Assessing Emotional Intelligence Competencies in Public Sector Petroleum Companies in Egypt

Hazem Halim, Karim Salem
The British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt

Omnia Hassan
The Egyptian Petrochemicals Holding Company, Cairo, Egypt

Although emotional intelligence (EI) has gained general acceptance as a set of competencies in many industries, there is still a need for increased empirical research on its importance, usage, and impact in the workplace. There is also a need for managers to know that EI should be developed as a part of interrelated package of both emotional and cognitive intelligence enhancement rather than being developed in isolation as an autonomous phenomenon. This study ventures to provide empirical information about discrepancies between self and others' assessments of EI's different competencies in government owned petroleum companies in Egypt. Differences between others' and self-scores for each competency were computed. This study also ventures to determine employee level of EI, as represented in its different competencies, when compared with a cut-off point. Data were analysed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Results indicated a lower level of EI among employees of the organisations in question and there is a significant gap between self and managers' perception of the different EI competencies.

Keywords: emotional intelligence (EI), public sector, petroleum companies in Egypt

Employment is one of the most important challenges facing Egypt today. Finding a job in either the public or private sectors is quite a tough task by itself. However, government jobs, and to be more specific, jobs in the government owned petroleum companies come with loads of benefits ranging from a decent above government average salaries, job security and stability, with comparatively relaxed working conditions and tendency for more seniority based promotion and less merit and performance based assessment (Assaad & Krafft, 2013; Barsoum, 2004). As a result, finding a job in a government owned petroleum company in Egypt is considered as one of the toughest tasks, as it is well-known among people that these jobs are usually not awarded to the best candidates, yet to graduates of politically and socially well connected families (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2011). This dilemma could probably affect the employability in these government owned companies.

Hazem Halim, Ph.D., professor, Faculty of Business Administration, Economics, and Political Sciences, the British University in Egypt; research field: human resources management. E-mail: Hazem.Halim@bue.edu.eg.

Corresponding author: Karim Salem, Ph.D., lecturer, Faculty of Business Administration, Economics, and Political Sciences, the British University in Egypt; research fields: public administration and strategic management in government. E-mail: karim.salem75@gmail.com.

Omnia Hassan, B.A. in Business Administration, Career Path Specialist, human resources department, the Egyptian Petrochemicals Holding Company; research field: human resources management. E-mail: omnia-nabil@echem-eg.com.

This study aims at finding unconventional solutions to the development of the capacities of those already hired employees. This does not imply in any way shape or form that the existing employees lack competencies, but rather some of them might not rise to the required standards due to both the mediocre output of graduates from the current educational system and the recruitment process that heavily relies on nepotism and societal influence.

Current interpretations of employability discuss it as the capacity of a candidate to function in a job and to be able to rotate jobs, thus remaining employable throughout their career span. Research studies propose that employability consists of four main elements. The first element is employability assets composed of employee knowledge, skills, and attitudes. The second element is deployment which includes career management skills, including the capacity for job search. The third element is presentation, which is concerned with “job getting skills” such as CV (*curriculum vitae*) writing, work experience, and interview techniques. Finally, employability assets which focus on the current level of opportunity are within the labour market (Van der Heijden, 2005; Hillage & Pollard, 1998).

One key factor of the employability problem facing Egypt is the discrepancy between the skills offered by the Egyptian educational system and the skills required by the job market while some initiatives targeted the education process to solve the problems of unemployment (El-Megharbel, 2007), and employability in Egypt, others were aiming at knowledge and skills of existing employees of the public sector. This study suggests improving knowledge and skills of existing employees through promoting emotional intelligence (EI)’s enhancement as a resolution for the aforementioned discrepancy. This empirical study is encouraging different managers/employees to know that EI should be developed as a part of interrelated package of both emotional and cognitive intelligence enhancement rather than being developed in isolation as an autonomous phenomenon. The achievement of this goal would not be possible unless a detection of employee level of EI in relation to different competencies have been declared. Accordingly, the objectives of this research study are:

- (1) To provide empirical information about discrepancies between self and others’ assessments of EI’s different competencies in government owned petroleum companies in Egypt;
- (2) To determine the employee level of EI, as represented in its different competencies, when compared with a cut-off point.

