2005

Emotional intelligence and its relationship with the goodness of fit hypothesis and perceived stress

Ryan Anthony Platt

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE GOODNESS OF FIT HYPOTHESIS AND PERCEIVED STRESS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

in

Psychology:

Industrial/Organizational

---

by

Ryan Anthony Platt

June 2005

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE GOODNESS OF FIT HYPOTHESIS AND PERCEIVED STRESS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

by

Ryan Anthony Platt

June 2005

Approved by:

[redacted]

Dr. Janelle Gilbert, Chair, Psychology — Date 6/8/05

[redacted]

Dr. Michael Lewin

[redacted]

Dr. James Kaufman

ABSTRACT

Emotional Intelligence (EQ) has received lots of attention in the current literature and popular culture. It has been suggested that EQ is an important variable in how successful individuals will be in the workplace. Previous literature has explored the relationship between EQ and stress, exploring the possibility that those who score higher on an instrument of EQ will experience less perceived stress. This study seeks to expand upon this literature and add a new variable to the equation.

It was posited in this study that goodness of fit has a positive relationship with EQ. The goodness of fit hypothesis stems from the research by Richard Lazarus and Susan Folkman, which basically states that there are two different ways of dealing with a stressful event, with the use of either problem or emotion-focused coping. Problem-focused coping is dealing with the event in direct fashion where emotion-focused coping is dealing with emotions that the stressful event triggers. The goodness of fit hypothesis states that with events that can be controlled problem focused coping would result in reduced stress and in situations that can not be controlled emotion-focused

coping would result in reduced stress. The belief examined in this study is that those with higher EQ would have a greater goodness of fit between the specific stressor and the coping strategy used.

In this study participants were given an EQ survey, a general anxiety inventory and were exposed to two different scenarios, controllable and uncontrollable. They were then given a inventory to determine stress levels and how they would cope with the different scenarios. Although a significant relationship was discovered between EQ and general anxiety, which was supported by previous research, the goodness of fit hypothesis was not supported. The results actually supported an alternate hypothesis that states that problem-focused coping will be the preferred coping strategy and lead to less stress regardless of whether the situations is found to be controllable or uncontrollable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Working on this Thesis has been one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of my life. There are several people whom were instrumental in giving me the help and support I needed to complete this project. First I would like to acknowledge my advisor and committee chair Dr. Janelle Gilbert and the rest of my committee, Dr. Michael Lewin and Dr. James Kaufman. I would also like to acknowledge the support of my family; Mary, John, Erin, Amanda and Jayme as well as my friends Matt Bielecki, Miguel Norden, Deb Katzman, Jeeves Patel, Tony Lu, Terry Ryan, Kevin Moy, and Susan Loomis. Thank you every one.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND COPING WITH STRESS

The finding that stress on the job contributes to negative outcomes, such as decreased productivity and job satisfaction, and increased employee health problems, is one that has received much attention in the literature. Much of this literature has focused on ways employees can effectively cope with work stressors to mitigate some of these negative effects. The problem with this literature is the inconsistency in the way that the concept of stress has been defined and the way it has been measured. Dewe, Cox and Ferguson, (1993 p. 6) noted that, "Stress has been treated as a stimulus, a response, or as a result of some interaction or imbalance between the individual and aspects of the environment." Stress has been measured by self reports, behaviorally, cognitively and physiologically. However, no matter how stress is defined or measured, stress experienced in the work place will elicit emotional reactions, to some degree, from employees (Jordon, Ashkanasy & Hartel, 2002). It is for this reason that I am projecting that individuals who can better

recognize, deal, and manage their emotions, will be able to cope better with stress.

There are many different types of coping theories and hypotheses outlined in the literature. One of these hypotheses, that has led to some contradictory findings as to its effectiveness, is the goodness of fit hypothesis. This hypothesis states that certain situations call for different coping strategies, and that a proper fit between situation and coping strategy will lead to less perceived stress. There are two different beliefs being put forward in this study. First is that this fit between coping strategy and situation will indeed lead to less perceived stress, and second that the individual differences of how someone perceives, recognizes and manages emotions will be positively related to goodness of fit.

Effectively recognizing, dealing and managing emotions defines the construct of emotional intelligence (EQ) originally proposed by Salovey and Mayer, (1990, 1993). There has been some research linking other individual differences to coping with work place stress (Parkes, 1986,1994), although the idea of EQ being

positively related to the goodness of fit hypothesis is a new proposition.

Emotional Intelligence: A Closer Look

For the purposes of this study, the definition of emotion posited by Salovey and Mayer (1990) will be used. They view, "emotions as organized responses, crossing the boundaries of many psychological subsystems, including physiological, cognitive, motivational and experiential systems. Emotions typically arise in response to an event, either internal or external, that has a positively or negatively valenced meaning for the individual" (Salovey & Mayer 1990, p. 186). The reason for using the Salovey and Mayer's conception of EQ is that they emphasize emotional intelligence as a specific set of abilities that can be looked at separately (Mayer, Carusco & Salovey, 2000).

The concept of EQ, first appeared, in the research on social intelligence. Several researchers who worked on the social intelligence concept recognized the importance of emotions. Cantor and Kihlstrom (1987) emphasized affective information and how it is processed by the individual. And Gardner's (1983) theory of multiple intelligence included

EQ in the form of personal intelligence which was divided into the two concepts of inter-personal and intra-personal intelligence (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Mayer and Salovey's theory of EQ grew out of the ideas presented by Gardner (1983). Basically EQ refers to the individuals, "ability to recognize the meanings of emotions and their relationships and to reason and problem solve on the basis of them" (Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 2000 p. 186).

EQ is separated into four different branches. These different branches have been described in a hierarchal fashion starting with the areas that require the least skill and moving up to branches that require higher amounts of skill. This first branch involves the ability to perceive emotions, which has been described as recognizing emotion in someone's facial expression, a piece of artwork or a song. An example of this branch would be seeing a frown and furrowed brow on your partners face and realizing this as the tell tale sign of anger. The second branch involves the ability to assimilate emotion related feelings. This ability has been described as a mental process that involves comparing emotions to each other, as well as other thoughts and sensations, thus

allowing emotions to guide ones attention. An example of this branch would be upon noticing the anger in your partner's facial features and realize this might be a good time to leave the house or at least not bring up the fact that you just lost three hundred dollars in Vegas last weekend. The third branch involves understanding information about the emotions, knowing how and why certain emotions emerge, and knowing the rules that apply to emotions. An example of this branch would be noticing a logical progression in an emotional reaction, such as displeasure as your partner learns you left for Vegas with out her, anger when she learns you lost the three hundred dollars, and then hate when she learns that you had left with your ex-girlfriend. The fourth branch involves the ability to manage and regulate emotions; this involves both the emotions of the self and emotions of others. An example of this area would include being able to feel anger, yet calm your self down, or to recognize emotional discomfort in some one else, and be able to help alleviate their emotional problems (Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 2000; Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004).

Although many other researchers agree that investigating emotions can yield useful answers to questions about how individuals interact in their environment, a few have voiced concerns about studying emotion as an intelligence (Pfeffer, 2001; Roberts, Zeidner & Matthews, 2001; Sternberg, 1997). Sternberg raises concerns that the concept of EQ is not developed enough to qualify as a true intelligence and Pheffer states that there are no acceptable instruments for measuring this concept. Roberts et al, raise more specific concerns about EQ being considered a set of abilities. However, proponents of EQ as a true intelligence state they have empirical evidence to back up their claims. Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (2000) have identified three criteria for a set of abilities to be defined as intelligence. The first criteria is conceptual, in that the intelligence should reflect mental performance, and this performance should clearly reflect emotion related abilities. The authors argued that EQ can be operationalized as a set of different abilities. The second criteria is correlational, which means that EQ should be correlated with other forms of accepted

intelligence, without being so related as to be considered the same construct. The authors reported an acceptable correlation with verbal intelligence. The third criteria is that the intelligence be developmental, meaning that the intelligence improves with the age and experience of the individual. In a separate experiment the authors supplied evidence in the form of testing children and adults and showing that the adults showed higher scores of EQ (Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 2000).

It is important to mention that there are other ways of getting at an EQ variable including measures by Bar-On (1997) and Goleman (1998). There are certain theoretical and measurement differences that make these measures distinct from each other and not necessarily interchangeable. It is important to keep this in mind when discussing literature on EQ.

Stress and Coping

One of the earliest studies on stress (Selye, 1956) defined it as "as a non-specific response of the body to any environmental demand" (Bailey, Wolfe, & Wolfe, 1994). Traditionally there have been two different views of the

origination of a stressful event, stress as an input and stress as an output. Stress as an input emphasizes objective external factors that cause stress. Stress as an output emphasizes the reaction of an individual to a situation, and measures their subjective reaction (Lazarus, 1990). Most of the current research on stress, in the organizational literature, defines stress as environmental factors that cause, "anxiety, tension, dissatisfaction and that tax the adaptive capacities of workers" (Bailey et al 1994).

