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This paper examines the trends and implications of data from 12,417 working individuals who have completed the EIP (Emotional Intelligence Profile) between 2001 and 2010.
This paper examines the trends and implications of data from 12,417 working individuals who have completed the EIP (Emotional Intelligence Profile) between 2001 and 2010.
What is Emotional Intelligence?

Emotional Intelligence (EI) is about intelligent use of our emotions. This requires being aware of our feelings and the feelings of others in order to manage our behaviour and relationships effectively. Underpinning all aspects of EI is our core attitude towards ourselves (Self Regard) and others (Regard for Others). The Emotional Intelligence Profile questionnaire measures 15 aspects of EI.

(See Appendix A)

Are leaders more emotionally intelligent?

- What distinguishes senior leaders (Directors and Senior Managers) from other job levels is their self-belief, in particular their Emotional Resilience, Goal Directedness, Personal Power, Positive Outlook and their capacity to manage conflict and act independently when required.
- Overall, higher level job-holders (across six job levels) score higher on nearly all aspects of EI.
- The results suggest that for Senior Managers to progress to Director level they may need to develop their Self Management (Self Awareness, Personal Power, Goal Directedness and Balanced Outlook).
- For Middle Managers to progress to Senior Manager level, they may need to develop aspects of Tough Mindedness (Emotional Resilience, Goal Directedness, Balanced Outlook, Conflict Handling and Interdependence).
- Managerial groups score noticeably higher in EI than Non-Managerial groups. This may suggest that development training should be made available to Non-Managerial groups as well as Managers.

Are there differences in EI between occupational groups?

- The Self-employed sector scores somewhat higher on EI than any other occupational group. This may be because there is a greater need to be emotionally intelligent if you are dependent mostly upon yourself for your business success. Incidentally, their EI attributes are also similar to those found in successful entrepreneurs (Cross, 2003).
- The Technology and Financial sectors scored lower than all other job groups on interpersonal aspects of EI. These sectors are traditionally less people-orientated professions (Grandin, 2005).
- Students scored significantly lower in areas of confidence and Self Regard.
- The Retail sector results indicate it to be fairly ‘Mistrusting’ and ’Aggressive’, perhaps reflecting a target-driven and competitive culture.
- People in the Health sector score lower in Self Regard, which may be an issue in the helping professions generally, i.e. putting yourself second and not taking care of your own needs (Chernis, 1995).
- The Human Resources sector scored higher in ‘Mistrusting’, which may reflect the nature of some aspects of their work, for example dealing with redundancies, tribunals and under performers.
- The Sales sector scores reflect a sense of ‘self-assuredness’; not easily being put off, being able to connect with people but not being overly caring towards others.
Can EI be developed and are these changes sustainable back in the workplace?

- Investing in EI training improved individuals’ EI by 18%, which was being sustained six months after the intervention. If this improvement in EI transferred directly into better job performance and productivity this would be a significant return on investment. Conservative estimates suggest that an 18% improvement in productivity would lead to 150% increase in pre tax profits (Zenger, 2009).

Is there a difference in EI between men and women?

- The findings suggest that men and women have fundamentally different attitudes in terms of their Self Regard and Regard for Others. Men have a more critical mindset with higher Self Regard and lower Regard for Others (also known as ‘I am okay/You are not okay’). Women have a more submissive mindset with lower Self Regard and higher Regard for Others (I am not okay/You are okay).
- There is no significant difference between men and women on overall EI, challenging the assumption that one gender is more emotionally intelligent than the other. However, women score higher on most relationship EI scales and men score higher on most self-management EI scales.

Does EI change with age?

- Most aspects of EI increase consistently with age (from 16 to 50+). Unlike other psychological faculties that deteriorate after mid-life, rather like ‘wisdom’ EI continues to improve as we get older.
- We tend to become more realistic (Balanced Outlook) with age, perhaps because we draw more on life experience, have greater acceptance of the way things are, and take fewer risks.
- Trust increases with age, which may reflect that we feel less threatened by others as we get older.
- We also become less ‘Dependent’ on others with age, perhaps because we seek the approval of others less.
- EI is particularly low in young adults (16 to 29), but increases noticeably between our twenties and thirties, perhaps linked to emotional maturity, career and family progression.

How has EI changed over the last ten years?

- It may be that our EI is related to the state of the economy. EI increased steadily during the prosperous years of 2001 to 2007, dropped noticeably in 2008 (at the start of the recession), rose slightly in 2009, and dipped again in 2010 (delayed impact of the recession).

Are there ethnic/cultural differences in EI?

- No overall differences were found between the seven continental groups in EI. However, there is a difference in how EI is expressed between continental cultures, such as some cultures being more emotionally controlled and others more expressive.
How do we get the best out of others? Get the brightest people to engage better with others? Instil authenticity in our leaders? Make personal change ‘stick’ back in the workplace? Remove people’s rigid and defensive behaviours?

