempts to define intelligence reveal some recognition of the distinction between cognitive and non-cognitive aspects and provide some insight into the line of thinking that has led to the present position. The Greek philosopher Aristotle (384 – 323 BC), cited within Cope (1817), suggested that intellect consists of two parts: something similar to matter (passive intellect) and something similar to form (active intellect), he went on to assert that intellect is “separable” and “unmixed”, seemingly recognising the existence of *different types*

of intelligence and perhaps alluding to some of the multiple intelligence factors that we recognise today.

During the middle ages the study of the mind was largely focused on the “localisation of cerebral function” with many physiologists believing that mental capacities were located in the fluid of the ventricles¹. Nonetheless, this early hypothesis of “localisation” was soon discredited and the focus shifted to the brain stem and the cerebrum. Early research, which was largely based on primitive human experimentation, was inconclusive and it was well into the 19th century before any credible theory of functional localisation was published (Gall & Spurzheim 1810). Though the theories of Gall & Spurzheim are somewhat detached from mainstream studies of intelligence, they do, add weight to the belief that the early theorists recognised the existence of multiple intellect factors. A later text by Spurzheim (1818) lists cerebral functions and refers to many emotional qualities such as self-esteem and conscientiousness. It would appear that some 150 years before Howard Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences (1983), the early pioneers in this field were immersed in the belief that specific mental processes may be linked to discrete regions of the brain.

Wilhelm Wundt (1871) further developed knowledge in the field of emotional theory when he attempted to classify a range of emotional feelings into a three dimensional system, which became known as “Wundt’s three dimensions of feeling”. The three dimensions that Wundt identified are pleasure → pain, strain → relaxation and excitation → quiescence. What Wundt set out to do was to place individuals somewhere on his three dimensional scale in much the same way as we may record the position of an object in space using x, y and z coordinates.

Moving towards more recent times the links between physiology and psychology were investigated by William James (1890), who argued that emotions were “instinctive”. The theory became known as the “James-Lang theory of emotion” as it was shared with a Danish psychologist, Karl Lang, who came up with a similar theory at exactly the same time. Though the James-Lang theory is still well known, it was quickly discredited by other academics, particularly, John B Watson, the founder of the “Behaviourist School of Psychology”, who put the James-Lang theory to experimental test and concluded that emotional responses were in fact “acquired” rather than “instinctive”.

In 1927, another behaviourist, Professor E.L. Thorndike suggested that intelligence may be considered to exist in three distinct categories, which he identified as “mechanical”, “social” and “abstract”. Thorndike advocated that future tests of intelligence should include measures of all the categories not simply the “abstract” dimension, which formed the focus of tests at that time. Unbeknown to Thorndike, it would be a considerable number of years before tests to measure social aspects of intelligence were developed and recognised as valid and worthwhile by the psychological world. In the intervening years work was largely focused on IQ until further research on “non-cognitive” aspects of intelligence was carried out by Burt (1949, p. 137) who suggested that a ‘general emotionality’ exists just as there is a ‘general factor’ that can be applied to cognitive aspects of intelligence. Burt refers to two bipolar factors, which demonstrate some similarity with the terms used in the more recent framework developed by Goleman (1998). Burt’s study, which was based on tests, observations, behavioural reports and similar methods, encompassed a sample of some 172 children of school age and possibly represents the first example of what we now know as emotional intelligence being tested and formally recorded. Burt (1949, pp. 138-9) concluded that just as with cognitive factors, non-cognitive aspects fit into a ‘hierarchical structure of progressively

complex levels', though he also acknowledged that there is still 'an obvious and urgent need for further research' .

