

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT Professionals

Dr. Pavithra Raj^{1*}

ABSTRACT

The current study was conducted to find out the effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT Professionals. A total of 60 subjects were taken between the age group of 25-35 through a method of convenient sampling. Designation of all the employers is “IT Professionals”. All the participants were given the Emotional Intelligence questionnaire. The Manager of the employers was then given Performance Appraisal Questionnaires and all the participants were rated. A within group design was used to find out the relationship between the two variables. The scores of high and low Emotional Intelligence and high and low Performance Appraisal was divided and ‘t’ test was done to find out the significance in both the variables. Chi square test was then used to compare the observed data with the data that was expected to obtain according to the hypothesis. The results showed that there is a positive relation between Emotional Intelligence and Performance Appraisal.

Keywords: *Emotional Intelligence, Job Performance, IT professionals*

Emotional Intelligence (EI) is the ability to identify, assess, and control the emotions of oneself, of others, and of groups. Various models and definitions have been proposed of which the ability and trait EI models are the most widely accepted in the scientific literature. Criticisms have centered on whether the construct is a real intelligence and whether it has incremental validity over IQ and the Big Five personality dimensions.

History

The earliest roots of emotional intelligence can be traced to Charles Darwin's work on the importance of emotional expression for survival and, second, adaptation. In the 1900s, even though traditional definitions of intelligence emphasized cognitive aspects such as memory and problem-solving, several influential researchers in the intelligence field of study had begun to recognize the importance of the non-cognitive aspects. For instance, as early as 1920, E.L. Thorndike used the term social intelligence to describe the skill of understanding and managing other people.

¹Assistant professor, Department of Psychology, Mount Carmel College, Autonomous, Bangalore, India
**Responding Author*

Received: February 12, 2021; Revision Received: March 26, 2021; Accepted: March 31, 2021

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

Similarly, in 1940 David Wechsler described the influence of non-intellective factors on intelligent behavior, and further argued that our models of intelligence would not be complete until we could adequately describe these factors. In 1983, Howard Gardner's *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* introduced the idea of multiple intelligences which included both *interpersonal intelligence* (the capacity to understand the intentions, motivations and desires of other people) and *intrapersonal intelligence* (the capacity to understand oneself, to appreciate one's feelings, fears and motivations). In Gardner's view, traditional types of intelligence, such as IQ, fail to fully explain cognitive ability. Thus, even though the names given to the concept varied, there was a common belief that traditional definitions of intelligence were lacking in ability to fully explain performance outcomes.

The first use of the term "emotional intelligence" is usually attributed to Wayne Payne's doctoral thesis, *A Study of Emotion: Developing Emotional Intelligence* from 1985. However, prior to this, the term "emotional intelligence" had appeared in Leuner (1966). Stanley Greenspan (1989) also put forward an EI model, followed by Salovey and Mayer (1990), and Daniel Goleman (1995). The distinction between trait emotional intelligence and ability emotional intelligence was introduced in 2000.

Models of emotional intelligence

The model introduced by Daniel Goleman focuses on EI as a wide array of competencies and skills that drive leadership performance. Goleman's model outlines four main EI constructs:

- Self-awareness – the ability to read one's emotions and recognize their impact while using gut feelings to guide decisions.
- Self-management – involves controlling one's emotions and impulses and adapting to changing circumstances.
- Social awareness – the ability to sense, understand, and react to others' emotions while comprehending social networks.
- Relationship management – the ability to inspire, influence, and develop others while managing conflict.

Goleman includes a set of emotional competencies within each construct of EI. Emotional competencies are not innate talents, but rather learned capabilities that must be worked on and can be developed to achieve outstanding performance. Goleman posits that individuals are born with a general emotional intelligence that determines their potential for learning emotional competencies. Goleman's model of EI has been criticized in the research literature as mere "pop psychology"

Measurement of the Emotional Competencies (Goleman) model

Two measurement tools are based on the Goleman model:

The Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI), which was created in 1999, and the **Emotional and Social Competency Inventory (ESCI)**, which was created in 2007. The **Emotional Intelligence Appraisal**, which was created in 2001 and which can be taken as a self-report or 360-degree assessment.

Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI)

Bar-On defines emotional intelligence as being concerned with effectively understanding oneself and others, relating well to people, and adapting to and coping with the immediate

surroundings to be more successful in dealing with environmental demands. Bar-On posits that EI develops over time and that it can be improved through training, programming, and therapy. Bar-On hypothesizes that those individuals with higher than average EQs are in general more successful in meeting environmental demands and pressures. He also notes that a deficiency in EQ can mean a lack of success and the existence of emotional problems. Problems in coping with one's environment are thought, by Bar-On, to be especially common among those individuals lacking in the subscales of reality testing, problem solving, stress tolerance, and impulse control. In general, Bar-On considers emotional intelligence and cognitive intelligence to contribute equally to a person's general intelligence, which then offers an indication of one's potential to succeed in life. However, doubts have been expressed about this model in the research literature (in particular about the validity of self-report as an index of emotional intelligence) and in scientific settings it is being replaced by the trait emotional intelligence (trait EI) model discussed below.

