How does Emotional Intelligence Impact Employee Performance? Validation of WEIP-S among Indian Professionals

DR.SHILPA JAIN[1], DR.BHAVNA BAJAJ[2*]

[1]Assistant Professor, University School of Management Studies, GGS Indraparstha University, Dwarka, New Delhi.
[2]Research Scholar, University School of Management Studies, GGS Indraparstha University, Dwarka, New Delhi.
*Corresponding Author
Email:bhavnabajaj16@gmail.com

Abstract: Emotional Intelligence has been linked with many desirable performance outcomes, however the strength and nature of this impact has often been debated. Leading researchers advocate the use of specific, relevant and well established instruments in empirical research to study Emotional Intelligence at the workplace. To this end, the current work validates WEIP-S, a popular Emotional Intelligence measure which has been specifically tailored for use in organizational research for use among Indian respondents. Results of study 1 (n = 253) and study 2 (n=852) suggest that WEIP-S retains its original four factor structure and shows acceptable reliability when tested among working professionals from diverse economic sectors in India. Results of study 3 (n=324) provide evidence for significant positive impact of Emotional Intelligence at the workplace, by linking WEIP-S scores to supervisor evaluations of performance. Additionally, results clarify the differential impact of the four dimensions of Emotional Intelligence on various aspects of employee performance.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Employee Performance, WEIP-S, Validation Study, CFA

INTRODUCTION

Emotional Intelligence is a well-researched construct in organizational settings and has been linked with many desirable performance outcomes. Emotional Intelligence is known to a predictor of effective leadership (Zehndorfer, 2013 ; Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000). Higher Emotional Intelligence is known to enhance executive's ability to meet business goals and be considered effective leaders (Rosette & Ciarrochi, 2005). Employees with higher Emotional Intelligence also receive higher performance ratings on interpersonal skills, stress management, and leadership (Lopes, Grewal, Kadis, Gall & Salovey, 2006). There have been studies demonstrating a significant relationship between Emotional Intelligence and job satisfaction and job performance (Wong & Law, 2002).

Most researchers agree that Emotional Intelligence may be 'more important' for some jobs as compared to others. The Emotional Intelligence - job performance link has been known to be stronger in jobs that have high interpersonal contact (Joseph & Newman, 2010). As a result, Emotional Intelligence has been more frequently investigated in the service sector where employees have people facing roles. Since the nature (and expression of Emotional Intelligence) varies by cultural context (Moon, 2011); Cote (2014) suggests that researchers should examine associations between Emotional Intelligence and work in different cultural contexts. In the Indian context specifically, studies on Emotional Intelligence have suffered from certain methodological limitations (See Table I in Appendix A). The sample sizes are small, the studies involve respondents from a niche domain, and the results are mixed. These constraints speak to the need for broad based and robust investigations into impact of Emotional Intelligence on the performance of Indian executives.

One major factor impeding such robust investigations into the impact of Emotional Intelligence in the Indian work space is that most Indian researchers have developed and validated their own scales measuring Emotional Intelligence (E.g. Singh, 2004; Hyde, Pethe, & Dhar, 2002; Chadha & Singh, 2001 etc.) to accommodate any possible variations existing out of cultural differences; rather than validate commonly used measures of Emotional Intelligence that are widely prevalent (and hence tested on a larger sample) in literature.

Our study addresses this gap by validating the popular WEIP-S for use among Indian respondents through two separate studies, and then by providing evidence of external validity for the instrument by linking it to Employee Performance among professionals engaged in different sectors of the Indian Economy.

Theoretical Background

The most commonly accepted definition of Emotional Intelligence, i.e. the ability to identify and manage emotions in self and others (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) (p. 189) was given in the 1990s, following which a plethora of overlapping definitions and tools of measurement of Emotional Intelligence proliferated over the next three decades. These were rooted in different conceptualisations of the construct (trait, ability and mixed) and since the construct of Emotional Intelligence happens to be of interest to researchers across diverse domains such as Psychiatry, Developmental Psychology, Positive Psychology and Organizational Behaviour; commonly used instruments vary not only in their conceptualisation of the measure but also in the dimensions that they focus on [For a detailed review of prevalent measures, see O'Connor et al., 2019 and Jordan, Murray & Lawrence, 2009].