Guilford (1959) acknowledged the existence of "social" intelligence in his work "Three faces of intellect". Within his work Guilford (1959, p. 156) suggests that 50 intellectual factors had been identified and this meant that: 'there are at least 50 ways of being intelligent'. He goes on to write about the 'hypothesized behavioural column of the structure of intelligence' (p. 157), suggesting that understanding the behaviour of others and of ourselves is largely nonverbal in character. He theorises that there may be as many as 30 abilities within the behavioural column including 'some having to do with understanding, some with productive thinking about behaviour and some with the evaluation of behaviour' (p. 157). He concludes by stating that: 'The abilities in the area of social intelligence, whatever they prove to be, will possess considerable importance in connection with all those individuals who deal most with other people' (p. 158).

During the 1960s there was considerable interest in the structure and validity of intelligence tests. Butcher (1968, p. 59) refers to results from the Terman-Merrill test noting: 'social competence has been found to be more closely associated with intelligence'. He also refers to work by Guilford and Hopper (1963) who worked tirelessly for over twenty years to develop tests, which would appraise around 120 specific abilities including many emotional factors, they concluded: 'information, essentially non-verbal, involved in human interactions, where awareness of the attitudes, needs, desires, moods, intentions, perceptions, thoughts etc., of other people and ourselves is important' (cited in Butcher 1968, p. 59).

Dennis Child (1977, p. 24) suggests a general definition for emotion may be 'physiological and psychological responses that influence perception, learning and performance'. This takes us back to the close relationship between physiology and psychology that was noted by James (1890) and has been briefly discussed above. Child seemingly recognises the psychological influence on emotional response but goes on to discuss in some detail the physiological sequence of "emotional arousal", which theorists believe takes place in two specific parts of the brain – the limbic system and the reticular formation. There is little in Child's work to suggest links between emotion and intelligence and the psychological links to which he refers seem to be restricted to personality factors and feelings.

Howard Gardner (1983) was the catalyst for much debate when he published his theory of "multiple intelligences". Within his work Gardner identified seven intelligences including what he described as the personal intelligences – interpersonal and intrapersonal. In a later work (1993, p. 23), he noted:

'Interpersonal intelligence builds on a core capacity to notice distinctions among others, in particular, contrasts in their moods, temperaments, motivations, and intentions.'

He went on to examine intrapersonal intelligence, suggesting that this form of intellect relates to:

'Knowledge of the internal aspects of a person: access to one's own feeling life, one's range of emotions, the capacity to effect discriminations among these emotions and eventually to label them and draw upon them as a means of understanding and guiding one's own behaviour' (p.25).

Gardner (1993, p. 25) comments that both forms of personal intelligence fit his criteria for being described as "intelligences" as they both feature 'problem-solving endeavours with

significance for the individual and the species'. Gardner was not the first person to suggest that there are separate and distinct human capacities for different types of intellect, but his arguments were certainly the most powerful to be published up to that time, as a consequence, many theorists consider Gardner to be the key figure in bringing about the change of emphasis from traditional views of IQ to the current and much broader perspective.

In 1995 the American psychologist Daniel Goleman published his first book entitled "Emotional Intelligence". Due to Goleman's subsequent popularity many people mistakenly believe that this was the first use of the term, however, this is not the case as an earlier reference to "emotional intelligence" has been traced to a doctoral thesis that was written in 1985 by Wayne Leon Payne a student at an "alternative liberal arts college in the USA" (see <http://eqi.org/history.htm>). Mayer et al (1990) also refer to "emotional intelligence" prior to Goleman's use of the term. Nevertheless, Goleman's contribution to the theory of emotional intelligence should not be underestimated. Goleman has been successful in bringing emotional intelligence to the forefront of psychological debate and his "emotional competence framework" (1998) is widely acknowledged as the foundation of much work that has followed in the intervening years.

Emotional intelligence and education

In the field of education, EI has become a topic of much debate in the context of teaching, learning, assessment, widening participation and student retention.

Mortiboys (2002) intimates that to be effective as educators we must be able to recognise and respond to the feelings of both ourselves and the learner. He goes on to note that it is part of the educator's role to encourage an emotional state in learners, which is conducive to learning.

Riemer (2003, p. 190) examines the impact of EI on learning suggesting that:

'Positive emotion can affect memory organisation so that cognitive material is actually better integrated and diverse ideas are seen as being more interrelated.'

