

Chapter One: Introduction

Research has suggested that some people are more successful in their careers than others even when they have had equal educational and experiential opportunities (“EQ Beats IQ,” 1988; McDowelle & Bell, 2000; Stuller, 1997). One explanation for these disparities may relate to differences between intellectual intelligence (IQ) and emotional intelligence (EQ). IQ measures academic competencies or one’s ability to use knowledge in making decisions and adapting to new situations (Bar-On, 1997). On the other hand, EQ is a measure of emotional and social competencies or one’s ability to identify emotional expressions in oneself and others (Goleman, 2001; Hettich, 2000). Although both can be improved through training and changed over time, EQ is distinct from IQ in that it is one’s ability to regulate emotions in response to environmental stimuli (Sutarso, 1996; Bar-On, 1997). EQ has been popularized as a learned skill that is a better predictor of life success than intellectual attainment or technical ability (Goleman, 1995).

Recent publicity might suggest that EQ is a new concept. In fact, it has been studied for years in various theories. Harvard University psychologist Howard Gardner introduced the theory of “multiple intelligences” in 1983. He identified two varieties he called “knowing one’s inner world” and “social adeptness” (Kemper, 1999, p.16). This distinction between interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence is the basis for the development of EQ theories (Wells, Torrie, & Prindle, 2000).

Reuven Bar-On (1997) used Gardner’s work to define EQ within the context of personality theory. He describes EQ as “an array of personal, emotional, and social abilities and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures” (p. 4). Within Bar-On’s model there are five domains: Intrapersonal Skills, Interpersonal Skills, Adaptability, Stress Management, and General Mood.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) defined EQ within a developmental model of intelligence. Their model of EQ is comprised of four hierarchical tiers that define a person’s ability to recognize and group emotions. Within the first stage, individuals learn how to identify emotions in themselves and others as well as how to discriminate between expressions of emotions. In the second stage, individuals use emotions to aid in the decision making process. The third stage is characterized by the ability to employ emotional knowledge. The capacity to recognize the relationships among emotions and transitions from one emotion to another are attributes of this

stage. Finally, the fourth stage is characterized by the ability to manage emotions by behavior associated with the information those emotions convey (Finegan, 1998).

In contrast to Salovey and Mayer (1990), Goleman (2001) proposes a theory of EQ that is performance based. Specifically, he relates EQ to 20 competencies in four clusters of general abilities. The four clusters consist of: Self-Awareness, Social Awareness, Self-Management, and Relationship Management. Each of the four clusters is seen as distinct from cognitive abilities and each other. The Self-Awareness cluster is defined as knowing what one feels. The Social Awareness cluster encompasses the competency of empathy and the ability to read nonverbal cues. Third, the Self-Management cluster relates to the ability to regulate distressing emotional responses and to inhibit emotional impulsivity. Relationship Management, the fourth cluster, is defined by one's ability to understand or influence the emotions of others.

These researchers provide a sampling of theories about EQ that have emerged since Gardner's initial work in the early 1980s. Each theory takes a unique approach to the topic. What all these theories have in common, however, is the basic premise that EQ refers to the abilities to recognize and regulate emotions in oneself and others (Goleman, 2001).

Given this overview of the theories associated with EQ, it is interesting to explore how the topic has been investigated in the literature. Much of the research conducted on EQ focuses on workforce effectiveness and behavior modification. Several studies have suggested that higher levels of EQ predict effectiveness in supervision and group interaction. For example, studies on school administrators illustrate that higher levels of EQ correlate with the ability to lead schools and cultivate positive relationships, and lead to teacher satisfaction with the administrator's performance. When superior leaders are compared to average leaders several competencies emerge to differentiate between the two groups. For example, two competencies that emerged in the superior group were self-confidence and the ability to adapt emotional expressions (Cherniss, 1998).

Further evidence of how EQ has been applied to the workplace can be seen in the field of engineering and the military. Engineers who score highly on the "adaptability factor" of EQ perform better on the job ("EQ Beats IQ," 1988). Likewise, the top recruiters in the Air Force attain high scores in stress tolerance and empathy, and have a positive outlook. These attributes are components of EQ (Stuller, 1997). Such studies look within a profession to learn what separates average employees from exceptional employees. In these studies, EQ proves to be a

more powerful predictor of success than IQ because technical and cognitive abilities are generally the same for individuals entering a profession (Goleman, 2001).

In addition to research on EQ and its relation to work force issues, EQ has also been studied in education. Behavior modification through curriculum design has been the focus of much of the research related to EQ and primary education. Interventions with students who lack social and personal skills utilize EQ components in the curriculum (DuPont, 1998; Elias, Bruene-Butler, Blum, & Schuyler, 1997; Finley, Pettigner, Rutherford, & Timmes, 2000; Gore, 2000). Labeled as social and emotional learning (SEL) programs, such projects look at ways to solve developmental issues within the classroom in order to promote student cooperation and alleviate discipline problems. SEL programs have proven effective in increasing students' interpersonal social skills in the classroom (Finley, et al., 2000; Gore, 2000).

A criticism of EQ in primary education, however, is that it may be used as a tool for social control. EQ-based curricular efforts attempt to change emotional and behavioral responses to what is deemed appropriate rather than using EQ as a means for discussing why certain emotional responses occur and accepting how they vary among individuals. Such methods for social control are seen as improper because educational institutions are defining what is morally acceptable and ignoring cultural or gender differences associated with expressions of emotions (Boler, 1999).

Issues of IQ and EQ have also emerged in higher education. College administrators are concerned with determining what factors lead to student success beyond college. Administrators have been called on to demonstrate how their programs and services add to the value of a college education and how they prepare students for their future work experiences. This has prompted extensive assessment in student affairs. Some of that has focused on assessing cognitive development (Baxter-Magolda, 1999; Mennuti & Creamer, 1991; Zhang & RiCharde, 1999). Other efforts have focused on elements of psychosocial development like competency and self-confidence (Baxter-Magolda, 1992; Cooper, Healy, & Simpson, 1994; Kuh, 1995; Martin, 2000; Pope, 2000). But the literature suggests that another competency affects success in life – namely EQ.

Programs that include EQ components within higher education are scarce (Goleman, 2001). A few studies have been conducted that examine EQ in graduate coursework, particularly in the field of educational administration and leadership (Cherniss, 1998; Jaeger, 2001;

McDowelle & Bell, 2000). A lack of EQ skills leads to ineffective team performance within organizations (Cherniss, 1998; McDowelle & Bell, 2000). In one study, a pretest/posttest experiment was conducted on graduate students. Students were assigned to separate sections of the same course and one section contained EQ curriculum. At the end of the semester, gains in EQ were measured among the participants of the EQ section. (Jaeger, 2001). Such findings have led to proposals for EQ training in graduate preparation programs (Jaeger, 2001; McDowelle & Bell, 2000).

Outside of the few studies conducted on the link between graduate preparation programs and EQ, research in higher education has focused on the relation between EQ and personal characteristics like sex, GPA, and learning disabilities (Bernet, 1996; Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Reiff, Hatzes, Bramel, & Gibbon, 2001; Sutarso, 1996; Wells et al., 2000). In a study conducted on EQ and sex, college-age participants were asked to self-estimate their EQ before completing an EQ instrument. Although most participants had some insight into their level of EQ, their gender determined how highly they rated themselves. In comparing self-estimated to actual EQ scores, women scored higher than men even though women rated themselves lower in EQ overall (Petrides & Furnham, 2000).

In a similar study, the Emotional Intelligence Inventory was administered to 138 college students. Once again, women scored higher than their male counterparts. In regards to GPA, however, there was no significant effect (Sutarso, 1996). When students at a two-year college were studied, researchers sought to correlate college grades with EQ. Two student populations (an adult education group and a group of students in a pre-employment center) completed the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). There was no correlation between EQ and GPA, however (Wells et al., 2000).

Another study examined learning disabilities (LD) and EQ. In one multi-campus study, the EQ-i (Bar-On, 1997) was administered to LD and non-LD students. The LD participants met the standards of disability of the Association of Higher Education and Disability. The results indicated that students with LD report a higher degree of stress than their non-LD counterparts, however, EQ scores did not correlate with GPA. Once again, men scored lower than female participants. (Reiff, et al., 2001)

While research around EQ in higher education is limited, practitioners have employed the concepts of EQ fairly extensively. For years, the student affairs profession has worked to develop

the whole student through programmatic efforts. Reports like the Student Learning Imperative (ACPA, 1994) support the idea that college-educated people should exhibit practical competency skills and an ability to apply knowledge to their vocation, family, and other areas of life.

Not everyone would agree that the efforts to develop the whole student have been successful, however. Recent literature has argued that today's students are deficient in life management skills including factors such as discipline and deferred gratification both of which are components of EQ (Newton, 2000).

As early as 1937, student affairs administrators began addressing the development of the whole student. *The Student Personnel Point of View* (American Council on Education, 1937) mentions the importance of developing not just the intellectual side of the student, but also preparing the student for life after college. This is accomplished not only through their occupational preparation in college, but also in their development along social, recreational, and cultural interests.

As a result of this focus on student development, programs have emerged to meet these holistic needs. Examples of programs that are holistic in nature include housing, counseling, and career development. Housing departments emphasize interactions with roommates, floor mates, and community members. Programming efforts in residential life focus on getting students to interact and learn from each other in the living environment. Such programs foster interpersonal and intrapersonal skill development (Chickering, 1987) as well as enhance cognitive growth (Kuh, 1995).

Counseling centers provide services to students to encourage psychosocial development and to ease the transitions that occur in college. Campus counseling centers assist students in the management of their emotions. The development of psychosocial skills relates not only to mental health but also to social competencies and autonomy (Council for the Advancement of Standards, 2001).

Career development offices on campus also provide transitional assistance with career guidance and preparation programs. Outcomes of services provided by career development offices include identity development, development of critical thinking skills, interpersonal competencies, enhancement of one's self-confidence, and management of emotions toward productive ends (Council for the Advancement of Standards, 2001).

Another service that enhances the development of the whole student is campus activities. Outcomes associated with participating in activities include areas of psychosocial development like interpersonal communication, decision-making, healthy lifestyle choices, and vocational development (Lampkin, 1991). Out-of-class experiences also help clarify vocational goals (Kuh, 1995). Employability is another outcome of participating in campus activities. Employers see leadership roles in student organizations and membership in pre-professional organizations as very important (Reardon, Lenz, & Folsom, 1998).

The present study operates from the assumption that developing the whole student is a desired outcome of many student affairs programs. What happens outside the classroom can contribute to valued outcomes of college in areas such as social competence, autonomy, confidence, self-awareness, and appreciation for human diversity (Baxter-Magolda, 1992; Kuh, 1995). One way that administrators attempt to develop the whole student is through organizational involvement. Opportunities that organizational involvement provides allow students to learn skills essential for life beyond college. These skills are often similar to components of EQ.