These are some of the typical challenges JCA have helped clients resolve through the application of Emotional Intelligence (EI).

Emotional Intelligence is an innate human attribute that enables us to make best use of our human potential. If we use our EI well then we can manage our thinking and feeling to improve our behaviour and relationships. If we liken the mind to a high-performance engine, EI would be the oil that enables us to maintain and manage ourselves to perform to our full potential.

In psychological terms EI is how we manage our thinking (IQ) and personality to be fully effective. For example, learning how to calm the emotional (limbic) brain helps us to think clearly, make more accurate decisions and be less impulsive. Learning how to manage our personality enables us to choose and be more flexible in how we behave.

Over the last ten years JCA has collected data on the Emotional Intelligence of over 12,000 working individuals. Based on this data we present a global picture of EI within the working population and consider some key questions such as:

- Are leaders more emotionally intelligent?
- Are there differences in EI across occupational groups?
- Can EI be developed and are these changes sustainable back in the workplace?
- Do men and women differ in their EI?
- Does EI change with age?
- How has EI changed over the last ten years?
- Are there cultural differences in EI?

Emotional Intelligence is still a relatively new field, and this type of normative data analysis is valuable in many ways:

1. It helps identify specific areas for development in each population group (for example by job levels, occupations, age and gender) rather than a ‘one-size-fits-all’ view.
2. It provides a benchmark for comparison between individuals and different groups. This can also help monitor for and minimise adverse impact on specific groups, for example in terms of age, gender and ethnic origin.
3. The results inform our understanding of these population groups and may confirm or challenge common assumptions.
Are leaders more emotionally intelligent?

Results (see table 1)

- What distinguishes senior leaders (Directors and Senior Managers) from other job levels is their self-belief, in particular their Emotional Resilience, Goal Directedness, Personal Power, Balanced Outlook and their capacity to manage Conflict and act independently when required.
- The overall score on EI increases with job level.
- On all 15 scales there is a general increase in EI from levels four to one (Supervisor to Director level). More specifically, higher level job holders tend to have higher Self Regard, are more self-aware, emotionally resilient, self-assured, goal directed, flexible, are less mistrustful, less ‘Pessimistic’, more able to manage how they express feelings, less ‘Passive’, and less ‘Dependent’ on others.
- When we compare Non-Managerial individuals (levels four to six) with Managerial (levels one to three) there are significant differences in eleven of the scales. Non-Managerial level job-holders are lower in Self Regard, less emotionally resilient, less self-assured, less goal directed, less flexible, less emotionally controlled, less ‘Assertive’ and more ‘Pessimistic’.
- There are only a few occasions when this pattern is not entirely consistent: those at the Director level scored slightly lower than Senior Managers on Authenticity (being consistent and dependable). Also, Supervisors tended to swing emotionally from being emotionally ‘Over Controlled’ and ‘Passive’ to being emotionally ‘Under Controlled’ and ‘Aggressive’.

Implications

The main finding from these results is that higher-level job-holders score significantly higher on EI in eleven of the scales. A recommendation may be that senior job-holders actively engage in being role-models and coaches to junior job-holders. This is particularly beneficial in higher-level jobs where the top 1% is estimated to be 127% more productive than the person in the 50th percentile (Hunter 1990).

Implications may be involved with terms of selection, succession planning and high potential programmes. The results suggest that for Senior Managers to progress to Director level they may need to develop their Self Management (Self Awareness, Personal Power, Goal Directedness and Balanced Outlook).

For Middle Managers to progress to Senior Manager level they may need to develop aspects of Tough Mindedness (Emotional Resilience, Goal Directedness, Balanced Outlook, Conflict Handling and Interdependence).
What distinguishes top leaders from the rest is their higher self-belief

These results may also be used to identify strengths and weaknesses within job levels and in designing development interventions. For example, Senior Managers score relatively lower in aspects of **Relationship Management** such as their **Regard for Others**, Awareness of Others and Connecting with Others. Similarly, Middle Managers score lower in areas to do with **Building Relationships** such as Awareness of Others, Connecting with Others and Trust. Both these findings are perhaps concerning as recent research suggests being able to ‘inspire and motivate others’ was rated by direct reports as what most distinguishes the top 10% of performers (Folkman, 2009).