The multiplicity of measures is especially prominent in management literature given the vast commercial opportunities that the construct provides (O' Connor et al., 2019), which in turn muddies waters and throws doubt over the validity of the construct itself (Landy, 2005) although that has been repeatedly refuted by meta-analytic studies (Miao, Humphrey& Qian, 2017; Kotsou et al., 2019)

Many authors who have compared and critiqued different models and respective measures of Emotional Intelligence (Van Rooy et al., 2005; Siegling et al. 2015, O' Connor et al., 2019) insist that valid empirical research in organizational contexts can be conducted through the use of measures that are specifically suited to context of research; grounded in theory; and come with a clear description of dimensions of Emotional Intelligence that are being measured.

Several popular measures of Emotional Intelligence such as SREIT (Schutte et al., 1998) , MSCEIT (Mayer et al., 2003) and WLEIS (Wong & Law, 2002) purportedly meet the above mentioned criteria and have been extensively used. However, researchers (Jordan & Lawrence, 2009) have argued that the above mentioned tests only measure general abilities and then extrapolate results to specific contexts, rather than provide a granular view of the Emotional Intelligence at the workplace. In contrast, the Work Group Emotional Intelligence Profile or WEIP-3 (Jordan, Ashkanasy, Härtel & Hooper (2002) specifically measures abilities (expressed as behaviours) that are important for workplace performance; and is based on the well accepted framework proposed by Mayer and Salovey (1997). Given the ubiquity of teams (Benishek & Lazzara, 2019) in the modern workplace, WEIP is arguably the most suited instrument for organizational research.

After the initial publication of WEIP, various versions of the scale containing 27 to 30 items were fine tuned for use in organizational settings (Jordan and Lawrence 2009; Jordan et al. 2002, WEIP-3, WEIP-6, Jordan & Troth, 2004). Jordan and Lawrence (2009) eventually presented a shortened 16 item version of the WEIP, the WEIP-S; which they offered as an efficient measure for use in organizational settings that remains faithful to the factor structure of the original measure. The validity of WEIP-S has also been established in several independent studies in a range of contexts from work (Michinov & Michinov,2020) to sports (Marchena-Giráldez et al., 2021; Brito-Costa et al., 2015)

The WEIP-S has four subscales, each comprising four items: (1) awareness of own emotions, i.e. the ability to discuss and disclose one's emotions, (2) management of own emotions, i.e. the ability to control one's emotional responses, (3) awareness of others' emotions, i.e. the ability to recognize others' feelings, to read faces and body language, and (4) management of others' emotions, i.e. the ability to positively influence others' emotional states. The construct validity, internal and test-retest validity of the original scale have been demonstrated in an Australian sample (Jordan & Lawrence 2009).

In the present study we seek to examine the psychometric properties of WEIP-S in a sample of Indian professionals. Additionally, in response to exhortations made by Jordan and Lawrence (2009, p. 466), that the "WEIP-S requires extensive testing on its predictive validity in applied settings", we tested the predictive validity of the instrument on effectiveness on Employee Performance.

METHODOLOGY
Study 1: Factor Structure and Internal Consistency
Method
In study 1, the factor structure of the WEIP-S (Jordan & Lawrence 2009) was examined. In line with the literature, we hypothesized that the WEIP-S would have a four-factor structure (awareness of own emotions, management of own emotions, awareness of others' emotions, management of others' emotions) as proposed by the authors of the inventory and confirmed by others in validation studies listed above.

Participants and Procedure
Data were obtained from a convenience sample of Indian professionals enrolled in an executive MBA program at a state university who were invited to participate in the study. To recruit participants, a link to a web-questionnaire was sent via email or a paper-pencil questionnaire was handed out to students during class. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and participants gave their informed consent. Two hundred and fifty three (253) students participated in the study, including 167 women (66%). The mean age was 28.57 years (SD = 3.54), and the majority of participants were in their final year of studies. All the students reported that

they had regularly done group work (at the university during the course of their study). Participants responded to the questionnaire in relation to group work during the current year at the university.