Most researchers and practitioners agree that EI is an essential factor responsible for determining the level of success in life and psychological well-being. It also plays an important role in shaping the interaction between individuals and their work environment (Vanitha & Barani, 2012) and in helping the managers and employees to cope with this dynamic change in the business environment (Ravichandran, Arasu, & Kumar, 2011). In the past decade, much has been written about EI and its impact in the workplace. Gurus in this field have contributed to the shaping of many definitions and models of measurement. However, the significant amount of controversy surrounding the constructs of EI supports the need for further research.

Over 70 years ago, Thorndike (1920) cited in Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (2000) proposed the existence of a construct very similar to EI, namely social intelligence. Thorndike suggested that intelligence could be organized under three broad dimensions: mechanical, abstract, and social. Wechsler (1939) and Gardner (2011) have also provided foundations for EI. Wechsler highlighted the influence of non-intellective factors on intelligent behaviour; while Gardner introduced the idea of multiple intelligences. In Gardner’s opinion, traditional view of intelligence fails to fully explain cognitive ability and also fail to explain performance outcomes. In the 90s, three definitions and models of EI have emerged.

A definition and model by Salovey and Mayer (1990) considers EI as a subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to interpret one's own and other's feelings and emotions to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions. Their conceptualization of the term highlights EI as having types of abilities: appraisal and expression of emotions in self and others; the regulations of emotions in self and others; and the utilization of emotions reflected in flexible planning, creative thinking, redirecting attention and motivation.

Salovey and Mayer model of measuring EI is called the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) which is based on a series of emotion-based problem solving items (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003). Mayer and Salovey (1997) in Salovey and Sluyter (1997) state that the EI construct would not suffer from the same problems as the social intelligence construct previously suggested by Thorndike in 1920. EI focuses more on emotional problem solving, rather than on the social, political, or verbal aspects inherent in the social intelligence construct (Mayer et al., 2000). By testing an individual's abilities on each of the areas of EI, it generates scores for each of the abilities as well as a total score.

Another definition and model of EI was set by Goleman (1995). He suggests that successful life outcomes are more of a function of emotional rather than cognitive intelligence. He defines it as a set of abilities which include self-control, enthusiasm, and persistence, and the ability to motivate oneself. Goleman (1995) suggested a model for measuring EI. The model was self-reviewed in 1998. It identified 25 social and emotional competencies that most strongly predict superior performance in many occupations. He organized these competencies into the five dimensions of self-awareness, self-regulation, self-motivation, social awareness, and relationship management. Recent research using the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI), a measure of EI developed by Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee (2000), led to a refined version of the original model, consisting of four dimensions and 19 emotional competencies: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management. Those 19 competencies were reduced to only 12 in a newer version of the model.

Another definition and model by Bar-On (1997) asserted that the word social should be added to the term and be called "emotional social intelligence" rather than "emotional intelligence". According to Bar-On (2004; 2006), emotional social intelligence is a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand others and related with them, and cope with daily demands. The emotional social competencies, skills, and facilitators include the following five key components namely the ability to recognize, understand, and express emotions and feelings; the ability to understand how others feel and relate with them; the ability to manage and control emotions; the ability to manage change, adapt and solve problems of a personal and interpersonal nature; and the ability to generate positive affect and be self-motivated. Bar-On (2004; 2006) emphasized that being emotionally and socially intelligent means to effectively manage social, interpersonal, and environmental change by realistically and flexibly coping with the immediate situation, solving problems, and making decisions to do this, one need to manage emotions to work for not against him/her and one need to be sufficiently optimistic, positive, and self-motivated.

Bar-On (1997) came up with the intelligent quotient inventory (EQ-i) which played an instrumental role in developing the model. It is a self-report consisting of 133 items in the form of short sentences and employ five-point Likert scale. The individual responses render an EQ score. The categories of the items to be tested are intrapersonal (self-regard, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, independence, and self-actualization); interpersonal (empathy, social responsibility, and interpersonal relationship); stress management (stress

tolerance and impulse control); adaptability (reality testing, flexibility, and problem solving); and general mood (optimism and happiness).