Riemer (2003, p. 193) goes on to suggest that, 'emotions contribute directly to rational thought' (p. 190), lamenting that 'emotions seem to have been largely left a distant second place in comparison to rationality and intellect'.

The views expressed by Mortiboys and Riemer seem to concur with Goleman's thoughts, which are detailed in his 1995 publication 'Emotional Intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ' Here, Goleman writes about "emotional memory", stating that:

'This means that, in effect, the brain has two memory systems, one for ordinary facts and one for emotionally charged ones'.(p. 21)

More worryingly, Goleman (1995, p. 21) goes on to note that, 'emotional memories can be faulty guides to the present'.

Moon (2004, p. 46) discusses emotional intelligence in the context of learning and concludes that:

'It has been important in reframing our view of what it means to be 'good' at learning and managing learning. It recognises the importance of many other

factors in contributing to effectiveness that go beyond the traditional notions of pure cognitive ability (IQ)

Gross (2008, p. 2) examines the implications of EI for adult learning and teaching. He suggests that EI is a 'powerful' influence on any teaching and learning situation, and goes on to outline some anxieties and barriers to learning stating:

'Are some of them anxious about being back in the classroom? Have they driven an hour to make your opening session? Is there any resentment, anger or anxiety in the room?'

On a more encouraging note, Gross (2008, p. 2) considers how we may harness emotional aspects to enhance learning, stating that, 'Motivation is contagious', and stressing that we may 'tap their empathy with a strong story or anecdote'.

In essence, there is little doubt that EI has a strong influence on the ultimate success or failure of a learning experience. There is much evidence that this is even more profound during assessment. The "new" forms of assessment, student presentations, co-operative learning submissions, role play and the like, make huge demands on the student's emotional capacities, particularly in the areas of self confidence, self control and general emotional awareness. Many other aspects of EI may also be significant depending on the type, circumstance and management of the assessment experience. It is in this context that the factors and dimensions that comprise the EI concept and therefore underpin such educational activity take on increased significance, and for that reason, we as educators are duty bound to further explore the frameworks, dimensions and clusters that we currently associate with EI as we endeavour to establish a generic model to inform future practice.

Frameworks, dimensions and clusters

Aristotle made an early attempt to identify the dimensions of emotion within his second book of rhetoric, which is thought to have been written around 350 B.C. Within his work Aristotle identified five emotional dimensions and three additional elements. These are listed in table (a) at the rear of this report:

In addition to his work in this area Aristotle had a great deal to say about emotions and other psychological issues including what he described as "observed activity" and its relationship with the hypothetical "underlying capacity or ability" on which it depended. It seems apparent that Aristotle had recognised the important distinction between intelligence and competence in much the same way as modern theorists distinguish between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Emotional Competence (EC). This distinction is explored in an earlier paper², and is not subject to further scrutiny here.

Contemporary instruments that purport to assess an individual's emotional intelligence provide evidence of the frameworks, dimensions and clusters that theorists currently recognise and reveal some commonality regarding the measurable components that form the basis of the tests. The BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory (BarOn EQ-I[®] 2003), records scores under five distinct categories. These are described as: intrapersonal factors, interpersonal factors, stress management factors, adaptability factors and general mood scale factors. Table (b) at the rear of this report provides a detailed account of the five dimensions and their inherent factors as defined by BarOn.

Some ten years before the BarOn EQ-I[®] was established, Mayer & Salovey (1993) published their “four branch model” of emotional intelligence. The Mayer-Salovey model identifies four main areas, which are shown in table (c) at the rear of this study.

The Mayer-Salovey model offered four dimensions of emotional intelligence, which individuals must develop if they are to become emotionally intelligent. The model was ultimately used as a basis for the ‘Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test’ (MSCEIT)³ (see The Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organisations at http://www.unh.edu/emotional_intelligence/) and it now exists in adult and youth versions, which may be taken on-line. The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso theory is often referred to as the ‘ability model of emotional intelligence’ (<http://emotionaliq.com>).