Measures

The Work Group Emotional Intelligence Scale short version (WEIP-S, Jordan and Lawrence 2009) was used. The number and order of items were the same as in the original. The response scale was modified with a 5 point Likert format ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) instead of a 7 point Likert scale in the interest of clarity and ease of use (Marton-Williams, 1986; Revilla, Saris, & Krosnick, 2014).

Results and Discussion (Study 1)

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, internal consistency (alphas), and correlations of the WEIP-S dimensions.

Table 1: means, standard deviations, internal consistency (alphas), and correlations of WEIPs

	Study	Mean	SD	Alpha	AS	MS	AO	MO
Awareness Self (AS)	1	2.91	1.08	.80	1.000			
Management Self (MS)	1	2.76	.997	.91	.693**	1.000		
Awareness Other (AO)	1	2.35	1.01	.89	.698**	.729**	1.000	
Management Other (MO)	1	2.45	1.03	.75	.631**	.623**	.783**	1.000
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).								

The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used to determine whether a four-factor solution fitted the data set better than other alternative models. The best fit model was identified using several indices: Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) ; Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA). The fit indices were interpreted using Hu and Bentler's (1999). The fit indices for the four factor model are given in Table 2.

Table 2: Model Fit for WEIP_S

Index	CMIN/DF	CFI	GFI	RMSEA	TLI
Default Model	**2.10**	**.975**	**.929**	**.056**	**.970**
Acceptable Values	1-5	>.95	> .90	<.08	>.95

The results of this first study confirmed the four-factor model of the WEIP-S. The   internal consistency of each dimension was good, suggesting that the four subscales capture four   different dimensions of Emotional Intelligence (Awareness of own emotions, Management of own emotions, Awareness of others' emotions, Management of others' emotions).

Study 2: Cross Validation

To eliminate the possibility of the factor structure of WEIP-S seen in Study 1 being dependent on the nature of sample (Study 1 was conducted on mature students enrolled in an Executive MBA program), a cross-validation study was developed using a sample of full time employees working in various managerial profiles across multiple sectors of the industry.

Participants and Procedure

The objective of this second study was to test the four factor structure of the WEIP-S with Indian employees in various occupations, as some results in the literature suggest that emotion regulation could be affected by the work context. Data were obtained from a 852 respondents, with 407 men (47.7%) and 445 women (52.2%) . Mean   age   was   34.5   years (SD = 9.08), ranging from 24 to 63 years. All participants had been engaged in full time paid work for more than a year at the time of taking the survey. Participation in the survey was voluntary and anonymous, and was based on convenience sampling The final sample came from 852 executives who worked for companies engaged in healthcare services (98, 11%); retail (169, 19%), Secondary Education (94, 11%), Advertising (84, 9%) Engineering (29, 3%)Auditing(110, 29%), IT project management (268, 31%).

Measures

The survey contained two sections. In the first section, respondents were asked questions regarding demographic variables (age, gender, activity sector, annual income). The second section consisted of the16 items of the WEIP-S scale. The order of items was the same as in the original, but as in Study 1, responses were sought on a 5 point Likert Scale.

Results and Discussion (Study 2)

The Mean, SD and internal consistencies of the four subscales of WEIPS are given in Table 3

Table 3: The Mean, SD and internal consistencies of the four subscales of WEIP-S

	Mean	SD	Alpha	AS	MS	AO	MO
Awareness Self (AS)	2.69	.961	.904	1.000			
Management Self (MS)	2.82	.921	.880	.791**	1.000		
Awareness Other (AO)	2.72	.912	.907	.805**	.839**	1.000	
Management Other (MO)	2.77	.929	.911	.787**	.824**	.878**	1.000

Study 2 consisted of data collected from working professionals; however confirmatory factor analysis showed acceptable data fit in line with the results of Study 1. All fit indices were within range (CMIN/DF = 3.382 ; CFI = .981 ; GFI=.950 ; RMSEA= .053). The overall reliability of the scale was found to be .93, and item loadings for all 16 items of the scale were satisfactory as shown in Table 4.

