Organization Management Journal

Volume 6 | Issue 1 Article 6

3-1-2009

Demonstrating the challenges of behaving with emotional intelligence in a team setting: an on-line/on-ground experiential exercise

William P. Ferris
Western New England College

Organization Management Journal (2009) 6, 23–38

Current Empirical Research

Demonstrating the challenges of behaving with emotional intelligence in a team setting: an on-line/on-ground experiential exercise

William P Ferris

School of Business, Western New England College, Springfield, Massachusetts, USA

Correspondence:
William P Ferris, Professor of Management, School of Business, Western New England College, 1215 Wilbraham Road, Springfield, Massachusetts 01119, USA.
Tel: +1 413-782-1629;
Fax: +1 413-796-2068;
E-mail: bferris@wnec.edu

Abstract
The idea of this new exercise is to involve two project team participants in an interpersonal conflict in front of a classroom of learner/observers and then to debrief the entire experience in terms of emotional intelligence (EI) concepts in a way that clarifies these concepts experientially. It is preceded by EI readings and may be followed by extended on-line discussions and a variety of different papers and/or homework assignments. It can be used in traditional, blended learning (BL), or on-line courses or training classrooms. Originally developed to involve on-ground (face-to-face) and on-line students from the same course in the same exercise either synchronously or asynchronously, it utilizes a webcam and electronic blackboard system such as generally available in all universities as well as an original survey tool to facilitate the debrief. Advantages of on-line processing of experiential exercises and some potentially inherent differences in the two methods as well as use of video clips in enriched debriefing are described.
Organization Management Journal (2009) **6,** 23–38. doi:10.1057/omj.2009.6

Keywords: experiential; emotional intelligence (EI); on-line; blended learning; team

Introduction

Although there are countless experiential exercises dealing with problem-solving, decision making, team-building, diversity, values, illustration of motivational and perception theories, among other worthy subjects, there are not so many dealing with the construct of emotional intelligence (EI); yet as the literature review below will show, there has been much study of the subject of EI as well as discussion of ideas said to be descriptive of EI in the popular press. In fact, EI has been under-studied in business schools in that we are still trying to live up to the requests of industry to produce students more versed in interpersonal communications and relations (Porter and McKibbin, 1988). In addition, with education now being delivered in many non-traditional ways, including on-line and blended (both on-line and face-to-face in the same course) delivery models, it has seemed a particular challenge to create an experiential exercise around emotions that could be used in either traditional or non-traditional environments or both, even simultaneously. Finally, if we did have such exercises, would essentially the same exercise presented in a blended or otherwise mixed

environment result in differing experiences that might lead to new discussion among the students, who themselves may be headed for such a mixed on-line/face-to-face work environment? These are all the challenges that the exercise presented in this paper attempts to meet.

A more extensive description of the exercise appears later in the paper and in the appendices, but perhaps a brief introduction of it here makes sense in advance of a literature review. In short, it presents two student team members in a frustrating conflict in front of the class while fellow class members fill out observer sheets that they do not realize are keyed to elements of EI theory. The role play is videoed through use of a webcam and will ultimately be placed on-line for other class members to watch from home while filling out the same observer sheets. Ultimately, the observer sheets are scored and the results discussed both in class (recorded for on-line students) and on-line in an asynchronous discussion.

Underlying readings to support the exercise may vary, as will become apparent following the literature review. Following the exercise and discussion of it, students can be expected to achieve the following learning objectives:

1. Understand the key domains or abilities of EI.
2. Be able to identify behavioral elements that comprise these domains.
3. Be able to identify behavioral elements that reflect both high and low EI.
4. Reflect on their own behaviors that are both amicable and inimical to high EI.
5. Discuss ways to avoid emotional intra-team conflicts such as the one in the role play.
6. Discuss differences in observations of on-line and face-to-face students and possible reasons and ramifications surrounding these differences.
7. With the help of material in the article and book selection read in advance, design policy and program initiatives that could be expected to raise organizational EI.
8. Design a personal agenda for raising their own EI using the same sources.

An important instructional goal of the exercise is that it is able to be used effectively by both on-ground and on-line students in the same course. A second instructional goal is to help students practice dealing with the inevitable conflicts within their teams if there is to be a team project in the course and to sensitize them to the need to act responsibly and take each other's needs into account when they are involved in team projects. As a by-product, if students are in a blended face-to-face/on-line environment, they will learn that there are often clearly identifiable differences in the way they process a role play observed in person compared to the way they might process it when presented on a video; over several instances of the use of this role play, they have been more critical of low EI behavior to varying degrees when seeing it on a video. A variety of possible reasons for this can be posited, some of which are discussed in the sample student discussion transcript in Appendix D. During the debrief, the instructor might be well-served to take the opportunity to discuss what other differences might come up in processing material on-line, especially instances when on-line processing can add value to learning or may risk distorting perceptions.

History and context of the exercise

This exercise was originally created to illustrate the concepts of EI (Salovey and Mayer, 1990; Goleman *et al*., 2001, 2002; Mayer *et al*., 2008) in a flexible blended MBA curriculum. It was intended to meet the challenge of having part of the class present on-ground and part present only on-line during the week without knowing who was going to be in which group until the hour of the class (the so-called ''flexible'' blended delivery model, in which those not attending face-to-face do the on-line equivalent assignments for that session). However, it can also be used in any of the other types of course delivery systems, so it, or a variation of it, might well be of interest to all instructors wishing to teach EI or similar concepts, though it would clearly have to be adapted for other concepts. As presented here, the exercise has some clear side benefits because of its illustration of conflict resolution strategies in use by the two role players who volunteer or are selected for starring roles in it. And because the setting is a personal conflict within a student team, it is ideal as an exercise early in the process of forming student teams to help student team members realize that there will probably be ''storming'' (Tuckman and Jensen, 1977) in their team's future and it would be valuable to consider how they might resolve interpersonal conflicts productively as the team works up to ''performing'' its final project or task. In fact, teams whose members are able to demonstrate high levels of EI are probably likely to be the most productive (see Goleman *et al*., 2002: Chapter 9, ''The emotional reality of teams''). In sum, the

exercise is extremely useful as an introduction to EI, following exploration of collaborative conflict resolution strategies, and in conjunction with the formation of student teams.

Literature review

EI literature

EI is becoming a well-established construct worthy of examination in graduate and undergraduate management courses as demonstrated by the amount of study it has generated in the past few years. A search of the phrase ''emotional intelligence'' as a subject in the well-known EBSCO Business Source Premier data base alone reveals over 300 academic journal peer-reviewed papers, and another 500 plus papers in trade publications and magazines. Amazon lists 25 books on the subject, many by academics.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) introduced the concept of EI as follows: ''the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions'' (p. 189). Later, they emphasized that they conceived of EI as ''a series of mental abilities [qualifying] it as a form of intelligence'' (Mayer and Salovey, 1993: 435). In Mayer and Salovey (1997), they went on to describe the ''Four Branch Model of Emotional Intelligence'' as being comprised of ''a set of skills that make up overall emotional intelligence … (a) managing emotions so as to attain specific goals, (b) understanding emotions, emotional language, and the signals conveyed by emotions, (c) using emotions to facilitate thinking, and (d) perceiving emotions accurately in oneself and others'' (Mayer *et al*., 2008: 507). Thus, their work has been focused on an ''abilities'' approach and measuring EI with demonstration or performance rather than self-reports or even 360 reports of peers, subordinates, superiors, and others.

