

6-1-2010

## Bringing together the three major Emotional Intelligence paradigms

William P. Ferris

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj>



Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), and the [Organizational Communication Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Ferris, William P. (2010) "Bringing together the three major Emotional Intelligence paradigms," *Organization Management Journal*: Vol. 7: Iss. 2, Article 7.  
Available at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj/vol7/iss2/7>



## Introduction to Emerging Conceptual Scholarship

# Bringing together the three major Emotional Intelligence paradigms

William P. Ferris

*Editor-in-Chief*

*Organization Management Journal*  
(2010) 7, 141–142. doi:10.1057/omj.2010.24



Organization  
Management  
Journal

“An Integrative Model of Emotional Intelligence: Emotional Ability as a Moderator of the Mediated Relationship of Emotional Quotient and Emotional Competence” by Craig R. Seal and Adrianna Andrews-Brown is a very intriguing article. The lead author is from the Center for Social and Emotional Intelligence at the University of the Pacific and has written on emotional intelligence (EI) for *OMJ* twice before (Seal *et al.*, 2006, 2009). The 2009 article is in some ways a companion piece to the one we are publishing in this issue because it offers an empirical complement to this conceptual article. Both point to a way of integrating the EI construct. In the present article, Seal and Andrews-Brown begin with Bar-On’s (1988, 2006) emotional quotient (EQ) approach, proceed to Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) emotional abilities concept, and finally add in Goleman’s (1995) emotional competence model as they assemble the parts for their integrative model. Essentially, they propose that emotional abilities moderate the relationship between preferred patterns of emotional behavior and the emotional behavior that eventuates, differentiating high and low performance outcomes.

This approach resolves a problem with Bar-On’s emotional quotient as a meaningful concept since having a self-reported pattern of preferences does not necessarily give you the ability to execute effectively. In other words, one could cognitively understand, say empathy, even think one was an empathic person, and yet be unaware that others with similar cognitive understanding of the meaning of the concept would not consider you very empathic. On the other hand, you could be good at executing EI concepts, for example active listening, but not really understand or even be committed to the empathic nature such listening requires, so you might score high on competence but be deceiving others and even yourself. If we consider emotional abilities (Salovey and Mayer have long called them “mental abilities”) as a moderator of the mediated relationship between EQ and emotional competence, to use Seal and Andrews-Brown’s words, then we can work toward a more unified paradigm to research. How do we arrive at a true assessment of our “emotional abilities?” That is the key to the unified paradigm because rather than a self-assessment about one’s emotional preferences, the MSCEIT, which tests for emotional abilities, is an actual test designed by Mayer *et al.* (2000), for which there are normed degrees of right and wrong answers. Scoring high on this still does not mean a person can execute or has the will to

execute, however, just that the person has the ability, while scoring low might indicate a low ability to execute. Eventually, emotional competencies can be tested, though, and that is where Goleman, and especially his frequent co-author, Boyatzis (2009), come in with competency tests. There is still the problem of emotional honesty, but the need to bring all these concepts together when

talking about or assessing EI is fulfilled. It does not seem plausible that any one of the EI approaches by itself can meaningfully help us understand EI; they all need to be accounted for in a meaningful theory of EI. That is where this article is of interest. Seal and Andrews-Brown help point us in that direction, the direction of a comprehensive and integrated, researchable model.

### References

- Bar-On, R. (1988). *The development of an operational concept of psychological wellbeing*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rhodes University, South Africa.
- Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, 18(suppl.): 13–25.
- Boyatzis, R.E. (2009). Competencies as a behavioral approach to emotional intelligence. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(9): 749–770.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P. & Caruso, P. (2000). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT)*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Salovey, P. & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition & Personality*, 9(3), 1989; 1990, 185–211.
- Seal, C.R., Boyatzis, R.E. & Bailey, J.R. (2006). Fostering emotional and social intelligence in organizations. *Organization Management Journal*, 3(3): 190–209.
- Seal, C.R., Sass, M.D., Bailey, J.R. & Liao-Troth, M. (2009). Integrating the emotional intelligence construct: The relationship between emotional ability and emotional competence. *Organization Management Journal*, 6(4): 204–214.