Aspects of self-esteem; **Self Regard** and **Emotional Resilience** are particularly low in Non-Managerial job groups. This suggests that these groups have the greatest room for improvement and most to gain from personal development in these (and most other) areas of EI. A survey by Gallup (2010) found an astonishing 71% of employees are not engaged in their work. Despite this, most development and support activities are targeted at Middle to Senior Managers (Scott-Jackson, 2008). There may be both a commercial and a moral case for giving greater support and training to lower level job-holders too.
Job level: percentage above or below the mean average score for the total population

Sample:
- Level 1 Director \(n = 1410\)
- Level 2 Senior Manager \(n = 2197\)
- Level 3 Middle Manager \(n = 3063\)
- Level 4 Supervisor \(n = 405\)
- Level 5 Non-Managerial \(n = 1127\)
- Level 6 Admin/Support \(n = 593\)

Key:
- **SR** = Self Regard
- **RO** = Regard for Others
- **SA** = Self Awareness
- **AO** = Awareness of Others
- **\(\bar{x}\)** = Mean average

**Self Management**
- **ER** = Emotional Resilience
- **PP** = Personal Power
- **GD** = Goal Directedness
- **FL** = Flexibility
- **AU** = Authenticity
- **BO** = Balanced Outlook

**Relationship Management**
- **CO** = Connecting with Others
- **EE** = Emotional Expression
- **TR** = Trust
- **CH** = Conflict Handling
- **IN** = Interdependence

TABLE 1
Are there differences in EI between occupational groups?

**Results (see table 2)**

Results are presented from the lowest-scoring EI occupational group to the highest-scoring EI group.

**Students**
- Overall, Students score significantly lower on EI than the other occupational groups.
- Students scored higher on scales to do with Awareness of Others and Connecting with Others.
- Students score lower on scales to do with self-esteem and Self Management, including: Self Regard, Emotional Resilience, Goal Directedness, Flexibility, Authenticity, Trust (more Mistrusting), Balanced Outlook (more Pessimistic), Conflict Handling (more Passive) and Interdependence (more Dependent).

**Technology**
- The Technology sector scores lower on scales to do with emotional awareness, including: Self and Other Awareness, Connecting with Others and Emotional Expression (Over Controlled).
- They do not score significantly higher on any scales.

**Financial Services**
- The Financial Services sector scores lower on many of the interpersonal aspects of EI, including: Regard for Others, Awareness of Others, Trust (more Mistrusting) and Conflict Handling (more Aggressive).
- They do not score significantly higher on any scales.

**Retail/Service Industry**
- The Retail/Service Industry scores lower on some of the interpersonal aspects of EI, including Regard for Others, Awareness of Others, Trust (more Mistrusting) and Conflict Handling (more Aggressive).
- They do not score significantly higher on any scales.

**Professional Services Industry**
- No significant differences were found for Professional Services.

**Health**
- The Health sector scores higher on scales to do with building positive relationships, including: Regard for Others, Balanced Outlook (less Pessimistic), Emotional Expression (less Over Controlled), Conflict Handling (less Aggressive) and Interdependence.
- They score lower on Self Regard.

**Sales**
- The Sales sector scores higher on scales to do with being self-assured and focused, including: Self Regard, Goal Directed, Connecting with Others, Balanced Outlook (less Pessimistic), Conflict Handling (less Passive) and Interdependence (less Dependent).

**Human Resources**
- The Human Resources sector scores higher on scales to do with interpersonal management, including: Regard for Others, self and other awareness, Connecting with Others, Emotional Expression and Conflict Handling (less Aggressive).
- They score lower in Trust (more Mistrusting).
Self-employed

- The Self-employed group scored significantly higher on overall EI than other groups.
- The Self-employed group scores higher on scales to do with understanding others and making things happen, including: Regard for Others, Self and Other Awareness, Personal Power, Connecting with Others and Emotional Expression (less Over Controlled).
- They scored lower on Trust (Over Trusting), Balanced Outlook (Over Optimistic) and Interdependence (Over Independent).

Of all the job sectors, Self-employed have by far the highest Emotional Intelligence.
Implications

Students
The lowest overall EI score was for Students who had significantly lower scores in nine scales. Many of these scales reflect having lower self-esteem, confidence and interpersonal skills. This may be expected of younger people who have less work experience and is consistent with our findings for younger age groups (see Section 5). Higher/further education establishments tend to focus upon academic development and rarely do students get the advantage of personal (EI) development training. These results may suggest the need to support students in their personal development as part of a more rounded curriculum.

Technology and Financial sectors
The Technology and Financial sectors scored lower on many of the interpersonal aspects of EI. These sectors are traditionally less people oriented professions and may attract individuals who are less developed in the relationship aspects of EI (Grandin, 2005). There is a risk of creating work environments that are low in EI where being less interpersonally competent becomes the accepted norm. There may be benefit in promoting EI values and attitudes in these sectors, so as to shift the organisational culture, expectations and behaviours to a higher standard of interpersonal functioning.