Daniel Goleman (1995) wrote the first book on EI entitled *Emotional Intelligence: Why it Can Matter More than IQ,* in which he sought to connect EI to the physiology of the brain. In his later work, he (Goleman, 1998) and co-authors Richard Boyatzis and Annie McKee (Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee, 2001, 2002) broadened the original concept and connected it to leadership and management in organizational settings. For them, EI is about the health and competency of one's relationship with one's own emotions in connection with one's behavior. Thus, they extended the focus to some degree to emotional ''competencies'' and they enlarged the variables to include items such as achievement, initiative, and optimism, competencies that the original researchers would reject as making the EI umbrella too broad and not yet well enough demonstrated to be part of EI. The four key EI ''domains'' that Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee say comprise EI as a result of their factor analysis are self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management, and there are no fewer than 18 competencies subsumed under these domains. In *Primal Leadership* (2002), they suggest that the order in which the domains are presented is important because they involve competencies that build sequentially on each other as one might work to improve one's EI. They describe the psychological precept that the moods and emotions of all of us are as important as the cognitive ideas we may attempt to explain or understand or use to undertake our tasks as well as to use when leading others. These moods and emotional perspectives may be there as a result of both genetic and environmental factors. They involve emotions and emotional states such as anger, fear, and frustration, etc., and our ability to manage them constructively in common interaction with others as well as in self-reflection.

To the degree that management of our emotions helps us to attain our objectives, we can be said to have high EI. This kind of intelligence can be analyzed in a person and people can learn to raise their emotional IQ in relationship and leadership situations, an idea documented in the book and in later studies (Boyatzis *et al*., 2002; Druskat *et al*., 2006; Wheeler, 2008), though still contested as to its validity (Mayer *et al*., 2008). Clearly, raising one's EI would be desirable for a manager. The 2001 Goleman *et al*. paper briefly expounds on the theory and suggests how individuals can enhance their EI systematically, whereas the 2002 book connects EI to leadership and expands in depth on how to train and develop an improved EI through driving emotions in a positive direction. The result is the attainment of ''resonance'' through behavior that is mindful, hopeful, compassionate, and authentic (Boyatzis and McKee, 2005), and that demonstrates accuracy in perceiving, understanding and managing emotions in self and others, to use Mayer and Salovey (1997) language. The four domains/competencies approach to EI does cast a wider net for the EI construct than Four Branch theorists feel is currently warranted. Classroom discussion on this

point can be entertained in connection with the exercise, if desired.

Despite the general acceptance of the EI construct among many academics and practitioners, there are detractors. For example, Locke (2005) felt that the construct was too vague and that there was not enough convincing empirical evidence for it or its ability to predict behavior in a meaningful way, though Ashkanasy and Daus (2005) rebutted him in the same publication. In contrast, Boyatzis *et al*. (2002) were able to show that MBA graduating classes had increased levels of competency in EI through a curriculum that targeted the construct for improvement, and Jordan *et al*. (2002) were able to show that higher EI levels among student team members predicted better initial performance, at least. Since Locke's paper, several dozen studies have been done, most showing evidence of the validity of the EI construct (see Druskat *et al*., 2006; Barsade and Gibson, 2007; Mayer *et al*., 2008; among others).

One of the more impressive and comprehensive of the recent studies was done by Cote and Miners (2006) in *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Using multiple measures of all variables, they were able to show several complex relationships in a large sample of 750 public university managerial and professional employees, including: (1) employees with high cognitive intelligence (IQ) generally performed well, no matter what their EI level, whereas among those with lower IQ's, to the degree to which their EI went up, so did their job performance, until the highest EI personnel had higher job performance than the highest IQ personnel; and (2) with regard to organizational behavior commitment to the organization (OBCO), the higher the EI among lower IQ personnel, the higher the OBCO until it exceeded that of the high IQ participants. Thus the tested construct of EI (using the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), described below) helped job performance and organizational commitment among those with lower cognitive intelligence as measured by IQ tests until at the highest EI levels, performance and organizational commitment exceeded the highest IQ personnel. This study is important confirmation that organizations can be successful if they attract and retain high EI individuals, and perhaps train for higher EI, ideas very important for students in an MBA program to understand, and an excellent reason for instructors to include study of EI in their curricula.

In addition, several instruments measuring EI have been validated. The MSCEIT, probably the most robust, is not a self-report, but rather a 141 item test asking respondents to identify emotions in photos of faces, landscapes, and other images as well as to define various emotions in relationship to each other and requiring them to answer questions about the interaction of emotion and reason, among other things (Mayer *et al*., 2002, 2003). In any case, it seems apparent that studies using the MSCEIT and other tests are mounting to confirm independently the value of improving one's EI both for individuals and for organizations.

Goleman (2007) has also published a book in which he describes ''social intelligence'' as EI at work in social situations of all kinds, and how people can learn and have learned to tune in to the feelings of others in social situations in ways beneficial to themselves and others. His thesis here is that we are hard-wired in our brains to subconsciously relate to the feelings of others through non-verbal behavior, and that we can consciously learn how to be even more empathic. Since appearing on the cover of *Time Magazine* in 1995 (Gibbs, 1995), he has also authored and co-authored a number of books and tapes to help people learn how to raise their empathy and general EQ[1] in order to be better workers, managers, and leaders.

In sum, study of EI is in the early stages and contending definitions need to be made more precise. Mayer and Salovey, the originators of the construct, are focused on the ''mental abilities'' required to manage, understand, use, and perceive emotions accurately in self and others. Although they argue that the MSCEIT is the most precise measure of the EI construct, several other measures exist, not all self-report. As mentioned earlier, Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee, among others, have researched the ''competencies'' of the four EI domains of self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management and they and their associates claim to have shown that these competencies or ''capabilities'' can be improved with training and development and measured using competency tests and 360 degree surveys (Boyatzis *et al*., 2002; Boyatzis and Sala, 2004). Mayer *et al*., 2008 as well as Salovey, 2006 suggest that several of the concepts used by the ''mixed models,'' – a term they use to include the Goleman, Boyatzis, McKee model, among others – such as optimism, initiative, and achievement, extend beyond the definition of the core concept of EI, yet their definition of EI is consonant with many if

not most of the key Goleman *et al*. competencies. But the ''schisms'' in a young field of study are normal and perhaps not critical to study deeply in most MBA and undergrad courses; on the other hand, if instructors so desire, this paper presents a good bibliography from which to choose. The main point, however, is to present some relevant EI material for the students to use to discuss EI theory. The assignment material used for this exercise came from the Goleman *et al*. (2002) model.