The previously highlighted definitions and models gained general acceptance among researchers and practitioners. One more model added by Cooper and Sawaf (1997) in which they divided EI into five attributes specifically current environment—this measures life pressures and life satisfaction; emotional literacy—this measures emotional self-awareness, emotional expression, and emotional awareness of others; emotional quotient competencies—this measures intentionality, creativity, resilience, interpersonal connections, and constructive discontent; emotional quotient values and attitudes—this includes outlook, compassion, intuition, trust radius, personal power, and integrated self; and the outcome area of the emotional quotient map—this measures explicit outcomes of EI such as general health, quality of life, relationship quotient, and optimal performance.

There are significant resemblances between the different components of the models. All of the models intend to measure how individuals recognize, assess, regulate, and use emotions of ones and of others. Relationships were established between the elements of different constructs through statistical analysis. There is also evidence that different measures of EI are related and may be measuring similar components (Brackett & Mayer, 2003).

Several researchers have found that EI can have a significant influence on various aspects of life. Pellitteri (2002) reported that people higher in EI were also more likely to use an adaptive defence style and thus exhibited healthier psychological adaptation. Scott-Ladd and Chan (2004) proved that organizational learning is more effective if enacted by emotionally intelligent employees within clear operating boundaries such as those offered by participation in decision-making. Schutte et al. (2001) emphasize, emotionally intelligent employees tend to want outcomes that benefit others as well as themselves.

It should be noted that a high level of EI has proved to positively contribute to coaching efficacy and factors related to it (Afkhani et al., 2011). EI was also found to enhance employee role in innovation and creative thinking (Othman, 2011) and it was also found to positively affect organizational commitment (Khalili, 2011). People with higher level of EI proved to have better role in workforce agility changes (Hosein, 2012).

The relationship between EI and employee/manager effective communication has been profoundly covered in the literature. Many studies were also made to measure EI impact on performance of staff (Jimoh, Olayide, & Saheed, 2012). Intuitively, one might assume that EI will increase staff performance standards. However, empirical research studies have not determined the acceptable level of EI that could positively affect communication and performance. Studies have not also determined the level of discrepancies that exist between self and people's perception of the level of EI in the workplace. This study aims to cover these gaps especially in government owned petroleum organizations.

Methodology

Secondary data were collected from relevant textbooks, journals, and online databases in an attempt to identify the research gap. A pretested questionnaire called Emotional and Social Competence Inventory (ESCI) (3.0) was used to collect the needed data. The questionnaire is the Hay/McBer model of ESCI that combines the work of both Goleman and Boyatzis with Hay/McBer's. The questionnaire is a 360-degree instrument measuring both emotional and social intelligence competencies via 68 questions with six behavioural anchors. The questionnaires were distributed among 60 employees from seven public sector petroleum companies.

Those companies represent almost 60% of the population as there are 12 fully government owned public sector petroleum companies in Egypt.

The questionnaires' forms were distributed amongst middle and senior managers. They were asked to assess their employees and also their employees were asked to assess themselves. The discrepancy found in both measures was identified.

ESCI test helped in indicating which competencies were weak or needed to be developed in order to enhance an employee's EI. The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) was used to analyse the collected data. Multiple regression was conducted to highlight the relationship between the two aforementioned variables. As a result, the analysis yielded results that contributed to the determination of the percentage of employees in each competency as well as the overall percentage of employees who have either high or low EI.

This study was specifically applied to government owned petroleum companies in Egypt. The aim is to observe the percentage of people who have low and high EI and determine a cut-off point where one can indicate the higher and lower levels of EI. If the percentage of people who have low EI is greater than those who have high EI, then there is a gap and a need to find out solutions to narrow this gap, hence determining the gap's impact on employees as well as their performance at work. The gap is related to two issues: firstly, to an employee's capability of being aware of his/her emotions; integrate emotions in thought; understand, control, and influence them; and being able to direct them as well; secondly, to the manager-employee awareness. This is very important as managers should be aware of their employees and how they act and react in different situations, as this improves managers' knowledge in predicting their employees' performance at work.

Results

As shown in Table 1 and Table 2—"competencies' descriptive statistics of both employees and managers", this is a descriptive analysis about the 12 competencies of EI test done by both employees and their managers. N is the number of individuals who have participated in this test, which equals to 60.

Table 1 and Table 2 show the ranges after deducting and adding standard deviation (SD) by the mean. Thus, the ranges of the scores of all employees and managers will be considered low, moderate, or high in each competency.