Some time after Mayer & Salovey developed their “four branch model”, Goleman (1998, p. 1) set out a framework for emotional intelligence, which is based on ‘internal research at hundreds of corporations and organisations’ that have collectively identified the distinguishing factors of ‘outstanding performers’. Goleman’s framework, which he has refined and updated since publishing the original 1998 version, categorises factors under two main headings – Self (personal competence) and Other (social competence). Table (d), which is included at the rear of this report, provides a detailed account of the factors that Goleman identified under each heading.

Comparison of Goleman’s framework with the factors identified by BarOn and used as the basis for the baron EQ-I[®] (2003) demonstrate that there is a great deal of commonality between the two models. Although the way the EI components are formed into clusters differs across the two tests, a significant degree of repetition at factor level may be identified.

Goleman expanded his work and along with Dr. Richard Boyatzis developed the Emotional Competence Inventory[®] (ECI). During 2001/2002, Johnson & Johnson Consumer & Personal Care Group (JJC & PC group) used the ECI[®] as part of a wider package of instruments to test and analyse specific leadership competencies among their staff. The research was conducted on a sample of 1400 employees and aimed to identify the leadership competencies that distinguished high performers from average performers within the company. The main instrument used for this purpose was a blend of the “J & J leadership competency model”, the “Standards of leadership[®]”, and the ECI[®].

The Consortium for research on emotional intelligence in organisations (2003) published the results of the JJ & PC group research including categorised results based on performance, potential and gender. Analysis of the categorised scores provides a good insight into the ECI framework, which is based on four main clusters or competencies. These may be identified as: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and social skills and as we may expect, the characteristics that comprise each cluster are closely aligned with Goleman’s framework which is published in table (d) at the rear of this study.

The Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence (2003) has published a further framework, which again draws extensively on the work of Goleman (1998) and also “distills” the findings of many other interested parties⁴. The emotional competence framework identifies two main categories – personal competence and social competence, with 3 clusters

in the first category and 2 in the second. Table (e), which is included at the rear of this report, shows the major dimensions that form the basis of the framework.

Comparison of the dimensions considered by Goleman's 1998 framework (table (d)) and the framework offered by the Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence 2003 (table (e)), reveals many similarities and Goleman's influence is very clear to see, indeed, Goleman's influence on many of the tests developed within the United States and Canada is easily identifiable.

Away from the United States and Canada, the Geneva Emotion Research Group[®] (2002) have adopted a different approach to testing and measuring emotional intelligence based on the Geneva Appraisal Questionnaire (GAQ version 3.0). The Geneva approach is based on "Stimulus Evaluation Checks" (SECs) with questions focussing on 5 clusters of SECs, which are identified in table (f) at the rear. The Geneva Emotion Research Group[®] acknowledge the work of Scherer, K.R. et al (2001) who first identified SECs as criteria for emotional intelligence appraisal.

Wakeman (2006) offered a further variation as a basis for his "Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire" (EIQu). The EIQu differs from the main instruments on offer today both in terms of its two dimensional approach to testing and its unique approach to scoring which places individuals into one of twelve sectors on a 360° polar graph. The two dimensions, which form the basis of the test, are named "non-cognitive self management personae" and "social dexterity" with each broken down into a number of factors that form clusters under the broader dimensions. Table (g) at the rear of this report, provides an overview of the two main dimensions.

The EIQu model displays some similarity to that offered by The Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence (table (e)), though the later offering is a more streamlined version than both the consortium model and Goleman's 4 dimensional approach, with a sharper focus on human factors rather than those with a management orientation. Wakeman (2006, p. 77) explains the reduced number of factors, stating that:

'The EIQu is based on the belief that some factors are irrevocably linked and cannot be isolated for the purpose of testing and analysis. The EIQu, therefore, comprises fewer factors which are grouped under two broader dimensions rather than the four suggested by Goleman.'