How employees adapt and deal with stress, has been another topic that has received a lot of attention in the literature. Some of the different approaches to studying the coping responses include animal models, ego psychology models, and personality characteristics. The animal model emphasizes learned behaviors, "that contribute to survival in the face of life threatening dangers." The coping responses emphasized are fear, which leads to avoidance, and anger which leads to confrontation. The ego psychology model harkens back to the theories of Sigmund Freud, which views the coping process as employing different defense mechanisms (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988). There is also

research that studies how certain temperament characteristics effect how someone will cope with stress. Two temperament characteristics that have received lots of attention with their connection to coping is Type A personality and locus of control (Parkes, 1986).

However the most prominent model of coping today, and the model of coping used in this study, combines the constructs of stress and coping into a transactional model. This model emphasizes the relationship between the environment and the individual, specifically the cognitive process that the individual goes through as the stressful situation is experienced. The individual appraises the situation as either stressful or not stressful, and then appraises the best way to cope with stressful situations (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988).

Transactional Theory of Stress and Coping

This project argues that a person's level of EQ will influence how they appraise a stressful situation and effectively deal with it. The process of individuals appraising a stressful situation, has been covered extensively by the researchers Lazarus and Folkman (1984), in their transactional theory. The theory emphasizes the

process that occurs between the individual and the environment with a focus on the change that occurs. In the transactional model the person individually appraises the situation, this appraisal is then broken down into two components, primary and secondary appraisal.

In primary appraisal the severity of the stressful situation is assessed. This depends on what the individual has at stake in the situation; this can range from personal self-esteem to concerns over physical well being. Secondary appraisal is where the appropriate coping response is decided for the situation. The two different coping strategies out-lined by the transactional model are problem-focused coping, dealing with the stress head on and emotion focused coping, dealing with ones emotional response to a stressor.

Problem-focused coping includes processes such as confrontive coping, and planful problem solving. Emotion-focused coping involves processes such as denial, distancing, wishful thinking, acceptance of responsibility and positive reappraisal (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Suls, David, Harvey, 1996; Dewe, Cox, & Ferguson, 1993). As an example, a failing grade on an examination can be coped

Basically this hypothesis states that, the appropriate coping response depends on how the situation is appraised (controllable or uncontrollable) and the affective consequences of a match between appraisal of the situation and the coping strategy (problem-focused or emotion-focused) (Vitaliano, etal, 1990). According to the goodness of fit hypothesis problem-focused coping would be more effective in situations that can be controlled or changed, and emotion-focused coping would be more effective in situations deemed uncontrollable or unchangeable.

There have been some inconsistencies in the literature concerning the effectiveness of the goodness of fit hypothesis. Some research has not entirely supported the goodness of fit hypothesis and has given support to the notion that problem-focused coping is always a more effective strategy in dealing with stress, this has been referred to as the main effect hypothesis (Vaillant, Bond, & Vaillant, 1986; Conway & Terry, 1992; Vitaliano, DeWolfe, Maiuro, Russo, & Kanton, 1990). The main effect hypothesis is based off of research by Vaillant, Bond & Vaillant (1986) which asserts that certain defense

mechanisms are inherently more adaptive then others. In research by Conway & Terry (1992) they evaluated the goodness of fit on a sample of university students and local residents. The participants were asked to rate a stressful events they had experienced, then rate the events controllability. Coping was then assessed using the Ways of Coping Inventory, developed by Folkman & Lazarus. The participants were then assessed on depression inventory and a coping efficacy inventory. The researchers found, "no support for the proposal that the use of problem-focused strategies would be maladaptive in uncontrollable situations or for the proposal that in uncontrollable situations, the use of emotion-focused strategies would be adaptive" (1992 p. 5). Similar findings were reported by Vitaliano, DeWolfe, Maiuro, Russo, & Kanton (1990).

Other researchers, however, have found more compelling support for the goodness of fit hypothesis. Research conducted by Zakowski, et al (2001) is of particular interest because in this study the researchers simultaneously tested the hypothesis that problem-focused strategy will be "associated with less distress and that

emotion-focused coping would be associated with more distress regardless of the controllability of the situations" (p. 162), and the goodness of fit hypothesis. The results of this study did not support the notion that problem-focused coping was always more effective and emotion-focused less effective, and the goodness of fit hypothesis was partly supported in this study, where perceived control did result in use of problem focused coping, and less perceived control resulted in more emotion-focused coping strategies.

Another study, conducted by Roussi (2002), also looked at the relationship between perceived controllability over the stressful situation, and use of the appropriate coping strategy. The aspect that this article added was the notion of discriminative facility to the goodness of fit hypothesis. Discriminative facility is conceptualized as, "individual differences in the ability to appraise the controllability of situations by taking into consideration their specific features and to employ coping behaviors appropriate for different situations." (Roussi, p. 180). Roussi found that people high in discriminative facility, experienced lower distress, then

people low in discriminative facility. This finding supports the notion that there may be an additional variable to be considered in an individuals ability to choose the correct coping strategy for a situation. In this experiment it is argued that EQ is that variable.

Emotional Intelligence and the Goodness of Fit Hypothesis

A situation that is stressful and that requires an individual to cope with it is going to elicit an emotional reaction. Folkman and Lazarus (1987, 1988) detail the relationship between emotions and coping as being a two-way street, each effecting the other. The ability to manage and regulate these emotions is the construct of EQ, as posited by Mayer and Salovey. This construct would be important in controlling these emotions so that stress can be dealt with effectively. But what part does EQ play in this relationship between coping and decreased perceived stress? This study is positing that individuals who score higher on levels of EQ will be able to appraise the controllability of a situation and correctly choose the appropriate coping strategy for situations that are either high or low in controllability. Choosing problem focused

coping strategies for situations high in control and emotion focused coping in situations that are low in control, with the end result being less perceived stress for individuals with higher levels of EQ.

Recent Literature on Emotional Intelligence and Work Place Stress

Although, as of yet, there has been no research conducted to look at the relationship between EQ and how it effects the emotion-focused coping and problem-focused coping - perceived stress relationship, there have been some studies that have looked at EQ and its relationship with stress. These findings, concerning EQ and stress, have been found using more general models of EQ, other than the MEIS, such as the Bar-On inventory. The Bar-On has been used in more studies associated with stress, then the MEIS, so they will be discussed here. Although it should be noted the MEIS and Bar-On are not interchangeable measures and they may not be getting at identical constructs.

Jordan, Ashkanasy and Hartel (2002) proposed a model where they state that an employee's level of EQ will moderate their negative reactions toward job insecurity.

Because the concept of EQ involves the ability to regulate and manage emotions, the authors conclude that an individual's level of EQ will "moderate the direct effects of employees perceptions" (p. 61) of job stress created by job insecurity. So an individual with high levels of EQ would report lower levels of perceived stress due to job insecurity.

The last two articles to be discussed have tested the relationship between EQ and coping with workplace stress. Bar-On, Brown, Kirkcaldy and Thome, (2000) measured EQ using the Bar-On EQ-i (1997). Participants in the study were employed in the helping professions which were separated into two types of jobs, police officers and social workers (which consisted of child care workers and mental health workers). The results indicated that police officers scored higher on EQ than child care workers and evidenced more effective coping behaviors than the child care workers. Based on the Bar-On EQ-I scales, police officers scored significantly higher than social workers on several important dimensions including problem solving abilities and stress tolerance. It is argued that these abilities "serve them well in adapting to dynamically

changing situations as they arise" (p. 1112). The article suggested that police work may attract those better able to manage and regulate their emotions; therefore they have higher scores on EQ. The authors also explain social workers' lower EQ scores in that it appears that they, "interpret threats in their workloads as emotional challenges….which they subvert by using denial and minimalisation strategies" (p. 1114). Basically this article supports that individuals that scored higher on a measure of Emotional Intelligence (the police officers) would be better able to handle occupational stress then those who scored lower on an Emotional Intelligence scale (the care workers).

The study conducted by Slaski and Cartwright, (2002) measured a group of retail managers on their level of EQ, again using the Bar-On EQ-i, and then collected data on the managers' subjective stress level and general health. The results indicated that there was a significant link between an individuals level of EQ and perceived stress and health, however due to the type of study that was conducted the direction of causality could not be assumed, but, "findings are encouraging that EQ may play an

important role in moderating the stress process and increasing individual resilience" (p. 67).

Hypotheses

H1 - EQ will be negatively related to stress.

H2 - Stress will be lowest when coping strategies fit the stressor (Goodness of Fit Hypothesis). The use of problem-focused coping with stressors perceived as controllable will lead to less perceived stress; stressors perceived as uncontrollable will lead to more perceived stress. The use of emotion-focused coping with stressors perceived as uncontrollable will lead to less perceived stress; stressors perceived as controllable will lead to more perceived stress.

H3 - Fit between stressors (controllable and uncontrollable) and the appropriate coping strategy (problem-focused and emotion-focused) is positively correlated with EQ.