Pedagogical literature

Experiential exercises using EI. There do exist a few papers describing the use of experiential exercises in connection with EI. Clark *et al*. (2003) assessed 121 undergraduate students in various sections of an experiential managerial skills class using a pre-test/post-test design to see if they showed post-course improvement on EI abilities/competences as measured by the Executive EQ Map, a self-report test, *vs* a control group of 113 in more traditional management courses. The managerial skills students showed significant improvements in the five EQ items tested – self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy, and social skills – whereas the control group showed no change. Although the EQ Map is a self-report, this study suggests the value in teaching interpersonal skills as they relate to EI concepts. Morris *et al*. (2005) reported on experiential exercises using poetry and the visual arts as a means of accessing and developing EI in business students, which the authors suggest that the students measure at the beginning of the course by taking a baseline EIQ test like the MSCEIT. Following presentation of emotional art to help with recognition skills and emotional poetry to help with empathy skills, students are encouraged to journal, to analyze Harvard Business School (HBS) business cases in terms of their idea of the EQ of the characters, and to write a gratitude letter to someone in their lives who has helped them immeasurably and then to report on a personal experience of reading the letter to the person. The authors report greater numbers of extra credit service hours by students in this course *vs* other courses and higher student evaluations, both outcomes that may be due to other reasons, but especially the gratitude assignment seems a clearly effective EI experiential exercise. Gibson (2006) sets out to help students explore ''how organizations affect individuals' feelings and expressions of emotions'' (p. 477). Students recall past emotional episodes in their organizational lives, then analyze them using surveys and team discussions. They focus especially on four emotions – happiness, anger, liking, and fear – in an analytical and reflective activity to understand how greater openness to their emotions can help them as well as their organizations. Finally, Brown (2003) has also provided experiential exercises that involve conflict in role plays after which student-observers, having read some EI literature, make ''constructive feedback'' suggestions about how the role players might have better resolved their conflicts. These role plays might be of interest to instructors looking for experiential approaches to discussion of EI in traditional settings or might be modifiable to a blended setting using techniques such as those demonstrated in the exercise presented in this paper.

BL. Since the exercise presented in this paper exists in a blended educational delivery model and contains learning objectives that are tailored to that fact, it may be of significance to cite some key sources that reflect the increasing development of on-line and blended education in business schools today. If we were to divide currently popular course delivery systems for college and university courses into four groups, they might divide as follows: (1) traditional on-ground or face-to-face courses in which all students meet together generally in the same classroom one to three times per week for 11–15 weeks, or possibly even a shorter time frame; (2) on-line courses in which students sign in from multiple places throughout the region or even throughout the world, generally using electronic blackboard software to meet either synchronously or asynchronously, with the goal of doing the same amount of work and covering the same conceptual material as traditional on-ground courses of the same name; (3) hybrid or ''blended'' courses that schedule on-ground as well as on-line activities usually in the same time periods as mentioned above; and (4) flexible BL courses that allow students to choose even without telling the instructor ahead of time whether they will attend scheduled on-ground sessions or alternatively fulfill the ''on-line option'' on any or every given class day. Each of these delivery systems presents its own challenges, but the fourth of them is arguably the most difficult for the instructor to stage yet the most convenient for today's increasingly busy, travel prone, or remotely located part-time students. Many highly qualified students who did not want an entirely on-line education but whose

life style or career choices made traditional face-to-face education difficult have reported that they had been resigned to never getting an MBA before they discovered the fourth model.

Additionally, of all the business courses that can be delivered at a college or university, one studying such subjects as interpersonal relations, organizational behavior (OB), leadership, and group dynamics can offer the most challenge for the business school instructor in courses that are either entirely on-line or blended, whether flexible or scheduled. These courses often utilize experiential exercises, yet it is a pedagogy that presents a special challenge to the instructor in the case of entirely on-line courses or flexible hybrid or blended ones. The exercise described here can be used in any of the four course delivery systems mentioned above, including the most challenging of the formats, the flexible blended course.

Martins and Kellermanns (2004) and Proserpio and Gioia (2007) have described the increasing prevalence of web-based education in business schools, whereas Klimoski (2007) has emphasized the importance of business school professors becoming more adept at delivering this kind of education. In fact, in its March, 2008 issue, *Academy of Management Learning & Education* reviewed no fewer than three books on the subject of BL. Bonk and Graham (2006) compiled an edited book with 39 chapters written by 80 authors on the general theme of the use of web-based technology in conjunction with traditional classroom learning both in academic institutions and in training environments throughout the world. Writing from a less macroscopic viewpoint about the nature and virtues of blended classroom education, Dzuiban and Picciano (2007) entertain the challenge of how best to prepare the institutions and their faculty for a BL experience in another edited volume. Garrison and Vaughan (2007) provide a useful guide to all members of academia about how to set up a community of inquiry that will allow BL to become the ''qualitatively enhanced experience that is not possible to achieve in a pure face-to-face environment.'' These authors all see BL as providing synergies and experiences not available in exclusively face-to-face learning and they see BL as eventually taking over most educational delivery systems as we progress through the 21st century. Most of us can either remain illiterate ''digital immigrants'' or learn how to teach and ultimately join the ''digital natives'' who are our students in a global environment (Prensky, 2001).

The exercise

The exercise to be presented here probably comes closest to those in Brown (2003) in that its goal is to allow at least two role players to actually feel certain emotions – anxiety, frustration, anger – in a 5 min, real time, role play, and then for the entire class that has been watching, both face-to-face and on-line, to deconstruct the action. Class members, in their own role as observers, analyze the levels of EI that they see by looking at each of EI's four domains as described in Goleman *et al*. (2002) (though the Mayer and Salovey, 1997, model could just as easily be used) through the lens of a carefully constructed 12 question survey, and ultimately make suggestions about how to improve the EQ of the characters in the role play. In a very rich debrief (see Appendix C) that can take place over parts of two class periods as well as during an on-line discussion mid-week for on-line students, they learn a little bit about EI, about the differences between face-to-face and video observations of the same interaction, and about how they might try to improve their own EQ (Appendices D and E).

Complete directions and materials for use of this exercise, both in class and on-line, are contained in Appendices A–G. The exercise itself appears in Appendix A. It works best when an EI reading set such as some of those mentioned in the References section is assigned in advance. It also works best when the instructor, using an LCD projector, can screen the results of the 12 question survey feedback sheets (Appendix B) immediately after the role play while the students are pondering the questions for discussion (Appendix C). This takes only a couple of min with a volunteer student entering the numbers from the feedback sheet – on a spreadsheet prepared in advance for the purpose – in the instructor's console computer or laptop while the instructor begins the debrief. Alternatively, it can be done by the instructor with students calling out their numbers and the instructor recording them on the spreadsheet. It can also be done more privately over the session break, if desired. This spreadsheet will play an important role in the exercise debrief, both on-ground and on-line, as will be explained in the ensuing pages. Appendix D reflects a typical sample of on-ground *vs* on-line differences in the 12 question survey results from one of the several instances of the use of the exercise, and Appendix D contains a written transcript of a sample discussion between on-ground and on-line students regarding their differences in watching the same role play. Of special

added value is the written paper assignment that can be used following the exercise (Appendix G).