Retail sector
The Retail sector results indicate it to be fairly ‘Mistrusting’ and ‘Aggressive’, perhaps reflecting a target-driven and competitive culture. This in itself is not a problem, but is unlikely to be sustainable if individuals have not developed other EI attributes (for example Emotional Resilience, Self Awareness and Regard for Others), in order to cope with the robust culture and to get the best out of others.

This may partly explain the high job turnover in this industry (Barnes, 2010) and highlights the need to develop these aspects of EI.

Health and Human Resources
Health and Human Resources are both people-oriented fields, scores in these areas are therefore unsurprisingly higher (for example Regard for Others).

However, people in the Health sector score lower in Self Regard, which may be an issue in the helping professions generally; i.e. putting yourself second and not taking care of your own needs (Chernis, 1995). In the longer term it may be difficult to help others if you are not looking after yourself; this may result in illness, absenteeism and under-performance. Low Self Regard no doubt is reflected in the workplace. For example; Zenger (2009) and Folkman found a massive 46% of employees report low job satisfaction and commitment. In the helping professions generally, such as teaching and the NHS, there may be clear benefits to be gained from training people in specific areas such as how to look after their own emotional needs.

The HR sector scored higher in ‘Mistrusting’ which may reflect the nature of some aspects of their work, for example dealing with redundancies, tribunals and under performers. There is a risk in certain occupations, for example Police work, of individuals becoming overly cynical and letting this affect other aspects of work and life. There may be some benefit here in specific coaching around developing constructive attitudes.

The Sales sector
The Sales sector scores higher on seven scales, all of which may be seen as relevant to effective sales. They reflect a sense of self-assuredness, not being easily put off, being able to connect with people, but not being overly caring.
The research into personality and sales performance is diverse; however, within EI there is less evidence and this research may help define important aspects of EI for selecting and developing sales people.

Self-employed
Self-employed people on average score somewhat higher for EI than any other group. This may be because there is a greater need to be emotionally intelligent if you are dependent mostly upon yourself for your business success. This would typically require good interpersonal skills (Regard for Others, Awareness of Others and Connecting with Others) and a degree of self-confidence (Personal Power) in your abilities. Incidentally, these attributes are also similar to those found in successful entrepreneurs (Cross, 2003).

The Self-employed group scored less well in areas that are usually important in larger organisational structures; for example they were Over Trusting, Over Optimistic (risk-taking) and Over Independent (less team-oriented).

Can EI be developed and are these changes sustainable in the workplace?

Results (see table 3)
A sample of 189 delegates attended an EI development programme (known as Mie – Maximising Individual Effectiveness) with JCA over a two-year period. This programme is two and a half days in duration, with a more indepth option that lasts for up to three and a half days. There is also a follow up programme three months later, Momentum, which lasts for a day and a half.

The 189 delegates completed the EIP questionnaire before the Mie event, and two to three months after it also. Of these, 22 delegates completed the EIP for a third time, two to three months later on the Momentum programme.

- The scores from the three completions of EIP show a consistent and significant increase in all of the EI scales. All but two scales increased between 14% and 24%.
- The overall mean increase between time one and time three was 18%.
- The overall mean increase between time one and time two was 9%.
- The overall mean increase between time two and time three was 8%.

Implications
Investing in EI training improved individuals’ EI by 18%, which was sustained six-months after the intervention. If this improvement in EI transferred directly into better job performance and productivity this would be a significant return on investment. Conservative estimates suggest that an 18% improvement in job performance would lead to 150% increase in pre tax profits (Zenger 2009).
Results and implications • Can EI be developed and are these changes sustainable in the workplace?

One limitation of these studies is that the questionnaires are of a self-report nature. However, in many of these programmes JCA included qualitative 360 degree feedback before and after the intervention, as well as some job outcome results. This feedback points strongly towards improvements in EI being found back in the workplace. For example, with one client, since participating in Mie, 95% of those rating either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that participants had made a significant difference to the engagement and motivation of their team. Such findings are supported by generic findings on EI; Chernis (1999) cites nineteen studies demonstrating the financial benefit to organisations employing EI.

One reason for the sustainable benefits of the Mie programme (three to six months after the initial intervention) may be due to the emphasis on addressing ‘attitudes’ which form the basis to this model of EI. Many EI programmes focus on changing behaviour and competencies, this may be less sustainable if not matched with a corresponding shift in attitude. This is in part due to a state known as ‘Cognitive Dissonance’ (Festinger, 1957), whereby individuals will strive to make their behaviour consistent with their attitude to avoid a state of anxiety brought about by this incongruity.

A second reason why the Mie programme may achieve enduring change is that much of the process is experiential and operates at the level of feelings. There is increasing research explaining how the ‘emotional’ and ‘thinking’ parts of the brain learn differently (Damasio, 1994, LeDoux, 1988). This may explain, for example, why people can often be very knowledgeable about how we should behave (and even become expert trainers or coaches in the field!), yet still find it very difficult to put this into practice.