H4 - The relationship between EQ and Stress will be partially mediated by Goodness of Fit.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

Participants

For this study participants were volunteer undergraduate university students enrolled in a psychology class. Volunteers were recruited from several lower division psychology courses at California State University San Bernardino. Participants received extra credit, in an amount that was determined by the instructor of the course, for participation in the study. A power analysis was conducted using Cohen's Power Primer (1992). With the inclusion of three predictors for the mediated Sobel analysis it was calculated that the current study requires 78 participants to have sufficient power. 119 participants were surveyed in this experiment.

Out of 119 participants in the study, 43 were male and 76 were female. 43 of the sample described them selves at white, 42 as Hispanic, 10 as Black, 12 as Asian, 1 as Middle Eastern, 1 as American Indian and 10 chose the other option. The Majority of the sample was between the ages of 18-25 with 99 of the participants.

The majority of the sample was Christian with the sample breaking down to 37 Catholic and 59 Protestant.

Procedures

The research design used in this study is based on the design used by Roussi (2001) to look at goodness of fit. Participants were asked to complete a questionnaire on general stress, The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, Trait form (STAI-T)(Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970)). Participants were then given both scenarios. One scenario depicting a controllable stressor, a group project, and one depicting an uncontrollable stressor, the terminal illness of a close friend. Which scenario was given to the participant first was counter-balanced to control for sequencing effects. The next step was to ask how much control the participants believed they had in the given situation, using a Likert type of scale (1 being no control, to 5 being complete control). Next the participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire used to measure coping styles for each of the scenarios (The Brief Coping Orientation to Problems Experienced developed by Carver, et al 1989). The participants were then asked

to think about the scenarios as they filled out the coping questionnaires. Next the participants filled out a questionnaire for specific stress related to the specific stressors in the scenarios, The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, State form (STAI-S). The order of receiving the coping measure and the specific stressor measure was counterbalanced to eliminate sequencing effects. The final step required the participants to fill out the measure on Emotional Intelligence (Emotional Intelligence Survey).

Materials

This study consisted of the following materials: an informed consent form (See Appendix A), one survey collecting demographic information (See Appendix B), a scenario depicting a controllable stressor (See Appendix C), a scenario depicting a uncontrollable stressor (See Appendix D), The Emotional Intelligence Survey (Evelyn, 2001, See Appendix E) to asses the participants emotional intelligence, The Brief COPE (Carver, 1997) to asses the coping response of the participant to both the group project (See Appendix F) and terminally ill friend scenarios (See Appendix G), The Trait Anxiety Inventory

(STAI-T) (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970, See Appendix H) to get a measure of general anxiety, two forms of the State Anxiety Inventory (STAI-S) (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970) to get a measure of situation specific anxiety for both the group project (See Appendix I) and terminally ill friend scenarios (See Appendix J), and one debriefing statement (See Appendix K).

Based on the Research conducted by Roussi (2001) different scenarios were created to represent different degrees of controllability. Scenario one was created to represent a situation that would be considered uncontrollable (terminal illness of a close friend) and scenario two was created to represent a situation that could be controlled (class group project). Each scenario was rated by a group of 5 subject matter experts, the SMEs were current graduate students in the field of psychology with education is measurement. The SMEs then evaluated the directions, wording and controllability of the scenarios. Slight modifications were made based on the feedback. Originally there was to be three scenarios, one depicting a stressor of medium controllability. However, due to

disagreement on its level of controllability among the SMEs it was dropped from the study.

To assess the participant's perception of control over the terminal illness of a close friend and a group project three different questions were asked. The questions that were asked included: "I feel that I have a great deal of control over this situation", "I can greatly affect the outcome of the situation", "The situation is such that there is little that I can do to make it better." Subjects rated how much they agree they have control on a 5 point Likert scale, 1 representing Strongly Disagree and 5 Strongly Agree. The alpha reliability for group project scenario was .73 and for the terminally ill friend was .66.

The Emotional Intelligence Survey in this study was constructed by Evelyn (2001) based on the work of Salovey which was modeled after the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 1997) and information from Daniel Goleman's book "Working with Emotional Intelligence" (1998). The MEIS is an inventory that is used to measure an individual's level of EQ. The MEIS measures 4 branches of EQ. The 4 branches each

represent a separate ability. These abilities include; Perceiving, Assimilating, Understanding and Managing Emotions. The Emotional Intelligence Survey adapted the MEIS into a shorter self-report form. Five dimensions identified by Daniel Goldman were used to tap into the concepts related to the four skills of the MEIS. These dimensions include, self awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. In the initial study by Evelyn, the Emotional Intelligence Survey had a high overall reliability of .98 which indicated good internal consistency. Each of the five dimensions also evidenced good reliability. The alpha reliability for the dimensions were: self-awareness .87,self regulation .86, motivation was .92 empathy .94 and social skill .92. The Emotional Intelligence Survey consists of 27 items in six point likert scale format. The scores ranged from Strongly Agree (6) to Strongly Disagree (1). The 27 items tap into each of the 4 branches identified in the MEIS. Participants' responses were then averaged together to obtain an EQ score. A high score on this measure indicated a high EQ and a low score indicated low EQ. This measure was chosen based on the ability to be administered in a

short survey packet. The alpha reliability for this measure was .93.

The Brief COPE (Carver, 1997) is a shortened and modified version of the COPE (Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989). The Brief COPE is a self report inventory that is used to measure the type of coping strategy an individual generally uses during a specific stressful event. Participants are asked to indicate how often they use a particular strategy on scale of 1 (I would not do this at all) to 4 (I would do this a lot). The Brief COPE consists of 28 items that create 14 subscales. The 14 subscales can be combined into two categories, problem-focused and emotion focused strategies. Problem-focused strategies include: Use of instrumental social support, Active coping, and Planning. Emotion-focused strategies include: positive reframing, self-distraction, venting, denial, religious coping, humor, behavioral disengagement, use of emotional social support, substance use, and acceptance. The 14 subscales were calculated as suggested by Carver. It has also been suggested in the research by Carver (Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989) and Moos (Moos & Holahan, 2003) that

there is a another sub-dimension to the emotion-focused scale that consists of adaptive items as opposed to maladaptive items and that people are less likely to report using the maladaptive items. The adaptive emotion-focused subscale consists of: positive reframing, self distraction, use of emotional social support, religious coping, humor and acceptance. This study used both the overall emotion-focused scale and the adaptive emotion-focused scale based on previous research. The reliabilities for each of the subscales exceeded the minimum acceptance level of .50 (Nunnally, 1978; Carver, 1997). The alpha reliabilities, for the controllable scenario (group project) are: problem-focused coping = .72, emotion-focused = .71, and emotion-focused with adaptive items only = .64. The alpha reliabilities for the uncontrollable scenario (terminally ill friend) are: problem-focused = .70, emotion-focused coping = .63, and emotion-focused coping adaptive items only = .61.

Goodness of Fit was calculated by separating the Brief COPE (Carver, 1997) into the two subscales of problem-focused and emotion focused coping. A score was calculated separately for each of the subscales. The

different sub-scales were then averaged together separately for both emotion and problem-focused coping. The score obtained from the emotion-focused scale was then transformed into a negative number by multiplying it by -1. The transformed emotion-focused coping score was then added to the problem-focused score to obtain a single score for coping for each scenario. This combined score was either positive or negative. A positive score indicating more problem-focused coping used and a negative score indicating more emotion-focused coping. These scores obtained for each scenario were then compared to the controllability of the two scenarios to obtain a fit variable. The controllable stressor (group project) was multiplied by +1 and the uncontrollable stressor was multiplied by negative -1 (terminally ill friend). A more problem-focused score combined with the controllable stressor resulted in a positive number which would represent fit. A more emotion-focused score combined with the uncontrollable stressor also yielded a positive number indicating good fit. Combining a problem-focused score with the uncontrollable stressor or the emotion-focused

score with the controllable stressor resulted in a negative number and is not indicative of fit.

For this study the measure of general and situation specific stress used is the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI). The STAI has a long history of being used to measure stress and anxiety among various samples including college students so it was deemed appropriate for use in this study. STAI consists of two self report scales that measure an individuals level of state and trait anxiety (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970). State anxiety has been defined as an individuals perceived response to certain situational demands and can change over time or vary depending on the situation. For this reason the State Anxiety scale (STAI-S) was used to measure individuals responses to the scenario's in the study. The STAI-S consists of twenty questions that measure an individuals stress at a particular moment. The measure uses a four point scale that assess their agreement on how a situation makes them feel (1 = Not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = Moderately so, 4 = Very much so). The alpha reliability coefficient for the STAI-S for the controllable stressor (group project scenario) was .94. The alpha reliability

coefficient for the STAI-S for the uncontrollable stressor (terminally ill friend scenario)was .95.

Trait anxiety (STAI-T) is defined as a more stable characteristic of the individual that transcends different situations. The STAI-T uses a 4 point scale that assess how the individual generally feels (1 = Not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = Moderately so, 4 = Very much so). The alpha reliability coefficient for the STAI-T was .92.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Data Screening

The dataset was screened using SPSS, for accuracy of data entry, missing values, possible outliers (univariate and multivariate) and a fit between the distributions of the variables and the assumptions of normality. No out of range values were discovered among the dataset. A missing value analysis was run on the dataset to asses missing data. No variable exceeded the 5% missing data limit so patterns of missing data were not analyzed.