Prior to introducing this instance of the exercise's use, all students of an MBA OB class were asked to read an *HBR* article on EI by Goleman *et al*. (2001) and selections from the book *Primal Leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence* (2002) by the same authors. The exercise (Appendix A) involved the class in analyzing the individual behaviors of each role player generated in a 5 min role play using a survey that actually reflects the four key components of EI as described in the above readings, however, the survey respondents do not necessarily notice that until the debrief. Questions 1–3 reflect *Self-awareness*, questions 4–6 reflect *Self-management*, questions 7–9 reflect *Social awareness*, and questions 10–12 reflect *Relationship management*. This arrangement of the questions helps structure and guide the discussion that follows the posting and screening of survey results in spreadsheet form (see Appendix E for an example for one of the role players).

Discussion by role players and audience members alike can revolve both around the actual behaviors displayed in the role play as well as around possible behaviors that might have shown higher EI than those displayed (see Appendix C for sample discussion questions). If the instructor has the use of a computer and LCD in the classroom, s/he can quickly screen the spreadsheet to aid in the discussion. For the on-line students, the instructor, who has taken a video on a laptop webcam, posts the video file in RealPlayer or a similar format on the course's electronic blackboard site. On-line students watch the role play on their home computers and fill out the survey on each of the role players. Then they provide the results to the two role players, who enter them into the spreadsheet generated by the on-ground audience in a way that the two groups' results can be compared, after which they send the spreadsheet to the instructor who checks it and posts it to all students (Appendix F). During the week, an on-line discussion ensues on the original topic of EI and on a second topic of analyzing spreadsheet summaries. Students also try to account for any apparently significant differences between the analysis of the on-ground audience and that of the on-line audience (see Appendix D for a transcript of an on-line discussion). The on-line audience members are often more critical of behavior they consider deficient in EI than the face-to-face students; possible reasons and ramification around this are explored. Also, as mentioned earlier, although this exercise centers on EI, it could also be used as a template for creation of exercises for use in the study of other OB subjects, especially conflict resolution.

The exercise as discussed has been used with a session of 40 professors at a conference as well as more commonly in an MBA level flexible blended OB course, but it could also easily be used in undergraduate management courses. Clearly, it could be used in an on-ground, more traditional course, too. In fact, if the instructor could round up two volunteers to perform the 5 min role play in front of a webcam, it could be used in an on-line-only course as well. These volunteers would not even have to be course members. On-line students could then watch the video, fill out the feedback sheets, and have an on-line discussion using the same questions provided in Appendix C. The entire exercise and discussion can take anywhere from 80 min to 150 min, depending on the depth that the instructor wishes. It can be used with any size group but might have to be slightly modified with more than 40 students; it would be very simple to take only a small sample of the score sheets from the observers and quickly score them up on the computer in the class – instead of having a total classroom population summary, instructors would have a convenience sample to show using the LCD projector. The same learning objectives would be met, though.

Post-on-line discussion and student assignments

As can be seen from the on-line discussion sample (Appendix D), students from both on-ground and on-line audiences have been able to hold a reasonable on-line discussion about the role play in one flexible blended MBA course in which the exercise was used. Subsequent to that discussion, there was a recorded discussion held among those students who attended the on-ground discussion. The recorded session was posted as an audio file on-line for the on-line students, who were then asked to write a two-page response to the points made in that discussion. Additionally, some students chose to write one of the two 4–6 page papers required for the course on EI and how they could better develop their own EIQ by heeding the EI development ''agenda'' proposed in a section of *Primal Leadership* (see Appendix C). So, quite a bit of processing and learning was stimulated by the original role

play and readings as well as subsequent readings on EI.

Student evaluations and a new approach to processing experiential exercises

Although there were no formal evaluations of the role play itself, one can see various student opinions reflected in the on-line discussion. For example, students were able to comment at length on specific role play behaviors that reflected elements of the four key domains of EI as well as actions that failed to reflect good EI and discuss both. They also offered various reasons as to why the on-line students graded the ''overburdened student'' more critically than the on-ground students did – three reasons offered were that (1) on-line students were not able to see as much of the contextual non-verbal behavior as the on-ground ones did, (2) it is easier to offer critical feedback when the observer is not in the presence of the observed, and (3) pleasant interpersonal interaction with the overburdened student both before and during the class period but before the role play might have made that student a more likeable figure. In any case, both on-ground and on-line students seemed impressed with the effort of the role players and were motivated to discuss their observations, as is evident in the transcript.

Advantages and disadvantages of face-to-face *vs* on-line processing

At the outset of discussion it seemed that on-ground processing of the role play would be richer than on-line because of the ''live'' aspect and the ability to view the role play in context and with all its non-verbals. It is of considerable interest, though, that later discussion centered on the realization that on-line students got to replay the role play repeatedly while on-ground students only saw it once, with all the inattentive moments that can attend observation of real-time behavior while one is taking notes. So the upshot was that the on-ground audience certainly did not hold all the advantages by being there; on-line students could independently study what they were seeing for a longer time before marking their feedback sheets, and they could even consult written EI sources while filling them out if they wanted. Thus, in the final (recorded) discussion a week later, all students were able to see that missing ''context'' did not make on-line students less valuable observers, but actually had its own advantages that on-ground students did not enjoy. Far from devaluing on-line feedback sheets that ''missed context,'' we should instead consider them in a new light as perhaps more enlightened. In short, maybe those on-ground student observers were just a bit too familiar with each other and having a little too much classroom fun to be the best judges they could be.

Enriching the debriefing process

Not surprisingly, a new learning around use of experiential exercises may be that where possible we should record them (or key parts of them) and re-process them at the next class opportunity in order that students can review their observations in a more informed and perhaps less emotional environment for homework. For this exercise, a school-bought 12 inch laptop with a built-in 180 degree swivel webcam that can allow such unobtrusive recordings to be made while the laptop screen is facing toward the instructor, not the students (a Dell M1210), was (and continues to be) used. Video files playable on common video software like RealPlayer were then posted on the electronic blackboard classroom website that accompanies every course – on-ground as well as blended and flexible blended – for later, more considered processing. The recording process is so unobtrusive – using the laptop that sits open facing the instructor, not the exercise participants, some 15 feet away – that students barely notice it. Needless to say, the instructor should ask the whole class' permission to record them at any time right from the beginning of the course; students rarely object and they will soon forget to notice whether the webcam is on or not. Incidentally, in a blended classroom, it is often a norm to record presentations, discussions, and other classroom activity in this manner, too, for further processing or for sharing with on-line students in the case of flexible blended courses in which on-ground and on-line students are enrolled simultaneously. It is important to note that the cost of trying this approach is not that one must have a new specialized laptop computer; it is only that one must have an inexpensive clip-on webcam with a good built-in microphone and use a plain vanilla laptop. That said, the instructor would lose some of the unobtrusiveness without the built-in webcam.

Conclusion

As the literature review for this paper has shown from the beginning, EI is an important construct to investigate, bring into educational settings, and

help students understand and develop, if possible. From a research point of view, it is a very young construct, still struggling to gain a definitional consensus. However, as management educators, we may be able to agree that it falls within a broad category of important skills and abilities to teach and that it focuses on such sub-concepts as emotional recognition, knowledge and awareness in the process of perceiving and interacting with others. If one is a manager or leader, effective emotional self-regulation in social settings, whether at work or elsewhere, is an important requirement for organizational goal attainment. It is not enough to command analytical and cognitive skills alone. As business educators, it becomes incumbent upon us to help students and trainees raise their level of EI so they can be better managers and leaders. There is now a steadily increasing literature suggesting that, whether we think of EI as ability-based or competence-based, we can make a difference for these students.