In summary, there are different definitions and models of EQ. Some of those have been used to study workforce effectiveness in the military and private sector. Studies on EQ in education are more limited. Those in primary education have looked at EQ from a programmatic perspective. Those in higher education have looked at EQ from a graduate student perspective. Practice in higher education, however, has used EQ more extensively. Institutions of higher learning offer a variety of programs that seek to promote EQ-like skills among students. In terms of measuring the outcomes, there are studies on the cognitive and psychosocial outcomes associated with involvement, but there seems to be a gap in the literature with respect to EQ and involvement. This study was designed to address that gap by exploring EQ and involvement among undergraduate college students.

Purpose

This study was designed to explore EQ among leaders and members of student organizations. Additionally, differences in EQ by membership status (leaders versus members) and type of campus organizations (governing bodies, service organizations, and special interest organizations) were investigated. For purposes of this study, an organization leader (OL) was defined as a student who held a recognized officer position within the organization (e.g.

president, secretary). An organization member (OM) was defined as a student who belonged to a student organization but did not hold an officer position within the group.

Definitions for type of organization were also developed for the study. A governing body was defined as an organization whose purpose is to provide representation for the student population in matters related to policy and procedure formation. A service organization was defined as an organization whose purpose is to provide activities and support for community service projects. A special interest organization was defined as an organization whose purpose is to unite students who have a common cause or interest in order to form a support group or to plan activities around the common interest.

To assess participants' levels of EQ, the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) (Bar-On, 1997) was administered. Scales of the EQ-i include: Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, Adaptability, Stress Management, and General Mood. In general, this study compared EQ scores within and between groups of participants. In addition, the interaction between leadership status and type of organization was explored.

Research Questions

Specifically, the study was designed to address the following research questions:

1. How do organization leaders measure on EQ?
2. How do organization members measure on EQ?
3. Are there differences in EQ scores by membership status (leader v. member)?
4. Are there differences in EQ scores by type of organization (governing v. service v. special interest)?
5. Are there differences in EQ scores among leaders by type of organization (governing, service, and special interest)?
6. Are there differences in EQ scores among members by type of organization (governing, service, and special interest)?
7. Are there differences in EQ scores by interaction of membership status (leader v. member) and organization types (governing, service, special interest)?

Significance of the Study

The present study had significance for future practice, research, and theory. In terms of practice, student activities staff might benefit from this study. Results provided student activities staff with data on EQ scores among leaders and members. Student activities staff might use the

results to identify skills where training might enhance leader competency within campus organizations.

Likewise, student activities staff could market the idea of involvement to students based on the results of this study. Results provided student activities staff with data on how EQ scores differ among leaders and members. In practice, this information can be used to promote participation in campus activities among uninvolved students.

Furthermore, the results of this study may be used to help students. Data on EQ scores among leaders and members were obtained from this study. Differences by organizational type and membership status may provide useful information on what types of activities are associated with higher EQ scores. Students might use the results to identify areas in which to become more involved in order to foster their own EQ development.

Potential student leaders and organizational members might also benefit from the results of the present study. The study provided them with data about differences in EQ scores by membership status and type of organization. Such information may help potential leaders and members formulate goals to determine their level of involvement within an organization. Furthermore, the results of this study might be used by students in determining what types of organizations to join and what types of roles to assume.

Future employers might also be interested in the results of this study. Differing levels of involvement may make a difference in potential employees' abilities as defined by the EQ-i scales. Such information may help future employers better assess EQ associated with certain types of positions or certain types of organizations.

In addition to significance for future practice, further research on the topic of EQ might be conducted as a result of this study. The present study investigated EQ among students involved in campus organizations. A future study might explore the differences in EQ between students who are involved in campus organizations and those who are not formally involved in an organization. The suggested study would enhance the existing body of literature by adding information about whether involvement influences EQ.

Researchers at different types of colleges and universities from the one where this investigation was conducted could repeat this study. The present study was conducted at a Research I institution. Private colleges and community colleges each provide different

organizational opportunities. Future research could measure the EQ of leaders and members at other types of institutions.

Furthermore, a study on whether EQ training enhances students' EQ levels would build upon the research conducted here. In the proposed inquiry, researchers would examine the relationship between EQ training and changes in EQ among students, whereas this study examined the students' extant EQ. The suggested study would enhance the existing body of literature by adding information about how EQ training affects changes in EQ.

This study was also significant because of its relevance to theory in higher education. This study provided data on EQ and involvement in college. The results might add to existing theory on EQ and college students.

The findings of the present study might also be used to expand on leadership theory. This study offered data on EQ among leaders and members in three types of campus organizations. The results might be used to supplement the literature on leadership among college students.

Finally, this study assisted researchers in the development of knowledge on emotional intelligence among college students. Differences in emotional intelligence scores between leaders and non-leaders were analyzed. Furthermore, EQ scores were compared between organization leaders and organization members of different types of organizations. Researchers might use the results to develop EQ theory as it relates to student leaders and campus organizations.

Delimitations

As with all research, the present study had some delimitations. Initially, this study confined itself to assessing EQ in leaders and members of organizations registered with a campus activities office. This meant that only information on student leaders and members in campus organizations was collected. Data from leaders of community organizations (e.g. Boy/Girl Scouts) or outside involvements (e.g. church groups) were not collected. This might have delimited the results of the study by limiting the types of student leaders and types of organizations studied.

In a similar manner, the results of this study may be difficult to generalize to other types of organizations that are represented on a college campus. This study included participants from three types of organizations (governing, service, and special interest). Additional types of organizations may include religious groups, sororities, fraternities, or academic clubs. Since different types of organizations may

foster EQ in various ways, results from this study may not be generalizable to students in all types of campus organizations.

There are also delimitations associated with using an established instrument. First, the constructs of the instrument confined the assessment of EQ to five specific areas: Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, Adaptability, Stress Management, and General Mood. It is possible that other elements of EQ exist that are not measured by this instrument. Second, items included in the assessment may not have asked all the necessary questions needed to accurately evaluate EQ. Furthermore, respondents may have interpreted questions differently or may have felt that available response options did not capture their true sentiments. If any of these eventualities occurred, the results of the study might have been skewed.

Despite these delimitations, the present study was important. It provided an initial look at EQ among students involved in campus organizations. Since research in this area is very limited, the present study filled an important gap in the existing body of work on EQ.

Organization of the Study

This study is reported in five chapters. Chapter One provided an introduction to the topic to be studied, a purpose statement, the research questions posed in the study, and the significance of the study. Chapter Two offers a literature review on issues related to EQ. The research design and procedures for conducting the study are discussed in Chapter Three. The findings are presented in Chapter Four. Conclusions, along with implications for future practice and research are discussed in Chapter Five.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

In order to examine emotional intelligence among college students it was necessary to investigate the literature on that topic. Ideally, that body of work would be organized around samples that enabled the analysis by type of organizations and member status (leaders and members of organizations). Unfortunately, this is not the case. Since the literature on the topic of EQ within the higher education setting is somewhat limited, the body of work must be categorized around settings used in past studies. Thus, the literature falls into four categories. The first category deals with the literature about non-educational institutions. Next, studies conducted on EQ in primary education are discussed. Research conducted on EQ in higher education is examined in the third section of the chapter. Within the fourth section of the chapter, instruments used to assess EQ are explored.

EQ in Non-Educational Institutions

For those in leadership positions, EQ skills account for close to 90% of what distinguishes outstanding leaders from those judged as average leaders (Kemper, 1999; McDowelle & Bell, 1997). When people consider those they think are effective leaders in an organization, personal traits are often deemed just as important as cognitive ability. A review of the literature on non-educational institutions and EQ has focused on several different areas: EQ and its impact on job performance; EQ and job satisfaction; EQ and leadership ability; and assessment of EQ in business.

Since EQ incorporates skills associated with teamwork and constructive feedback, it is a major predictor of job performance. Research has suggested that there are links between job performance and EQ (Campion, 1996; Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Kahn, 1990; Williams & Sternberg, 1988). Higher group performance is one link with EQ that has been studied (Campion, 1996). Members within work groups that have stronger interpersonal skills (a measure of EQ) are more likely to be motivated on the job, work interdependently, and exhibit effective communication skills. Therefore, the individual EQ skills of group members increase the group's performance. Additionally, groups with high EQ levels have members with greater self-awareness (Williams & Sternberg, 1988). Self-awareness allows individuals to direct their attention to issues of higher priority. As a result, groups that are more successful on the job are

those that have members with high scores in EQ measures like interpersonal skills and self-confidence.

Research has also shown that there are links between job satisfaction and EQ. Higher levels of EQ predict higher levels of job satisfaction and stronger connections with co-workers and supervisors (Abraham, 1999; Kahn, 1990). The interpersonal skills associated with teamwork and the ability to provide constructive feedback serve as resources for individuals to deal effectively with others. For example, Kahn (1990) conducted two qualitative studies on job satisfaction among employees. Conditions in which people personally engage or disengage within the work environment were studied at both an architecture firm and at a summer camp. Employees reported that more psychologically meaningful job tasks resulted when those tasks included positive interactions with co-workers. Therefore, interpersonal relations can either promote or hinder the ability to express the self. Expressing the self impacts job satisfaction.

A third group of studies has examined the link between individual success and EQ. Specifically, studies have been conducted to examine the predictive relationship between EQ and the ability to adjust to new environments, to fill recruitment quotas, and to predict job success (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; EQ Beats IQ, 1999; Huy, 1999). Results suggest that individuals with higher levels of EQ are more likely to adapt to changes in the work environment (Huy, 1999). An Air Force study examined differences between successful recruiters and those who failed to meet recruitment quotas and found that higher levels of EQ could predict which recruiters would be more successful (EQ Beats IQ, 1999). For the U.S. Air Force, this knowledge led to the implementation of EQ assessment in all their recruitment and selection efforts. The Air Force uses EQ as a tool to identify matches between job roles and appropriate personnel. This has resulted in more effective job placements which, in turn, has generated \$3 million in annual savings (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001).

Much of the literature on EQ in non-education settings focuses on training employees in order to promote leadership performance. Research has examined what sets average employees apart from outstanding employees in order to determine what skills define leaders (Sala, 2001; McClelland, 1998; Rajan & Van Eupen, 1997). For example, in a study involving either outstanding or typical employees in one multi-national corporation, McClelland (1998) looked at how the participants described what they said, thought, felt, and did in six job-related scenarios. Differences between the two groups were found in how they described such scenarios and their

reactions to them. Specifically, outstanding employees report higher levels of achievement orientation, developing others, flexibility, initiative, interpersonal understanding, organizational awareness, self-confidence, and team leadership abilities than average employees.