Table 4

S.No	Item	Estimate
1	I can explain the emotions I feel to team members.	.690**
2	I can discuss the emotions I feel with other team members.	.740**
3	If I feel down, I can tell team members what will make me feel better.	.693**
4	I can talk to other members of the team about the emotions I experience	.684**
5	I respect the opinion of team members, even if I think they are wrong	.634**
6	When I am frustrated with fellow team members, I can overcome my frustration.	.548**
7	When deciding on a dispute, I try to see all sides of a disagreement before I come to a conclusion.	.703**
8	I give a fair hearing to fellow team members' ideas.	.711**
9	I can read fellow team members 'true' feelings, even if they try to hide them.	.715**
10	I am able to describe accurately the way others in the team are feeling	.718**
11	When I talk to a team member I can gauge their true feelings from their body language	.700**
12	I can tell when team members don't mean what they say	.697**
13	My enthusiasm can be contagious for members of a team.	.629**
14	I am able to cheer team members up when they are feeling down	.747**
15	I can get fellow team members to share my keenness for a project	.634**
16	I can provide the 'spark' to get fellow team members enthusiastic.	.548**

In view of the above results, it can be confirmed that the WEIP-S, a 16 item questionnaire bears a four factor structure and adequate reliability (>.8) in a sample of 852 Indian working professionals. The results are in agreement with those reported in the original (Jordan & Lawrence, 2009) with Australian students and

subsequently in studies conducted on Spanish (Lopez -Zafra et al, 2012) and French (Michinov & Michinov, 2020) employees.

Study 3: Linkage With Employee Performance

The aim of the study was to examine the relationship between dimensions of Emotional Intelligence and workplace performance of Indian executives. Emotional Intelligence has rarely been linked directly to measures of Employee Performance but this is highly recommended (Jordan & Lawrence, 2009). To this end, we examined WEIP-S scores in relation to supervisory evaluation of respondents' performance at the workplace.

Participants and Procedure

Working Indian executives were invited to participate in research, and were asked to fill in either a paper - pen or e- version of the WEIP-S finalised in Study 2.

For executives who participated in the study, an appraisal of their performance was sought from their immediate supervisors. Data was collected by enlisting willing organizations for this research in return of free soft skills' training workshops by experts.

The survey for the respondents consists of questions regarding demographics (age, gender, designation and annual income) and 16 items of the WEIPs as validated in Study 2. The participants' supervisors were asked to rate participants on several parameters of workplace performance. Participants were assured that though their supervisors will be sharing an appraisal of their performance with the researchers; participants' responses on the questionnaire shall remain confidential. Informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Only those participants for whom performance evaluations could be gathered were included in the study. The final sample comprised of 324 participants, with 212 men and 112 women who were engaged in varying profiles namely Advertising (46,14%), Financial Planning & Auditing (75, 23%), Sales Management (103, 32%), IT and IT Services (100 ,31%). Mean age was 30.39 years (SD = 6.38), ranging from 24 to 57 years.

Materials

The questionnaire consisted of a demographic section (Age, Gender, Work Profile, Supervisor Name and Supervisor Contact Information) and the sixteen items of the WEIPs validated in previous studies .

For each executive who participated in the survey, performance evaluation was sought from his/ her respective supervisor. These supervisors were asked to rate the respondents on the 13 parameters of the Performance Evaluation Schedule (PES, Lather & Jain, Unpublished) given in Appendix B. The PES asks the supervisor to rate each employee on a Likert Scale ranging from 5 (Very High) to 1 (Very Low) on 13 different parameters of employee performance (see Appendix B). The total of the scores obtained on all the 13 parameters was used as Performance Score for the individual. The internal consistency of PES was examined and found to satisfactory as a whole (.89) ; and for each component (Cognitive: .76; Social: .79; and Personal: .82)

Results and Discussion (Study 3)

Table 5 shows the means, standard deviations of the variables measured. Table 6 presents the correlations between the totals as well as between four dimensions of WEIP-S and the three dimensions of PES.