In summation, there are seven major frameworks that have emerged to demonstrate the scope, dimensions and factors of emotional intelligence. The frameworks differ in scope and complexity from the 5 dimensional models offered by Aristotle (table a) BarOn (table b,) and the Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence (table e), to Wakeman's 2 dimensional example (table g). In between these extremes we have the 4 dimensional approaches offered by Mayer-Salovey (table c) and Goleman (table d), and the 5 part Geneva offering, which uses "stimulus evaluation checks" as the basis for testing and evaluation. In the final section of this paper I shall attempt to create a generic framework from the seven approaches considered in this paper.

Towards a generic framework

To achieve a generic framework, it is necessary to determine which and how many "dimensions" and "clusters" are needed to accommodate all the factors that embody the EI concept. An overview of the seven models examined in the previous section of this article leads us to the position shown in table (h), which is included at the rear.

Analysis of table (h) shows much commonality. Goleman, the Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence and Wakeman are in accord over what may be described as “higher level dimensions”. Despite variations in terminology, all agree that personal factors and social factors form separate clusters for the purpose of testing and analysis. If we consider the BarOn descriptors in light of this categorisation, there is further common ground. As the terms suggest, interpersonal and intrapersonal fit nicely into the personal category. At this point, however, things become less straightforward, as we have some elements that do not sit comfortably in either of the personal or social categories and would appear to impact in equal measure on both of these dimensions.

Aristotle’s offering and, to some degree, those identified by the Geneva group cause similar problems, appearing to require a third higher level dimension that sits directly between the personal and social categories and contains elements that transcend the dimensional boundaries. We may call this third dimension the “Emotional Spectrum” (ES) as it contains elements that are difficult to manage in an emotional sense yet have a significant impact on both personal and social intelligence.

The type of factors that may fall into the ES are characterised by Aristotle’s dimensional limits, for example anger and calmness or fear and confidence. Though Aristotle saw these contrasting pairs as dimensions in their own right, it seems appropriate to suggest that each of these traits have an impact on both the personal and social dimensions in the context of interpersonal and intrapersonal actions and behaviours. BarOn’s general mood scale includes other factors that would fit comfortably into the emotional spectrum, while some factors from the Consortium may also be included in the ES category.

Below the “higher level” dimensions, it is possible to identify some “lower level” labels, examples include, self awareness and social awareness as defined by Goleman and the Consortium, or self regulation and social skills also from the Consortium table.

Many of the remaining factors relate to management skills and competencies and require a “higher level” dimension for the purposes of categorisation and analysis. The “management dimension” encompasses a number of lower level labels such as “coping potential” and “compatibility with standards” from the Geneva model and “relationship management” as defined by Goleman. We may also include ‘stress management’ under this categorisation though this kind of EI has broader implications across the emotional framework.

In essence, therefore, the generic framework has four main components, the personal and social dimensions with the emotional spectrum between and the management strand, which is somewhat distinct from the main EI elements. The proposed generic framework is shown in diagrammatic form in table (i) at the rear.

The generic structure described by table (i) provides a synopsis of the seven major frameworks that guide current thinking and practice. As noted previously, the management dimension is somewhat detached from emotional intelligence in its purest form and reflects the fact that a number of the frameworks that have formed the focus of this paper were developed as management tools for the purpose of assessing and evaluating emotional competence in staff. It could be argued that some factors included within the seven frameworks do not reflect emotional intelligence at all. Political awareness and service orientation are two examples that fall into this category and for this reason they and similar factors have been omitted from the generic construct. It is hoped that the final outcome will provide a platform for serious debate on the scope, dimensions and clusters that shape the emotional intelligence concept and some 2,350 years after Aristotle’s early attempt at defining

the emotional elements and dimensions, move us one step closer to an accepted EI paradigm.