Measurement of the ESI model

The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i), is a self-report measure of EI developed as a measure of emotionally and socially competent behavior that provides an estimate of one's emotional and social intelligence. The EQ-i is not meant to measure personality traits or cognitive capacity, but rather the mental ability to be successful in dealing with environmental demands and pressures. One hundred and thirty three items (questions or factors) are used to obtain a Total EQ (Total Emotional Quotient) and to produce five composite scale scores, corresponding to the five main components of the Bar-On model. A limitation of this model is that it claims to measure some kind of ability through self-report items (for a discussion, see Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2001). The EQ-i has been found to be highly susceptible to faking (Day & Carroll, 2008; Grubb & McDaniel, 2007).

Trait EI model

Soviet-born British psychologist Konstantin Vasily Petrides ("K. V. Petrides") proposed a conceptual distinction between the ability based model and a trait based model of EI and has been developing the latter over many years in numerous scientific publications. Trait EI is "a constellation of emotional self-perceptions located at the lower levels of personality." In lay terms, trait EI refers to an individual's self-perceptions of their emotional abilities. This definition of EI encompasses behavioral dispositions and self perceived abilities and is measured by self report, as opposed to the ability based model which refers to actual abilities, which have proven highly resistant to scientific measurement. Trait EI should be investigated within a personality framework. An alternative label for the same construct is trait emotional self-efficacy.

The trait EI model is general and subsumes the Goleman and Bar-On models discussed above. The conceptualization of EI as a personality trait leads to a construct that lies outside the taxonomy of human cognitive ability. This is an important distinction in as much as it bears directly on the operationalization of the construct and the theories and hypotheses that are formulated about it.

Measurement of the trait EI model

There are many self-report measures of EI including the EQ-i, the Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT), and the Schutte EI model. None of these assess intelligence, abilities, or skills (as their authors often claim), but rather, they are limited measures of trait emotional intelligence. One of the more comprehensive and widely researched measures of this construct is the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

(TEIQue), which was specifically designed to measure the construct comprehensively and is available in many languages.

The TEIQue provides an operationalization for the model of Petrides and colleagues, that conceptualizes EI in terms of personality. The test encompasses 15 subscales organized under four factors: Well-Being, Self-Control, Emotionality, and Sociability. The psychometric properties of the TEIQue were investigated in a study on a French-speaking population, where it was reported that TEIQue scores were globally normally distributed and reliable.

The researchers also found TEIQue scores were unrelated to nonverbal reasoning (Raven's matrices), which they interpreted as support for the personality trait view of EI (as opposed to a form of intelligence). As expected, TEIQue scores were positively related to some of the Big Five personality traits (extraversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness) as well as inversely related to others (alexithymia, neuroticism). A number of quantitative genetic studies have been carried out within the trait EI model, which have revealed significant genetic effects and heritabilities for all trait EI scores. Two recent studies (one a meta-analysis) involving direct comparisons of multiple EI tests yielded very favorable results for the TEIQue.

Criticisms

EI cannot be recognized as a form of intelligence

Goleman's early work has been criticized for assuming from the beginning that EI is a type of intelligence. Eysenck (2000) writes that Goleman's description of EI contains unsubstantiated assumptions about intelligence in general, and that it even runs contrary to what researchers have come to expect when studying types of intelligence:

"[Goleman] exemplifies more clearly than most the fundamental absurdity of the tendency to class almost any type of behaviour as an 'intelligence'... If these five 'abilities' define 'emotional intelligence', we would expect some evidence that they are highly correlated; Goleman admits that they might be quite uncorrelated, and in any case if we cannot measure them, how do we know they are related? So the whole theory is built on quicksand: there is no sound scientific basis."

Similarly, Locke (2005) claims that the concept of EI is in itself a misinterpretation of the intelligence construct, and he offers an alternative interpretation: it is not another form or type of intelligence, but intelligence—the ability to grasp abstractions—applied to a particular life domain: emotions. He suggests the concept should be re-labeled and referred to as a skill.

The essence of this criticism is that scientific inquiry depends on valid and consistent construct utilization, and that before the introduction of the term EI, psychologists had established theoretical distinctions between factors such as abilities and achievements, skills and habits, attitudes and values, and personality traits and emotional states. Thus, some scholars believe that the term *EI* merges and conflates such accepted concepts and definitions.

EI has little predictive value

Landy (2005) claimed that the few incremental validity studies conducted on EI have shown that it adds little or nothing to the explanation or prediction of some common outcomes

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

(most notably academic and work success). Landy suggested that the reason why some studies have found a small increase in predictive validity is a methodological fallacy, namely, that alternative explanations have not been completely considered:

"EI is compared and contrasted with a measure of abstract intelligence but not with a personality measure, or with a personality measure but not with a measure of academic intelligence." Landy (2005)

Similarly, other researchers have raised concerns about the extent to which self-report EI measures correlate with established personality dimensions. Generally, self-report EI measures and personality measures have been said to converge because they both purport to measure personality traits.^[22] Specifically, there appear to be two dimensions of the Big Five that stand out as most related to self-report EI – neuroticism and extroversion. In particular, neuroticism has been said to relate to negative emotionality and anxiety. Intuitively, individuals scoring high on neuroticism are likely to score low on self-report EI measures.