Table 5: Means and Standard deviations of WEIP-s scores; PES Scores and their subscales

	EP_C	EP_S	ER_P	AS	MS	AO	MO	EP_T	EI_T
Mean	14.76	7.29	23.03	10.65	11.37	10.88	10.96	45.09	43.83
SD	3.67	2.219	7.55	3.47	3.27	3.18	3.40	12.56	11.70

Key :
AS : Awareness- Self; AO: Awareness -Other; MS: Management -Self; MO: Management -Others
EP_C, EP_S, EP_P : Cognitive. Social and Personal dimensions of Employee Performance respectively
EI_T: Total Score on WEIPs   EP_T : Total score given to respondent by the mentor on PES

Table 6: Correlations between WEIPs and PES Subscales

	EP_C	EP_S	EP_P	EP._Total
Awareness -Self	.059	**.198****	**.125****	
Awareness - Others	.072	**.248****	**.195****	
Management - Self	**.117***	**.242****	**.157****	
Management - Others	**.117***	**.242****	**.157****	
EI_Total				**.21****
Key : EP_C, EP_S, EP_P : Cognitive. Social and Personal dimensions of Employee Performance respectively EI_Total : Total Score on WEIPs EP_Total : Total score given to respondent by the mentor on PES * significant at .05 ** significant at .001				

The results indicate that an Employee's individual performance is significantly and positively impacted by his/ her Emotional Intelligence. A deeper examination of the correlations between the various subscales of Emotional Intelligence and Employee Performance illustrates the exact nature of this impact. The results indicate that one's awareness of one's own emotions (AS), Awareness of Others' emotions (AO) as well as Management of one's emotions (MS) only help one navigate the social and interpersonal aspects of work, while playing no role in one's cognitive performance. In contrast, one's capacity to Manage others' emotions that significantly impacts one's own cognitive performance as well one's social and interpersonal performance. In modern workplaces, employees often depend on co workers for information sharing and task related feedback. In such situations, an individual's ability to manage others, and elicit support from them should impact his/ her cognitive performance, since this dimension of performance is linked to information that one can readily access. The results help clarify the differential roles played by the four dimensions of Emotional Intelligence on workplace performance.

The EP_S (social dimension) of Performance Evaluation Schedule includes seven parameters (Leadership Qualities, Initiative, Innovation, Being a team player, Crisis Handling, Going Beyond Assigned job, Ready to do attitude. For the complete PES, See Appendix B).

These parameters have traditionally been studied as contextual factors in job performance studies. Contextual performance and Emotional Intelligence are known to be strongly related. However, our results help establish that both interpersonal aspects (for e.g. ability to be a team player) and aspects related to recognizing evolving needs of a social system (for e.g. innovative behaviour and initiative) are both strongly linked to Emotional Intelligence. Available studies had only looked at one or two of these variables in conjunction with Emotional Intelligence so far as is known; and rarely any of these studies linked Emotional Intelligence to actual on the job performance of the individuals. In this regard, the current work makes an important contribution.

Though the absolute values of the linkage between Emotional Intelligence scores and Performance scores are only moderate, the results do shed light on the direction and nature of impact that Emotional Intelligence has on workplace performance. These relationships should be examined in future studies while controlling for nature of task and organization for further insight. At this stage, the results provide adequate evidence of the external validity of the instrument. A moderate correlation between self report Emotional Intelligence scores and workplace performance is almost ubiquitous in literature, but instead of discouraging us from examining Emotional Intelligence at the level of the individual, it should compel us to look into how this linkage varies across job types. The current study having linked Emotional Intelligence scores to actual supervisory ratings, rather than proxy measures of performance such as Organizational Commitment or Core Self Efficacy provides support for the notion that Emotional Intelligence impacts workplace performance positively and thus is worthy of continued examination in OB research.

General Discussion

Modern work requires extensive interaction with others such that work outcomes are contingent upon successful collaboration among those working together. As a result, Emotional Intelligence has caught the attention of researchers and practitioners. Emotional Intelligence has been linked with a variety of constructs including life satisfaction (Palmer, Donaldson & Stough, 2002); healthy psychological adaptation (Salguero, Palomera, & Fernández-Berrocal, 2012), and positive interactions with peers (Mavroveli, Petrides, Rieffe, &

Bakker, 2007). However, its linkage with real world outcomes at the workplace, especially at the level of the individual employee has always been severely debated.