Table 1

Average Item Scores Equivalent to High, Medium, and Low Competency Levels According to the Employees

ESCI 3.0 cluster	Competency	Low range	Moderate range	High range
Self-awareness	Self-awareness	< 36-43.48	43.49-54.21	> 54.22-59
Self-management	Self-control	< 6-9.24	9.25-12.61	> 12.62-14
	Adaptability	< 18-28.32	28.33-37.83	> 37.84-41
	Achievement orientation	< 13-22.40	22.41-30.12	> 30.13-33
	Positive outlook	< 15-16.90	16.91-21.89	> 21.90-25
Social awareness	Empathy	< 22-28.29	28.30-37.60	> 37.61-46
	Organisational awareness	< 11-15.68	15.69-22.21	> 22.22-25
Relationship management	Conflict management	< 0.00-4.15	4.16-7.94	> 7.95-10
	Coach and mentor	< 3-5.72	5.73-9.30	> 9.31-10
	Influence	< 3-8.69	8.70-13.67	> 13.68-15
	Inspirational leadership	< 2-7.93	7.94-12.69	> 12.70-15
	Teamwork	< 7-10.50	10.51-14.79	> 14.80-15

Table 2

Average Item Scores Equivalent to High, Medium, and Low Competency Levels According to Managers

ESCI 3.0 cluster	Competency	Low range	Moderate range	High range
Self-awareness	Self-awareness	< 31-41.30	41.31-56.75	> 56.76-64
Self-management	Self-control	< 4-7.86	7.87-12.83	> 12.84-15
	Adaptability	< 20-26.48	26.49-36.87	> 36.88-41
	Achievement orientation	< 17-21.50	21.51-31.22	> 31.23-36
	Positive outlook	< 9-14.03	14.04-21.86	> 21.87-25
Social awareness	Empathy	< 19-27.03	27.04-37.56	> 37.57-44
	Organisational awareness	< 8-15.15	15.16-22.91	> 22.92-26
Relationship management	Conflict management	< 3-4.63	4.64-8.76	> 8.77-10
	Coach and mentor	< 3-5.23	5.24-8.59	> 8.60-10
	Influence	< 0.00-6.44	6.45-12.55	> 12.56-15
	Inspirational leadership	< 0.00-5.59	5.60-11.70	> 11.71-14
	Teamwork	< 5-9.44	9.45-14.15	> 14.16-15

A paired t-test is used in order to compare the means of two samples in which the results of one sample can be paired with results of the other sample. As cited in McDonald (2009), the level of significance is usually 0.05, thus any number less than 0.05 suggests significance between the two samples. According to Table 3, a significance exists between managers and their employees in three competencies in relationship management cluster, which are influence, inspirational leadership, and teamwork, revealing that both managers and employees have different perceptions.

After determining the competency level and the differences between employee self-assessment and manager-employees assessment, the next step was getting the percentage of employees as well as managers for each competency. This step demonstrated how much employees have low, moderate, or high percent in each competency.

Table 3

Overall Differences Between Employees Self-Assessment and Managers-Employees Assessment (N = 60)

ESCI 3.0 cluster	Competency	Assessment				t	Sig.
		Employees		Managers			
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Self-awareness	Self-awareness	48.85	5.36	49.03	7.72	-0.16	0.87
Self-management	Self-control	10.93	1.69	10.35	2.48	1.73	0.089
	Adaptability	33.08	4.76	31.68	5.19	1.86	0.068
	Achievement orientation	26.27	3.86	26.37	4.86	-0.128	0.899
	Positive outlook	19.4	2.49	17.95	3.91	2.77	0.007
Social awareness	Empathy	32.95	4.65	32.3	5.26	0.81	0.419
	Organisational awareness	18.95	3.26	19.03	3.87	-0.13	0.896
Relationship management	Conflict management	6.05	1.89	6.7	2.06	-1.8	0.076
	Coach and mentor	7.51	1.78	6.91	1.68	1.9	0.062
	Influence	11.18	2.48	9.5	3.05	3.19	0.002*
	Inspirational leadership	10.32	2.38	8.65	3.05	3.28	0.002*
	Teamwork	12.65	2.14	11.8	2.35	2.34	0.022*

Note. *—significant at significance level of 0.01.