The interpretations of the correlations between EI questionnaires and personality have been varied. The prominent view in the scientific literature is the Trait EI view, which re-interprets EI as a collection of personality traits.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

A **performance appraisal (PA)** or **performance evaluation** is a systematic and periodic process that assesses an individual employee's job performance and productivity in relation to certain pre-established criteria and organizational objectives. Other aspects of individual employees are considered as well, such as organizational citizenship behavior, accomplishments, potential for future improvement, strengths and weaknesses, etc. To collect PA data, there are three main methods: objective production, personnel, and judgmental evaluation. Judgmental evaluations are the most commonly used with a large variety of evaluation methods. A PA is typically conducted annually. The interview could function as "providing feedback to employees, counseling and developing employees, and conveying and discussing compensation, job status, or disciplinary decisions". PA is often included in performance management systems. Performance management systems are employed "to manage and align" all of an organization's resources in order to achieve highest possible performance. "How performance is managed in an organization determines to a large extent the success or failure of the organization. Therefore, improving PA for everyone should be among the highest priorities of contemporary" organizations.

Some applications of PA are performance improvement, promotions, termination, test validation, and more. While there are many potential benefits of PA, there are also some potential drawbacks. For example, PA can help facilitate management-employee communication; however, PA may result in legal issues if not executed appropriately as many employees tend to be unsatisfied with the PA process. PAs created in and determined as useful in the United States are not necessarily able to be transferable cross-culturally.

A central reason for the utilization of performance appraisals (PAs) is performance improvement ("initially at the level of the individual employee, and ultimately at the level of the organization"). Other fundamental reasons include "as a basis for employment decisions (e.g. promotions, terminations, transfers), as criteria in research (e.g. test validation), to aid with communication (e.g. allowing employees to know how they are doing and

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

organizational expectations), to establish personal objectives for training” programs, for transmission of objective feedback for personal development, “as a means of documentation to aid in keeping track of decisions and legal requirements” and in wage and salary administration. Additionally, PAs can aid in the formulation of job criteria and selection of individuals “who are best suited to perform the required organizational tasks”. A PA can be part of guiding and monitoring employee career development. PAs can also be used to aid in work motivation through the use of reward systems.

Potential Benefits of Performance Appraisals

There are a number of potential benefits of organizational performance management conducting formal performance appraisals (PAs). There has been a general consensus in the belief that PAs lead to positive implications of organizations. Furthermore, PAs can benefit an organization’s effectiveness. One way is PAs can often lead to giving individual workers feedback about their job performance. From this may spawn several potential benefits such as the individual workers becoming more productive.

Other potential benefits include:

Facilitation of communication: communication in organizations is considered an essential function of worker motivation. It has been proposed that feedback from PAs aid in minimizing employees’ perceptions of uncertainty. Fundamentally, feedback and management-employee communication can serve as a guide in job performance.

Enhancement of employee focus through promoting trust: behaviors, thoughts, and/or issues may distract employees from their work, and trust issues may be among these distracting factors. Such factors that consume psychological energy can lower job performance and cause workers to lose sight of organizational goals. Properly constructed and utilized PAs have the ability to lower distracting factors and encourage trust within the organization.

Goal setting and desired performance reinforcement: organizations find it efficient to match individual worker’s goals and performance with organizational goals. PAs provide room for discussion in the collaboration of these individual and organizational goals. Collaboration can also be advantageous by resulting in employee acceptance and satisfaction of appraisal results.

Performance improvement: well-constructed PAs can be valuable tools for communication with employees as pertaining to how their job performance stands with organizational expectations. “At the organizational level, numerous studies have reported positive relationships between human resource management (HRM) practices" and performance improvement at both the individual and organizational levels.

Determination of training needs: “Employee training and development are crucial components in helping an organization achieve strategic initiatives”. It has been argued that for PAs to truly be effective, post-appraisal opportunities for training and development in problem areas, as determined by the appraisal, must be offered. PAs can especially be instrumental for identifying training needs of new employees. Finally, PAs can help in the establishment and supervision of employees’ career goals.

Potential Complications of Performance Appraisals

Despite all the potential advantages of formal performance appraisals (PAs), there are also potential drawbacks. It has been noted that determining the relationship between individual

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

job performance and organizational performance can be a difficult task. Generally, there are two overarching problems from which several complications spawn. One of the problems with formal PAs is there can be detrimental effects to the organization(s) involved if the appraisals are not used appropriately. The second problem with formal PAs is they can be ineffective if the PA system does not correspond with the organizational culture and system. Complications stemming from these issues are:

Detrimental to quality improvement: it has been proposed that the use of PA systems in organizations adversely affect organizations' pursuits of quality performance. It is believed by some scholars and practitioners that the use of PAs is more than unnecessary if there is total quality management.

Negative perceptions: "Quite often, individuals have negative perceptions of PAs". Receiving and/or the anticipation of receiving a PA can be uncomfortable and distressful and potentially cause "tension between supervisors and subordinates".

Errors: PAs should provide accurate and relevant ratings of an employee's performance as compared to pre-established criteria (i.e., organizational expectations). Nevertheless, supervisors will sometimes rate employees more favorably than that of their true performance in order to please the employees and avoid conflict. "Inflated ratings are a common malady associated with formal" PA.

Legal issues: when PAs are not carried out appropriately, legal issues could result that place the organization at risk. PAs are used in organizational disciplinary programs as well as for promotional decisions within the organization. The improper application and utilization of PAs can affect employees negatively and lead to legal action against the organization.