There were no univariate outliers which exceeded the criterion of Z-score of 3.3. After looking for outliers the distributions of the scales were then assessed for normality. Z-scores were computed for skewness and kurtosis, a score higher than 3.3 is considered significant. None of the Z-scores for skewness or kurtosis reached the level for significance, the scales therefore met the assumption of normality.

Means and Standard Deviations

The following means and standard deviations can be viewed in Table 1 (See Appendix L). The mean for the EQ Survey was 4.47 on a six point scale with a standard deviation of .66. The STAI-T used to measure trait anxiety had a mean of 2.06 and a standard deviation of .54 on a four point scale. The STAI-S used to measure situation specific anxiety was measured twice in the study. It was measured for both of the scenarios. The mean for the STAI-S for the group project scenario was 2.63 with a Standard deviation of .68. The mean for the STAI-S for terminally ill friend scenario was 2.81 and the standard deviation was .70. The STAI-S is a four point scale. The four item Brief COPE Scale was also evaluated for both of the scenarios. The Brief COPE was separated into both problem focused and emotion focused scales. The mean for the group project scenario problem focused coping scale was 3.2 with a standard deviation of .51. The mean for the group project scenario emotion focused coping scale was 2.1 with a standard deviation of .34. The mean for the terminally ill friend scenario problem focused coping scale was 3.1 with a standard deviation of .51. The mean for the

terminally ill friend scenario emotion focused coping scale was 2.2 with a standard deviation of .31. The mean for the group project adaptive items only emotion focused scale was 2.6 with a standard deviation of .48. The mean for the terminally ill friend adaptive items only emotion-focused scale was 2.7 with a standard deviation of .39.

The manipulation check was the sense of control the participants felt they had over the different scenarios. This was included to ensure that the participants viewed the scenarios in the way they were intended. The mean for group project scenario was, 3.75 and the mean for the terminally ill friend scenario was 2.92. A paired sample T-test was conducted between these two means which revealed, ($t=8.693$, $p < .01$) which indicated that there is a significant difference between the two means that was not due to chance. Therefore the participants sense of control over the group project scenario was significantly higher then their sense of control over the terminally ill friend scenario.

Mean Differences

The means of how much a particular coping strategy was used in the two scenarios was calculated to determine if it turned out as expected by the goodness of fit. As it turns out the means were higher for the participant who indicated they would use problem-focused coping for both the group project scenario; ($t = 19.6$, $p < .05$) and the terminally ill friend scenario; ($t = 18$, $p < .05$). So in both the controllable scenarios (group project) and the uncontrollable scenario (terminally ill friend) problem focused-coping was used significantly more than emotion-focused coping. These results do not support the hypothesis of this experiment and will be discussed in a later section.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 - Emotional Intelligence Will be Negatively Related to Stress

A correlation matrix for the following relationships can be viewed in Table 2 (See Appendix M). Hypothesis one stated that EQ will be negatively related to stress. This was partially supported by the research in the literature review. Results from the EQ survey and the results from

the STAI-T, the measure of general anxiety, were significantly negatively correlated, ($r = -.436$, $p < .01$). This supports the hypothesis that the higher the participants score on a measure of emotional intelligence the lower the score of general anxiety. However, the correlation between the situation specific anxiety and EQ did not reach the level of significance for either the group project scenario or the terminally ill friend scenario. The correlation for the group project scenario was ($r = -.04$, $p = .669$) and for the terminally ill friend scenario ($r = -.042$, $p = .652$).

Hypothesis 2a - Goodness of Fit, Between Situation and Type of Coping (Emotion-Focused and Problem-Focused) Will be Negatively Related to Anxiety

Hypothesis two consisted of two parts, whether the goodness of fit is correlated with less anxiety (both general and situation specific) for problem focused and emotion focused coping. The Pearson correlation for the goodness of fit and anxiety for the group project scenario (the controllable stressor) was a significant, ($r = -.212$, $p < .05$). The correlation is negative indicating that when fit was high (participants use problem-focused coping) for the group project they reported less general stress. The

same can not be said for the situation specific stressor which was not significant, (r=.146, p = .114).

The correlation for the goodness of fit for the terminally ill friend scenario and general anxiety was not consistent with the hypothesis. It is a significant positive correlation, (r= .293, p < .05). This indicates that as the goodness of fit increased for emotion-focused coping and the terminally ill scenario so did participants perceived level of general anxiety. The correlation between the situation specific anxiety and the goodness of fit was not significant, (r=.-133, p = .148).

Hypothesis 2b - Goodness of Fit, Between Situation and Type of Coping (Emotion-Focused, Adaptive Items Only, and Problem-Focused) Will be Negatively Related to Anxiety

Hypotheses two through four had to be run twice, once with all the items included in the emotion focused scale and once with only the adaptive items of the emotion focused scale. Each hypothesis was split into an A and B section to represent the differences in the emotion focused scale.

The use of a scale consisting of the adaptive items from the emotion-focused coping scale resulted in different findings for the hypothesis. The pearson

correlation for goodness of fit between general anxiety and the group project scenario, ($r = -.03$, $p = .72$) does not reach the level of significance. The correlation for the situation specific anxiety however, ($r = .212$, $p < .05$) was significant. This correlation indicates that as the specific stress increases so does use of the goodness of fit in the group project scenario.

The pearson correlation for the goodness of fit between general anxiety and the terminally ill friend scenario, ($r = .02$, $p = .77$) did not reach the level of significance. The correlation for the situation specific anxiety, ($r = -.259$, $p < .01$) was significant. This correlation signifies that the specific anxiety decreased as goodness of fit for the terminally ill friend scenario increased.

Hypothesis 3a- Goodness of Fit Will be Positively Related to Emotional Intelligence

The third hypothesis tested whether the participants' scores on the emotional intelligence survey were correlated with the goodness of fit scores for both scenarios. EQ was positively correlated with the goodness of fit for the group project, ($r = .338$, $p < .01$) meaning that participants who scored higher on the EQ survey had a

goodness of fit with problem-focused coping and the group project, this finding supports the hypothesis. However the correlation between EQ and the goodness of fit for the terminally ill friend scenario do not support the hypothesis. The correlation was significantly negative, ($r=.-369$, $p < .01$) which indicates that those who scored higher on the EQ survey reported less of a goodness of fit between emotion-focused coping and the terminally ill friend scenario. Those higher on EQ used more problem-focused coping.

Hypothesis 3b- Goodness of Fit, Using the Adaptive Items for the Emotion-Focused Scale, Will be Positively Related to Emotional Intelligence

The pearson correlation between EQ and the goodness of fit for the group project scenario is not significant, ($r=.14$, $p =.14$). The correlation between the goodness of fit and the terminally ill friend scenario is also not significant, ($r=-.14$, $p = .12$).

Hypothesis 4a - The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Anxiety Will be Partially Mediated by Goodness of Fit

The fourth hypothesis run was a Sobel analysis which tests whether there is a mediation in the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and General Anxiety. A

Sobel was not run for Emotional Intelligence and the situation specific anxieties because the correlations between these two variables did not reach the level of significance. None of the Sobel analyses conducted were found to be significant, indicating no significant mediation of Goodness of fit in the relationship of EQ and general anxiety. The t-score for general anxiety for the group project scenario was, (t= -.745, p= .456). The t-score for the terminally ill friend scenario for general anxiety was, (t= -1.606, p=.108).

Hypothesis 4b - The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Anxiety Will Be Partially Mediated by Goodness of Fit, Using the Adaptive Items to Form the Emotion-Focused Coping Scale

None of the Sobel analyses, conducted using the positive items to create the total coping score, were found to be significant. The t-score for general anxiety for the group project scenario was, (t = .32, p =. 74) and for specific anxiety was, (t = 1.26, p = .20). The t-score for the terminally ill friend scenario was (t = .40, p =.68) for general anxiety and (t =.1.38, p = .16).

Additional Analyses

Some additional analyses were run on the data. The use of problem focused coping in the group project scenario was positively correlated with a high score on the Emotional Intelligence Survey, ($r = .404$, $p < .01$). This would indicate those who scored higher on EQ chose a problem-focused coping strategy. The use of emotion focused coping in the group project scenario was not significantly correlated with EQ, ($r = .001$, $p = .994$) however the use of emotion focused coping with the adaptive items yielded another positive correlation, ($r = .255$, $p < .01$).

Similar results were found when the terminally ill friend scenario was analyzed. The use of problem focused coping in the terminally ill friend scenario was positively related to the score on the Emotional Intelligence Survey, ($r = .392$, $p < .01$). The use of emotion focused coping was not significantly correlated with EQ, ($r = .005$, $p = .959$). The use of emotion focused coping with the adaptive items, however, resulted in a positive correlation, ($r = .351$, $p < .01$). Because the results seemed to be support an alternative hypothesis for the

main effect of problem-focused coping an additional Sobel analysis was run based off of the scores for problem focused coping. None of these Sobel analyses turned out to be significant.