As shown in Table 4 that moderate level has the highest percentage of employees. This means that employees are not fully aware of their internal states, intuitions, preferences, and resources.

According to managers-employees assessment, the percentage is also high in moderate level, which means that the majority of both perspectives (manager and employees) are related to each other, and employees need to be more aware about themselves. However, managers perceive that 20% of their employees have high self-awareness while employees' self-assessment shows that only 13.3% of them have high self-awareness. This result illustrates that either some managers are not aware of their employees or employees are not able to assess themselves correctly.

Table 4

Employees and Managers' Self-Awareness

ESACAT						MSACAT				
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	11	15.5	18.3	18.3	Valid	Low	11	15.5	18.3
	MOD	41	57.7	68.3	86.7		MOD	37	52.1	61.7
	High	8	11.3	13.3	100		High	12	16.9	20
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100

Table 5 shows that most employees have a moderate level of self-control, which is related to their ability of keeping disruptive impulses as well as emotions in check. Additionally, managers' results are quite similar to employees' results at the moderate level with a slight difference occurring between some managers-employees perspectives. In this competency, it was obvious that employees have the ability to control their emotions and impulses, but was not fully empowered to do that.

Table 5

Employees and Managers' Self-Control

ESCCAT						MSCCAT				
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	10	14.1	16.7	16.7	Valid	Low	7	9.9	11.7
	MOD	40	56.3	66.7	83.3		MOD	43	60.6	71.7
	High	10	14.1	16.7	100		High	10	14.1	16.7
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100

Adaptability is related to employees' flexibility in handling/managing change. As shown in Table 6, the moderate level of both employees and managers is very close to each other in this competency, showing a highly shared perspective between them, with managers' understanding the level of adaptability of their employees, and that the employees are aligned with that.

Table 6

Employees and Managers' Adaptability

EACAT						MACAT				
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	8	11.3	13.3	13.3	Valid	Low	10	14.1	16.7
	MOD	39	54.9	65	78.3		MOD	40	56.3	66.7
	High	13	18.3	21.7	100		High	10	14.1	16.7
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100

Table 7 highlights the level of striving that employees exert in order to meet or enhance a standard of excellence. The highest percentage of employees in this competency is shown in moderate level, however, there is a 10% difference between managers' and employees' result. Managers see that only 60% of employees have moderate level while the rest of employees are between low and high categories. In other words, managers see that only 60% are trying to enhance and improve themselves toward excellence and the 10% difference between both scales could refer to employees who think that they are trying to enhance themselves while their managers do not think that.

Table 7

Employees and Managers' Achievement Orientation

EAOCAT						MAOCAT				
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	10	14.1	16.7	16.7	Valid	Low	13	18.3	21.7
	MOD	42	59.2	70	86.7		MOD	36	50.7	60
	High	8	11.3	13.3	100		High	11	15.5	18.3
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100

The highest percent in Table 8 is shown at the moderate level, as both managers' and employees' results are quite similar. This implies that employees' level of persistence in following goals in the face of setbacks and obstacles is normal. The importance of this competency is that it is used to identify employees who have positive views of life as well as the future that appears to be a distinct outlook, thus, it helps in predicting employees' performance.

Table 8

Employees and Managers' Positive Outlook

EPOCAT						MPOCAT				
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	7	9.9	11.7	11.7	Valid	Low	13	18.3	21.7
	MOD	36	50.7	60	71.7		MOD	35	49.3	58.3
	High	17	23.9	28.3	100		High	12	16.9	20
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100

The highest level in both scales is also at the moderate level, however; there is 10% difference between managers' and employees' results. As shown in Table 9, employees have moderate levels of sensing others' perspectives and feelings, and handling their concerns.

Table 9

Employees and Managers' Empathy

EECAT						MECAT				
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	8	11.3	13.3	13.3	Valid	Low	10	14.1	16.7
	MOD	45	63.4	75	88.3		MOD	39	54.9	65
	High	7	9.9	11.7	100		High	11	15.5	18.3
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100

As shown in Table 10, both managers and employees agreed on the percentage of employees who have the ability of reading the power relationships and current emotions of a group. However, with regard to the high level of organisational awareness, there is 6.6% difference between the perspectives of both of them.