Performance goals: performance goals and PA systems are often used in association. Negative outcomes concerning the organizations can result when goals are overly challenging or overemphasized to the extent of effecting ethnics, legal requirements, or quality. Moreover, challenging performance goals can impede on employees' abilities to acquire necessary knowledge and skills-based pay: some researchers contend that the deficit in merit pay and performance-based pay is linked to the fundamental issues stemming from PA systems. Especially in the early stages of training, it would be more beneficial to instruct employees on outcome goals than on performance goals.

There are three main methods used to collect performance appraisal (PA) data: objective production, personnel, and judgmental evaluation. Judgmental evaluations are the most commonly used with a large variety of evaluation methods.

Objective production

The objective production method consists of direct, but limited, measures such as sales figures, production numbers, the electronic performance monitoring of data entry workers, etc. The measures used to appraise performance would depend on the job and its duties. Although these measures deal with unambiguous criteria, they are usually incomplete because of criterion contamination and criterion deficiency. Criterion contamination refers to the part of the actual criteria that is unrelated to the conceptual criteria. In other words, the variability in performance can be due to factors outside of the employee's control. Criterion deficiency refers to the part of the conceptual criteria that is not measured by the actual criteria. In other words, the quantity of production does not necessarily indicate the quality

of the products. Both types of criterion inadequacies result in reduced validity of the measure. Regardless of the fact that objective production data is not a complete reflection upon job performance, such data is relevant to job performance.

The Happy-Productive Worker Hypothesis

The happy-productive worker hypothesis states that the happiest workers are the most productive performers, and the most productive performers are the happiest workers. Yet, after decades of research, the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance produces only a weak positive correlation. Published in 2001 by *Psychological Bulletin*, a meta-analysis of 312 research studies produced an uncorrected correlation of 0.18. This correlation is much weaker than what the happy-productive worker hypothesis would predict. There is no clear relationship between job satisfaction and job performance.

Personnel

The personnel method is the recording of withdrawal behaviors (i.e. absenteeism, accidents). Most organizations consider unexcused absences to be indicators of poor job performance, even with all other factors being equal; however, this is subject to criterion deficiency. The quantity of an employee's absences does not reflect how dedicated he/she may be to the job and its duties. Especially for blue-collar jobs, accidents can often be a useful indicator of poor job performance, but this is also subject to criterion contamination because situational factors also contribute to accidents. Once again, both types of criterion inadequacies result in reduced validity of the measure. Although excessive absenteeism and/or accidents often indicate poor job performance rather than good performance, such personnel data is not a comprehensive reflection of an employee's performance.

Judgmental Evaluation

Judgmental evaluation appears to be a collection of methods, and as such, could be considered a methodology. A common approach to obtaining PAs is by means of raters. Because the raters are human, some error will always be present in the data. The most common types of error are leniency errors, central tendency errors, and errors resulting from the halo effect. These errors arise predominantly from social cognition and the theory in that how we judge and evaluate other individuals in various contexts is associated with how we "acquire, process, and categorize information".

An essential piece of this method is rater training. Rater training is the "process of educating raters to make more accurate assessments of performance, typically achieved by reducing the frequency of halo, leniency, and central-tendency errors". Rater training also helps the raters "develop a common frame of reference for evaluation" of individual performance. Many researchers and survey respondents support the ambition of effectual rater training. However, it is noted that such training is expensive, time consuming, and only truly functional for behavioral assessments.

Another piece to keep in mind is the effects of rater motivation on judgmental evaluations. It is not uncommon for rating inflation to occur due to rater motivation (i.e. "organizationally induced pressures that compel raters to evaluate rates positively"). Typically, raters are motivated to give higher ratings because of the lack of organizational sanction concerning accurate/inaccurate appraisals, the rater's desire to guarantee promotions, salary increases, etc., the rater's inclination to avoid negative reactions from subordinates, and the observation that higher ratings of the rates reflect favorably upon the rater.

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

The main methods used in judgmental performance appraisal are:

Graphic Rating Scale: graphic rating scales (see scale (social sciences)) are the most commonly used system in PA. On several different factors, subordinates are judged on 'how much' of that factor or trait they possess. Typically, the raters use a 5- or 7-point scale; however, there are as many as 20-point scales.

Employee-Comparison Methods: rather than subordinates being judged against pre-established criteria, they are compared with one another. This method eliminates central tendency and leniency errors but still allows for halo effect errors to occur. The rank-order method has raters ranking subordinates from "best" to "worst", but how truly good or bad one is on a performance dimension would be unknown. The paired-comparison method requires the rater to select the two "best" subordinates out of a group on each dimension then rank individuals according to the number of times each subordinate was selected as one of the "best". The forced-distribution method is good for large groups of rates. The raters evaluate each subordinate on one or more dimensions and then place (or "force-fit", if you will) each subordinate in a 5 to 7 category normal distribution. The method of top-grading can be applied to the forced distribution method. This method identifies the 10% lowest performing subordinates, as according to the forced distribution, and dismisses them leaving the 90% higher performing subordinates.

Behavioral Checklists and Scales: behaviors are more definite than traits. The critical incidents method (or critical incident technique) concerns "specific behaviors indicative of good or bad job performance". Supervisors record behaviors of what they judge to be job performance relevant, and they keep a running tally of good and bad behaviors. A discussion on performance may then follow. The behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS) combine the critical incidents method with rating scale methods by rating performance on a scale but with the scale points being anchored by behavioral incidents. Note that BARS are job specific.