Differences have also been found between high-level administrators and low-level administrators in their self-estimate of EQ competencies (Sala, 2001). In a study of 1,000 people in a wide range of organizations, participants were asked to rate themselves on EQ measures and were also rated by others on those EQ measures. Larger discrepancies between self evaluations and evaluations by others were found for high-level administrators than for low-level administrators. Specifically, high-level administrators consistently rate themselves higher than others rate them, while low-level administrators are more likely to see themselves as others see them. The findings have significance for employee training because accurate self-perceptions impact the effectiveness of skill training (Sala, 2001).

In another study involving 49 top business leaders, Rajan and Van Eupen (1997) tried to identify key leadership skills and ways to enhance them. Structured interviews revealed that three of the top five skills identified relate to interpersonal components of EQ. These three skills include: the ability to inspire trust and motivation, the ability to express a vision, and effective communication with others. Leaders learned these leadership skills through workplace experiences. Additionally, leaders possess high levels of EQ that enable them to handle workplace and situational events more effectively than others.

Other studies have assessed EQ and compared it with other psychological measures to determine if EQ predicts success in areas outside of the work environment. These studies have revealed a link between how people manage themselves, others, and their career (Wagner & Sternberg, 1985). As people gain experiences and knowledge, they increase their ability to manage life tasks. This is a different type of knowledge (EQ) than what is learned through training or academic studies (IQ). EQ has a direct impact on goal orientation, life satisfaction, and the regulation of one's feelings (Martinez-Pons, 1997).

Although much of the literature discusses how EQ affects individual and organizational performance, the present study explored how EQ relates to students in educational settings. Therefore, it was important to examine studies that relate EQ to the field of education.

Research on EQ within Primary Education

Research on participants in educational settings suggests that there are links between EQ and social skills. Many school districts are looking at ways in which teachers incorporate EQ training into their classrooms. Benefits of teaching EQ-related skills to students include an improvement in the students' social skills in intrapersonal situations, improvement in their approach to resolving conflicts and managing behavior, and an increase in interpersonal skills (Cherniss, 1998; Finley, et al, 2000; Ford & Tisak, 1983; Gore, 2000; Pettinger, Rutherford, & Timmes, 2000).

Some of the literature focuses on the instruction of social and emotional learning and how such instruction may increase students' intrapersonal skills in the classroom setting (DuPont, 1998; Finley, Pettinger, Rutherford, & Timmes, 2000; Gore, 2000). Research has also been conducted on EQ and its relation to educational leadership and intrapersonal skills. Several social competencies consistently emerge in emotionally intelligent leaders. Specifically, these leaders possess higher levels of self-confidence, managing emotions, motivation, persistence, persuasiveness, and developing interpersonal relationships (Cherniss, 1998).

The development of interpersonal skills such as self-awareness is another area of study. Increased self-awareness correlates with the ability to regulate emotional responses. Research has positively affirmed this correlation in children (Finley et al, 2000; Gore, 2000). Increases in social competencies leads to improved performance. Results from research on EQ and development of interpersonal skills of students also lend support to how the development of these skills impact group behavior. Specifically, enhanced EQ skills within individual students foster collaboration and communication within groups.

Other studies have examined the benefits of teaching EQ competencies to change student behavior in the classroom. Results indicate that classroom behavior is more easily predicted by EQ variables than by academic intelligences (Ford & Tisak, 1983). This information has been used to examine how EQ curriculum impacts classroom behavior. Pre- and post-tests explored the impact of EQ components incorporated into the curriculum. Exposure to EQ education increases students' ability to communicate feelings effectively, empathize with others, work cooperatively, and handle conflict (Finley et al., 2000; Gore, 2000).

Research on EQ within Higher Education

In the above literature, individual and group performance has been related to EQ. Many studies have also examined these correlations using college students as respondents (Davis, 1983; Jaeger, 2001; Mayer et al., 1999; LePage-Lees, 1997; Mellard & Hazel, 1992; Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Reiff et al., 2001). Some studies have looked at the relationship between EQ and gender (Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Reiff et al., 2001; Sutarso et al., 1996), academic ability (LePage-Lees, 1997; Mayer et al., 2001; Mellard, 1992; Reiff, et al., 2001; Sutarso et al., 1996), and social competencies (Davis, 1983; Jaeger, 2001; Mellard, 1992).

Studies on EQ among college students have looked at gender differences. Findings indicate only a slight difference in EQ between men and women, with women scoring higher (Bernet, 1996; Reiff et al., 2001; Sutarso et al., 1996). However, on self-estimated tests of EQ women rate themselves lower than men even though they scored higher on the actual EQ assessment (Petrides & Furnham, 2000).

Other studies have looked at the relation between EQ and academic ability. Students with learning disabilities score lower on EQ measures related to adaptability and other social skills. As a result, they have greater difficulty in relating to others (Mellard, 1992; Reiff et al., 2001). Furthermore, giftedness was thought to predict high scores on EQ measures. Defined as an outstanding ability in intelligence, creativity, and leadership skills, giftedness was found to relate to EQ measures. Students with high EQ appear to organize emotional material about interpersonal relationships more completely and describe their interactions more accurately than those with a lower EQ (Mayer et al., 2001). Therefore, gifted students have greater ability to understand emotional messages rather than just having a higher IQ level. This ability may be what sets the gifted student apart from the average student. In comparing grade point average and EQ, no correlations have been found to exist (Sutarso et al., 1996). Although female students from disadvantaged backgrounds were found to possess higher levels of EQ, these abilities assisted them in maintaining high academic standards for themselves (LePage-Lees, 1997).

The ability to enhance EQ through training and experience has also been examined using college students as participants. Looking primarily at graduate students, pre- and post-test revealed that students in sections of classes that included an EQ curriculum have higher average EQ scores than those students who are enrolled in non-EQ curriculum sections (Jaeger, 2001). The focus on EQ among graduate students is a direct result of the business sector's investment in

retraining new graduates who are deficient in skill areas associated with EQ. Thus, graduate schools are looking at ways to change their curricula to meet the demands of the corporate world (Tucker, Sojka, Barone, & McCarthy, 2000).

Social competencies among college students are associated with EQ variables. Social competencies include skills such as relating to others, empathy, self-esteem, and the ability to accurately interpret visual stimuli (Davis, 1983; Finegan, 1998; Mellard & Hazel, 1992). Studies on college students, EQ, and social competencies reveal there are correlations between established psychological measures and EQ components (Davis, 1983). Specifically, there is a correlation between social competence, self-esteem, emotionality, and sensitivity to others and other established psychological measures. For example, the four measures of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI), which assesses a specific aspect of empathy related to the Hogan Empathy Scale.

Furthermore, research on visual stimuli and the accurate perception of emotions concluded that individuals differ in their understanding and ability to regulate emotions and use them to determine behavior (Finegan, 1998). In a study involving 140 undergraduate students, findings suggest that the ability to accurately predict emotional content in visual stimuli depends upon how well the participant can understand different emotional cues. The higher the EQ level, the greater their ability to understand and predict emotions related to visual stimuli.

While studies on EQ and individuals are fairly prevalent, research that looks at EQ and group performance among college students is limited. What research has been done suggests that other factors like relationships, cooperation, and team dynamics are enhanced by the ability to apply skills learned from EQ, thus impacting effectiveness within an academic setting (McDowelle & Bell, 1997). Results revealed that 75% to 96% of one's ability to perform a job is related to variables like EQ. In addition, emotional illiteracy was found to lower team effectiveness and create dysfunctional team interactions.

Thus far, this literature review has examined studies on the topic of EQ. Since the present study sought to measure EQ among select samples of college students, however, it is important to examine what is known about instruments that assess emotional intelligence.

EQ Assessment Instruments

There are several instruments that measure the concept of EQ (Bar-On, 1997; Bernet, 1996; Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 1999; Mehrabian, 2000). Since there are numerous

interpretations of the meaning of EQ, each measure of EQ varies in what aspect it assesses (Bar-On & Parker, 2000). Several instruments are self-assessments like the Trait Meta-Mood Analysis (Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey, & Palfai, 1995), Emotional Perception Tests (Mayer, DiPaulo, & Salovey, 1990), the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Hay/McBer, 1999), Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) (Mayer & Salovey, 1997), Style in Perception of Affect Scale (Bernet, 1996), the EQ-Map (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997), and the Bar-On EQ-i (Bar-On, 1997). Other instruments are ability assessments like the Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT).

Based on Mayer and Salovey's definition of EQ, the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) measures EQ through 25 competencies arranged in five clusters. The ECI asks participants to describe themselves on each item on a scale of 1 to 6. The five clusters include: Self-Awareness, Self-Regulation, Motivation, Empathy, and Social Skills. Each cluster is composed of three to nine competencies. A relatively new instrument, the ECI is still considered to be in the experimental stage since very little validity data have been established (Boyatzis et al., 2001). Two other instruments based on Mayer and Salovey's definition of EQ are the Trait Meta-Mood Scale and the Emotional Perception Tests (Pfeiffer, 2001). The Trait Meta-Mood Scale is a 30-item self-estimate that measures attention to feelings and responses. The Emotional Perception Tests measure emotional perception through responses to various stimuli. Responses are measured on six emotional scales: Happiness, Sadness, Anger, Fear, Surprise, and Disgust.

The Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) and the more recent Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), are also based on Mayer and Salovey's definition of EQ. Both instruments measure EQ as it relates to the processing of information (Bar-On & Parker, 2000). The MEIS is divided into four components: emotional perception, emotional facilitation of thought, emotional understanding, and emotional management. The MSCEIT is designed to yield an overall EQ score, as well as subscale scores for perception, facilitation, understanding, and management (Bar-On & Parker, 2000).

The Style in Perception of Affect Scale (SIPOAS) is a 93-item instrument developed to measure an individual's preference for one of three emotional awareness styles. The three styles include: Based on Body, Emphasis on Evaluation, and Looking to Logic. Based on Body is an awareness of body feelings that precede or accompany the awareness of emotion. Emphasis on Evaluation is an effort to understand what is happening to oneself. Looking to Logic is the

inclusion of logic between the initial feeling and the response. It is an effort to control or avoid a particular emotional response (Bernet, 1996).

The EQ-Map divides EQ into five components: Current Environment, Emotional Literacy, EQ Competencies, EQ Values and Attitudes, and Outcomes. Respondents are asked to rate their feelings to statements on a four-point Likert Scale. Point values for each response are then added together for a composite component score that is then plotted on a scoring grid ranging from Optimal to Caution (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997).