The score on the EQ survey was evaluated for gender differences (Male N = 43, Female N = 73) using a one-way ANOVA. The ANOVA was non-significant, ($f = 1.47$, $p = .228$) indicating that neither men nor women, in this study, were more likely to score higher or lower on the EQ survey.

The Emotional Intelligence Survey was also separated into sub-scales based on the four sub-scales of the MEIS (perceiving, assimilating, understanding and managing emotions). See table 3 for inter-correlation of the sub-scales (Appendix N). A Pearson correlation was run on each of the four sub-scales with the goodness of fit for both the controllable and uncontrollable situations. The goodness of fit for the group project was positively correlated with each of the emotional intelligence sub-scales, perceiving ($r = .235$, $p < .05$) assimilating ($r = .268$, $p < .05$), understanding ($r = .352$, $p < .01$), and managing ($r = .277 < .05$). This indicates that those that use problem-focused coping in the group project scenario

score higher on the Emotional Intelligence Survey, on each of the subscales. When the adaptive items only were used to create the emotion-focused coping scale, non of the correlations were significant. Perceiving ($r = .065$, $p = .485$) assimilating ($r = .058$, $p = .535$), understanding ($r = .172$, $p = .065$), and managing ($r = .122 < .189$).

The goodness of fit for the terminally ill friend was significantly correlated with the emotional intelligence survey for all of the sub-scales negatively. perceiving ($r = -.201$, $p < .01$) assimilating ($r = -.332$, $p < .01$), understanding ($r = -.327$, $p < .01$), and managing ($r = -.273 < .05$). This indicates that those who used emotion-focused coping more for the terminally ill friend scenario scored lower on the Emotional Intelligence Survey. For the emotion-focused scale developed with the adaptive items only, only one of the subscales was found to be significant and that was the perceiving sub scale ($r = -.201$, $p < .05$). The other three sub-scales were not significant, assimilating ($r = -.129$, $p = .16$), understanding ($r = -.131$, $p = .16$), and managing ($r = -.05 = .54$). These results are consistent with the overall findings identified earlier.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

Discussion of Hypotheses

In this study it was our intent to examine several different relationships. One of these was the relationship between EQ and perceived stress to different situations. Another relationship examined was whether there was a goodness of fit between the type of stressor presented (controllable or uncontrollable) and type of coping strategy used against the stressor (problem-focused or emotion-focused). The third relationship examined was to test for a mediation of the goodness of fit variable between the variables of EQ and general and specific Anxiety.

Before discussing the hypotheses it is important to note that there was a significant difference found between the controllability of the scenarios. Participants perceived that they had more control in the group project scenario, then they did in the scenario with the terminally ill friend. The scenarios used in this study were effective in describing conditions in which participants felt they had control and a situation in

which they felt they had less control. This finding is encouraging in that it allows us to interpret the results in this study and make conclusions based on the results that we obtain.

As was predicted by hypothesis 1 and supported by previous research (Bar-On, Brown, Kirkcaldy & Thome; Jordan, Ashkanasy & Hartel, 2002; Salaski & Cartwright, 2002) there was a significant relationship between general anxiety and EQ. The higher the participants scored on the EQ survey the less stress they reported on the anxiety survey not specific too the scenarios presented in the study. This would seem to suggest that those who have a higher EQ are better able to manage their day to day stressors that are encountered and report less general anxiety. It could be that EQ is a good predictor of general anxiety and not of anxiety specific to a certain situation. It is also possible that the use of scenarios presented a situation that was to unrealistic to get the true responses from the participants where the questions about general anxiety were more relevant to the participants.

Hypothesis 2 in the study looked at whether the goodness of fit would be correlated to less perceived anxiety. This hypothesis was not supported. There was a relationship between general anxiety and the goodness of fit for the group project, which means that the more the participants chose the problem focused items the less general anxiety they reported. However for the terminally ill friend scenario the relationship was in the opposite direction than predicted. The more participants chose the emotion-focused coping items in the terminally ill friend scenario, the more anxiety they reported. This finding does not support the hypothesis presented in this research, but supports the alternate hypothesis presented in other research. This is the hypothesis that states that problem-focused coping will be more adaptive then emotion-focused coping no matter the situation (Vaillant, Bond, & Vaillant, 1986; Conway & Terry, 1992).

Another interesting finding was that although the specific anxiety measure was not significantly correlated with the goodness of fit for either the problem or emotion-focused coping situations. This changed when the scale that used the adaptive items to create the emotion-

focused coping scale was used. The goodness of fit, with the adaptive items used to create the emotion-focused scale, for the controllable situation was positively correlated with the specific anxiety measure ($r = .212$, $p < .05$). This would indicate that as participants chose the problem-focused coping strategy they experienced more anxiety in the controllable situation. This is not consistent with the theory presented in this paper, or with the other results in this study.

Another finding was that there was a significant negative correlation between goodness of fit for the uncontrollable situation, with the adaptive items used to create the emotion-focused coping scale, and the specific anxiety scale ($r = -.259$, $p < .01$). This finding is consistent with the hypothesis in this study, indicated that those who used an emotion-focused strategy in the uncontrollable situation would experience less specific anxiety. Although this finding is also inconsistent with the other findings in this study in which the majority indicate that emotion-focused coping is associated with higher levels of anxiety.

Hypothesis 3 stated that goodness of fit, for the two scenarios would be positively related to emotional intelligence. This would mean that participants who chose problem-focused coping with a controllable stressor (the group project) would score a higher score on the EQ survey. This would also mean that those who chose a emotion-focused coping strategy with an uncontrollable stressor (the terminally ill friend) would score a higher score on the EQ survey.

This hypothesis was only partially supported. There was a significant positive relationship between the goodness of fit hypothesis, for the controllable stressor, and EQ. So participants who chose a problem-focused strategy when dealing the group project scenario evidenced higher amounts of EQ, however the opposite was found for those that used an emotion-focused coping strategy for the uncontrollable stressor. The relationship was negative with EQ. This seems to indicate that those that decided on the emotion-focused items actually score lower on emotional intelligence. These results seem to suggest that those who chose the problem-focused coping strategy had higher amounts of EQ, no matter the scenario to which they

were responding. This also tends to lend more support to the hypothesis that problem-focused coping maybe more adaptive across situations and not the goodness of fit hypothesis. Using only the adaptive items for the emotion-focused coping scale did not have any effect of changing the direction of the relationship between the goodness of fit and the uncontrollable stressor, although it did reduce the power of the relationship resulting in it no longer being significant.

Hypothesis 4 tested whether there was mediation for the relationship between general anxiety and EQ. The mediator tested was the goodness of fit for the different scenarios. There was no significant mediation of the goodness of fit on the relationship between general anxiety and EQ. This was not surprising considering the fact that goodness of fit was not supported for the emotion-focused coping and in fact showed the opposite of what was expected.

The additional analyses tested for relationships among problem-focused coping and EQ and emotion-focused coping and EQ. The results indicated that there was a positive relationship between problem-focused coping and

EQ in the controllable anxiety scenario, however there was no relationship with emotion-focused coping and EQ for the controllable situation. According to the hypotheses presented in this study the relationship was expected to be negative. Another interesting finding was that when using the emotion-focused scale that included only adaptive items there was also a positive relationship indicating that as the participants chose the adaptive emotion-focused items on the controllable scenario, they scored higher on the EQ survey. For the uncontrollable scenario problem-focused coping was again positively related to higher EQ scores, meaning that participants that chose problem-focused coping items for the uncontrollable scenario scored higher on EQ. Again emotion-focused coping for the uncontrollable scenario and EQ was not significant, where it was expected to be a positive correlation. There was a positive correlation between the adaptive emotion-focused scale and EQ indicating that the more a participant chose these items in the uncontrollable scenario scored higher on EQ. These findings tend to establish that problem-focused coping strategies are more adaptive for each of the scenarios.

This evidence is in direct opposition with the hypothesis in this research but does raise some interesting questions, and idea for future research that will be discussed in the next section.

Limitations and Future Research

There were several limitations to this study that should be examined in the hope that future research can improve upon them. The first of which is the sample that was used. The participants in the study were college undergraduates taking introductory psychology courses, whom may not be generalizable to the population at large.

Another limitation was the use of the EQ survey by Evelyn (2001) instead of a more established measure. In the best case scenario the MEIS (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 1997) would have been used, which the EQ survey was created from. Unfortunately the design of the study precluded the use of lengthy and time consuming MEIS. Future research should test the relationship between EQ, anxiety and the goodness of fit using the MEIS, or other measures of established validity, to compare the results with the present study.

Another possible limitation was the use of scenarios for eliciting anxiety. Although the results support that the different scenarios did significantly differ from each other and that participants felt that the group project scenario was a more controllable than the terminally ill friend scenario, there could be a problem that involves the motivation of the participant. Participants who take the scenarios more seriously and truly identify with the situations may feel more anxiety, then participants who just answer the survey with how they think they would feel with out really internalizing the scenario for themselves. In future research it may be possible to get a more genuine feeling of anxiety from a biological measure of stress or perhaps testing participants in actual situations similar to those described in the scenarios.