Conclusions

This desktop study, which relies almost entirely on documentary review and analysis as a source of facts, records and data, proposes a generic framework for psychologists, managers and educators with an interest in Emotional Intelligence and its inherent structures. The paper explores the thinking of seven theorists who have been influential in guiding the notion of EI to its current position, and concludes with the suggestion that a generic EI structure will need to comprise four higher level dimensions including the all important “emotional spectrum”, which transcends the boundaries between the personal and social aspects of EI.

The management dimension, though considered important in the work that has led us to the current position, is not considered by the author to represent EI in its purest form but may be influenced or driven by aspects of EI from each of the personal and social dimensions and possibly more so by the factors that form the emotional spectrum. Factors from the management dimension may be considered as management capabilities, the levels of which may be dictated by EI factors but are not inherently part of an individual’s EI profile.

It could be argued, of course, that all the factors noted in the generic table represent aspects of emotional competence rather than EI. As noted previously this distinction has been noted in a previous paper and mirrors work in the area of intelligence more generally where the Intelligence Quotient (IQ) is based on the assessment of competence in maths, reasoning and non-verbal reasoning rather than the more problematic measurement of the intelligence concept, which would require some form of genetic or DNA analysis.

In essence, the generic table proposed takes us one step further in establishing the parameters of EI and provides a fundamental overview of the tangible aspects that individuals often demonstrate and by which they are frequently judged. As Goleman (1996) suggested, in this respect emotional intelligence is almost certainly more important than IQ as it is on the basis of the visible aspects of EI that many judgements relating to individuals are made and it is on this evidence that life and career changing decisions are based.

Notes

¹ Source: Wozniak, Robert H. "*Mind and Body: Rene Descartes to William James*" <http://serendip.brynmawr.edu/Mind/>; Bryn Mawr College, Serendip 1995. Originally published in 1992 at Bethesda, MD & Washington, DC by the National Library of Medicine and the American Psychological Association.

² See Wakeman (2006) pp.72 – 73

³ MSCEIT is a trademark of Multi-Health Systems (MHS).

⁴ The generic competence framework distils findings from MOSAIC *competencies for professional and administrative occupations* (US office of personnel management); Spencer & Spencer, *competence at work*; Rosier. R.H. (ed) (1994) and (1995); and Goleman. D. (1998).

References

- Boyatzis, R., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (2000) Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the emotional competence inventory (ECI). In BarOn, R. & Parker, J.D.A. (Eds) *Handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burt, C. (1949) The structure of the mind. In Wiseman, S. (Ed) *Intelligence and ability*. 2nd edition. Bungay: The Chaucer Press.
- Butcher, H.J. (1968) *Human intelligence: Its nature and assessment*. Methuens Manuals of Psychology. London, UK: Methuen & Co Ltd.
- Cavallo, K. & Brienza, D. (2003) *Emotional competence and leadership excellence at Johnson & Johnson*. Available on-line: http://www.eiconsortium.org/research/jj_ei_study.htm
Accessed September 3rd 2003.
- Cherniss, C. (2000) *Emotional Intelligence: What it is and why it matters*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the society for industrial and organizational psychology, New Orleans. April 15th 2000.
- Child, D. (1977) *Psychology and the teacher*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston Ltd.
- Cope, E.M. (1817) *An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric: With Analysis, Notes and Appendices* London: McMillan & Co. (1867)
- Gall, F.J. & Spurzheim, J.C. (1810) *Observations sur la phrénologie, ou la connaissance de l'homme moral et intellectuel, fondée sur les fonctions du système nerveux*. Strasbourg and Paris.
- Gardner, H. (1983) *Frames of mind*. New York. Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1993) *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*. New York. Basic Books.
- Geneva Emotion Research Group (2002) *Geneva appraisal questionnaire (GAQ)*. Available on-line: <http://www.unige.ch/fapse/emotion/>
Accessed November 17th 2003.
- Goleman, D. (1995) *Emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Goleman, D. (1996) *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Goleman, D. (1998) *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York. Bantam.
- Goleman, D. (2003) *An EI-based theory of performance*. Available on-line: http://www.eiconsortium.org/research/ei_theory_performance.htm
Accessed 3rd March 2008
- GROSS, R. (2008) *EI in adult learning and teaching*. Available on-line: http://adulthood.about.com/cs/learningstyles/a/EQ_2.htm
Accessed 10th June 2008.
- Guildford, J.P. (1959) *Three faces of intellect*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California
- James, W. (1890) *The principles of psychology* New York: Henry Holt Publishers.
- Koifman, R. (2002) *The relationship between E.Q., I.Q., and creativity*. Toronto: York University.
- Mayer, J.D., DiPaolo, M.T., & Salovey, P. (1990). *Perceiving affective content in ambiguous visual stimuli: A component of emotional intelligence*. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 54, 772-781.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2002) *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)* <http://www.eiconsortium.org/measures/msceit.html>. Accessed 22nd June 2008

- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence*, 17(4), 433-442
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997) *Ability model of emotional intelligence*. Available on-line: <http://emotionaliq.com/> Accessed November 17th 2003.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (eds). *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Implications for Educators* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.
- Moon, J. (2004) *A Handbook of Reflective and Experiential Learning: Theory and Practice*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Mortiboys, A. (2002) *Teaching with emotional intelligence*. ESCalate. Issue 4. Spring 2006.
- Multi Health Systems (MHS) (2003) *Emotional intelligence*. Human resources and career development booklet. pp 112.
- Riemer, M.J. (2003) *Integrating emotional intelligence into engineering education*. World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education, Vol. 2. No. 2. (2003) pp. 189 - 194
- Salovey, P. & Mayer, J. (1990) *Imagination, cognition and personality*. *Emotional Intelligence*. 9(3) pp185 - 211.
- Scherer, K.R., Schorr, A. & Johnstone, T. (Eds.). (2001). *Appraisal processes in emotion: Theory, Methods, Research*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spurzheim, J.G. (1827) *Outlines of phrenology*. London: Bagster and Thoms Printers.
- The Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organisations (2004) *Emotional competence framework*. Available on-line: http://www.eiconsortium.org/reports/emotional_competence_framework.html Accessed June 6th 2008
- Wakeman, C.E. (2006) *Emotional intelligence: testing, measurement and analysis* *Research in Education*, Vol. 75 (May 2006). pp. 71 – 93.
- Watson, J, B. (1913). 'Psychology as the behaviorist views it' *Psychological Review*, 20, pp. 158-177.
- Wundt, W. (1893) *Physiological psychology*. Leipzig University.

Table (a): Aristotle's Emotional Dimensions & Elements

Aristotle's Emotional Dimensions
Anger ↔ Calmness Friendship (Love) ↔ Enmity Fear ↔ Confidence Shame ↔ Shamelessness Kindness ↔ Unkindness
Aristotle's Emotional Elements
Pity Indignation Envy

Table (b): BarOn's Five Dimensions and EI factors

Intrapersonal	Interpersonal	Stress Management	Adaptability	General Mood Scale
Self-regard	Empathy	Stress tolerance	Reality testing	Optimism
Emotional self-awareness	Social responsibility	Impulse control	Flexibility	Happiness
Assertiveness	Interpersonal relationships		Problem solving	
Independence Self-actualisation				

Table (c): The Mayer-Salovey model

The Mayer-Salovey Model	
1	The capacity to accurately perceive emotions.
2	The capacity to use emotions to facilitate thinking.
3	The capacity to understand emotional meaning.
4	The capacity to manage emotions.