The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) (Bar-On, 1997) was the first instrument published by a psychological test publisher designed to measure non-cognitive intelligence. The EQ-i consists of a five-point response format that renders a total EQ score and five EQ composite scores based on 15 subscale scores. The five EQ composite scales include: Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, Stress Management, Adaptability, and General Mood.

The EQ-i has been used in the study of graduate students and assessments of EQ curricula (Jaeger, 2001), learning disabilities and gender among undergraduate students (Reiff et al., 2001), and community college students and grades (Wells et al., 2000). As such, it was deemed to be the most appropriate instrument to use in the present study. Additional details with regard to the scales and sub-scales as well as the validity and reliability of the EQ-i are presented in the next chapter.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there seems to be a relatively extensive body of literature on the issue of EQ and its relation to practices in non-educational environments (Campion, 1996; Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Kahn, 1990; Martinez-Pons, 1997; McClelland, 1998; Rajan & Van Eupen, 1997; Sala, 2001; Wagner & Sternberg, 1985). Research on EQ and its application within primary education has also been conducted (Cherniss, 1998; DuPont, 1998; Finley et al, 2000; Ford & Tisak, 1983; Gore, 2000). Studies have also explored EQ in the higher education environment (Davis, 1983; Jaeger, 2001; Mayer et al., 1999; Mellard & Hazel, 1992; Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Reiff et al., 2001). Studies within higher education typically explored how demographic, academic, or social variables of students related to EQ measures. An assessment of how EQ relates to leaders and members in organizations, however, has not been conducted. In addition, research that has assessed EQ through use of the EQ-i has been conducted in the higher education arena only to a limited degree. The current study sought to address this gap in the

literature by using the EQ-i to examine EQ as it relates to college students. Specifically, the study examined EQ among organizational leaders and organizational members and analyzed differences by membership status and organization type.

Chapter Three: Methodology

The present study examined EQ levels among student leaders and members of governing, service, and special interest organizations. The BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory, (EQ-i) (Bar-On, 1997) was administered to measure participants' levels of EQ. In general, this study compared EQ scores within and between groups of participants. In addition, the interaction between leadership status and type of organization was also studied. Specifically, the study was designed to explore the following research questions:

1. How do organization leaders measure on EQ?
2. How do organization members measure on EQ?
3. Are there differences in EQ scores by membership status (leader v. member)?
5. Are there differences in EQ scores by type of organization (governing v. service v. special interest)?
8. Are there differences in EQ scores among leaders by type of organization (governing, service, and special interest)?
9. Are there differences in EQ scores among members by type of organization (governing, service, and special interest)?
10. Are there differences in EQ scores by the interaction of membership status (leader v. member) and organization types (governing, service, special interest)?

This chapter describes the methodology used in the present study. This includes sample selection, the instrument employed in the study, validity/reliability, and data collection and analysis procedures.

Sample Selection

The population from which the sample was drawn included leaders and members of student organizations at a large, research university in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The university's Student Activities Office staff work with approximately 500 registered student organizations on campus. The target sample of participants for this study had several characteristics. First, the researcher sought a sample size of 120 participants. Half (60) of those selected to participate were to be organization leaders (OLs) (a student who held a recognized officer position within the organization e.g. president, secretary) and the other half were to be organization members (OMs) (a student who belonged to a student organization but did not hold

an officer position within the group). In addition, the researcher wanted equal representation among the following types: (a) governing bodies, (b) service organizations, and (c) special interest organizations. The target sample would consist of 20 OLs in governing bodies, 20 OMs in governing bodies, 20 OLs in service organizations, 20 OMs in service organizations, 20 OLs in special interest organizations, and 20 OMs in special interest organizations. Furthermore, the researcher attempted to obtain an equal number of male and female participants from each organization. Finally, the researcher sought participants between the ages of 18 and 23 years.

The researcher obtained a list of all campus organizations and used an existing structure to identify organizations by type. First, the term “governing body” was defined as an organization whose purpose is to provide representation for the student population in matters related to policy and procedure formation. Examples of this type of organization include: Student Government Association, Residence Hall Federation, and Council of International Student Organizations.

Second, the term “service organization” was defined as an organization whose purpose is to provide activities and support for community service projects. Examples of this type of organization include: American Red Cross Club, Circle K, and Habitat for Humanity.

Third, the term “special interest organization” was defined as an organization whose purpose is to unite students who have a common cause or interest in order to form a support group or to plan activities around the common interest. Examples of this type of organization include: Black Student Alliance, Amnesty International, and Skydiving Club.

Finally, some organizations did not conform to any of these three definitions. Examples of these types of organizations include: Greek letter sororities and fraternities, academic clubs, honor societies, ROTC, athletic groups, media groups, religiously affiliated organizations, and performing arts groups. These organizations were not assigned to any group and leaders and members of those organizations were not considered for inclusion in the study.

After organizations were categorized by type, the researcher identified presidents from each organization in order to recruit volunteers. Since each registered organization is required to have a president’s name on record, the researcher was able to obtain contact information on all organizations selected for the study.

A general e-mail announcement and written publicity was sent to all presidents of selected organizations to ask for volunteers. Each organization was asked to recruit volunteers

who were either OLs (someone who held a officer position within the organization) or OMs (someone who was a member, but had no official position within the organization) and who might be interested in participating in the study. Participants were asked to be between 18 and 23 years of age. The message informed potential respondents that they had an opportunity to participate in the study as well as to find out how they measured in terms of EQ. They were told that participating would entail attending one assessment session and that they would have an option to meet with the researcher at a later date to discuss their results. The assessment would take anywhere from 40 to 60 minutes. They were also informed that an incentive would be provided for their participation: the organization's name would be entered for a cash drawing of \$100 if at least two OLs and two OMs from their organization participated. A copy of the e-mail message and written publicity appear in Appendix A.

The e-mail message asked those who were interested to contact the researcher by e-mail or phone. Once an inquiry was received, the researcher then called interested participants to evaluate whether they met the criteria to participate in the study. During this phone call, the researcher obtained the participants' organization name and their role within the organization (leader or member). The age of the participant was obtained along with their gender. Next, they were given details about the purpose of the study, their obligations, and how the incentive would be distributed. Finally, if the student met the selection criteria and was still interested in participating, their verbal commitment to take part was solicited before setting up an assessment meeting time. This process was repeated until the desired number of participants from each type of group was selected (i.e. 20 OLs from governance organizations, 20 OMs from service organizations). If volunteers from a particular group exceeded the number needed for the study, prospective participants were asked if they would be willing to serve as an alternate if someone failed to attend a selected assessment session. A list was created of possible alternates to be contacted at a later date if additional participants were needed. A copy of the prescreening protocol appears in Appendix B.

To accommodate varying participant schedules, assessment sessions were scheduled in advance for three-hour time blocks on a variety of days during a two-week period of time. The researcher attempted to group participants together in the pre-arranged time slots. After a verbal commitment was provided on the phone, the researcher listed for the student the pre-arranged dates and times and asked if they would be able to attend one of those sessions. If the

student could attend one of the sessions, the researcher registered that person for the pre-scheduled date and time.

If the prospective participant had a conflict, the researcher obtained three alternative days and times when he or she would be available and asked the volunteer if the researcher could call the student back after she had obtained the same information from others who had scheduling difficulties. When the recruitment process neared the target number, those individuals who were not already scheduled were grouped according to similarities in schedules or the researcher met with individuals privately. The researcher then contacted these individuals to inform them of their assessment time.

Instrumentation

The instrument used to collect data on the EQ of participants was the EQ-i (Bar-On, 1997). The EQ-i has five composite scales: Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, Adaptability, Stress Management, and General Mood. Each scale is comprised of two to five subscales; each subscale consists of six to nine items where response options range from “no answer,” “very seldom or not true of me,” “seldom true of me,” “sometimes true of me,” “often true of me,” and “very often true of me or true of me”. Thus, the instrument consists of 133 items that yield a total EQ score as well as individual scale and subscale scores (see Appendix C).

The Intrapersonal scale is measured through five subscales: Emotional Self-Awareness, Assertiveness, Self-Regard, Self-Actualization, and Independence. This scale consists of 40 items that ask participants to assess their ability to identify and understand their personal feelings. For example, participants are asked if they feel comfortable in expressing their feelings and if they understand how they are feeling.

Three subscales comprise the Interpersonal scale: Empathy, Social Responsibility, and Interpersonal Relationships. Within this scale, participants are to identify their feelings towards others in 28 items. Participants are asked if they are able to identify and understand the emotions of others.

The Adaptability scale is also measured by 26 items along three subscales: Reality Testing, Flexibility, and Problem Solving. Participants are measured on their ability to handle problems and changes in their life. Respondents are asked if they approach difficulties by taking one step at a time and if they stop and think about a problem before reacting.

The fourth scale, Stress Management, is measured along two subscales: Stress Tolerance and Impulse Control. The items on this scale ask participants to identify their ability to control their emotional responses through 18 items. Participants are asked questions about whether they can handle stress without getting too nervous and their ability to handle most upsetting problems.

Finally, the General Mood scale is measured via two subscales: Optimism and Happiness. This 17-item scale asks participants to identify their general outlook on life. For example, participants are asked whether they are satisfied with their life and if they normally hope for the best.

Finally, there are four items that measure response bias. These items are used to determine if the respondent is answering candidly and if the results are accurate reflections of the participant's EQ.

The EQ-i assessment rates the respondents on the strength of their responses to itemized statements. Participants' levels of EQ are evaluated by how high they rate on each component of the instrument. Raw scores are converted into standard scores with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix C.

Reliability and Validity of the EQ-i

Reliability relates to the extent to which an instrument accurately measures a phenomenon with different groups of participants at various times (Creswell, 1994). The EQ-i was found to have a high degree of reliability (Bar-On, 1997). Based on seven population samples, the internal consistency coefficients for the EQ-i subscales were analyzed. The average Cronbach's alpha coefficients were high for all of the subscales, ranging from .69 (Social Responsibility) to .86 (Self-Regard), with an overall average internal consistency coefficient of .76. The results indicated strong reliability and each item correlated highly to the factor being measured.

Furthermore, test-retest reliability studies indicated that there was consistency in the findings from one administration to the next. One month and four month test-retest values range from .78 to .92 and .55 to .82. These findings support the argument that the EQ-i is a reliable instrument but suggest that it is sensitive to changes in emotional and social functioning (Bar-On, 1997).

Validity relates to the extent to which an instrument measures what it is designed to measure (Creswell, 1994). Bar-On evaluated the validity of the EQ-i through nine types of validity studies in six countries. Studies were conducted on: content and face validity; factorial validity; construct validity;

convergent validity; divergent validity; criterion group validity; discriminant validity; and predictive validity.