In future research there are several things that could be changed in the experimental design. Participants could be recruited from more professional settings to test the hypotheses and scenarios that are more common to that population could be used.

Another interesting avenue for future research would be looking at the differences between perceived stress and

actual measures of stress outcomes and there relationship to EQ. In situations where individuals have to deal with actual stress outcomes, the relationship with coping strategies might be different. The goodness of fit, might be more evident in situations where individuals are actually dealing with anxiety, as opposed to situations where they are deciding how they would respond to situations where the anxiety is only perceived.

Also, in future research it would be beneficial to study the adaptive and maladaptive dichotomy. It appeared by looking at the results in this study that emotion-focused coping was not used more for the uncontrollable anxiety scenario but the emotion-focused scale created from the more adaptive items was positively related to EQ. Such an experiment would yield useful information in supplying evidence that individuals with higher EQ would chose more adaptive strategies. It might also be possible that a closer look at the relationship between problem-focused coping and EQ might yield important information. There was a significant relationship between problem-focused coping and EQ suggesting that those with higher EQ will choose the problem-focused strategy.

Implications

This study further adds to the findings that EQ is negatively related to anxiety (Bar-On, Brown, Kirkcaldy & Thome; Jordan, Ashkanasy & Hartel, 2002; Salaski & Cartwright, 2002) making the case for this hypothesis even stronger. This benefits the scientific community and has practical uses as well. EQ has become a popular buzz word in many professional organizations today, and many believe that finding ways to boost EQ would make dealing with work related issues easier. This study supports such propositions as those with higher EQ reported less general anxiety.

This study also did lend some support for the alternate hypothesis of the goodness of fit, the main effect hypothesis, which states that problem-focused coping is the superior coping response no matter the situation (Vaillant, Bond, & Vaillant, 1986; Conway & Terry, 1992; Vitaliano, DeWolfe, Maiuro, Russo, & Kanton, 1990). Although it is possible that it is the refinement of instruments that yielded the goodness of fit not supported in this study, the possibility does remain that the goodness of fit was not supported because there is

another hypothesis that better explains how people cope. If this is the case than this study may help point future researchers in new directions that can shed light on the coping phenomenon and its relationship to EQ.

This study's purpose was to look at the relationship between EQ, the goodness of fit and perceived stress. It was hypothesized that those with high EQ would be better able to chose the appropriate coping strategy to fit the appropriate stressor, in effect a high EQ would enhance the goodness of fit and a low EQ would hinder the goodness of fit. This was not supported, due to the fact that no there was no support for the goodness of fit. Problem-focused coping was related to less anxiety and higher EQ scores, lending support to the main-effect hypothesis. The results from this study suggest that relationship between EQ and problem-focused coping is an important one, and warrants further research to learn more about the relationship. This study also points to the fact that in future research on the goodness of fit more studies that include actual stress measures, as opposed to perceived stress measures, are needed to further

understanding of this construct and its possible relationship to EQ.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in a study designed to investigate how individuals deal with different situations. We are interested in how individuals respond to different stressful situations. The study is being conducted by Ryan Platt as a requirement for a masters degree in Industrial/Organizational Psychology. The study is under the supervision of Dr. Janelle Gilbert, Associate Professor of Psychology. This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board of California State University, San Bernardino. The University requires that you give your consent before participating in a research study. This consent form should bear the Psychology IRB Sub-Committee stamp of approval.

These surveys should take about 30 minutes to complete. There are no foreseeable risks or direct benefits to you for your participation in this study. Please be assured that any information you provide will be held in strict confidence by the researchers. At no time will your name be reported with your responses. Your name will not even be collected. Consequently all responses are anonymous. All data will be reported in group form only. 2 units of extra credit will be offered for participation in this study. If you would like to receive a report of the results, you can contact Dr. Janelle Gilbert at 909-880-5587 (Reference Ryan Platt's study). Results will be available by August of 2004.

Please understand that your participation in this research is totally voluntary and you are free to withdraw at anytime during this study without penalty, and remove any data at any time during this study.

Any questions or inquiries about this research should be directed to Janelle Gilbert at 909-800-5587 (Reference Ryan Platt's study).

By placing a mark in the space provided below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. By this mark I further acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

Give you consent to participate by making a check or "X" mark here: _____

Today's date is _____.

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SURVEY

Demographic Information

Please answer the following questions about yourself. This information is for statistical purposes only and will remain confidential. Please place a mark beside only one option. **DO NOT SIGN.**

1. What is your gender?
   Male ____
   Female ____

2. What is your age?
   Please SPECIFY _____

3. What is your ethnicity?
   American Indian/Native American ____
   White/European American ____
   Hispanic/Latino/Chicano ____
   Black/African American ____
   Asian/Pacific Islander/Indian ____
   Middle Eastern/Arab ____
   Multiethnic/Other ethnic background (Please SPECIFY) _____

4. What is your religion? E.g. Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, Atheist...ect.
   Please SPECIFY _____

APPENDIX C

GROUP PROJECT SCENARIO

Group project scenario

For the following scenario imagine as best you can that it is happening to you and that you must deal with the situation.

You have just started one of the most important classes of your undergraduate career. You are interested in pursing a graduate degree after you finish your undergraduate schooling and have been informed by your advisor that a good grade in this class will be pivotal in your getting accepted into a graduate program. In this class you have been assigned to a group of two people and you must complete a small project that will result in a substantial part of your grade. Each member of the group is responsible for a different part of the project. On the final day of the group project, you call your fellow group member to ask how his part of the project is coming along, when he informs you that he has not had time to work on it and will not have time to finish. This unfortunate situation leaves you in a bad place. You have 12 hours to complete your group members part of the assignment and get a passing grade for the project. If you start now you can finish it in time for class.

Rate how much you agree with the following statement about the above scenario on a scale of 1 to 5.

1= Strongly Disagree	2= Disagree	3= Neutral	4= Agree	5= Strongly Agree

1. I feel that I have a great deal of control over the situation

1----------2----------3----------4----------5

2. I can greatly affect the outcome of the situation

1----------2----------3----------4----------5

3. The situation is such that there is little that I can do to make it better

1----------2----------3----------4----------5

APPENDIX D

TERMINALLY ILL FRIEND SCENARIO

Ill friend scenario

For the following scenario imagine as best you can that it is happening to you and that you must deal with the situation

You are at home relaxing after a hard day of school and have just started to think about what you are going to do for dinner when the phone rings. The phone call is from one of your close friend. After a few minutes of pleasantries, your friend informs you that she has some bad news. She has just come back from an appointment at the local medical center and has been informed that she has developed a form of cancer. The doctor said that the cancer was in the later stages of development and she probably only had 1-2 years to live. You accompany your friend on her later visits to the hospital. After repeated visits your friend has become more and more depressed. The treatments are slowly making your friend more visibly sick. You want to comfort your friend but you know you can not change her diagnosis.

Rate how much you agree with the following statement about the above scenario on a scale of 1 to 5.

1= Strongly Disagree	2= Disagree	3= Neutral	4= Agree	5= Strongly Agree

1. I feel that I have a great deal of control over the situation

1----------2----------3----------4----------5

2. I can greatly affect the outcome of the situation

1----------2----------3----------4----------5

3. The situation is such that there is little that I can do to make it better

1----------2----------3----------4----------5

APPENDIX E

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE SURVEY

Please rate yourself on the following items

Please indicate the extent to which you strongly disagree or strongly agree with the following statements by circling a number from 1 to 6.

1. I recognize my own strengths and weaknesses.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

2. I handle stressful situations in a constructive manner.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

3. I am able to recognize different emotions in myself and others.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

4. I seek mutual understanding and welcome sharing information.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

5. I promote a friendly and cooperative climate.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

6. I am able to regulate my temper and outbursts.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

7. I communicate effectively when a problem arises.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

8. I handle stressful situations effectively.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

9. I have the ability to energize and direct a project.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

10. I am willing to take initiative and set goals.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

11. I am patient and persistent in the face of setbacks.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

12. I am able to make everyone around me enthusiastic about assignments.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

13. I can guide the performance of others while holding them accountable.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

14. I can articulate and arouse enthusiasm for a shared vision and mission.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

15. I am attentive to emotional cues and listen well.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

16. I show sensitivity and understand others' perspectives.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

17. I foster open communication and am receptive to bad news as well as good.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

18. I cultivate relationships with people.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

19. I show concern for others' needs.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

20. I encourage understanding points of view of other people.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

21. I develop interpersonal relationships with other people.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

22. I respect and relate well to people from varied backgrounds.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

23. I understand diverse worldviews and am sensitive to group differences.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

24. I am able to detect social networks.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

25. I cultivate and maintain extensive informal networks.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

26. I seek out relationships that are mutually beneficial.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

27. I am able to make and maintain personal friendships among work associates.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

APPENDIX F

THE BRIEF COPE FOR THE GROUP PROJECT SCENARIO

Coping with the group project

These items deal with ways that you would cope with being in the preceding group project. There are many ways to try to deal with problems. These items ask how you would cope with this one. Obviously, different people deal with things in different ways, but we are interested in how you would try to deal with it. Each item says something about a particular way of coping. We want to know to what extent you would do what the item says. How much or how frequently. Don't answer on the basis of whether you think it would work or not—just whether or not you would do it. Use these response choices. Try to rate each item separately in your mind from the others. Make your answers as true FOR YOU as you can.