Table 10

Employees and Managers' Organisational Awareness

		EOACAT						MOACAT			
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P			Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	11	15.5	18.3	18.3	Valid	Low	9	12.7	15	15
	MOD	42	59.2	70	88.3		MOD	40	56.3	66.7	81.7
	High	7	9.9	11.7	100		High	11	15.5	18.3	100
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100	

This competency is related to the ability of employees to negotiate and resolve disagreements. As shown in Table 11, the highest percentage exists at the moderate level, as most employees are able to handle and find solutions for obstacles they might face at work. Also, the other percentages in both low and high categories are similar to each other. Thus, in this competency, there is a high level of alignment between employees' and managers' perspectives at the three levels.

Table 11

Employees and Managers' Conflict Management

		ECMCAT						MCMCAT			
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P			Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	10	14.1	16.7	16.7	Valid	Low	11	15.5	18.3	18.3
	MOD	38	53.5	63.3	80		MOD	37	52.1	61.7	80
	High	12	16.9	20	100		High	12	16.9	20	100
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100	

Table 12 illustrates a relatively wide discrepancy between both managers' and employees' perspectives regarding the coach and mentor competency. The results of the three categories (low, moderate, and high) of coach and mentor are not that similar to each other. A minimum of 6.6% difference exists between both perspectives. However, most employees have a moderate level in both scales, which means that they have a modest ability in developing others, in other words, are able to recognize the developmental needs of others as well as reinforce and strengthen their abilities.

Table 12

Employees and Managers' Coach and Mentor

		ECOMECAT						MCOMECAT			
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P			Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	7	9.9	11.7	11.7	Valid	Low	12	16.9	20	20
	MOD	46	64.8	76.7	88.3		MOD	37	52.1	61.7	81.7
	High	7	9.9	11.7	100		High	11	15.5	18.3	100
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100	

Also in Table 13, there is difference between managers' and employees' perspectives regarding employees' ability to influence or using effective methods for persuasion. Although, both managers and employees' results

show that the highest percentage is located at the moderate level, where managers see that 80% of their employees are able to influence and convince others, and employees self-assessment shows that only 68.3% are having a moderate level of this competency.

Table 13

Employees and Managers' Influence

EICAT						MICAT				
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	9	12.7	15	15	Valid	Low	5	7	8.3
	MOD	41	57.7	68.3	83.3		MOD	48	67.6	80
	High	10	14.1	16.7	100		High	7	9.9	11.7
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100

Inspirational leadership is the ability to guide and inspire groups and individuals. As shown in Table 14, Employees have a moderate level in this competency with a 6.7% difference between perspectives of both managers and employees. This shows that some employees perceive themselves as having a modest levels in this competency and that either managers do not perceive them as having a moderate ability in influencing others or employees are not aware of the absence of this competency in them.

Table 14

Employees and Managers' Inspirational Leadership

EILCAT						MILCAT				
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	6	8.5	10	10	Valid	Low	8	11.3	13.3
	MOD	45	63.4	75	85		MOD	41	57.7	68.3
	High	9	12.7	15	100		High	11	15.5	18.3
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100

Table 15 is assessed employees' ability to work with others toward mutual goals. As shown, most employees are having a moderate ability of teamwork, also there is a great difference between both scales. A 15% difference exists between managers-employees assessment and employees' self-assessment at the moderate level; and 11.7% difference between both results in the high level of employees' teamwork.

Table 15

Employees and Managers' Teamwork

ETCAT						MTCAT				
		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P		Freq	Pct	V.P	C.P
Valid	Low	10	14.1	16.7	16.7	Valid	Low	8	11.3	13.3
	MOD	35	49.3	58.3	75		MOD	44	62	73.3
	High	15	21.1	25	100		High	8	11.3	13.3
	Total	60	84.5	100			Total	60	84.5	100

The next step after determining the percentage of employees in each competency was to find out the cut-off point, which is the boundary or limit that will help in determining the percentage of employees having either high or low EI. The cut-off point has been determined from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) Technical Manual, prepared by Wolff (2005).

The percentage of employees who have either high or low EI is identified as shown in Table 16 and Table 17.