Peer and Self Assessments

While most judgmental PA research is evaluated by a superior (e.g. supervisor, manager), peer assessments are evaluated by one's colleagues. With self-assessments, individuals evaluate themselves.

Peer Assessments: members of a group evaluate and appraise the performance of their fellow group members. There are three common methods of peer assessments. *Peer nomination* involves each group member nominating who he/she believes to be the "best" on a certain dimension of performance. *Peer ratings* has each group member rate each other on a set of performance dimensions. *Peer ranking* requires each group member rank all fellow members from "best" to "worst" on one or more dimensions of performance.

Self-Assessments: for self-assessments, individuals assess and evaluate their own behavior and job performance. It is common for a graphic rating scale to be used for self-assessments. Positive leniency tends to be a problem with self-assessments.

360-Degree Feedback: 360-degree feedback is multiple evaluations of employees which often include assessments from superior(s), peers, and one's self.

Performance appraisal interviews

The performance appraisal (PA) interview is typically the final step of the appraisal process. The interview is held between the subordinate and supervisor. The PA interview can be considered of great significance to an organization's PA system. It is most advantageous when both the superior and subordinate participate in the interview discussion and establish goals together. Three factors consistently contribute to effective PA interviews: the supervisor's knowledge of the subordinate's job and performance in it, the supervisor's support of the subordinate, and a welcoming of the subordinate's participation.

Employee reaction to performance appraisal

Numerous researchers have reported that many employees are not satisfied with their performance appraisal (PA) systems. Studies have shown that subjectivity as well as appraiser bias is often a problem perceived by as many as half of employees. Appraiser bias, however, appears to be perceived as more of a problem in government and public sector organizations. Also, according to some studies, employees wished to see changes in the PA system by making "the system more objective, improving the feedback process, and increasing the frequency of review." In light of traditional PA operation defects, "organizations are now increasingly incorporating practices that may improve the system. These changes are particularly concerned with areas such as elimination of subjectivity and bias, training of appraisers, improvement of the feedback process and the performance review discussion."

According to a meta-analysis of 27 field studies, general employee participation in his/her own appraisal process was positively correlated with employee reactions to the PA system. More specifically, employee participation in the appraisal process was most strongly related to employee satisfaction with the PA system. Concerning the reliability of employee reaction measures, researchers have found employee reaction scales to be sound with few concerns through using a confirmatory factor analysis that is representative of employee reaction scales.

Researchers suggest that the study of employees' reactions to PA is important because of two main reasons: employee reactions symbolize a criterion of interest to practitioners of PAs and employee reactions have been associated through theory to determinants of appraisal acceptance and success. Researchers translate these reasons into the context of the scientist-practitioner gap or the "lack of alignment between research and practice."

Cross Cultural Implications of Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal (PA) systems, and the premises of which they were based, that have been formed and regarded as effective in the United States may not have the transferability for effectual utilization in other countries or cultures, and vice versa. Performance "appraisal is thought to be deeply rooted in the norms, values, and beliefs of a society". "Appraisal reflects attitudes towards motivation and performance (self) and relationships (e.g., peers, subordinates, supervisors, organization), all of which vary from one country to the next". Therefore, appraisal should be in conjunction with cultural norms, values, and beliefs in order to be operative. The deep-seated norms, values and beliefs in different cultures affect employee motivation and perception of organizational equity and justice. In effect, a PA system created and considered effectual in one country may not be an appropriate assessment in another cultural region.

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

For example, some countries and cultures value the trait of assertiveness and personal accomplishment while others instead place more merit on cooperation and interpersonal connection. Countries scoring high on assertiveness consider PA to be a way of assuring equity among employees so that higher performing employees receive greater rewards or higher salaries. Countries scoring low on assertiveness but higher in interpersonal relations may not like the social separation and pay inequity of higher/lower performing employees; employees from this more cooperative rather than individualistic culture place more concern on interpersonal relationships with other employees rather than on individual interests. High assertive countries value performance feedback for self-management and effectiveness purposes while countries low in assertiveness view performance feedback as “threatening and obtrusive”. In this case, the PA of the high assertive countries would likely not be beneficial for countries scoring lower in assertiveness to employ. However, countries scoring lower in assertiveness could employ PA for purposes of improving long-term communication development within the organization such as clarifying job objectives, guide training and development plans, and lessen the gap between job performance and organizational expectations.

EI, IQ And Job Performance

Research of EI and job performance shows mixed results: a positive relation has been found in some of the studies, in others there was no relation or an inconsistent one. This led researchers Cote and Miners (2006) to offer a compensatory model between EI and IQ, that posits that the association between EI and job performance becomes more positive as cognitive intelligence decreases, an idea first proposed in the context of academic performance (Petrides, Frederickson, & Furnham, 2004). The results of the former study supported the compensatory model: employees with low IQ get higher task performance and organizational citizenship behavior directed at the organization, the higher their EI.

A more recent study suggests that EI is not necessarily a universally positive trait. They found a negative correlation between EI and managerial work demands; while under low levels of MWD, they found a negative relationship between EI and teamwork effectiveness. An explanation for this may suggest gender differences in EI, as women tend to score higher levels than men. This furthers the idea that job context plays a role in the relationships between EI, teamwork effectiveness, and job performance.