1=I would not do this at all	2= I would do this a little bit	3= I would do this a medium amount	4= I would do this a lot

1. I would turn to work or other activities to take my mind off things

1----------2----------3----------4

2. I would concentrate my efforts on doing something about the situation I'm in

1----------2----------3----------4

3. I would say to myself "this isn't real."

1----------2----------3----------4

4. I would us alcohol or other drugs to may myself feel better.

1----------2----------3----------4

5. I would get emotional support from others

1----------2----------3----------4

6. I would give up trying to deal with it.

1----------2----------3----------4

7. I would take action to try to make the situation better.

1----------2----------3----------4

8. I would refuse to believe that it has happened.

1----------2----------3----------4

1=I would not do this at all	2= I would do this a little bit	3= I would do this a medium amount	4= I would do this a lot

9. I would say things to let my unpleasant feelings escape.

1----------2----------3----------4

10. I would get help and advice from other people.

1----------2----------3----------4

11. I would use alcohol or other drugs to help me get through it.

1----------2----------3----------4

12. I would try to see it in a different light, to make it seem more positive,

1----------2----------3----------4

13. I would criticize myself.

1----------2----------3----------4

14. I would try to come up with a strategy about what to do.

1----------2----------3----------4

15. I would get comfort and understanding from someone.

1----------2----------3----------4

16. I would give up the attempt to cope.

1----------2----------3----------4

17. I would look for something good in what is happening.

1----------2----------3----------4

18. I would make jokes about it.

1----------2----------3----------4

19. I would do something to think about it less, such as going to movies, watching TV, reading, daydreaming, sleeping, or shopping.

1----------2----------3----------4

1=I would not do this at all	2= I would do this a little bit	3= I would do this a medium amount	4= I would do this a lot

20. I would accept the reality of the fact that it has happened.

1----------2----------3----------4

21. I would express my negative feelings.

1----------2----------3----------4

22. I would try and find comfort in my religion or spiritual beliefs.

1----------2----------3----------4

23. I would try to get advice or help from other people about what to do.

1----------2----------3----------4

24. I would learn to live with it.

1----------2----------3----------4

25. I would think hard about what steps to take.

1----------2----------3----------4

26. I would blame myself for things that happened.

1----------2----------3----------4

27. I would pray or meditate.

1----------2----------3----------4

28. I would make fun of the situation.

1----------2----------3----------4

APPENDIX G

THE BRIEF COPE FOR THE TERMINALLY ILL FRIEND SCENARIO

Coping with the illness of a friend

These items deal with ways that you would cope with your friend being terminally ill. There are many ways to try to deal with problems. These items ask how you would cope with this one. Obviously, different people deal with things in different ways, but we are interested in how you would try to deal with it. Each item says something about a particular way of coping. We want to know to what extent you would do what the item says. How much or how frequently. Don't answer on the basis of whether you think it would work or not—just whether or not you would do it. Use these response choices. Try to rate each item separately in your mind from the others. Make your answers as true FOR YOU as you can.

1=I would not do this at all	2= I would do this a little bit	3= I would do this a medium amount	4= I would do this a lot

1. I would turn to work or other activities to take my mind off things

1----------2----------3----------4

2. I would concentrate my efforts on doing something about the situation I'm in

1----------2----------3----------4

3. I would say to myself "this isn't real."

1----------2----------3----------4

4. I would us alcohol or other drugs to may myself feel better.

1----------2----------3----------4

5. I would get emotional support from others

1----------2----------3----------4

6. I would give up trying to deal with it.

1----------2----------3----------4

7. I would take action to try to make the situation better.

1----------2----------3----------4

8. I would refuse to believe that it has happened.

1----------2----------3----------4

1=I would not do this at all	2= I would do this a little bit	3= I would do this a medium amount	4= I would do this a lot

9. I would say things to let my unpleasant feelings escape.

1----------2----------3----------4

10. I would get help and advice from other people.

1----------2----------3----------4

11. I would use alcohol or other drugs to help me get through it.

1----------2----------3----------4

12. I would try to see it in a different light, to make it seem more positive,

1----------2----------3----------4

13. I would criticize myself.

1----------2----------3----------4

14. I would try to come up with a strategy about what to do.

1----------2----------3----------4

15. I would get comfort and understanding from someone.

1----------2----------3----------4

16. I would give up the attempt to cope.

1----------2----------3----------4

17. I would look for something good in what is happening.

1----------2----------3----------4

18. I would make jokes about it.

1----------2----------3----------4

19. I would do something to think about it less, such as going to movies, watching TV, reading, daydreaming, sleeping, or shopping.

1----------2----------3----------4

1=I would not do this at all	2= I would do this a little bit	3= I would do this a medium amount	4= I would do this a lot

20. I would accept the reality of the fact that it has happened.

1----------2----------3----------4

21. I would express my negative feelings.

1----------2----------3----------4

22. I would try and find comfort in my religion or spiritual beliefs.

1----------2----------3----------4

23. I would try to get advice or help from other people about what to do.

1----------2----------3----------4

24. I would learn to live with it.

1----------2----------3----------4

25. I would think hard about what steps to take.

1----------2----------3----------4

26. I would blame myself for things that happened.

1----------2----------3----------4

27. I would pray or meditate.

1----------2----------3----------4

28. I would make fun of the situation.

1----------2----------3----------4

APPENDIX H

STATE TRAIT ANXIETY INVENTORY - TRAIT

General Stress

A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement then circle the appropriate number of the statement to indicate how you generally feel. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement, but give the answer which seems to describe how you generally feel.

1= Not at all	2= Somewhat	3= Moderately So	4= Very much so

1. I feel pleasant.

1----------2----------3----------4

2. I feel nervous and restless.

1----------2----------3----------4

3. I feel satisfied with myself.

1----------2----------3----------4

4. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.

1----------2----------3----------4

5. I feel like a failure.

1----------2----------3----------4

6. I feel rested.

1----------2----------3----------4

7. I am "calm, cool, and collected".

1----------2----------3----------4

8. I feel that difficulties are piling up so that I cannot overcome them.

1----------2----------3----------4

9. I worry too much over something that really doesn't matter.

1----------2----------3----------4

10. I am happy.

1----------2----------3----------4

1= Not at all	2= Somewhat	3= Moderately So	4= Very much so

11. I have disturbing thoughts.

1----------2----------3----------4

12. I lack self-confidence

1----------2----------3----------4

13. I feel secure

1----------2----------3----------4

14. I make decisions easily.

1----------2----------3----------4

15. I feel inadequate.

1----------2----------3----------4

16. I am content.

1----------2----------3----------4

17. Some unimportant thought runs through my mind and bothers me.

1----------2----------3----------4

18. I take disappointments so keenly that I can't put them out of my mind.

1----------2----------3----------4

19. I am a steady person.

1----------2----------3----------4

20. I get in a state of tension or turmoil as I think over my recent concerns and interests.

1----------2----------3----------4

APPENDIX I

STATE TRAIT ANXIETY INVENTORY -

STATE FOR THE GROUP PROJECT SCENARIO

Group project scenario

A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Keeping the scenario in which you are in a group project in mind please, indicate how you feel right now, that is, at this moment. Do not spend too much time on any one statement, but give the answer which seems to describe your present feelings best.

1= Not at all	2= Somewhat	3= Moderately So	4= Very much so

1. I feel calm

1----------2----------3----------4

2. I feel secure

1----------2----------3----------4

3. I am tense

1----------2----------3----------4

4. I feel strained

1----------2----------3----------4

5. I feel at ease

1----------2----------3----------4

6. I feel upset

1----------2----------3----------4

7. I am presently worrying over possible misfortunes

1----------2----------3----------4

8. I feel satisfied

1----------2----------3----------4

9. I feel frightened

1----------2----------3----------4

10. I feel comfortable

1----------2----------3----------4

1= Not at all	2= Somewhat	3= Moderately So	4= Very much so

11. I feel self-confident

1----------2----------3----------4

12. I feel nervous

1----------2----------3----------4

13. I am jittery

1----------2----------3----------4

14. I feel indecisive

1----------2----------3----------4

15. I am relaxed

1----------2----------3----------4

16. I feel content

1----------2----------3----------4

17. I am worried

1----------2----------3----------4

18. I am confused

1----------2----------3----------4

19. I feel steady

1----------2----------3----------4

20. I feel pleasant

APPENDIX J

STATE TRAIT ANXIETY INVENTORY -

STATE FOR THE TERMINALLY ILL FRIEND SCENARIO

Ill friend scenario

A number of statements which people have used to describe themselves are given below. Keeping the scenario in which your friend is terminally ill in mind, please indicate how you feel right now, that is, at this moment. Do not spend too much time on any one statement, but give the answer which seems to describe your present feelings best.