It seems as if experiential learning may be an excellent vehicle to help us accomplish this. However, with education continuing to expand its methodology as a result of the technical advances of web-based technology, the time –and place demands of the 21st century workplace, and the geographic requirements of the global environment, we face a serious potential obstacle in teaching something as difficult to convey and as subject to misinterpretation as EI through cyberspace and various kinds of teleconferencing. Yet, on-line and BL are becoming more and more prevalent; in fact, a great many of our students are demanding these innovations. If we are to show enough EI to listen carefully, we may have to realize that it is not enough to design pedagogy with only the physical classroom in mind any more. But teaching about something as dependent on face-to-face communication as emotions and EI while using techniques that minimize that same face-to-face contact presents a challenge of the highest order. Meeting that challenge is exactly what the exercise described herein – and the many variations that others might design – has attempted.

This description of the exercise and its use in a flexible blended OB course should serve to demonstrate a versatility with experiential exercises, perhaps more than has been expected by instructors who have used them primarily in live situations in the more traditional classroom delivery settings. Hopefully, it has revealed some relatively innovative ways of debriefing such exercises and focused once again on the importance of the debriefing process. Clearly, there is value in watching videos of short exercises or key parts of exercises – i.e., bringing face-to-face on-line – and commenting upon what has been observed or learned beyond the moments immediately following the exercise. Additionally, discussing the exercise a week later, following significantly more reflection, has the added benefit of helping students experience the value of what David Kolb (1984) called reflective observation in his well-known work on experiential learning.

In sum, this exercise can be very motivating for students who wish to improve their EIQ to help them become more effective leaders and managers and even teammates. If it encourages them to continue efforts to develop their EI through self-reflection, 360 degree feedback, role play practice, and the design of personal agendas to improve their emotional awareness of self and others, they and those with whom they interact are likely to become the better for it.

Note

[1]The popularized term EQ or emotional quotient was first used by Keith Beasley writing in *Mensa* magazine in 1987 (see http://eqi.org/beasley.htm) and then adopted by the popular press following the *Time* cover story on 2 October 1995, which was entitled ''The EQ Factor'' (Gibbs, 1995). Loosely stated, it refers to one's EI quotient (*vs* IQ) and has also spawned other similar terms, like EIQ and EQ-i.

References

Ashkanasy, N.M. & Daus, C.S. (2005). Rumors of the death of emotional intelligence in organizational behavior are vastly exaggerated. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4): 441–452.

Barsade, S.G. & Gibson, D.E. (2007). Why does affect matter in organizations? *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1): 36–59.

Bonk, C.J. & Graham, C.R. (Eds) (2006). *The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Boyatzis, R.E. & McKee, A. (2005). *Resonant leadership: Renewing yourself and connecting with others through mindfulness, hope and compassion*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Boyatzis, R.E. & Sala, F. (2004). The emotional competence inventory (ECI). In G. Geher (Ed), *Measuring Emotional Intelligence: Common Ground and Controversy*, 147–180. New York: Nova Science.
Boyatzis, R.E., Stubbs, E.C. & Taylor, S.N. (2002). Learning cognitive and emotional intelligence competencies through graduate management education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 1(2): 150–162.
Brown, R.B. (2003). Emotions and behaviors: Exercises in emotional intelligence. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(1): 122–134.
Clark, S.C., Callister, R. & Wallace, R. (2003). Undergraduate management skills courses and students' emotional intelligence. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(1): 3–23.
Cote, S. & Miners, C.T.H. (2006). Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(1): 1–28.
Druskat, V.U., Sala, F. & Mount, G. (Eds) (2006). *Linking emotional intelligence and performance at work: Current research evidence with individuals and groups*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Dzuiban, C.D. & Picciano, A.G. Eds (2007). *Blended learning: Research perspectives*. Needham, MA: Sloan Center for OnLine Education.
Garrison, D.R. & Vaughan, N.D. (2007). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework principles and guidelines*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Gibbs, N. (1995). The EQ factor. *Time*, 146 (October): 60–68.
Gibson, D.E. (2006). Emotional episodes at work: An experiential exercise in feeling and expressing emotions. *Journal of Management Education*, 30(3): 477–500.
Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
Goleman, D. (2007). *Social intelligence: The new science of human relationships*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. & McKee, A. (2001). Primal leadership: The hidden driver of great performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(11): 42–51.
Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
Jordan, P.J., Ashkanasy, N.M., Härtel, C.E.J. & Hooper, G.S. (2002). Workgroup emotional intelligence: Scale development and relationship to team process effectiveness and goal focus. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2): 195–214.
Klimoski, R.J. (2007). From the editor: Becoming a prophet in our own land. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(4): 433–438.
Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Locke, E.A. (2005). Why emotional intelligence is an invalid concept. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4): 425–431.
Martins, L.L. & Kellermanns, F.W. (2004). A model of business school students' acceptance of a web-based course management system. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(1): 7–26.
Mayer, J.D., Roberts, R.D. & Barsade, S.G. (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59: 507–536.
Mayer, J.D. & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence*, 17: 433–442.
Mayer, J.D. & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey and D. Sluyter (Eds), *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Educational Implications*, 3–31. New York: Basic Books.
Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P & Caruso, D.R. (2002). *Manual for the MSCEIT Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.
Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P & Caruso, D.R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, 63(6): 503–517.
Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D.R. & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. *Emotion*, 3: 97–105.
Morris, J.A., Urbanski, J. & Fuller, J. (2005). Using poetry and the visual arts to develop emotional intelligence. *Journal of Management Education*, 29(6): 888–904.
Porter, L.W. & McKibbin, L.E. (1988). *Management education and development: Drift or thrust into the 21st century?* New York: McGraw-Hill.
Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*. Manchester, UK: MCB University Press, October, 9(5). Available online: http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20–%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20–%20Part1.pdf.
Proserpio, L. & Gioia, D.A. (2007). Teaching the virtual generation. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(1): 69–80.
Salovey, P. (2006). Epilogue: The agenda for future research. In V.U. Druskat, F. Sala, and G. Mount (Eds), *Linking Emotional Intelligence and Performance at Work: Current Research Evidence with Individuals and Groups*, 267–272. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Salovey, P. & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 9: 185–211.
Tuckman, B.W. & Jensen, M.A. (1977). Stages of small-group development revisited. *Group Organizational Studies*, 2(4): 419–427.
Wheeler, J.V. (2008). The impact of social environments on emotional, social, and cognitive competency development. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(1): 129–145.