Another interesting find was discussed in a study that assessed a possible link between EI and entrepreneurial behaviors and success. In accordance with much of the other findings regarding EI and job performance, they found that levels of EI only predicted a small amount of entrepreneurial behavior.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Kevin W. et.al. (2008) Using a longitudinal sample of medical technologists (MTs) this study found, after controlling for prior overall job satisfaction, individual difference, and organization-level variables, that task responsibilities and employee performance appraisal satisfaction significantly affected subsequent overall MT job satisfaction. Overall job satisfaction significantly declined for repeat-respondents over the 4-year period. Data also suggested that the impact of task responsibilities on overall job satisfaction can dissipate over time, and that the supervisor's role in affecting employee job satisfaction is important. Results and limitations are discussed.

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

Jeanette N (2006) studied that performance appraisal is used in organizations for a variety of purposes. However, little empirical research has been conducted to determine (a) the extent to which performance appraisal is used for each of several purposes in industry, (b) the extent to which appraisal data may be used for multiple and possibly conflicting uses within the same organization, and (c) organizational correlates of these uses. A survey questionnaire designed to answer these questions was mailed to 243 members of Division 14 of the American Psychological Association who were employed in industry. A factor analysis of the 106 completed questionnaires indicated four general uses of information from performance appraisals. The use of performance appraisal to simultaneously make distinctions between and within individuals is common. Canonical correlation analyses indicated that organizational characteristics were significantly related to uses of performance appraisal.

Jack M. (2005) Construes performance appraisal as the outcome of a dual-process system of evaluation and decision making whereby attention, categorization, recall, and information integration are carried out through either an automatic or a controlled process. In the automatic process, an employee's behavior is categorized without conscious monitoring unless the decisions involved are problematic; a consciously monitored categorization process would then occur. Subsequent recall of the employee is viewed to be biased by the attributes of prototypes (abstract images) representing categories to which the employee has been assigned. Dispositional and contextual factors influence the availability of categories during both assignment and recall. Although automatic and controlled processes can create accurate employee evaluations, categorization interacting with task type tends to affect subsequent employee information with halo, lenient/stringent, racial, sexual, ethnic, and personality biases. Behavior taxonomies, individual differences in cognitive structure, validation of behavior-sampling techniques, and laboratory studies of appraisal processes are presented as potential topics for research.

MA Brackett (2003) This study investigated the convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of one ability test of emotional intelligence (EI)—the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso-Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT)—and two self-report measures of EI—the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) and the self-report EI test (SREIT). The MSCEIT showed minimal relations to the EQ-i and SREIT, whereas the latter two measures were moderately interrelated. Among EI measures, the MSCEIT was discriminable from well-studied personality and well-being measures, whereas the EQ-i and SREIT shared considerable variance with these measures. After personality and verbal intelligence were held constant, the MSCEIT was predictive of social deviance, the EQ-i was predictive of alcohol use, and the SREIT was inversely related to academic achievement. In general, results showed that ability EI and self-report EI are weakly related and yield different measurements of the same person.

Edward C (2003) tested 217 middle managers from 3 industrial groups responded to an open-ended questionnaire in which they described the determinants of particularly fair or unfair performance appraisals. By Q-sort procedure, the responses were categorized and combined to yield 7 distinct determinants of fairness in performance evaluations. Ratings of the perceived importance of these determinants were factor analyzed, revealing 2 distinct factors—Procedural and Distributive determinants. The implications of the determinants are discussed with respect to existing research and theory on justice in organizations.

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

Frank J (2002) studied that the most ubiquitous method of performance appraisal is rating. Ratings, however, have been shown to be prone to various types of systematic and random error. Studies relating to performance rating are reviewed under the following headings: roles, context, vehicle, process, and results. In general, cognitive characteristics of raters seem to hold the most promise for increased understanding of the rating process. A process model of performance rating is derived from the literature. Research in the areas of implicit personality theory and variance partitioning is combined with the process model to suggest a unified approach to understanding performance judgments in applied settings.

Douglas M. (2001) This study examines the relationship between employee perceptions of performance appraisal and both employee burnout and experienced job satisfaction in a county government. More specifically, the authors examine whether the following aspects of performance appraisal are related to burnout and job satisfaction: instrument validity, distributive justice, and procedural justice. The results indicate a modest relationship between these 3 independent variables and job satisfaction, as well as a modest relationship between procedural and distributive justice and job burnout for a sample ($N=134$) of professional county employees. The implications of these findings for managers are also explored.

Roger C (2001) studied recent theoretical developments have enabled the empirical study of trust for specific referents in organizations. The authors conducted a 14-month field study of employee trust for top management. A 9-month quasi-experiment found that the implementation of a more acceptable performance appraisal system increased trust for top management. The 3 proposed factors of trustworthiness (ability, benevolence, and integrity) mediated the relationship between perceptions of the appraisal system and trust.