There are several other key ingredients to the Mie programme that operate at an attitudinal level, such as: reinforcing habits, being aware of feelings in the moment, visualising intended outcomes, having live face-to-face feedback, creating an atmosphere for change and working interactively. We would suggest that EI programmes that do not employ these EI fundamentals are less likely to have a long-term effect.

We would propose that an important implication of these results is that with the right sort of intervention, EI is amenable to development and can improve workplace performance.

Specific EI training could produce a 150% increase in pre tax profits
### A decade of Emotional Intelligence

**Attempt:** percentage above or below the mean average score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attempt</th>
<th>Percentage Above/Below Mean</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.70%</td>
<td>n = 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.99%</td>
<td>n = 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>n = 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- **SR = Self Regard**
- **RO = Regard for Others**
- **SA = Self Awareness**
- **AO = Awareness of Others**
- **X = Mean average**

**Self Management**
- **ER = Emotional Resilience**
- **PP = Personal Power**
- **GD = Goal Directedness**
- **FL = Flexibility**
- **AU = Authenticity**
- **BO = Balanced Outlook**

**Relationship Management**
- **CO = Connecting with Others**
- **TR = Trust**
- **EE = Emotional Expression**
- **CH = Conflict Handling**
- **IN = Interdependence**

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attempt 1</th>
<th>Attempt 2</th>
<th>Attempt 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.70%</td>
<td>15.99%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample:**
- Attempt 1: n = 189
- Attempt 2: n = 189
- Attempt 3: n = 22
EI in society

4 Do men and women differ in their EI?

Results (see table 4)

- There was no significant difference between men and women in their overall EI.
- Men scored higher than women on many aspects of Self Management, including: Self Regard, Emotional Resilience, Goal Directedness, Flexibility, Assertiveness, Balanced Outlook (less Pessimistic) and Conflict Handling (less Passive).
- Women scored higher than men on many aspects of Relationship Management, including: Regard for Others, Self Awareness, Awareness of Others, Connecting with Others, Emotional Expression and Interdependence.

Implications

The findings suggest that men and women have fundamentally different attitudes towards life, as they differ so significantly on the two core attitude scales that underpin EI: Self Regard and Regard for Others. Men score higher on Self Regard and lower on Regard for Others (also known as ‘I am okay/You are not okay’) (Berne 1964). This leads to a more ‘critical’ orientation and manifests in EI behaviours such as higher Self Management and lower Relationship Management. Women score lower in Self Regard and higher in Regard for Others (I am not okay/You are okay). This leads to a more ‘submissive’ orientation and mindset, manifesting in lower Self Management and higher Relationship Management behaviour.

The clear trend in these results is that women score higher on the interpersonal (relationship) scales and men score higher on the intrapersonal (Self Management) scales.

In the main, strengths for males are weaknesses for females and vice-versa. For example, men have higher Self Regard and women have higher Regard for Others. Consistent with other findings (Bar-on, 1997), but not all (Gerits, 2005), there is no significant overall difference in EI between men and women. One implication of this is that men and women would benefit from a different emphasis in their personal development. Men may benefit more from developing their interpersonal effectiveness and women from developing their self-management. Of course, these results are generalisations and ideally a development programme would address the needs of the individual.

These findings may be applied elsewhere, such as how best to lead, support, motivate, retain and communicate effectively with male and female employees. For example, women may generally be more motivated through transformational and interpersonal support, while men may sometime respond better to transactional and goal-directed support and leadership.

There may also be general benefits in mixing the sexes, say in teams, to cover a fuller range of the EI attributes.
**Gender:** percentage above or below the mean average score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage Above or Below Mean Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self Management**
- **ER** = Emotional Resilience
- **PP** = Personal Power
- **GD** = Goal Directedness
- **FL** = Flexibility
- **AU** = Authenticity
- **BO** = Balanced Outlook

**Relationship Management**
- **CO** = Connecting with Others
- **EE** = Emotional Expression
- **CH** = Conflict Handling
- **IN** = Interdependence

**Key**
- **Mean average**

**Sample**
- Male: n = 7333
- Female: n = 5067

**TABLE 4**

Men and women have fundamentally different attitudes.
**Does EI change with age?**

**Results** *(see table 5)*

- Overall scores on EI increase consistently with age (from 16 to 50+).
- The graphs show fairly consistent increases in EI scores with age, particularly around Self Management. These include: Self Regard, Self Awareness, Emotional Resilience, Flexibility, Authenticity, Trust (less Mistrusting) Balanced Outlook (less Pessimism), Emotional Expression (less Under Controlled), Conflict Handling (less Passive) and Interdependence (less Dependent).
- Scores decrease with age for only one scale: Connecting with Others.