Content and face validity is an indication of how well the items are thought to cover the domain of each of the scales and how easily they are understood by the respondent (Creswell, 1994). The EQ-i was validated by the way in which the items were generated and selected. Professional proofreaders and pre-test subjects provided feedback on each of these items. Furthermore, additional information has been gathered over the years from respondents who have taken the test.

Factorial validity was used to assess the extent to which the subscale structure was empirically and theoretically justified (Bar-On, 1997). This analysis was used to see if the components of noncognitive intelligence structurally exist. A number of factor analyses were performed and the results suggested a close match between the expected theoretical subscale structure and the empirical subscale structure. This provides support for the inventory's hierarchical structure.

Construct validity was used to measure how well the instrument actually assesses what it was designed to assess (Creswell, 1994). Validity was established by correlating the inventory's subscale scores with various scale scores of other established instruments. Ten instruments were administered along with the EQ-i in six countries over a 12-year period (Bar-On, 1997). For example, the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (Bar-On, 1997) had a .30 correlation with the Emotional Self-Awareness subscale, .60 with the Assertiveness subscale, .40 with the Social Responsibility subscale, and .44 with the Independence subscale. A positive correlation between each of the 15 subscales and other established instruments offered support for the inventory's construct validity.

Convergent validity assesses whether the instrument correlates with external measures believed to tap the same or similar constructs (Bar-On, 1997). The EQ-i was validated through the use of self-assessments, observer ratings, and measures of acculturation, attributional style, and coping with occupational stress, job performance, and work satisfaction. In general, the degree of correlation between the EQ-i and the self-assessment and observer ratings was high with an average of .57 and .52, respectively. Furthermore, a distinct connection was found between attributional style and the dimensions of emotional and social intelligence tested by the inventory. Results from the assessment of occupational stress, job performance, and work satisfaction also indicated a strong connection based on a self-reporting scale (Bar-On, 1997).

Divergent validity ensures that the instrument is not evaluating something that it was not intended to measure (Bar-On, 1997). Specifically, the EQ-i was designed to measure noncognitive

intelligence as opposed to cognitive intelligence (IQ). Through a comparison with other intelligence tests, the total EQ scale had a .12 correlation with IQ. Furthermore, there was a low correlation between specific EQ-i subscales and other inventories' subscales that were defined differently. For example, the Flexibility subscale measures adaptability, not instability and had a .15 correlation with Cattell, Eber, and Tatsouka's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire's Emotional Stability component (as cited in Bar-On, 1997).

Criterion group validity assesses whether predicted content areas will measure strongly for particular groups known to be strong in those areas (Bar-On, 1997). Validity was assessed by administering the EQ-i to special experimental groups in a variety of settings. Groups that represented opposite ends of a spectrum illustrated significant differences in scores. The results indicated that the EQ-i mirrors occupational and professional profiles (Bar-On, 1997).

Discriminant validity examines the inventory's ability to differentiate between individuals who are more emotionally and socially intelligent from those who are less so (Bar-On, 1997). The first approach examined whether the subscale scores could differentiate between individuals who were successful in coping with environmental demands from those who were unsuccessful. The average total EQ score for those who were successful was 104.4 compared to 101.7 for those who were unsuccessful in meeting environmental demands (Bar-On, 1997). The second approach examined whether the subscale scores could differentiate between special clinical samples and matched control groups. The results indicated that the EQ-i could differentiate between groups with the clinical group scoring 81.9 on total EQ and the control group scoring 90.7 (Bar-On, 1997).

Predictive validity examines the general level of the instrument's concurrent, convergent, and discriminant validity. As a result of the previously mentioned findings, the EQ-i was found to demonstrate the ability to predict academic success, occupational success, and one's ability to benefit from rehabilitation programs (Bar-On, 1997).

In summary, the EQ-i was found to have sufficient validity in measuring EQ. Because the EQ-i is the first empirically constructed test of noncognitive intelligence to be published, it can be used in research such as the present study with a reasonable certainty of obtaining meaningful results.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher sought permission from the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at the institution where the study was conducted before gathering data. In addition, permission was obtained from the Student Activities Office at the institution to

use contact information filed there. Once approval was obtained, the sample was selected and the data collection began.

Participants were asked to attend one of three pre-arranged data collection sessions organized by the researcher. Each pre-arranged session was three hours in length so that participants could arrive at any point during that time to complete the assessment instrument. Three data collection sessions were held to accommodate the participants' varying schedules. The data collection sessions were held in the student center on the campus where the study was conducted. The sessions were held on different days at different times to facilitate participation. When scheduling proved difficult, the researcher held a limited number of smaller sessions to accommodate the remaining participants.

All 120 participants were asked to identify which data collection session they planned to attend at the time they were pre-screened by the researcher. If they could not attend one of the sessions already arranged, they were asked to provide three alternate dates and times when they would be available to complete the instrument. As a result, the researcher had a list of participants for each of the three scheduled sessions and a list of preferences for those who had scheduling conflicts.

Cover sheets were created for each survey that identified the participant's name, leader/member status, organization type, gender, age, whether they were members of other organizations, if they held other offices within the organization they were representing or in other campus organizations, and identification number. The identification number was listed on the assessment instrument to insure that the researcher could match responses to participants after the responses were analyzed. This was important because the EQ-i had to be sent away to the publishing agency for scoring and the researcher promised to provide participants their individual results if they so desired.

At the beginning of each session, each participant was greeted by the researcher and checked off of the participant roster. After participants' identities were ascertained, they were provided a copy of the assessment instrument with their identification number and a copy of the informed consent form. The informed consent form addressed issues like confidentiality, the process for the donation of the incentive to their organization for their participation, and benefits and risks of participating in the study. Participants were then asked to be seated and to read the cover sheet for instructions before completing the assessment.

The instructions on how to complete the instrument were written in accordance with the recommendations of the publishing agency. Participants were given approximately 45 minutes to complete the EQ-i, the recommended time for this task.

At the completion of the assessment, the researcher verified that the participant signed the consent form and that the identification number on the instrument matched the participants name on the roster. Once all participants had completed the EQ-i, the instruments were sent to the publishing agency for scoring. The publishing agency scored the instruments and provided the researcher with individual scores on each of the scales and subscales in addition to an overall score for each participant. After they were scored, the instruments were returned to the researcher for analysis.

Data Analysis Procedures

The study was designed to measure the EQ levels of OMs and OLs in three types of organizations and to explore the differences in scores between and among different groups of participants. The data were analyzed to examine the statistical hypotheses posed in the study. To investigate these hypotheses, the researcher examined the range of scores, mean scores and standard deviations for different groups of participants. Additionally, a series of ANOVAs was conducted to investigate significant differences between and among groups.

To answer the first two questions, data was analyzed to obtain scores for OMs and OLs. First, responses were divided into two groups. Next, the mean scores for each of the scales were calculated for each group. The researcher then examined the range and mean scores and standard deviations of OLs and OMs to address the first two research questions posed in the study.

The third research question investigated the differences in scores between all leaders and all members. To answer this question, an ANOVA was conducted on the mean total EQ scores and means scores on each of the scales of OMs and OLs to see if there was a significant difference.

To answer the fourth research question, a series of ANOVAs was conducted to investigate whether there was a significant difference in the mean scores between OLs and OMs within organizations. Respondents were divided into six groups: OLs and OMs in governing bodies, OLs and OMs in service organizations, and OLs and OMs in special interest organizations. Then, group means on each of the scales and mean total EQ scores were

calculated for OLs and OMs in each organization group. Next, ANOVAs were conducted to look for significant differences in scores between OMs and OLs within organization types.

The fifth and sixth research questions investigated the how scores differed among OLs and OMs by type of organization. First, all OL responses were divided into three groups: governing organizations, service organizations, and special interest organizations. Next, the mean score for each scale and total score were calculated. The scores were then compared using ANOVA.

The sixth research question investigated how scores differed among OMs by type of organization. All OM responses were divided into three groups: governing organizations, service organizations, and special interest organizations. Next, the mean scores for each scale and total score were calculated. The scores were compared using ANOVA.

The seventh research question investigated how scores differed based on the interaction between membership status and type of organization. To answer this question, an ANOVA was conducted on the mean total EQ scores and mean scores on each of the scales of OMs and OLs within each organizational type to see if there was a significant difference.

In conclusion, the purpose of this study was to examine differences in EQ between OMs and OLs among governing bodies, service organizations, and special interest organizations. The methodology described in this chapter was deemed sufficient to address the research questions posed in the study.

Chapter Four: Results

This chapter reports the findings of the study. First, a few minor changes in data collection procedures are reported. Then, a description of the sample is provided. Finally, the results of the data analysis related to the seven null hypotheses are reported.

Changes in Procedures

The researcher originally planned to conduct three meetings with multiple participants during which the participants would complete the EQ-i. However, due to time constraints on the part of individual participants, the researcher allowed participants to complete the instrument individually. Individual meetings with the researcher were scheduled, during which the participants completed the EQ-i in the researcher's office. Additionally, the researcher attended organization meetings in order to accommodate participants' schedules. At the conclusion of the organization meeting, the researcher administered the EQ-i to respondents.

The sample selection process did not yield as many volunteers as originally planned. The original desired number of participants was 120. After successive attempts to recruit participants, the target sample size was revised during the process to 78 participants. These changes in the data collection procedures did not unduly influence the outcome of the study, however.

Description of the Sample

A total of 79 students participated in the study. During the pre-screening process, information was collected which would allow the researcher to match leaders with members based on information about the student's age, gender, organization status, and organization type. The researcher also checked each completed assessment as it was submitted to ensure that it was completely filled out. Due to the pre-screening process and the manner in which participants completed the instruments, only one participant's data was discarded. All remaining students who met the criteria for participation completed the assessment satisfactorily. The demographic characteristics of the sample are provided in Table 1.

Forty-four percent (44%) of the participants were male and 56% were female. The respondents were divided into two groups, those who held a leadership position within their organization, and those who did not. Forty-nine percent (49%) were leaders and 51% were members. Three types of organizations were examined. Twenty-eight of the participants were

Table 1
Characteristics of the Sample (N=79)

Characteristics/Groups	n	%
Sex		
Male	35	44.3
Female	44	55.7
Subtotal	79	100
Organization Status		
Leader	39	49.4
Member	40	50.6
Subtotal	79	100
Organization Type		
Governing	28	35.4
Service	26	32.9
Special Interest	25	31.6
Subtotal	79	100
Age		
18	10	12.6
19	25	31.6
20	18	22.8
21	18	22.8
22	4	5.1
Other	4	5.1
Subtotal	79	100

involved in a Governing organization, representing 35% of the total respondents. Service organization participants represented 33% of the respondents with 26 participants. Thirty-two percent (32%) or 25 of the respondents were from Special Interest organizations.