Our results indicate that Emotional Intelligence is indeed linked to individual Employee Performance. This linkage is admittedly moderate when viewed as a whole, but our results indicate that the linkage only appears to be moderate because only certain dimensions of performance are strongly impacted by Emotional Intelligence, while others are not. Specifically, our results clarify that while Emotional Intelligence impacts all dimensions of Employee Performance (Cognitive, Social and Personal); and that various sub-dimensions of Emotional Intelligence impact these three dimensions of Employee Performance differentially. While social and interpersonal aspects of performance are affected by all four dimensions of Emotional Intelligence (Awareness of Self, Awareness of Other, Management of Self, Management of Others) ; cognitive performance is affected by how an individual manages the emotions of others. In fact, Cognitive Performance is exclusively affected by how one manages others' emotions (MO), and not by the mere awareness of one's own (AS) or others' emotions (AO). Given that the cognitive task intensity of jobs across the world is increasing (Vashisht & Dubey, 2019), the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and cognitive performance becomes salient and worthy of attention. In this regard, our results suggesting that one's ability to manage others' emotions can impact one's cognitive performance are important, and warrant further investigation.

Clearly, the role of Emotional Intelligence is not limited to the 'soft aspects' of performance alone, we should thus not assume Emotional Intelligence to be relevant only at the level of the team, or only for certain profiles. Furthermore, Modern work expects all employees to be interpersonally competent irrespective of their work profile; it would be a fallacy to examine Emotional Intelligence only in context of certain occupations or only at the level of teams, while ignoring the impact it has at the level of the individual. To this end, the contributions made by current work are of value. Our results show that Emotional Intelligence scores on the WEIP-S are positively and significantly linked to Employee Performance. The results validate the use of WEIP-S among Indian professionals, and supports the notion that Emotional Intelligence should be investigated as an individual level phenomena as much as a group level phenomena. This validation will undoubtedly help researchers study Emotional Intelligence in the context of the country with the world's largest workforce, and clarify the role of this glorious yet poorly understood construct.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

Although the results of the present work strongly support the use of WEIP-S to measure Emotional Intelligence among Indian professionals, further research on the subject is warranted in view of certain unavoidable limitations. One, we could not account for supervisor characteristics or organizational factors while examining the linkage between Emotional Intelligence and workplace performance. Two, although the sample size was sufficiently diverse, yet we could not specifically examine the impact of job characteristics on WEIP-S scores and the implications thereof. Future studies could study these aspects. Future studies could also test the predictive validity of WEIP-S in context of overall team effectiveness in both co-located and distributed teams such that the utility of the WEIP-S for use in a variety of organizational contexts can be established.

CONCLUSION

The near universal appeal of Emotional Intelligence across disciplines has led to extensive research on the construct across academic domains from Education to Psychiatry. Wide appeal coupled with a multiplicity of conceptualisations, has ironically muddied waters, and diminished the importance of the construct in areas such as management, where empirical results have been mixed at best. Researchers have asserted the presence of moderating variables (Van Rooy & Viswesvaran, 2004); proposed compensatory models (Cote & Miners, 2006); and called for better measurement methods (Jensen et al., 2007) to clarify the link between Emotional Intelligence and workplace performance.

We suggest that management researchers strictly adhere to specific (arguably narrow) work centric conceptualisations of Emotional Intelligence when investigating it in organizational settings; and use work specific questionnaires such as WEIP-S (Jordan & Lawrence, 2009) as far as possible.

To that end, it becomes useful to conduct validation of such questionnaires and examine their utility across cultural contexts. The current study contributes significantly in this regard. Through two independent studies, the present work establishes that Emotional Intelligence can be reliably measured through WEIP-S among Indian respondents. Further, it demonstrates that scores of WEIP-S are linked to reliable measures of workplace performance. As far as is known, this study is among the first of its kind to link Emotional Intelligence to supervisor ratings of employee performance for a wide variety of working professionals in India.

The results of the study should encourage practitioners to adopt WEIP-S for recruitment, selection and assessment purposes in the Indian context. The reliability indices and robust factor structure of WEIPs confirmed in the current work should also be relevant for researchers who wish to examine the role of Emotional Intelligence in the Indian workplaces.