**Implications**

Of the 15 scales, ten increased consistently with age (and two less consistently with age), supporting findings that Emotional Intelligence generally improves with age *(Bar-on, 1997)*. Despite its more recent popularity, EI is nothing new. It has a similar definition to the concept of ‘wisdom’ (the effective application of our experience and knowledge), which is almost synonymous with ‘age’ *(Depp, 2010)*.

Three scales in particular continue to develop into middle/older age: Balanced Outlook, Trust and Interdependence. With Balanced Outlook it may be that we become more realistic because we draw more on life experience, have more acceptance of the way things are, and take fewer risks *(Vroom 1971)*. Trust increases with age, which may reflect that we feel less threatened by others. We also become less dependent on others as we age, perhaps because we seek the approval of others less.

However, two scales did not increase with age (Regard for Others and Awareness of Others) and one scale decreased with age (Connecting with Others), all of which are to do with valuing and being attentive towards others. This may suggest that EI increases more in terms of Self Management than Relationship Management with age. It may be that as we become older we focus more on our own wants and needs and less on others *(Baker, 2009)*. We may also become more selective in who we spend time with and get emotionally close to.

Some of the age-related research on EI suggests that EI plateaus or reduces after middle age *(Kafetsios, 2004)*. In this study the sample was taken from the working population, which may suggest that remaining in work supports continued development of EI. This would be consistent with other research on psychological development being prolonged through active engagement in work *(Cyr, 1996)*.

It is noticeable that the younger age group, 16 to 19, score particularly low on nine scales and the 20 to 29 age group score relatively low on seven scales. It may be that younger people experience ‘role confusion’ during the teenage years *(Erikson, 1968)* affecting their EI.

At age 30 to 39 there appears to be a considerable increase in EI. This is consistent with other findings that at this age EI typically improves *(Goleman, 1998)*. One hypothesis for this is that individuals become more ‘emotionally mature’ about life and towards others; for example, they get married, have children, have greater job responsibility, etc. On two scales: Personal Power and Goal Directedness, this age group (30 to 39) scores higher than all other age groups. Both these scales are to do with ‘Making Things Happen’, and this is the age when individuals may have most motivation to progress their careers *(Super, 1957)*.
### TABLE 6

**Age:** percentage above or below the mean average score

| Age Group | SR | RO | SA | AO | ER  | PP  | GD  | FL  | AU  | BO  | CO  | TR  | EE  | CH  | IN  | x   |
|-----------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Aged 16-19| -8.04% | -11.38% | -10.34% | -12.33% | -10.51% | -10.04% | -11.38% | -13.51% | -10.04% | -20.59% | -13.03% | -10.9% | -11.38% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.04% | -20.59% |
| Aged 20-29| -11.38% | -12.33% | -10.51% | -10.04% | -11.38% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -10.04% | -11.38% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -10.04% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% |
| Aged 30-39| -10.04% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% |
| Aged 40-49| -20.59% | -13.03% | -10.9% | -11.38% | -10.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% |
| Aged 50+  | -13.03% | -10.9% | -11.38% | -10.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% | -13.51% | -10.51% |

**Key:**
- SR = Self Regard
- RO = Regard for Others
- SA = Self Awareness
- AO = Awareness of Others
- X = Mean average

**Self Management**
- ER = Emotional Resilience
- GD = Goal Directedness
- AU = Authenticity
- PP = Personal Power
- FL = Flexibility
- BO = Balanced Outlook

**Relationship Management**
- CO = Connecting with Others
- TR = Trust
- EE = Emotional Expression
- CH = Conflict Handling
- IN = Interdependence

**Sample:**
- Age 16-19 n = 68
- Age 20-29 n = 1472
- Age 30-39 n = 4707
- Age 40-49 n = 4389
- Age 50+ n = 1731

---
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How has EI changed over the last ten years?

Results (see table 6)

- There was a gradual increase in EI from 2001-07, followed by a drop in 2008, and a rise in 2009 before it dropped again in 2010.
- In 2001-04, scores were lower in Goal Directedness and Balanced Outlook (more Pessimistic). In 2005 scores were higher in Awareness of Others, and lower in Trust (Mistrusting). In 2006 scores were higher in Self Regard and lower in Regard for Others. In 2007 scores were higher in Self Regard, Invitation to Trust, Balanced Outlook (less Pessimistic) and Conflict Handling (less Aggressive). In 2008 scores were lower in Goal Directedness. In 2009 scores were higher in Regard for Others. In 2010 scores were lower in Self Regard.