Ten 18 year-old students participated in this study, representing 13% of the respondents. Twenty-five 19 year-old students participated, representing 32% of the respondents. Eighteen 20 year-old students, or 23%, participated. Twenty-one year old students accounted for 22% of the total participants. Finally, four 22 year-old students participated in this study, representing 5% and four 23 year-old or older students participated in this study, representing 5% of the total participants.

Data Analysis

This study was designed to explore EQ among leaders and members of student organizations. Descriptive statistics were used to address the two research questions. Additionally, differences in EQ by membership status (leaders versus members) and type of campus organization (governing bodies, service organizations, and special interest organizations) were investigated. To explore these hypotheses, a series of seven ANOVAs ($p < .05$) was conducted to examine the main effects (leadership status and organization type) and the interaction effect (Total EQ and scale scores) on emotional intelligence levels. Results are described below.

EQ Among All Leaders

The first research question posed in the study addressed EQ scores among all leaders. The mean score on Total EQ for all leaders was 104.92. According to Bar-On (1999), “High Total EQ scores indicate individuals who are in touch with their feelings, feel good about themselves, and are fairly successful in realizing their potential” (p. 48). By using the EQ-i Technical Manual to interpret the results, this mean falls within the “average” category where adequate emotional capacity is exhibited (Bar-On, 1999).

Similarly, each scale mean score falls between 90 and 109, the standard scores indicative of the “average” category. An average score on the Intrapersonal scale indicates that leaders adequately express their feelings, convey ideas and beliefs, and have a positive self-image (Bar-On, 1999). The Interpersonal scale scores ranged from a low of 80 to a high of 132. A score of 80 would be considered “low” as interpreted by the EQ-i Technical Manual and 132 would be considered “markedly high” (Bar-On, 1999). The Interpersonal scale measures an individual’s

social skills and dependability. The range of scores on the Stress Management scale ranged from 80 to 126. Again, 80 is considered “low” and 126 is considered “very high” or illustrative of an extremely well developed emotional capacity. Stress Management measures the ability to withstand anxiety provoking situations and the ability to manage one’s impulses. The Adaptability scale scores ranged from 67 to 133, covering the whole range of standard scores from “markedly low” to “markedly high” (Bar-On, 1999). This scale measures how successfully one is able to cope with environmental demands. Finally, General Mood measures one’s ability to enjoy life and feelings of contentment. Scores among leaders ranged from a low of 61 to 125. Details are provided in Table 2.

EQ Among All Members

The second research question examined EQ among all members. The mean score on total EQ for all members was 102.92. The mean scale scores ranged from 97.57 to 102.10. All of these scores fall into the “average” category as defined by the EQ-i Technical Manual. The scale scores ranged from “very low” (74) on General Mood to a “very high” (129) on Interpersonal. Details are provided in Table 3.

EQ Between All Leaders and All Members

Differences in EQ between leaders and members were the focus of the next research question. When the mean score of leaders was compared to the mean score of members on Total EQ, no significant differences emerged at the .05 level. However, if a .10 level were used, there would be a significant difference between the two Total EQ mean scores. Similarly, a significant difference was found between leaders and members on the Intrapersonal and Adaptability scales at the .05 level. In both cases, leaders reported higher scores than members. Had the level of significance been established at the .10 level, there would also be a significant difference on the Stress Management scale where leaders scored higher than members. Details are provided in Table 4.

EQ Scores by Type of Organization

The fourth research question looked at EQ scores by type of organization. When the mean scores on Total EQ were compared by type of organization, no significant differences emerged at the .05 level. However, if a .10 level were used, there would be a significant difference on Total EQ with scores from Governing groups reported at the highest level and

Table 2

EQ Among All Leaders (N=39)

Score/Scale	Range	Mean
Total EQ	63-128	104.92
Intrapersonal	64-128	104.66
Interpersonal	80-132	105.64
Stress Management	80-126	105.94
Adaptability	67-133	103.76
General Mood	61-125	104.69

Table 3

EQ Among All Members (N=40)

Score/Scale	Range	Mean
Total EQ	69-123	102.92
Intrapersonal	77-124	99.60
Interpersonal	76-129	102.10
Stress Management	77-123	100.07
Adaptability	75-127	101.17
General Mood	74-118	97.57

Table 4

Results of ANOVA on EQ Between All Leaders (N=39) and All Members (N=40), (N=79)

Score/Scale	n	%	M	sd	df	F	p
Total EQ					1	3.668	.059
Leader	39	49.4	104.92	12.623			
Member	40	50.6	99.60	12.078			
Interpersonal					1	.772	.382
Leader	39	49.4	105.64	11.303			
Member	40	50.6	100.08	10.821			
Intrapersonal					1	5.000	.028*
Leader	39	49.4	104.67	13.107			
Member	40	50.6	102.10	12.859			
Stress Management					1	2.901	.093
Leader	39	49.4	105.95	11.404			
Member	40	50.6	101.18	13.401			
Adaptability					1	5.135	.026*
Leader	39	49.6	103.77	13.766			
Member	40	50.6	97.58	10.328			
General Mood					1	.349	.557
Leader	39	49.6	104.69	13.289			
Member	40	50.6	102.93	13.313			

*=significant at the .05 level

Service groups at the lowest level. Similarly, a significant difference was found between types of organizations on the Intrapersonal scale at the .05 level. Again, scores among those in Governing groups were highest and the Service groups were lowest. See Table 5 for more details.

EQ Scores Among Leaders by Type of Organization

The next research question looked at the EQ scores among leaders by type of organization. When the mean score of leaders on Total EQ and scales were compared by type of organizations, no significant differences were found. Table 6 provides more details.

EQ Between All Members by Type of Organization

EQ among members by type of organization was considered next. A significant difference was found between mean scores of members of Governing, Service, and Special Interest organizations on the Intrapersonal scale of the EQ-i. The mean score of members in Governing organizations was highest (110.00), while the mean score of members in Service organizations was lowest (95.25) and members in Special Interest organizations fall in between (99.30). Refer to Table 7 for a full reporting.

EQ Between Leaders and Members by Type of Organization

The final research question explored EQ between leaders and members by type of organization. Total EQ scores and scale scores were compared between leaders and members within three types of organizations, as shown in Table 8. The first type of organization, Governing, indicated a significant difference between leaders who reported a higher score (109) and members (100) on the Adaptability scale. Again, however, if the .10 level of significance had been used, the Interpersonal scale would have been meaningful with leaders, again, reporting higher scores (107) than members (93).

When the mean score of the leader was compared with the mean score of the member within the Service organizations, no significant differences emerged. This suggests no significant difference in Total EQ or scale scores among those involved in Service organizations.

As with the Service organizations, there were no significant differences between the mean scores of leaders and members in Special Interest organizations. Again, this finding suggests that no significant difference in Total EQ or scale scores among Special Interest organizations.

These findings suggest some interesting patterns. The meaning of these results, and their implications for future research and practice, are discussed in the final chapter of this study.

Table 5

Results of ANOVA on EQ By Type of Organization (N=79)

Scale	Organization	n	%	M	sd	df	F	p
Total EQ		79	100	102.23	12.559	2	2.922	.060
	Governing	28	35	106.43	9.882			
	Service	26	33	98.46	13.969			
	Special Interest	25	32	101.44	12.764			
Interpersonal		79	100	102.82	11.341	2	1.425	.247
	Governing	28	35	103.00	12.317			
	Service	26	33	100.11	11.396			
	Special Interest	25	32	101.92	9.849			
Intrapersonal		79	100	103.37	12.964	2	4.943	.010*
	Governing	28	35	109.00	10.041			
	Service	26	33	98.69	13.882			
	Special Interest	25	32	101.92	13.006			
Stress Management		79	100	103.53	12.606	2	1.034	.361
	Governing	28	35	106.25	11.790			
	Service	26	33	101.65	13.729			
	Special Interest	25	32	102.44	12.251			
Adaptability		79	100	100.63	12.464	2	2.191	.119
	Governing	28	35	104.53	11.445			
	Service	26	33	98.50	13.258			
	Special Interest	25	32	98.48	12.121			
General Mood		79	100	103.80	13.246	2	2.354	.102
	Governing	28	35	106.54	10.437			
	Service	26	33	99.31	16.906			
	Special Interest	25	32	105.40	10.801			

*=*significant at the .05 level*

Table 6

Results of ANOVA on EQ Scores Among Leaders (N=39) by Type of Organization

Scale	Type	n	%	M	sd	df	F	p
Total EQ		39	100	104.92	12.62	2	1.275	.292
	Governing	13	33	108.92	10.39			
	Service	14	36	101.21	15.62			
	Special Interest	12	31	104.92	10.40			
Interpersonal		39	100	105.64	11.30	2	.799	.458
	Governing	13	33	107.23	12.30			
	Service	14	36	102.57	12.47			
	Special Interest	12	31	107.50	8.60			
Intrapersonal		39	100	104.67	13.11	2	.745	.482
	Governing	13	33	107.85	12.05			
	Service	14	36	101.64	14.98			
	Special Interest	12	31	104.75	12.09			
Stress Management		39	100	105.95	11.40	2	1.031	.367
	Governing	13	33	109.23	10.03			
	Service	14	36	102.93	14.77			
	Special Interest	12	31	105.92	7.57			
Adaptability		39	100	103.77	13.77	2	1.496	.238
	Governing	13	33	109.08	11.95			
	Service	14	36	100.78	16.84			
	Special Interest	12	31	101.50	10.65			
General Mood		39	100	104.69	13.29	2	1.217	.308
	Governing	13	33	106.38	9.76			
	Service	14	36	100.36	17.76			
	Special Interest	12	31	107.92	9.74			

Table 7

Results of ANOVA on EQ Scores Among Members (N=40) by Type of Organization

Scale	Type	n	%	M	sd	df	F	p
Total EQ		40	100	99.60	12.08	2	2.092	.138
	Governing	15	37	104.27	9.22			
	Service	12	30	95.25	11.59			
	Special Interest	13	33	98.23	14.27			
Interpersonal		40	100	100.07	10.82	2	1.117	.338
	Governing	15	37	99.33	11.49			
	Service	12	30	97.25	9.73			
	Special Interest	13	33	103.54	10.87			
Intrapersonal		40	100	102.10	12.86	2	6.107	.005*
	Governing	15	37	110.00	8.23			
	Service	12	30	95.25	12.19			
	Special Interest	13	33	99.30	13.74			
Stress Management		40	100	100.17	13.40	2	.417	.662
	Governing	15	37	103.67	12.90			
	Service	12	30	100.17	12.88			
	Special Interest	13	33	99.23	14.98			
Adaptability		40	100	97.57	10.33	2	1.032	.366
	Governing	15	37	100.60	9.72			
	Service	12	30	95.83	7.07			
	Special Interest	13	33	95.69	13.12			
General Mood		40	100	102.93	13.31	2	1.416	.255
	Governing	15	37	106.67	11.33			
	Service	12	30	98.08	16.55			
	Special Interest	13	33	103.08	11.59			