REFERENCES
1. Benishek, L. E., & Lazzara, E. H. (2019). Teams in a New Era: Some Considerations and Implications. Frontiers in psychology, 10, 1006.
2. Brito-Costa, S., Bem-Haja, P., Alberty, A., Gomes, A., Castro, F. V., & de Almeida, H. (2015). Portuguese version of workgroup emotional profile-short version (WEIP-S): Psychometric properties. International Journal of Developmental and Educational Psychology, 2
3. Chadha NK (2001) How to measure your E.Q. in Dalip Singh (Ed.), "Emotional Intelligence at Work A. Professional Guide, New Delhi: Sage publications
4. Côté, S. (2014). Emotional intelligence in organizations. Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav., 1(1), 459-488.
5. Cote, S., & Miners, C. T. (2006). Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. Administrative science quarterly, 51(1), 1-28.
6. Dulewicz, V., & Higgs, M. (2000). Emotional intelligence–A review and evaluation study. Journal of managerial Psychology, 15(4), 341-372.
7. Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal, 6(1), 1-55.
8. Hyde, A., Pethe, S., & Dhar, U. (2002). Manual for emotional intelligence scale. Lucknow: Vedant Publications..
9. Jensen, S., Kohn, C., Rilea, S., Hannon, R., & Howells, G. (2007). Emotional intelligence: A literature review. Department of Psychology: University of the Pacific.
10. Jordan, P. J., & Troth, A. C. (2004). Managing emotions during team problem solving: Emotional intelligence and conflict resolution. Human performance, 17(2), 195-218.
11. Jordan, P. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., Härtel, C. E., & 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.
12. Jordan, P. J., Murray, J. P., & Lawrence, S. A. (2009). The application of emotional intelligence in industrial and organizational psychology. In Assessing emotional intelligence (pp. 171-190). Springer, Boston, MA.
13. Joseph, D.L., & Newman, D.A. (2010). Emotional Intelligence: An Integrative Meta-Analysis and Cascading Model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(1), 54-78
14. Kotsou, I., Mikolajczak, M., Heeren, A., Grégoire, J., & Leys, C. (2019). Improving emotional intelligence: a systematic review of existing work and future challenges. Emotion Review, 11(2), 151-165.
15. Landy, F. J. (2005). Some historical and scientific issues related to research on emotional intelligence. Journal of organizational Behavior, 26(4), 411-424.
16. Lopes, P. N., Grewal, D., Kadis, J., Gall, M., & Salovey, P. (2006). Evidence that emotional intelligence is related to job performance and affect and attitudes at work. Psicothema, 18, 132-138.
17. Lopez-Zafra, E.,Martos,M. P., BerriosMartos,M. P., & Augusto-Landa, J. M. (2012). Psychometric properties of the Spanish version of the work group emotional intelligence profile-short version. Psicothema, 24, 495–502.
18. Marchena-Giráldez, C., Acebes-Sánchez, J., Román, F. J., & Granado-Peinado, M. (2021). Validation of the Spanish Version of the Work Group Emotional Intelligence Profile Short Version (WEIP-S) in the Sports Context. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(2), 715. MDPI AG. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18020715
19. Marton-Williams, J. (1986), "Questionnaire Design, Chapter 5", In: Worcester, Robert and Downham, John, Consumer Market Research Handbook, 3 rd Edition, London, McGraw-Hill Book Company
20. Mavroveli, S., Petrides, K. V., Rieffe, C., & Bakker, F. (2007). Trait emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and peer-rated social competence in adolescence. British journal of developmental psychology, 25(2), 263-275.
21. Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence. Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications, 3, 31
22. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2. 0. Emotion, 3(1), 97.
23. Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2017). A meta-analysis of emotional intelligence and work attitudes. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 90(2), 177-202
24. Michinov, E., & Michinov, N. (2020). When emotional intelligence predicts team performance: Further validation of the short version of the Workgroup Emotional Intelligence Profile. Current Psychology, 1-14.
25. Moon, S. (2011). East meets west: The cultural-relativity of emotional intelligence. University of Toronto.