Appendix A

Teammates: A role play

Instructions: Give each role play volunteer one of the role player instructions below without letting them see both. Tell them to take a seat more or less facing each other in a well-lit area of the room. Assuming that you wish to use this role play for online students as well, tell the role players that there will be a webcam recording their interaction from a notebook or other computer stationed about 15 feet away and not near a ventilator, air conditioner, or other background noise producing machine. Tell the role players they will have 5–10 min to try to resolve any issues that they might have as part of the role play, but that they should try to stay true to their character as long as they can. Distribute the observer feedback sheet (Appendix B) to the role players' classmates in the audience, who should fill them out on each role player separately. Instructor should collect the feedback sheets and screen them in summary form on the LCD projector if possible for the debrief. If there is no LCD, let the students keep a blank feedback sheet and write the results to the 12 questions on the blackboard. This data is

central to processing the exercise in class. See discussion questions below.

The anxious student

You have been anxious ever since you were assigned to this team because you have a sneaking suspicion that your team members do not take their participation as seriously or as responsibly as you do. After all the roles were assigned, you chose to analyze the results of the survey and write the discussion because you knew that was the key position and would make or break the team. The presentation and report are due imminently and the person whose job was to distribute the survey and record the data is now 3 days overdue with that responsibility and you are emotionally distraught because you are worried you will not have enough time to do your part well and that your group as well as your grade will go down in flames, and that you will be the one seen as the most responsible party for the failure. You have decided to confront the data recorder yet again, but this time in person.

The overburdened student

You are taking an extra course in the program and between your job, your family responsibilities, and all your other coursework, you are drowning. Now you have this team project to complete with your teammates and it's due in just a few days. Luckily, you have decided that getting a B is good enough, just to retain your sanity, though you have not confided this to any of your teammates since team members all get the same grade. You do not like to look as if you are not pulling your share. You know you are late with the data but there should still be enough time for the next person to analyze it for the presentation and report. Everyone you know does a better job as the deadline approaches anyway.

Appendix B

Observer's analysis of role play

Name of the person being observed_____

Remember, this is a role play, so you are only assessing the above person in the person's role as provided in the exercise. This feedback instrument is being used for pedagogical purposes only.

How frequently does the above person demonstrate the following behaviors in his/her role? Use a scale of 1–5 (never, rarely, sometimes, often, consistently).

1.	Seems to understand own emotions	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Seems to know the right amount of pressure to exert on others	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Seems to know intuitively how own moods affect others	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Seems able to control own emotions and act w/honesty	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Acts in a consistent and adaptable manner w/integrity	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Does not seem to allow bad moods to ruin the day	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Seems to have empathy for others	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Seems to have intuition about organizational problems	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Seems to be able to go beyond sensing emotions of others	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Seems to have interpersonal communication skills	1 2 3 4 5
11.	Can convincingly disarm conflicts	1 2 3 4 5
12.	Seems able to win support when support is needed	1 2 3 4 5

Note: These 12 questions are meant to reflect the four key factors of EI as discussed in *Primal Leadership* (2002) by D. Goleman, R. Boyatzis, and A. McKee. Questions 1–3 reflect *Self-awareness*, questions 4–6 reflect *Self-management*, questions 7–9 reflect *Social awareness*, and questions 10–12 reflect *Relationship management*.

Appendix C

Note: It is very important to preface any discussion of the completed role play with the caveat that discussants are not talking about the EI or the behaviors of the actual persons who volunteered for the role play but rather that of the character they portrayed.

Discussion directions

1. General discussion of the concept of EI as described in readings such as Goleman *et al*. (2001, 2002). A one-page summary of key EI principles can help keep concepts fresh.
2. Discussion of the feedback sheets and how they reflect the four key components of EI.
3. Were there any times when either of the two characters reflected good EI in your view? When and which of the factors were represented?
4. Were there any times when either of the two characters seemed EI-challenged? When and in what ways?
5. What might the character have done differently that might have reflected better EI?
6. When you look at the spreadsheet scores, what do you notice? Can you draw any overall conclusions from them?
7. What are overall EI challenges that you have observed in interpersonal situations in your work or other organizational experience? What kind of behavior might have reflected a higher degree of EI in those situations?
8. If you are willing, would you care to recall any of your own personal EI challenges and how you have either addressed them or propose to address them (in small groups, if desired)?
9. Can you recommend any initiatives that might enhance EI within an organization?

After folding in the results from on-line feedback summaries and discussion (see sample summary of all student scores in Appendix F):

1. What were the similarities between the ways the on-ground observers viewed the role play and the ways in which the on-line observers reviewed them? Differences?
2. What does the agreement between the two kinds of observers tell you?
3. What accounts for the major differences?
4. Can you identify the value in both kinds of observations?
5. How could one, as a leader, help create ''resonance'' in an organization?

Appendix D

On-line discussion transcript

The following is a transcript of the on-line discussion held on this exercise over the electronic blackboard site for the class. On-line students had watched a video of the on-ground students engaging in the role play and completed their own surveys of the behavior of the two role players. In addition, after all students had filled out their surveys, on-line students listened to the audio-taped discussion with all on-ground students, including the two role players ,which was posted to the blackboard site. A third discussion of differences between perceptions of on-ground students and on-line video watchers was held in an on-ground setting a week later, audio-taped, and posted to the class website.

Hi all
I am attaching the spreadsheets around the role play and the 12 question surveys you all did. Though you may not have known it, the 12 questions were oriented, 3 each, around the 4 dimensions of Emotional Intelligence – self-awareness, self-management, awareness of others, and relationship management – in order. Thus the characters can be analyzed in terms of their EI competence in each area and they can see (theoretically) where they could improve. You will also notice clear differences in Erin's spreadsheet around observations by on-liners *vs* those who were onsite, lesser differences in Jack's respondents (did you guys not notice how he wanted to bust her in the chops in the first min?!!). So, for discussion purposes, for the next few days,

A. what conclusions can we draw around EI competencies of the 2 characters?

B. to what do we ascribe such on-line *vs* onsite observational differences as seem to be present and what implications and ramifications do these differences have?
Best,
Bill

Some relevant responses during the discussion:

From one of the role players, the ''Anxious Student'':
First the results demonstrate what a good job Erin did playing her low EI character. As the spreadsheet shows, my character did score fairly high with an overall score of 4.28 out of 5 with a fairly balanced rating across most of the survey questions. As such, I do believe the character displayed high EI in the interaction, (despite threatening to punch Erin in the face). Actually, I should say, in part for suggesting that he punch Erin in the face. The utilization of humor was mentioned in the article as an effective tool that demonstrates high EI to acknowledge a problem but sets the stage for moving past the problem to a problem -solving focus. In retrospect, I do think the remark did exactly that. It acknowledged that Erin's character had messed up big time but the humor cleared the air in order to move on to address the problem.