* = significant at the .05 level

Table 8

Results of ANOVA of EQ Scores Between Leaders (N=39) and Members (N=40) by Type of Organization

Organization	Subscale	n	%	M	sd	df	F	p
Governing								
	Total EQ	28	100	106.43	9.88	1	1.579	.220
	Leader	13	46	108.92	10.39			
	Member	15	54	104.27	9.22			
	Interpersonal	28	100	103.00	12.32	1	3.084	.091
	Leader	13	46	107.23	12.30			
	Member	15	54	93.33	11.49			
	Intrapersonal	28	100	109.00	10.04	1	.312	.581
	Leader	13	46	107.85	12.05			
	Member	15	54	110.00	8.23			
	Stress Management	28	100	106.25	11.79	1	1.585	.219
	Leader	13	46	109.23	10.03			
	Member	15	54	103.67	12.90			
	Adaptability	28	100	104.54	11.44	1	4.285	.049*
	Leader	13	46	109.08	11.95			
	Member	15	54	100.60	9.72			
	General Mood	28	100	106.54	10.44	1	.005	.945
	Leader	13	46	106.38	9.76			
	Member	15	54	106.67	11.33			
Service								
	Total EQ	26	100	98.46	13.97	1	1.187	.287
	Leader	14	54	101.21	15.62			

Member	12	46	92.25	11.59			
Interpersonal	26	100	100.12	11.39	1	1.433	.243
Leader	14	54	102.57	12.47			
Member	12	46	97.25	9.73			
Intrapersonal	26	100	98.69	13.88	1	1.392	.250
Leader	14	54	101.64	14.98			
Member	12	46	95.25	12.19			
Stress Management	26	100	101.65	13.73	1	.254	.619
Leader	14	54	102.93	14.77			
Member	12	46	100.17	12.88			
Adaptability	26	100	98.50	13.26	1	.898	.353
Leader	14	54	100.78	16.84			
Member	12	46	95.83	7.07			
General Mood	26	100	99.30	16.91	1	.113	.740
Leader	14	54	100.36	17.76			
Member	12	46	98.08	16.55			
Special Interest							
Total EQ	25	100	101.44	12.76	1	1.767	.197
Leader	12	48	104.92	10.40			
Member	13	52	98.23	14.27			
Interpersonal	25	100	105.44	9.85	1	1.010	.325
Leader	12	48	107.50	8.60			
Member	13	52	103.54	10.87			
Intrapersonal	25	100	101.92	13.01	1	1.097	.306
Leader	12	48	104.75	12.09			
Member	13	52	99.31	13.74			
Stress Management	25	100	102.44	12.25	1	1.931	.178

Leader	12	48	105.92	7.57			
Member	13	52	99.23	14.98			
Adaptability	25	100	98.48	12.12	1	1.460	.239
Leader	12	48	101.50	10.65			
Member	13	52	95.69	13.12			
General Mood	25	100	105.40	10.80	1	1.267	.272
Leader	12	48	107.92	9.74			
Member	13	52	103.08	11.59			

*=significant at the .05 level

Chapter Five: Discussion and Implications

This chapter discusses the results of the study and their implications for future research and practice. First, the findings are discussed in light of the hypotheses posed in the study. Then, the results are discussed in relationship to prior research on emotional intelligence. Next, the researcher presents implications for future research, practice, and theory. Finally, conclusions about student leaders and members and their emotional intelligence are presented.

Discussion

The first research hypothesis considered in this study explored the emotional intelligence scores of organization leaders. Participants who held an executive position within the organization were defined as leaders. The results suggest that leaders have an average EQ and have adequate ability to express their feelings, convey ideas and beliefs, and have a positive self-image. Since scores were average, those who work with student leaders may or may not believe that average scores are sufficient. If not, efforts to improve EQ among leaders might be implemented (see Implications section of this chapter).

In this study, students who did not hold an executive office within the organization were placed in the member category. The second hypothesis in the present study concerned the emotional intelligence scores of organization members. Again, the results indicate an average EQ among members and an adequate ability to express feelings, convey ideas and beliefs. Members also report a positive self-image. Again, the concern for those who work with members of student organizations is the degree to which efforts to improve EQ should be developed. Suggestions on how to promote the development of EQ among members are offered in the Implications section of this chapter.

These results indicate that as a group, leaders and members have an average level of EQ. When scores are compared by membership status, however, significant differences emerged. Differences in emotional intelligence scores by membership status were considered in the third hypothesis. Results suggest that there is a significant difference on some components of EQ between leaders and members. This distinction accounts for the difference in Total EQ. In both the Interpersonal and Adaptability scales, leaders' mean scores were higher. This finding suggests that leaders are more skilled at expressing themselves and their beliefs or opinions than members. They are also more adept at coping with environmental demands.

There may be several possible explanations for these findings. First, since leaders have the responsibility to lead group activities and discussions, it is possible that they gain more experience in expressing personal viewpoints and in public speaking. This additional experience would provide practice in clarifying thoughts and feelings and could build self-esteem. Second, leaders manage group activities and may gain more experience in handling last minute demands or emergencies. This would explain their greater ability to adapt to changing circumstances. In either case, the findings identify the elements of EQ on which leaders outscore members. This enables those who work with group leaders and members to target programmatic efforts to enhance specific elements of EQ.

The fourth hypothesis considered differences in emotional intelligence scores by type of organization. Differences in Total EQ among those in the three types of organizations were of significance as were differences among scores on the Intrapersonal scale. The mean scores indicated those in Governing organizations score higher than those involved in the other two types of organizations (Service and Special Interest). Moreover, those in Service organizations score the lowest. Even though there were not significant differences found in the other scales, the mean scores indicate that people associated with Governing organizations perform better and those in Service organizations consistently scored the lowest. These findings indicate that students engaged in Governing organizations are stronger in EQ components than those who participate in Service or Special Interest organizations.

Potential explanations for these findings vary. First, it is possible that Governing organizations attract members and leaders who are more adept in EQ-related skills. Those associated with Governing groups typically are elected to positions so they have to run campaigns. Campaigns require them to give speeches and promote themselves to others. These are activities that might assist them in developing skills associated with higher EQ levels. This could account for the higher scores reported by members of Governing organizations in this study.

A second possibility is that Governing organizations foster the development of EQ-like skills among participants through the activities they undertake. For example, Governing organizations are associated with holding meetings with the population that has elected them into office. The purpose of these meetings is to find out about issues or concerns that are facing their constituents. Members of Governing organizations must relay the information they gather from

their constituency back to the larger organization. In the process, this activity might assist them in developing skills associated with higher EQ levels. This could account for the higher scores reported by Governing organizations.

Differences in emotional intelligence scores among leaders by type of organization were considered in the fifth hypothesis. No significant differences were found in the mean scores of leaders in the three types of organizations studied. Scores indicated that the leaders of these organizations were average, indicating adequate emotional capacity. It may be that leaders in campus organizations possess similar skills that prepare them for their leadership positions. That is, perhaps the leaders share similar experiences overall and those experiences result in similar levels of EQ.

The sixth hypothesis examined emotional intelligence scores among members by type of organization. Only one significant difference, Intrapersonal, emerged in the mean scores of members on the scales. The mean scores indicated that those in Governing organizations score higher than those involved in the other two types of organizations (Special Interest and Service). Moreover, those in Service organizations scored the lowest. These findings indicate that students engaged in Governing organizations are stronger in Intrapersonal skills than those who participate in Special Interest or Service types of organizations. The Intrapersonal scale measures one's ability to express feelings and opinions.

One possible explanation for the difference in Intrapersonal skills among members in the three types of organizations could be that some organizations attract members that are better at expressing their feelings and opinions than others. For instance, those in Governing groups need to feel comfortable in offering opinions when the group is debating issues. Governing groups may attract students who are skilled at expressing opinions. On the other hand, those who work in Service groups are often socialized not to offer opinions. It is more important to offer support and less important to express opinions when working with adults who cannot read or homeless people. The nature of the group might influence the type of student drawn to that group and, if so, that might account for differences in EQ scores.

A second possible explanation is that some organizations require more input and decision-making from members than others. If a certain type of organization requires active participation from its membership then students who are seeking the opportunity to express their views and opinions may choose that particular type of organization. Furthermore, these

organizations may further develop the member's sense of worth by not only supporting the free expression of ideas and beliefs, but also by actively acknowledging the member's opinions. For instance, those in Governing groups often need to discuss issues concerning the welfare of the student body or university community. Since these issues have a direct impact on the quality of life of the individual student, those students who see how their viewpoints can have a direct impact on their environment may be attracted to trying to persuade others to support their cause. On the other hand, those in Service organizations may place value in providing assistance to the larger community, but do not place value on achieving a personal objective from the project. The nature of the outcomes associated with the organization's projects might influence the type of student drawn to the group, which in turn might account for differences in EQ scores.

The seventh hypothesis explored the differences between membership status and organization type on EQ scores. Only one significant difference emerged and that related to leaders and members in Governing organizations. Leaders' mean scores on the Adaptability and Interpersonal scales were higher than the mean scores of members. These results indicate a stronger ability among Governing leaders to adapt to environmental demands and suggest that such leaders possess greater social skills and a stronger sense of responsibility than members.

There may be several possible explanations for these findings. First, since leaders are held more accountable for the tasks that the organization undertakes, students who are attracted to leadership positions in Governing organizations may have a greater sense of responsibility to the organization. Second, executive positions within Governing organizations are held by members who provide leadership to other campus organizations. This unique characteristic might create a situation where leaders have to be better adept socially in order to be trusted by other leaders for the tasks that they undertake. Not only do the leaders have to guide the membership in organization tasks, but also they are leading members who have leadership experience within the organizations that they represent to the Governing agency. It is reasonable to expect that members in Governing organizations demand more skills from executive board members than other types of organizations and that leaders in these organizations have risen to this challenge.

Relationship of Findings to Prior Research

This research yielded similar results to several prior studies about leadership and emotional intelligence. However, the findings of this study also differed slightly from other previous results.