Table 16

Employees EI Category

EEICAT		Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Valid	Low EEI	37	52.1	61.7	61.7
	High EEI	23	32.4	38.3	100.0
	Total	60	84.5	100.0	

Table 17

Managers EI Category

MEICAT		Frequency	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Valid	Low MEI	36	50.7	60.0	60.0
	High MEI	24	33.8	40.0	100.0
	Total	60	84.5	100.0	

According to Table 16, the valid percentage of employees' self-assessment shows that 61.7% have low EI while 38.3% only have high EI. Also in Table 17 that is related to managers-employees assessment shows that 60% have low EI and 40% have high EI. Both results are almost identical, showing that most employees lack lots of critical competencies that are vital to employees' effectiveness at work. As mentioned earlier, these competencies are related to one's capacity to recognize his/her own feelings and those of others, being able to motivate one's own self and controlling one's own emotions as well as others effectively.

The number and percentage of people at the moderate levels indicate the need for paying extensive attention for these competencies. These modest competency levels indicate that employees need to have the appropriate development.

It was noted that people who have rated themselves higher in EI tend to correspondingly report higher interpersonal success (being accepted and respected by superiors and peers), higher hierarchical success (accomplishing their career goals), higher job success (felt challenged and supported by the management of their work as well as accountable and responsible in their work), and higher life success (being more satisfied and happier with their private life) (Boyatzis, 2009).

Conclusions

The main aim was to define whether employees of government owned petroleum companies have high or low EI and is there any gap between employees' and their managers' perception. It was determined that most employees have low EI and only few employees have high EI. It was also observed that there is a gap between employees' self perception and their managers' perceptions, as employees in some competencies give themselves higher rate.

The study also showed the range of each EI competency and the average rate for each one of the 12 competencies by both managers and employees.

The concept of EI has been shown more than just a superficial uproar or management buzzword (Brown, 2005). EI is a driver of superior and well-supported predictor of organisational performance, thus, there is a

crucial need that leaders or managers know that EI should be developed as a part of interrelated package of both emotional and cognitive intelligence enhancement rather than being developed in isolation as an autonomous phenomenon.

Moreover, for EI to be enhanced, there is a need to be encouraged by the philosophy of an organisation that values its usage in the workplace. Definitely, while developing EI, it is essential that teams and individuals should be motivated to utilize it on an ongoing basis. In order to develop EI, managers should be aware that it is a long term process that requires providing 360 feedback to employees and follow-up plans that could be used in determining employees' current performance and its enhancement level as well as the organisation-wide performance.

Furthermore, EI helps in overcoming conflicts that might arise from teams or individuals in an organisation, also, it helps in making an organisation be more effective so that it would be able to reach its current as well as its future objectives.

Finally, it is recommended to conduct an EI assessment in future recruitment in government owned petroleum companies. This could be among the determinants of employee selection, thus restraining nepotism in the hiring process, as well as lay the ground for a more competitive working environment.

References

- Afkhami, E., Mokhtari, P., Tojjari, F., Bashiri, M., & Salehian, M. H. (2011). Relationship between emotional intelligence and coaching efficacy in coaches. *Annals of Biological Research*, 2(4), 469-475.
- Assaad, R., & Krafft, C. (2013). The Egypt labor market panel survey: Introducing the 2012 round. *IZA Journal of Labor & Development*, 2(1), 1-30.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *The emotional intelligence inventory (EQ-i): Technical manual*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (2004). The Bar-On emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i): Rationale, description and summary of psychometric properties. In G. Geher (Ed.), *Measuring emotional intelligence: Common ground and controversy*. Hauppauge, N.Y.: Nova Science Pub Incorporated.
- Bar-On, R. E., & Parker, J. D. (2000). *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace*. San Francisco, C.A.: Jossey-Bass.
- Bar-On, R. M. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, 18(1), 13-25.
- Barsoum, G. (2004). The employment crisis of female graduates in Egypt: An ethnographic account. The American University in Cairo. *Cairo Papers Series*, 25(3).
- Boyatzis, R. E. (2009). Competencies as a behavioral approach to emotional intelligence. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(9), 749-770.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). *Handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 343-362). San Francisco, C.A.: Jossey-Bass.
- Brackett, M. A., & Mayer, J. D. (2003). Convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of competing measures of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(9), 1147-1158.
- Brown, B. (2005). Emotional intelligence: Implications for human resource development. *Otago Management Graduate Review*, 3(4), 21-36.
- Cooper, R. K., & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: Emotional intelligence in business*. London: Orion Books.
- El-Megharbel, N. (2007). *The impact of recent macro and labor market policies on job creation in Egypt*. The Egyptian Centre for Economic Studies. Retrieved from http://www.eces.org.eg/publications/View_Pub.asp?p_id=10&p_detail_id=36
- Gardner, H. (2011). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York, USA: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York, USA: Bantam Books.
- Hillage, J., & Pollard, E. (1998). Employability: Developing a frame work for policy analysis. *Research Brief*, 85. Retrieved from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RB85.pdf>