I think it is clear that Erin's character displayed low EI but I would suggest that the on-line responders were tougher because they were not as ''sympathetic'' to Erin personally because they were watching it in a more removed setting. This points out an interesting element that we perhaps ''judge'' others based upon more than the ''facts'' at hand. In this situation it was tricky to separate Erin from her character. It is also apparent that the class observed that Erin ''understood her emotions'' which Erin really did but I wonder whether in a real situation Erin's character would be so self aware. I am perplexed in the difference that the class thought Erin's character did not let it ''ruin the day'' which is what I thought was the character's position yet the on-line folks did not score that as high. Again, it may have been more obvious in class that Erin and her character were having a good time. Those factors made for the bulk of the difference in the overall averages.
Jack

Jack,
I definitely agree with both of your observations Jack. In the threat to punch Erin in the face, I absolutely took it to be humorous. I did not feel that it was meant to be intimidating and aggressive. Of course, threatening to punch somebody in the face is never a good thing, [but] it seemed to be a humorous way of dealing with the problem. Erin made a big mistake and that was highlighted by the statement. The humor of the statement was a good way to disperse any tension or nervousness that resulted from the mess being pointed out.
I gave Erin's character a low EI score. It does seem that the on-liners did give Erin a lower score. In viewing the interaction from my computer at home, I must admit, I had very little sympathy for Erin's character. I believe that in watching Jack and Erin from a distance, it likely did affect my feelings towards Erin's character. The people who were able to see the communication between Erin and Jack personally, would likely be able to provide a more realistic EI score. Seeing how a person reacts, and experiencing what is going on in the room would give those actually seeing the interface between Erin and Jack a more rational understanding of both characters. At least that is what I believe. It is too easy to be hard on someone who is not there in front of you.
Thanks,
Leigh-Anne

Hi all
Don't forget to see if you can differentiate among the 4 different EI competencies based on the 4 groups of questions asked and the differences among scores from group to group (review my memo starting this discussion).
Best,
Bill

From James:
John's character was effective with his cognitive abilities in dealing of Erin. As different situations and circumstances call for different types of leadership abilities. John displayed good self-awareness with his ability to control his emotions with Erin. John was persuasive in his attempt to keep Erin on track and to meet his requested deadline. John appears to have a good self-awareness and a deep understanding his own emotions, strengths, and weaknesses in his dealing with Erin. John believes in the values and goals that need to be inherent in Erin to be recognized as a reliable and credible business partner. By having a keen self-awareness, John is better able to work with difficult or demanding people. John also knew where he wanted to direct the conversation to achieve his ultimate objective and did not concede on the project. Instead of ''punching Erin'' John was able to turn his frustration and anger into something positive and constructive. Good self-regulation allowed John to control his emotions and to direct them in a more constructive and useful manner. When you can master your emotions you are more able to roll with the challenges. If John displayed negative emotions, he probably would have failed at leading change with Erin. This action delivered the result John wanted. John also demonstrated a good sense of humor, which is a good thing. We all need to laugh at ourselves at times. John knew the importance of meeting the commitment and deadline. John was not about to set himself up to fail because of Erin's cavalier attitude. Emotional intelligence increases with age and life experiences. Jack also demonstrated empathy for Erin as he debated [respectfully] to somehow accommodate her needs. Erin did not exercise adequate self-awareness in her cavalier attitude towards her commitment and with meeting a critical deadline. Erin did not exercise effective self-awareness, as she did not appear to understand the importance of her responsibility and the importance to the team. John was able to work effectively with a difficult employee and achieve his objective. Erin did not even understand or properly interpret John's request or the importance of the task. John also displayed some candor in his empathy in dealing with Erin's excuses and in the process of making his decision. John was also tuned in [to] Erin's non-verbal communication. His ability to be attuned to these subtleties help in understanding Erin's seriousness and lack of commitment to the task. John's listening was another example of strong empathy towards Erin. Overall, John's self-regulation in his ability to control his emotions was key in resolving this dilemma. John was persistent with Erin to get her to commit and John was willing to explore other avenues to get the job done. This displayed good motivation and social skills, as John was successful in leading Erin in the direct John needed. John was driven to achieve his objective as well as being optimistic with Erin even in the face of problems. The on-line responders may have not observed the non-verbal antics of Erin, which contributed to the response. Close attention would have showed that Erin did not take the responsibility as important or had a different set of priorities. However, this could also create a breakdown in communication, which could lead to bad information, or poor quality in the information observed.

From Jessica:
Jack displayed high EI. He remained calm even though you could clearly tell he was annoyed that Erin hadn't completed her part of the project. He showed self awareness by being able to communicate his frustrations with Erin on how she wasn't pulling her part and wasn't prepared. Jack expressed how important the project is to him and the other teammates to have completed on time. Jack showed his awareness to Erin's needs of wanting to get up around noon and wanting to go shopping for make-up. He was able to

show understanding of how important those things are to Erin, and possessed relationship management when he able to give the right amount of push to get Erin to understand how important the project is to her teammates and was able to get her to make a commitment of meeting at noon tomorrow. Erin displayed low EI. She was only concerned about herself and how she works to get her assignments done. She didn't show awareness of others because she didn't give any care of her other teammates and how they prefer to work. I think the differences you see between the in class and on-line observations occurred because the in class students were able to see and feel the emotions of Jack and Erin more than the on-line students. The on-line students were also able to replay the conversation if they wanted before answering the questions, putting a little thought into each question, where the in class students had to answer each question from memory.

From Holen:
I think at least from my own perspective as one of the students viewing the role play on-line, I guess I had a hard time differentiating what was part of the role play, and what might have just been some of the difficulty posed w/ acting, and staying in character. For instance, Jack threatening to punch Erin, I thought that was like a joke, and not part of his character. I think it is harder to assess a role play when you aren't viewing it in person. Some aspects of the skit are not as clear when you are viewing the video. I think Leighanne mentioned something to this effect, but I am not entirely sure what it is we miss.
As for the four emotional competencies, the results seem to indicate that Jack needs to work social awareness and self-awareness the most. This strikes me as a bit odd just because it seemed like he was pretty self aware, but I think the social awareness might make more sense.
As for Erin, she had lower EI across the board. The obviously lowest category was social awareness, which was one of Jack's lowest also. Perhaps it is the hardest competency to develop? The second lowest for Erin differed from Onsite to on-line. For onsite students it was the self awareness, and for on-line students it was the relationship management. It is interesting that self awareness and social awareness seemed to be the most difficult for both of them.
I think the distinction between the on-line and the onsite differences for Erin are not that substantial in each category, because her overall EI was so low.

From Nick:
I also have the perspective of viewing the role play on-line. I think one of the major challenges was that the character that Erin played was too fictional. I know the role were exaggerated to be able to clearly show the differences. I thought the exaggeration was a little distracting in making an accurate observation. I think this could have been the main reason why there [were] differences between on-line and in-class. It was tough to pick up on body language which also made it difficult. One other thing was the class' laughter made it seem like a TV sitcom. Not being there in person and laughing with everyone I believe made it more difficult to judge Erin's character.
Jack was quite aware of his own emotions and was able to control them in a tense situation. He was able to manage the situation, come out with a positive outcome and a plan for the future. He continued to have empathy for Erin's needs and was willing to accommodate her own personal plans. Jack convinced Erin to step up [to] the plate, though she was barely in the batters box, and give some effort in getting the job done.
Erin showed limited control of her own emotions where she was only concerned with get her own personal things done. She could have been aware of her selfish nature putting her own needs before getting her job done. Erin's self management was lacking where she was very resistant in changing her own schedule for the benefit of the teams. She really did not respond to the joke made by Jack wanting [to] punch her in the face. There wasn't a noticeable change in her character after that statement was made. Her management of the relationship with Jack was poor where she continued to be uncooperative and not allowing the two of them to pull together to get the work done.