Implications

- It may be that our EI is related to the state of the economy. EI increased steadily during the prosperous years of 2001-07, dropped noticeably in 2008 (at the start of the recession), rose slightly in 2009, and dipped again in 2010 (possible delayed impact of the recession).
- It may also be that economic uncertainty affects our feelings of security. When people feel threatened they may switch into ‘survival mode’, and try to protect what they have. Unfortunately this can make things worse as they become less adaptive and responsive to change, and may miss opportunities.
- Some commentators have suggested that the financial crisis was caused by unrealistic optimism rather than greed (De Meza, 2010). This would fit with the finding that Balanced Outlook (being less Pessimistic) peaked in 2007 before dropping significantly when the recession started in 2008. Goal Directedness also dropped in 2008, which may be due to a sense of uncertainty and an inability to plan or forecast ahead.
- Regard for Others peaked in 2009, which may suggest that the recession prompted a more people-caring and less materialistic attitude.
- The general rise in EI between 2001-04 and 2007 may also be due to the growing popularity of EI training and development courses during these years. Unfortunately, though, investing in staff development is often the first casualty of any budget reductions.
- Personal Power has consistently increased over the last ten years. The concept of Personal Power may relate to Prime Minister David Cameron’s ‘Big Society’ aspiration that individuals take greater self-responsibility and be less dependent on the State.

Our EI may be related to the state of the economy
Job sector: percentage above or below the mean average score

Sample:
- Year 2001/4: n = 890
- Year 2005: n = 1594
- Year 2006: n = 2142
- Year 2007: n = 2065
- Year 2008: n = 2917
- Year 2009: n = 2027
- Year 2010: n = 1671
Are there ethnic/cultural differences in EI?

Results

One hundred and ten countries were included within this study, in which they were placed into seven continental groups. There were no significant differences in the overall EI between continents.

Some significant differences were identified between EI scales:

- **Africa** was higher on scales related to self-esteem and consistency, including: Self Regard, Emotional Resilience, Goal Directedness and Invitation to Trust. They were lower on Emotional Expression (more Over Controlled).
- **Asia** was higher on scales to do with ‘knowing what you want’, including Self Awareness and Goal Directedness. They were lower on scales to do with interpersonal behaviours: Trusting (more Mistrusting), Emotional Expression (more Over Controlled) and Conflict Handling (more Passive and Aggressive).
- **China** scored lower on scales to do with managing emotional behaviour, including: Balanced Outlook (more Pessimistic) Emotional Expression (more Over Controlled) and Conflict Handling (more Passive and Aggressive).
- **Europe** was lower on Self Regard and Authenticity.
- **North America** scored higher on scales to do with self-esteem, including: Self Regard, Emotional Resilience and Authenticity.
- **Oceania** scored higher on scales to do with self-determined, including: Emotional Resilience, Personal Power and Authenticity.
- **South America** scored higher on scales to do with inner confidence, including: Self Regard, Personal Power, Goal Directedness and Authenticity. They scored lower on Trust (Over Trusting).

Implications

The fact that there is no overall significant difference in EI between continents is perhaps not surprising. EI represents the management of underlying attitudes and feelings and humans all share a common set of feelings. Some differences may lie, however, in how these attitudes and feelings are expressed as shown by some of the scale differences. It may be inaccurate to assume that lower scores are necessarily ‘worse scores’, as this may be the cultural norm within a continent and perceptions could adjust accordingly. (The same of course could be argued for any population group such as gender, age, occupational groups, etc.). The differences may only become noticeable when the different population groups (cultures) interact.

These differences may have implications when choosing norm groups for comparison purposes. For example, within South America it may be more normal and expected to trust people. Therefore comparison between countries within the continental norm group may be more relevant and meaningful.

From these findings people in Africa and Asia are more controlled and reserved in expressing their feelings. Those in Asia also tend to be passive and aggressive (Conflict Handling), suggesting that by holding in their feelings they tend to eventually ‘burst out’.

Several continents (Africa, Asia, Oceania, South and North America) score higher on some of the Self Management scales including Self Regard, Emotional Resilience, Personal Power and Goal Directedness, suggesting that their working population (mostly Managerial) are more driven.
Europe tended to score correspondingly lower on these scales. One consideration here may be that a higher percentage of the Europe sample (mainly UK) would have been from the public sector, and their attitude is more likely to be about public service than being profit-driven. Also that other nationalities who completed the EIP were typically more Senior Managers (see Section 1).

One other scale that is significantly higher (for North America, South America and Oceania) is **Authenticity** (the degree to which people hold principles and act accordingly). It is very difficult to know why this difference exists. It may be that in these continents there are stronger underlying principles (for example, religion), or a sense of unifying norms which lead to such behaviour (Collectivism).

All cultures share the same emotions but may express them differently.
The EIP scales defined

Core attitude scales
It is hard to develop EI if you do not value yourself and others. These core attitude scales underpin development in all aspects of EI.