Since the assessment of EQ within non-educational institutions makes up the majority of the previous literature on EQ in general, no comparisons can be drawn between the current study and past studies conducted in non-educational environments. In addition, the research that has been conducted in primary and higher education settings has not studied EQ levels in relation to leadership and membership status. In spite of these limitations, however, the results from this study are similar to studies on the relationship between social competencies and EQ. Social competencies such as self-confidence and interpersonal relationships have emerged in emotionally intelligent leaders (Cherniss, 1998). Furthermore, social competencies have been found to improve performance (Finley et al, 2000; Gore, 2000). It would seem that the results of this study are additional evidence of how greater social competencies separate leaders from members.

Several social competencies consistently emerge in emotionally intelligent leaders. Specifically, these leaders possess higher levels of self-confidence, managing emotions, motivation, persistence, and persuasiveness (Cherniss, 1998). In the present study, leaders reported higher scores than members on the Intrapersonal scale and on Total EQ. In some sense then, the current study supports the findings of Cherniss (1998).

Social competencies also include EQ-like skills such as relating to others and empathy (Davis, 1983; Mellard & Hazel, 1992). In the present study, the mean score of leaders on the Interpersonal scale was higher than the mean score of members. Furthermore, there were significant differences between the mean scores of leaders and members by type of organization with leaders scoring higher than members in each case. The current study, therefore, supports the findings of Davis (1983) and Mellard and Hazel (1992).

Implications of the Study

In addition to its relation to past research, this study has implications for future practice, research and theory. The results are interesting for several constituencies of student affairs practitioners and those students who receive their services.

Student activities staff may use the results of this study to design training activities to enhance particular components of EQ. If these professionals know the EQ levels of their leaders, and members, they can design educational opportunities around specific EQ components. Knowing the EQ levels of students in different types of organizations would help practitioners identify areas for further leadership development. For example, in this study those in Governing

organizations outscored those in Service and Special Interest organizations on Total EQ and on the Intrapersonal scale. A training program that addresses Intrapersonal topics could be geared towards Service and Special Interest groups. One session could look at the topic of emotional self-awareness. Participants would learn how to understand why they feel the way they do in specific situations. Students could be presented with several scenarios and asked how they would initially respond. Then, a group discussion would allow participants to question why individuals responded the way that they did and present alternatives. At the end of the session, respondents would be asked to reflect on their initial responses and identify ways in which they might now respond differently.

Furthermore, this study revealed that both leaders and members in all of the organizations studied were average in their EQ scores. If a leadership program aspires to graduate students with exceptional EQ-like skills, then this study is of value because it illustrates the need for EQ training among all organizations. One program that could be offered to students is a six-week EQ training course. Each week would address a different EQ subcomponent. For example, the first week might be an initial assessment followed by sessions on self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship management, and then a final assessment. The six-week course would provide basic knowledge on what each subcomponent is and how individuals can enhance their knowledge and skills in each area.

Another service that could be provided to organizations is the option to have staff conduct a mini-session on EQ for a specific organization. The presentation could consist of a brief overview of what EQ is and how the different subcomponents can affect group effectiveness. Participants could take a few moments to do a condensed self-assessment and after being presented with the EQ information could talk about specific ideas to further the EQ development of members within the organization.

A third service that could be offered to students is the availability for incoming officers or those who want to assume a leadership role in an organization to take an assessment and then participate in a one-day leadership workshop that includes EQ-skill training. This training could be incorporated into any type of transition training or leader development program. Similar to the session that is offered to specific organizations, officers or those students who want to enhance their leadership skills could participate in a session that describes EQ and how leaders can foster the development of EQ within themselves to be more effective in their leadership roles. For

example, in this study leaders scored higher in Total EQ and the Intrapersonal scale than members. Emphasis on the areas that make up the Intrapersonal scale could be discussed in greater detail with activities that challenge the students to enhance their skills in emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, self-actualization, and independence.

Results of this study may also be used by student activities staff to market extracurricular and leadership opportunities. If students are aware of their strengths and weaknesses in relation to EQ subcomponents, then they may be persuaded to participate in leadership development programs that help them strengthen areas of weakness. For example, consider students who are members of organizations but aspire to be leaders of those organizations. Staff might offer a program that deals with stress management. Such a program would teach students how to cope with stress actively and positively. In turn, the ability to handle stressful situations more effectively might increase their ability to lead group activities.

Furthermore, if students are interested in taking on a leadership position, they may be interested in developing those EQ skills that separate leaders from members. In this study, Intrapersonal skills were shown to be stronger in leaders than in members. Therefore, if members wanted to take on a leadership position within their organization, they may be interested in learning how to be more assertive, how to interpret their emotions, and how to realize their full potential. Such activities would enhance their Intrapersonal skills and better prepare them for leadership roles. Thus, marketing leadership programs and organization involvement in a way that appeals to students may increase student participation in such activities.

Students may also use the results of this study to further their understanding of how to enhance their EQ in relation to leadership and organizational activities. Activities that promote active involvement and a sense of commitment will develop a sense of dependability and collaboration among the membership. For example, those organizations that provide opportunities for continuous feedback and opinion sharing foster Interpersonal skills like social responsibility and empathy. Furthermore, such activities develop Intrapersonal skills like independence, self-esteem, and assertiveness.

Increased involvement in organizational activities also provides experiences that enhance other EQ subcomponents like Adaptability and Stress Management. For example, projects that give members the opportunity to attempt to solve problems rather than avoid them would

enhance their problem solving, reality testing, and flexibility skills. The development of Stress Management and Adaptability skills are key determinants in one's ability to succeed in life beyond college and should be of particular concern to students.

In addition to these implications for future practice, the results of the present study suggest that further studies of EQ are warranted. These future studies may take several forms. First, the lack of significant difference in EQ among people in different types of organizations may provide an interesting starting place for research. While psychosocial outcomes like interpersonal communication, decision-making, and clarification of vocational goals have been associated with extracurricular activities (Lampkin, 1991; Kuh, 1995), this study reveals that there are no significant differences between those in Governing, Service, or Special Interest organizations. Future scholars may wish to explore different types of extracurricular activities and EQ more fully.

Second, further research might be conducted about how different levels of involvement affect EQ. It would be interesting to know if student members who lack skills in certain scales like Adaptability or Intrapersonal, avoid leadership positions because they are not as talented in these areas as other students. Student affairs practitioners could use the results of such a study to ensure that all students are given an equal chance to learn skills that can be translated into leadership opportunities.

Furthermore, a future study might be conducted that examines differences in EQ levels between students who are involved in campus life and those who are not. The present study investigated EQ only among students involved in campus organizations. The proposed study would provide additional information on how extracurricular activities are related to students' EQ levels.

Fourth, additional research might be conducted that looks at the role of an organization advisor to EQ scores among participants and organizations. The present study only looked at leaders and members in campus organizations. The proposed study would look at how those organizations with full-time advisory support differ from those organizations with no direct advisory support and the impact on an organization's level of EQ among its leaders and members.

Finally, this study has implication for theory. Specifically, the results of this study can be related to EQ theory. EQ theory prior to this point has looked primarily at research conducted

within non-educational institutions or in primary education setting. Since this study examined students in higher education, it builds upon the knowledge base and can add insights into how EQ is developed among college age students and within campus organizations.

This study also has implications for involvement theory. Previous studies have examined the relationship of out-of-class activities with college success. This study adds to the existing information on the relationship between involvement and learning by looking specifically at how involved students differ in EQ. This information can be used to further support how involvement in extracurricular activities develops skills essential for success in life.

Finally, leadership theory can benefit from the results of this study. This study offered data on EQ among leaders and members in campus organizations. The findings of this study illustrate how leaders differ from members in certain types of EQ-like skills. This information supplements literature that defines leadership and how students can enhance their leadership skills.

Limitations

This study, like all research had some limitations. One of these limitations is related to the environment in which the instruments were administered. Initial assessment sessions in which participants from any of the three types of organizations could attend were conducted. After these initial sessions, further efforts had to be made in order to recruit participants from Governing and Service organizations. Individual contact with specific organizations within the two types resulted in assessment sessions after organization meetings or prior to an organization event. It is possible that the different circumstances under which the instrument was administered influenced how participants responded in some unforeseen way. If this occurred, the results might have been skewed.

A second limitation is the time frame in which the study was conducted. The researcher planned to collect all data within a two-month period of time. Due to a low participant rate, this time period had to be extended so data were actually collected over a five-month time period. Differences in terms of when participants completed the EQ-i may have impacted responses and that, in turn, may have influenced the results of the study.

A third limitation is related to the technique used to classify participants as a leader or member. Participants completed the instrument as a representative of a particular type of organization. Some participants, however, may have been a member or leader in another

organization outside of this study. Therefore, it is possible that responses reflected experiences beyond those designed to be examined in the study and this might have skewed the results in some way.

Furthermore, the data was not analyzed by age or gender. Participants reported this information to provide demographic data for the study; however, EQ scores may be determined by the participants' gender or age. Therefore, it is possible that if the data were analyzed by age or gender a pattern may have emerged that reflected a correlation with these variables.

Another limitation is that other factors could have influenced the EQ scores of participants. For example, some organizations have an advisor that works closely with the organization. This type of professional support may contribute to the development of EQ-like skills. Therefore, the scores may be indicative of influences beyond those designed to be examined in the study and this might have skewed the results in some way.

A final limitation comes from the sampling procedure. All participants were volunteers. Incentives were provided to some organizations for their participation in the study but not offered to others. Therefore, volunteers may have differed in some important way between those in organizations offered an incentive and those not in such organizations. Furthermore, volunteers within organizations may have differed from non-volunteers in some way that may have impacted the results.

In spite of these limitations, this study provided important information about EQ among student leaders and members. Most studies that have been conducted regarding EQ among leaders have examined the business community, not college students. Also, many prior studies did not focus specifically on student organizations. The present study provides student affairs practitioners and others with an improved understanding of EQ among student organizations and their memberships.

This study revealed that college student leaders demonstrate a higher level of EQ than student members in campus organizations. In general, then, it would seem that there might be a relationship between higher EQ and subcomponent scores and a student's leadership status within a campus organization.

However, the results are perhaps more interesting in terms of what was not revealed in the findings. That is, there was no significant difference between types of organizations and leadership status. It would seem, therefore, that greater efforts to promote specific EQ skills

among both leaders and members in all types of organizations are needed. Furthermore, none of the EQ scores was above average. Efforts to increase EQ among leaders and members of all types of organizations would therefore be of benefit.

Assessment of student outcomes has become a major focus of student affairs work in recent years. This study suggests that EQ skills among students in campus organizations, although stronger in leaders than in members, are an area that can be developed among all students. The results of this study may help leadership programs address students' and administrators' concerns about the value of extracurricular activities to the college experience. The relationship between EQ skills and organizational involvement show how such opportunities expand an individual's ability to succeed beyond college. What is of primary importance, however, is that each individual is given the opportunity to enhance the skills that they currently possess.