Table (d): Goleman's framework (1998)

Self (personal competence)	Other (social competence)
<p>Self-Awareness Emotional self-awareness Accurate self-awareness Self-confidence</p> <p>Self-Management Self-control Trustworthiness Conscientiousness Adaptability Achievement drive Initiative</p>	<p>Social-Awareness Empathy Service orientation Organizational-awareness</p> <p>Relationship management Developing others Influence Communication Conflict management Leadership Change catalyst Building bonds Teamwork and collaboration</p>

Table (e): The consortium for research EI framework (2003)

Personal Competence	Social Competence
<p>Self-awareness Emotional awareness Accurate self-assessment Self-confidence</p> <p>Self-regulation Self-control Trustworthiness Conscientiousness Adaptability Innovativeness</p> <p>Self-motivation Achievement drive Commitment Initiative Optimism</p>	<p>Social awareness Empathy Service orientation Developing others Leveraging diversity Political awareness</p> <p>Social skills Influence Communication Leadership Change catalyst Conflict management Building bonds Collaboration and cooperation Team capabilities</p>

Table (f): The Geneva appraisal questionnaire

Geneva Appraisal Questionnaire (GAQ)
<p>Stimulus Evaluation Checks (SECs)</p> <p>Novelty: Suddenness Familiarity Predictability</p> <p>Intrinsic pleasantness: Goal/Need importance</p> <p>Goal/Need significance: Cause: agent Cause: motive Outcome probability Discrepancy from expectation Conduciveness Urgency</p> <p>Coping potential: Control Power Adjustment</p> <p>Compatibility with standards: External Internal</p>

Table (g): Wakeman's EIQu framework (2006)

Non-Cognitive Self-Management Personae	Social Dexterity
<p>Self-confidence Self-discipline Initiative Conscientiousness Dependability Emotional awareness</p>	<p>Leadership Conflict management Communication Influence Relationships Empathy Team ethics</p>

Table (h): An overview of the seven models

Aristotle	BarOn	Mayer-Salovey	Goleman	
Dimensions	Intrapersonal	The capacity to accurately perceive emotions	Self (Personal Competence)	Other (Social Competence)
Anger ↔ Calmness	Self-regard Emotional self-awareness		Self-Awareness Emotional self-awareness	Social-Awareness Empathy
Friendship (Love) ↔ Enmity	Assertiveness Independence Self-actualisation		Accurate self-awareness Self-confidence	Service orientation Organizational-awareness
Fear ↔ Confidence	Interpersonal	The capacity to use emotions to facilitate thinking		
Shame ↔ Shamelessness	Empathy Social responsibility Interpersonal relationships			
Kindness ↔ Unkindness	Stress management	The capacity to understand emotional meaning	Self-Management Self-control Trustworthiness Conscientiousness Adaptability Achievement drive Initiative	Relationship management Developing others Influence Communication Conflict management Leadership Change catalyst Building bonds Teamwork and collaboration
	Adaptability	The capacity to manage emotions		
	Reality testing Flexibility Problem solving			
Elements	General Mood Scale			
Pity Indignation Envy	Optimism Happiness			
Consortium		Geneva	Wakeman	
Personal Competence	Social Competence	Novelty Suddenness Familiarity Predictability	Non-Cognitive Self Management Personae	Social Dexterity
Self-awareness Emotional awareness. Accurate self-assessment. Self-confidence.	Social awareness Empathy Service orientation. Developing others Leveraging diversity. Political awareness.	Intrinsic Pleasantness Goal/Need importance.	Self-confidence Self-discipline Initiative Conscientiousness Dependability Emotional awareness	Leadership Conflict management Communication Influence Relationships Empathy Team ethics

<p>Self-regulation</p> <p>Self-control Trustworthiness Conscientiousness Adaptability Innovativeness</p>	<p>Social skills</p> <p>Influence Communication Leadership Change catalyst Conflict management Building bonds Collaboration and cooperation Team capabilities</p>	<p>Goal/Need Significance</p> <p>Cause: agent Cause: motive Outcome probability Discrepancy from expectation Conduciveness Urgency</p>		
<p>Self-motivation</p> <p>Achievement drive Commitment Initiative Optimism</p>		<p>Coping Potential</p> <p>Control Power Adjustment</p>		
		<p>Compatibility with standards</p> <p>External Internal</p>		

Table (i): The generic framework