1. **Self Regard**: the degree to which you accept and value yourself.
2. **Regard for Others**: the degree to which you accept and value others as people, as distinct from liking or approving of what they may do.

Awareness scales
Self and other awareness is the foundation to developing EI. Our feelings tell us what we want, like and need so as to understand ourselves and other people.

3. **Self Awareness**: the degree to which you are in touch with your body, your feelings and your intuitions.
4. **Awareness of Others**: the degree to which you are in touch with the feeling states of others.

Self Management scales
Self Management is how we manage our thoughts, feelings and behaviour in order to be personally effective.

5. **Emotional Resilience**: the degree to which you are able to pick yourself up and bounce back when things go badly for you.
6. **Personal Power**: the degree to which you believe that you are in charge of and take responsibility for your outcomes in life, rather than seeing yourself as the victim of circumstances and/or of other people.

7. **Goal Directedness**: the degree to which your behaviour is related to your own long-term goals.
8. **Flexibility**: the degree to which you feel free to adapt your thinking and your behaviour to match the changing situations of life.
9. **Authenticity**: the degree to which you invite the trust of others by being principled, reliable and consistent.
10. **Balanced Outlook**\(^*\): a healthy balance is tending towards optimism, but being sure to check out your hopes against reality.

Relationship Management scales
Relationship Management is how we manage our thoughts, feelings and behaviour in our relationships in order to be interpersonally effective.

11. **Connecting with Others**: the extent and ease to which you make significant connections with other people.
12. **Trust**\(^*\): a healthy balance is being ready to trust others, but only to the extent of simultaneously looking after yourself and your interests.
13. **Emotional Expression**\(^*\): a healthy balance is being free to express your feelings, but also in control of whether, how and when to do so.
14. **Conflict Handling**\(^*\): a healthy balance is to be assertive, standing up for your wants and needs, but staying calm and respecting the other while doing so.
15. **Interdependence**\(^*\): a healthy balance in taking yourself and others into account.

Within EIP there is a 16th scale called **Reflective Learning**. This has not been included in this study, as it is not so much an aspect of EI but a mechanism for its development.

*These scales are all Multi-scales, i.e. it is possible to have too much as well as too little on each scale. For example, for Conflict Handling an individual may move from being Passive and bottling in feelings to Aggressive and letting feelings out in the wrong way. The ideal is to score highest in the middle (for example: being assertive).
The EIP theory of Emotional Intelligence

The EIP scales are grouped into six clusters as represented by the framework shown here. The basis of this model is that all parts are connected but change is largely driven from the bottom up; i.e. core attitudes create feeling responses which influence our actions.

Emotional Intelligence is what distinguishes superior performance from run-of-the-mill performance, both in individuals and in teams. It is made up of two parts:

- **Personal intelligence** – being intelligent in picking up what is going on inside of us (Self Awareness) and doing what we need to do about it (Self Management).

- **Interpersonal intelligence** – being intelligent in picking up what is going on in other people and between people (Awareness of Others) and doing what we need to do about that (Relationship Management).

At a deeper level EI is influenced by our attitudes, in particular our attitude towards ourselves (Self Regard) and towards other people (Regard for Others).

In order to help understand the relevance of these results it is important to bear in mind a few points that may distinguish this model of EI from other approaches:

- All aspects of EI are amenable to development and are changeable; unlike personality traits and IQ measures, which are relatively fixed and less open to development.

- EI is not ‘one thing’; people can be higher or lower in different aspects.

- EI relates to performance. Unlike Personality, EI is about being effective.

- EI is not the same as behavioural competencies. EI is derived from core attitudes and how we manage our thinking and feeling.

- EI is not a ‘thing’ or a ‘noun’ that a person has more or less of, but a verb, it is what a person engages in doing in the present moment.
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JCA is a leading people development and assessment business. Our mission is to increase people’s effectiveness, Emotional Intelligence and well-being at work.

We enable organisations to get the best out of people in a sustainable way by applying a range of scalable consulting, training and product solutions.

Renowned for our rigour, sensitivity and creativity, JCA’s success stems from our company values and personality. Our progressive and client centred approach creates energy, engagement and trust to maximise results.

We believe that putting people and relationships first leads to long-term personal and business success.

JCA (established in 1993) have long recognised that to change behaviour so as to be self-directed and enduring, requires a shift at a deeper level of feelings and attitudes. Too often performance programmes only teach at a cognitive skills level which may have an immediate impact, but is soon forgotten once back in the familiar environment of work.

The Emotional Intelligence Profile product was developed in order to help consultants and development practitioners have a powerful impact on their clients’ short and long-term effectiveness in managing themselves and their relationships more productively.