- Hosein, Z. Z. (2012). The role of emotional intelligence on workforce agility in the workplace. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 4(3), 48.
- Jimoh, Y. A., Olayide, R., & Saheed, O. (2012). Influence of leadership styles and emotional intelligence on job performance of local government workers in Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, 3(4), 973-976.
- Khalili, A. (2011). Examining the relevance of emotional intelligence and organizational commitment among employees of small and medium enterprise in private sector. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(12), 180.
- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2000). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27(4), 267-298.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. *Emotion*, 3(1), 97.
- McDonald, J. H. (2009). *Handbook of biological statistics* (Vol. 2, pp. 173-181). Baltimore, M.D.: Sparky House Publishing.
- Othman, A. K. (2011). Emotional intelligence and employees' innovator role: The moderating effect of service types. *Asian Social Science*, 7(10), 151.
- Pellitteri, J. (2002). The relationship between emotional intelligence and ego defense mechanisms. *The Journal of Psychology*, 136(2), 182-194.
- Ravichandran, K., Arasu, R., & Kumar, S. A. (2011). The impact of emotional intelligence on employee work engagement behavior: An empirical study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(11), 157.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185-211.
- Salovey, P., & Sluyter, D. J. (Eds.). (1997). *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Bobik, C., Coston, T. D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C., ... Wendorf, G. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 141(4), 523-536.
- Scott-Ladd, B., & Chan, C. C. (2004). Emotional intelligence and participation in decision-making: Strategies for promoting organizational learning and change. *Strategic Change*, 13(2), 95-105.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2011). *Arab development challenges report 2011: Towards the developmental state in the Arab region*. Cairo: Regional Centre for Arab States.
- Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M. (2005). *No one has ever promised you a rose garden*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Vanitha, G., & Barani, G. (2012). Impact of emotional intelligence of textile employees with reference to Tamil Nadu. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 33(3), 374-380.
- Wechsler, D. (1939). *The measurement of adult intelligence*. Baltimore, USA: Williams and Witkins.
- Wolff, S. B. (2005). *Emotional competence inventory (ECI): Technical manual*. Hay Group. Retrieved from http://www.eiconsortium.org/pdf/ECI_2_0_Technical_Manual_v2.pdf

Appendix

Nomenclature

- Pct—Percentage
- C.P—Cumulative Percentage
- V.P—Valid Percentage
- Freq—Frequency
- MOD—Moderate
- CAT—Category
- ESA—Employees' Self-Awareness
- MSA—Managers' Self-Awareness
- ESC—Employees' Self-Control
- MSC—Managers' Self-Control
- EA—Employees' Adaptability
- MA—Managers' Adaptability

EAO—Employees' Achievement Orientation
 MAO—Managers' Achievement Orientation
 EPO—Employees' Positive Outlook
 MPO—Managers' Positive Outlook
 EE—Employees' Empathy
 ME—Managers' Empathy
 EOA—Employees' Organisational Awareness
 MOA—Managers' Organisational Awareness
 ECM—Employees' Conflict Management
 MCM—Managers' Conflict Management
 ECOME—Employees' Coach and Mentor
 MCOME—Managers' Coach and Mentor
 EI—Employees' Influence
 MI—Managers' Influence
 EIL—Employees' Inspirational Leadership
 MIL—Managers' Inspirational Leadership
 ET—Employees' Teamwork
 MT—Managers' Teamwork
 EEI—Employees' Emotional Intelligence
 MEI—Managers' Emotional Intelligence