From Olena:
From the dialogue we could definitely tell the difference in emotional intelligence between Jack and Erin's characters. In the beginning Jack got frustrated with Erin's attitude towards the completion of the project but was able to demonstrate his self-awareness by trying not to put too much pressure on Erin. He rather patiently considered alternative ways so Erin could manage to do her part by the adjusted deadline.
Jack was also able to demonstrate good self-management in terms of controlling his emotions. For some reason it seemed to me that his joke about the punch in the face made Erin relax a little bit and be a little less hostile to the conversation, even though she did have a tough time putting her personal priorities in line with the project. I also think Jack was able to apply his social awareness and relationship management skills well in his intent to understand Erin's situation and find a solution that would be feasible for both. Jack naturally showed empathy and care for Erin and was pretty nice handling the conversation.
Erin's character, on the other side, came out somewhat selfish not willing to recognize other people's needs and schedules, project importance, and her role as a part of the team. She played a one-way street role and showed no communication skills.
The difference between the onsite *vs* on-line observations is due to onsite students being a part of the dialogue while the on-liners were the outsiders just observing. The onsite students were exposed to real-time emotions and nonverbal communication. It seems to me that due to being the witnesses of the conversation and having a closer emotional contact with Jack and Erin, onsite students were able to perceive the information more accurately.
Thank you,
Olena

From Erika:
The character Jack played had a very high EI. He was aware of the importance to stay calm and communicate effectively with Erin. Jack talked through the situation before jumping to conclusions as to why Erin had slacked off on her part of the project. The humor Jack used in a tough situation showed the control he had over his high EI. Jack also came up with great alternatives in trying to solve the situation which made Erin's job a little more difficult at trying to resist giving in and helping out with the project.

I feel that Erin did a great job staying in character and made it clear that to her character the group project was not high in importance. Erin's character had low EI and was very inconsiderate to her teammates. I think the on-line group was at a disadvantage because they were removed from the setting and did not get or see the same interaction the onsite class members were able to witness.

Overall I agree with everyone in saying Jack showed a very high EI where Erin's was low. Jack displayed all four characteristics of EI in a positive manner where Erin did a great job playing into her low EI character. Jack did a great job staying in control and calm during a frustrating situation, which demonstrates great self management. His concern for the group as a whole demonstrated his awareness of others and the impact that the delay in the project would have on them. Jack also provided Erin with options in how to get the work done and even offered to help, which shows good relationship management.

Erin on the other hand was just the opposite. She was inconsiderate and selfish and it appeared as though she didn't even care that Jack was upset. Both Jack and Erin played well into their characters.

I believe you would get a better sense of character being in the room than watching the clip on-line. You distance yourself more when watching the clip on-line and I think it's harder to pick up on all the emotions.

Randy

Appendix E

In-class (face-to-face or on-ground) spreadsheet

This is a sample spreadsheet that a volunteer student scores up for each of the two role players. Normally, this spreadsheet would be on the instructor's console computer and be able to be screened within 10 mins of the completion of the role play. In the interim, instructor runs a short discussion based around the first few questions listed in Appendix C. Alternatively, student teams or small groups discuss their answers to these questions in preparation for a full class discussion.

Jack's scores – Master sheet

Persons responding with their observations

How frequently does the above person demonstrate the following behaviors in his/her role?
Use a scale of 1–5 (never, rarely, sometimes, often, consistently)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	*Avg*
Questions from Emotional Intelligence Observer Feedback Sheet (Appendix B)													
1. Seems to understand own emotions													####
2. Seems to know the right amount of pressure to exert on others													####
3. Seems to know intuitively how own moods affect others													####
4. Seems able to control own emotions & act w/honesty													####
5. Acts in a consistent and adaptable manner w/integrity													####
6. Does not seem to allow bad moods to ruin the day													####
7. Seems to have empathy for others													####
8. Seems to have intuition about organizational problems													####
9. Seems to be able to go beyond sensing emotions of others													####
10. Seems to have interpersonal communication sills													####
11. Can convincingly disarm conflicts													####
12. Seems able to win support when support is needed													####
													####
Totals (Avg)													####

Appendix F

.

Average responses of eight on-ground students watching role-play in class *vs* six on-line students watching same role-play on RealPlayer individually on their home computer.

Questions from Emotional Intelligence Observer Feedback Sheet	*Anx std on-ground (Jack)*	*Anx std on-line (Jack)*	*Ov std on-ground (Erin)*	*Ov std on-line (Erin)*	*Notes*
	Avg	*Avg*	*Avg*	*Avg*	
1. Seems to understand own emotions	4.13	4.50	3.83	2.60	
2. Seems to know the right amount of pressure to exert on others	4.38	4.17	2.92	2.60	
3. Seems to know intuitively how own moods affect others	4.00	4.00	1.92	1.60	
4. Seems able to control own emotions & act w/honesty	4.63	4.83	2.17	3.40	
5. Acts in a consistent and adaptable manner w/integrity	4.63	4.83	2.25	2.00	
6. Doesn't seem to allow bad moods to ruin the day	4.13	3.83	3.00	2.40	
7. Seems to have empathy for others	3.75	4.17	3.00	1.80	
8. Seems to have intuition about organizational problems	4.38	4.50	1.92	1.00	
9. Seems to be able to go beyond sensing emotions of others	4.50	4.33	1.83	1.20	
10. Seems to have interpersonal communication skills	4.50	4.50	2.42	2.40	
11. Can convincingly disarm conflicts	4.38	4.67	2.58	2.20	
12. Seems able to win support when support is needed	4.00	4.00	2.33	1.80	
Total	4.28	4.36	2.46	2.08	

Notes: Anx std=Anxious student and Ov std=Overburdened student. Uses a scale of 1–5 (never, rarely, sometimes, often, consistently).

Appendix G

Supplementary homework or student paper assignment

Following is a quote from the Goleman *et al*. (2001) *Harvard Business Review* paper entitled ''Primal Leadership: The Hidden Driver of Great Performance.'' Consider it and the ideas in that paper as you prepare a 4–6 page paper in which you create a tactical plan addressing how you might improve your EI and enhance your leadership skills:

> [Improving your EI is a five-part process] designed to rewire the brain toward more emotionally intelligent behaviors. The process begins with imagining your ideal self and then coming to terms with your real self, as others experience you. The next step is creating a tactical plan to bridge the gap between ideal and real, and after that, to practice those activities. It concludes with creating a community of colleagues and family – call them change enforcers – to keep the process alive. (p. 48)

About the author

William P Ferris is Professor of Management at Western New England College and is also Editor-in-Chief of *Organization Management Journal*. He has earned his A.B. from Dartmouth College, M.A. from Trinity College, and Ph.D. from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and has been a Visiting Fellow in Organizational Behavior at Yale University. He is a past President and Fellow of the Eastern Academy of Management, past President of the Academy of Business Education, and past Division Chair of the Management Education and Development Division of the Academy of Management. His research is in management education, teambuilding, business ethics, and leadership, areas in which he also consults in business organizations. He can be reached at bferris@wnec.edu.