James D. A(2000) Examined the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i), a comprehensive model and measure of emotional and social intelligence. The findings presented in this chapter suggest that emotional and social intelligence is multifactorial array of interrelated emotional, personal, and social abilities that influence one's overall ability to actively and effectively cope with daily demands. The author presents data on the development and psychometric properties of the EQ-i, including internal consistency, stability reliability, factor structure, and validity. The factor structure of the construct is composed of the following 10 components: self-regard, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, empathy, interpersonal relationship, stress tolerance, impulse control, reality testing, flexibility, and problem solving. In addition to these key components, 5 facilitators of emotionally and socially intelligent behavior are described: optimism, self-actualization, happiness, independence, and social responsibility

William F (1990) studied that a neglected area of performance appraisal research concerns the context within which the appraisal process occurs. For a sample of exempt employees, measures were developed that assessed system components of the appraisal context. The contribution of these variables (complexity, implementation, and follow-up) to the prediction of 2 measures of employee reactions to performance appraisal (review session satisfaction and appraisal system satisfaction) was compared with the contribution of a more frequently studied set of variables—supervisory behaviors in the review session. The relationship of a salary linkage variable to the 2 outcome criteria also was assessed. The supervisory session variables were related to session satisfaction, and the system contextual variables were primarily related to system satisfaction. Salary linkage was associated with system satisfaction.

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

Dobbins, Gregory H (1989) investigated the effects of purpose of appraisal and individual differences in stereotypes of women on the evaluations of male and female ratees in two studies. In Study 1, 52 female and 51 male undergraduate students with traditional or nontraditional stereotypes of women evaluated written vignettes of either male or female ratees. Raters were informed that their evaluations would be used for scale development (experimental purposes) or for merit pay and promotion decisions (administrative decisions). Analyses revealed that female ratees were evaluated less accurately by raters with traditional stereotypes of women than by raters with nontraditional stereotypes of women. Such differences occurred, however, only when appraisals were made for administrative decisions. In Study 2, 810 raters with traditional or nontraditional stereotypes of women evaluated the teaching effectiveness of eight male and six female professors. Analyses indicated that women were evaluated more favorably by raters with nontraditional stereotypes of women than by raters with traditional stereotypes of women. Implications of the findings for sex differences in appraisal, future research, and organizational effectiveness are discussed.

Igen, Daniel R (1983) studied that performance appraisal process is construed as a function of 3 interacting systems: organizational context, the appraiser's information processing system, and the behavioral system of the appraisee. It is argued that aspects of each system constrain the ability of the appraisal process to produce accurate, unbiased, and reliable assessment of individual behavior and performance. The following characteristics of the appraisal process are discussed: (1) observation, reward opportunities, and systemic issues such as function and expectations within the context of the organization; (2) the appraiser's automatic attention processes, categorization and memory, and information search and recall; and (3) appraisees' automatic and controlled modes of behavior. Recommendations for improving the appraisal process are presented. Performance appraisal: A process focus.

METHODOLOGY

Aim:

To study the effect of emotional quotient on the performance of IT professionals.

Hypothesis:

“Higher the Emotional Quotient, Higher will be the Performance.”

Design:

In the present study a within group design was used. Employees from a private sector were considered. Questionnaires of Emotional Quotient and Performance Appraisal were given for data collection. Performance rating of the employers was compared.

Variables

Independent Variable- Emotional Quotient Questionnaire

Dependant Variable- Performance

Sample:

The total size is 60. Participants between age group of 25-35 are considered. Designation of the employers is “IT Professionals”. Samples were chosen through a method of convenient sampling.

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

Materials required

Emotional Quotient Questionnaire by Dalip Singh(2001) consisting of 22 statements each of which has 3 alternatives.

- Performance Appraisal Questionnaire.
- Scoring key
- Answer Sheet

Reliability & Validity (for EQ): This test has been designed for professional managers, business men, bureaucrats, artists and graduate students. This emotional quotient test has a test-retest split half reliability of 0.94 & 0.89 respectively and a validity of 0.89.

Procedure: The experimenter approached a group of 60 employees working in a private sector. Rapport was established between the employees and experimenter. Participants were requested to fill the emotional quotient questionnaire. They were asked to fill it honestly as it provided them with a feedback of their feelings at work place. They were asked to go through instructions on the facing sheet of the questionnaire before answering the questions. The answer sheets were then collected for scoring and interpretation. The manager was then requested to rate each of the 60 employees chosen for the study using performance appraisal questionnaire. The results of the employees were then compared.

Instructions

For Emotional Quotient Questionnaire- “The situations given below will measure your emotional response to different situations. Please answer on the basis of how you feel and not what you think. There is no right or wrong answer. Please answer honestly and do not spend much time on each question. Your first response is the best. Do not leave questions unanswered.”

For Performance Appraisal Questionnaire- “There are 11 traits given below. You have to grade each of the employees chosen for the study on all the 11 traits according to their performance during last one year. Read each definition of the trait on the right-hand side of the page & carefully assign the grade to each trait. You should indicate the grade number with reference to the scale of gradation given in the sheet below. A help matrix provided on the left side of the page helps in detailed clear-cut assessment & gradation of traits.”

Precautions

- The experimenter must make sure to obtain the consent of the individuals before providing the participants with the questions.
- Proper instructions must be given regarding the test. Doubts if any must be clarified by the experimenter.
- They are asked to give their first reaction to the statement.
- They must be informed that the test results will be kept confidential and hence it is necessary to give honest replies.
- They are assured that it would provide them with a feedback of their feelings at work place.

Analysis of Result: The t ratio is computed for the performance score of those who had obtained high and low scores on the Emotional Quotient Questionnaire.