26. O'Connor, P. J., Hill, A., Kaya, M., & Martin, B. (2019). The measurement of emotional intelligence: A critical review of the literature and recommendations for researchers and practitioners. Frontiers in psychology, 10, 1116.
27. Palmer, B., Donaldson, C., & Stough, C. (2002). Emotional intelligence and life satisfaction. Personality and individual differences, 33(7), 1091-1100.
28. Revilla, M. A., Saris, W. E., & Krosnick, J. A. (2014). Choosing the number of categories in agree–disagree scales. Sociological Methods & Research, 43(1), 73-97.
29. Rosete, D., & Ciarrochi, J. (2005). Emotional intelligence and its relationship to workplace performance outcomes of leadership effectiveness. Leadership & Organization Development Journal.
30. Salguero, J. M., Palomera, R., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2012). Perceived emotional intelligence as predictor of psychological adjustment in adolescents: a 1-year prospective study. European journal of psychology of education, 27(1), 21-34.
31. Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. Personality and individual differences, 25(2), 167-177.
32. Siegling, A. B., Saklofske, D. H., and Petrides, K. V. (2015). Measures of ability and trait emotional intelligence. Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Constructs, eds G. J. Boyle, G. Matthews, and D. H. Saklofske (San Diego, CA: Academic Press), 381–414.
33. Singh, S. (2004). Development of a measure of emotional intelligence. Psychological Studies-University of Calicut, 49, 136-141.v1.324.
34. Van Rooy, D. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (2004). Emotional intelligence: A meta-analytic investigation of predictive validity and nomological net. Journal of vocational Behavior, 65(1), 71-95.
35. Van Rooy, D. L., Viswesvaran, C., & Pluta, P. (2005). An evaluation of construct validity: What is this thing called emotional intelligence?. Human Performance, 18(4), 445-462.
36. Vashisht, P., & Dubey, J. D. (2018). Changing task contents of jobs in India: Implications and way forward (No. 355). Working Paper.
37. Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. The leadership quarterly, 13(3), 243-274.
38. Wong, C. S., Law, K. S., & Wong, P. M. (2004). Development and validation of a forced choice emotional intelligence measure for Chinese respondents in Hong Kong. Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 21(4), 535-559.
39. Zehndorfer, E. (2013). Leadership: A Critical Introduction (1st ed.). Routledge.

APPENDIX - A

Table I : Studies on Emotional Intelligence and Employee Performance in Indian firms

Author (s)	Domain	Findings
Kumari & Priya (2018)	Banking N=600	Emotional Intelligence has direct and significant impact on organizational commitment(r=0.580, p<0.01). There is a significant and positive correlation between Emotional Intelligence and job performance (r=0.707, p<0.01)
Dhani & Sharma (2017)	IT N=157	Emotional Intelligence is positively correlated with job performance for female employees (r= 0.517, p= .000)
Pandey & Sharma (2016).	Banking N=446	Emotional Intelligence impacts work performance of employees in the banking sector
Munshi& Haanji (2015)	Sales Personnel in Retail Sector N=700	Emotional Intelligence explains 47% of variance in the work performance
Ahuja(2011)	Sales Personnel in the insurance sector N=100	There is positive correlation between Total Emotional Intelligence Score and Total Performance Scores(r= 0 741, p= < .001)
Mishra & Mohapatra (2010)	Executives N=90	The analysis found statistically significant positive correlations between scores on the emotional intelligence scale and scores on the performance scales(r=0.91, p= <.001)
Kulkarni, Janakiram,	Automobile Sector	Emotional Intelligence is not related to performance of Managers and supervisors in Automobile Sector

Kumar (2009)	N=125	
Rathi & Rastogi (2008)	Executives N=120	A positive and significant correlation is observed between Emotional Intelligence and occupational self-efficacy (p<0.01), a positive relationship (not significant) is observed between Emotional Intelligence and organizational commitment.

APPENDIX B : PES (filled by respondents' supervisors)

Please rate _____ on the following parameters :

Employee Name   Designation

Sno.	Performance Criterion	5 Very High	4 High	3 Medium	2 Low	1 Very Low
1	Productivity	....	....	....	......	....
2	Fast Delivery	....	....	....	......	....
3	Error Less Delivery	....	....	....	......	....
4	Discipline	....	....	....	......	....
5	Punctuality	....	....	....	......	....
6	Leadership Qualities	....	....	....	......	....
7	Initiative	....	....	....	......	....
8	Innovation	....	....	....	......	....
9	Knowledge Base	....	....	....	......	....
10	Being a Team Player	....	....	....	......	....
11	Crisis Handling	....	....	....	......	....
12	Going beyond Assigned Job	....	....	....	......	....
13	Ready-to-do Attitude	....	....	....	......	....