NOTE: High and Low scores were obtained by reference to the scoring keys & norms.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The aim of the study was to assess the effect of Emotional Intelligence on Performance of IT Professionals. It was hypothesized that “Higher the Emotional Intelligence, Higher will be the Performance.” The study was carried out on a group of 60 people who were IT Professionals and were between the age group of 25-35.

Table 1 shows the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio for the score of those participants who have obtained high and low scores on Emotional Intelligence.

	High Scores on EI	Low Scores on EI
MEAN	51.05	44.92
SD	8.47	7.60
‘t’ ratio	2.93	

The mean and SD for those who have obtained high scores on Emotional Intelligence Test are 51.05 and 8.47 respectively. The mean and SD for those who have obtained low scores on Emotional Intelligence Test are 44.92 and 7.60 respectively. The obtained ‘t’ ratio is 2.93 which is greater than the table values of 2.00 at 0.05 level of significance and 2.66 at 0.01 level of significance thus indicating that there is a significant difference in the performance of the group.

Table 2 shows the Mean, SD and ‘t’ ratio for the score of those participants who have obtained high and low scores on Performance Appraisal.

	High Scores on PA	Low Scores on PA
MEAN	51.03	44.14
SD	8.24	8.01
‘t’ ratio	3.28	

The mean and SD for those who have obtained high scores on Performance Appraisal are 51.03 and 8.24 respectively. The mean and SD for those who have obtained low scores on Performance Appraisal are 44.14 and 8.01 respectively. The obtained ‘t’ ratio is 3.28 which is greater than the table values of 2.00 at 0.05 level of significance and 2.65 at 0.01 level of significance thus indicating that there is a significant difference in the performance of the group.

Table 3 shows the number of participants that fall in each of the four categories and their chi square significance.

	High Scores on PA	Low Scores on PA	Total
High Scores on EI	22	12	34
Low Scores on EI	10	16	26
TOTAL	32	28	60

The degree of freedom is (r-1) i.e. (2-1) i.e. 1. the chi square value is 4.07 which is greater than the table value of 3.84 at 0.05 level of significance thus accepting the hypothesis which states that “Higher the Emotional Intelligence, Higher will be the Performance.”

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The objective of the study was to assess the effect of Emotional Intelligence on Performance. The assessment was carried out on a group of 60 IT Professionals of the age group 25-35. All the participants were given the Emotional Intelligence questionnaire. The Manager of the employers was then given Performance Appraisal Questionnaires and all the

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

participants were rated. A within group design was used to find out the relationship between the two variables. The scores of high and low Emotional Intelligence and high and low Performance Appraisal was divided and 't' test was done to find out the significance in both the variables. Chi square test was then used to compare the observed data with the data that was expected to obtain according to the hypothesis. The results showed that there is a positive relation between Emotional Intelligence and Performance Appraisal.

The mean and SD for those who have obtained high scores on Emotional Intelligence Test are 51.05 and 8.47 respectively. The mean and SD for those who have obtained low scores on Emotional Intelligence Test are 44.92 and 7.60 respectively. The obtained 't' ratio is 2.93 which is greater than the table values of 2.00 at 0.05 level of significance and 2.66 at 0.01 level of significance thus indicating that there is a significant difference in the performance of the group.

The mean and SD for those who have obtained high scores on Performance Appraisal are 51.03 and 8.24 respectively. The mean and SD for those who have obtained low scores on Performance Appraisal are 44.14 and 8.01 respectively. The obtained 't' ratio is 3.28 which is greater than the table values of 2.00 at 0.05 level of significance and 2.65 at 0.01 level of significance thus indicating that there is a significant difference in the performance of the group.

The degree of freedom is $(r-1)$ i.e. $(2-1)$ i.e. 1. the chi square value is 4.07 which is greater than the table value of 3.84 at 0.05 level of significance thus accepting the hypothesis which states that **“Higher the Emotional Intelligence, Higher will be the Performance.”**

Limitation

- A sample size 60 was adopted for the study and therefore it cannot be generalized.
- The study can also be conducted using variable such as particular job and age factor.

Application value

- Individual differences in performance can be noted.
- Performance styles can be noted through observation and recording.
- Score and analysis can be considered for rewards and promotional purposes.
- Additional programs can conduct to enhance levels of Emotional Intelligence.

REFERENCES

- Wagner & Hollenbeck (2010), "Organizational Behavior – Securing Competitive Advantage," 5th edition, Routledge, 81-87
- Pinder, Craig C (2008), "Work Motivation In Organizational Behavior," 2nd Edition
- Spector, Paul 1997, "Job satisfaction – Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences", Sage Publications
- <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~mbolin/tella2.pdf>
- http://www.unesco.org/education/aladin/paldin/pdf/course02/unit_14.pdf
- www.psychologytoday.com/basics/emotional-quotient
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/performance>
- <http://www.managementparadise.com/forums/human-resources-management-h-r/205363-factors-influencing-performance.html>
- <http://www.enotes.com/job-satisfaction-reference/performance>
- <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/bul/127/3/376/>

Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals

<http://pss.sagepub.com/content/1/4/240.short>

Acknowledgement

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Raj P. (2021). Effect of Emotional Intelligence on the Job Performance of IT professionals. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(1), 1793-1810. DIP:18.01.189/20210901, DOI:10.25215/0901.189