1= Not at all	2= Somewhat	3= Moderately So	4= Very much so

1. I feel calm

1----------2----------3----------4

2. I feel secure

1----------2----------3----------4

3. I am tense

1----------2----------3----------4

4. I feel strained

1----------2----------3----------4

5. I feel at ease

1----------2----------3----------4

6. I feel upset

1----------2----------3----------4

7. I am presently worrying over possible misfortunes

1----------2----------3----------4

8. I feel satisfied

1----------2----------3----------4

9. I feel frightened

1----------2----------3----------4

10. I feel comfortable

1----------2----------3----------4

1= Not at all	2= Somewhat	3= Moderately So	4= Very much so

11. I feel self-confident

1----------2----------3----------4

12. I feel nervous

1----------2----------3----------4

13. I am jittery

1----------2----------3----------4

14. I feel indecisive

1----------2----------3----------4

15. I am relaxed

1----------2----------3----------4

16. I feel content

1----------2----------3----------4

17. I am worried

1----------2----------3----------4

18. I am confused

1----------2----------3----------4

19. I feel steady

1----------2----------3----------4

20. I feel pleasant

1----------2----------3----------4

APPENDIX K

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for participating in this study. The reason for conducting this study was to assess whether individuals who are better able to appraise the controllability of the stressor are better able to match it with an appropriate coping strategy. The researchers were also interested in whether higher amounts of Emotional Intelligence predicted choosing a more appropriate coping strategy, and whether higher Emotional Intelligence predicted less perceived stress. If you would like to obtain results of this study please contact Dr. Janelle Gilbert at 909-880-5587 (Reference Ryan Platt's study). Results will be available August of 2004. If for any reason this study has elicited any concerns or feelings of distress you are welcome to drop by the University Community Counseling Center to discuss these issues. There is not cost to university students for this service. The number is 880 – 5569.
Please do not discuss the nature of this study with anyone who may be a potential participant.

APPENDIX L

TABLE 1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR MEASURES

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for Measures (N = 119)

Measures	Mean	Standard deviation
Emotional Intelligence Survey	4.47	.659
STAI-T (General Anxiety Scale)	2.06	.543
STAI-S for the Controllable Stressor (Situation Specific Anxiety Scale)	2.63	.677
STAI-S for the Uncontrollable Stressor (Situation Specific Anxiety Scale)	2.81	.701
Brief COPE (problem-focused scale for the controllable stressor)	3.2	.510
Brief COPE (emotion-focused scale for the controllable stressor)	2.1	.337
Brief COPE (problem-focused scale for the uncontrollable stressor)	3.1	.512
Brief COPE (emotion-focused scale for the uncontrollable stressor)	2.2	.309
Brief COPE (emotion-focused scale with adaptive items for the controllable stressor)	2.64	.437
Brief COPE (emotion-focused scale with adaptive items for the uncontrollable stressor)	2.82	.409

APPENDIX M

TABLE 2 CORRELATIONS MATRIX

Table 2 Correlation Matrix

	EQ	STAI-T	SSGPTOT	SSTITOT	GFGP	GFTI	GFGP2	GFTI2
EQ	-	-.436**	.04	.042	.338**	-.369**	.136	-.144
STAI-T		-	.398**	.221*	-.212*	.293*	-.032	.027
SSGPTOT			-	.507**	.146	-.071	.212*	-.156
SSTITOT				-	.058	-.133	.127	-.259**
GFGP					-	-.560**	.880*	-.433
GFTI						-	-.358**	.856**
GFGP2							-	-.384**
GFTI2								-

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

EQ – Total Scores on the Emotional Intelligence Survey

STAI-T – Total scores on the measure of General Anxiety

SSGPTOT – Total Score on the measure of Specific Anxiety for the controllable situation

SSTITOT – Total Score on the measure of Specific Anxiety for the uncontrollable situation

GFGP – Goodness of fit for the controllable situation

GFTI – Goodness of fit for the uncontrollable situation

GFGP2 – Goodness of fit for the controllable situation (adaptive items for emotion-focused coping only)

GFTI2 – Goodness of fit for the uncontrollable situation (adaptive items for emotion-focused coping only)

APPENDIX N

TABLE 3 INTER-CORRELATIONS OF

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE SURVEY SUB-SCALES

Table 3: Inter-correlations of the Emotional Intelligence Survey Sub-scales

	Perceiving	Assimilating	Understanding	Managing
Perceiving	-	.723**	.729**	.597**
Assimilating		-	.825**	.682**
Understanding			-	.589**
Managing				-

**Significant at the .01 level

REFERENCES

Bailey, D., Wolfe, D., & Wolfe, C. (1994). With a little help from our friends: Social support as a source of well-being and of coping with stress. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 21,* 127-152.

Bar-On, R., Brown, J., Kirkcaldy, B., & Thome, E. (2000). Emotional expression and implications for occupational stress; an application of the Emotional Quotient Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28,* 1107-1118.

Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory: A measure of emotional intelligence.* Technical Manual. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

Cantor, N., & Kihlstrom, J.F. (1987). *Personality and social intelligence.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Carver, C. (1997). You Want to Measure Coping But Your Protocol's Too Long: Consider the Brief COPE. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4,* 92-100.

Carver, C., Scheier, M., & Weintraub, J. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56,* 267-283.

Cohen, J. (1992). A Power Primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,*155-159.

Conway, V., & Terry, D. (1992). Appraised controllability as a moderator of the effectiveness of different coping strategies. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 44,* 1-7.

Dewe, P., Cox, T., & Ferguson, E. (1993). Individual strategies for coping with stress at work: A Review. *Work and Stress,* 7, 5-15.

Evelyn, J. (2001). *Emotional Intelligence as a Predictor of Consideration Behaviors, Which Lead To Leadership Effectiveness.* Unpublished Masters Thesis, California State University San Bernardino.

Folkman, S., Lazarus, R.S., Dunkel-Schetter, C., DeLongis, A., & Gruen, R. J. (1986). Dynamics of a stressful encounter: Cognitive appraisal, coping, and encounter outcomes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 992-1003.

Folkman, S., Lazarus, R.S. (1988). The Relationship Between Coping and Emotion: Implications for Theory and Research. *Social Science Medicine, 26* 309-317.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

Jordan, P., Ashkanasy, N., & Hartel, C. (2002). Emotional Intelligence as a Moderator of Emotional and Behavioral reactions to job insecurity. *Academy of Management Review, 27,* 361-372.

Lazarus, R. (1990). Theory-Based Measurement. *Psychological Inquiry 1,* 3-13.

Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Psychological stress and the coping process.* New York: Springer.

Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S (1987). Transactional Theory and Research on emotions and coping. *European Journal of Personality, 1* 141-169

Mayer, J., Salovey, P. (1993). The Intelligence of Emotional Intelligence. *Intelligence,17,* 433-442.

Mayer, J., Caruso, D., & Salovey, P. (2000). Emotional Intelligence Meets Traditional Standards for an Intelligence. *Intelligence, 27,* 267-298.

Mayer, J., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2004). Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Findings, and Implications. *Psychological Inquiry,* 15, 197-215

Moos, R., Holahan, C. (2003). Dispositional and Contextual Perspectives on Coping: Toward an Integrative Framework. *Journal of Clinical of Psychology, 59,* 1387-1403.

Nunnally, J. (1978). Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Parkes, K. (1986). Coping in Stressful Episodes: The Role of Individual Differences, Environmental Factors, and Situational Charecteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51,* 1277-1292.

Parkes, K. (1994). Personality and Coping as moderators of Work Stress process: Models, Methods, and Measures. *Work and Stress, 8,* 110-129.

Pfeiffer, S. (2001). Emotional Intelligence: Popular but Elusive Construct. *Roeper Review, 23,* 138-142.

Roberts, R., Zeidner, M., & Matthews, G. (2001). Does emotional intelligence meet traditional standards for an intelligence? Some new data and conclusions. *Emotion, 1,* 196-231.

Roussi, P. (2002). Discriminative Facility in Perceptions of Control and its Relation to Psychological Distress. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping, 15,* 179-191.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9,* 185-211.

Selye, H. (1956) *The Stress of Life.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Slaski, M., & Cartwright, S. (2002). Health, Performance, and Emotional Intelligence: An Exploratory study of Retail Managers. *Stress and Health, 18,* 63-68.

Spielberger, C., Gorsuch, R., & Lushene, R. (1970). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Self Evaluation Questionnaire).* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Sternberg, R. (1997). The concept of intelligence and its role in lifelong learning and success. *American Psychologist, 52,* 1030-1037

Suls, J., David, J., & Harvey, J. (1996). Personality and Coping: Three Generations of Research. *Journal of Personality, 64,* 711-735.

Vaillant, G., Bond, M., & Vaillant, C. (1986). An empirically validated hierarchy of defense mechanisms. *Archives of General Psychicatry, 43,* 786-794

Vitaliano, P., DeWolfe, D., Maiuro, R., Russo, J., & Kanton W.(1990). Appraised changeability of a stressor as a modifier of the relationship between coping and depression: A Test of the Goodness of Fit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59,* 582-592

Zakowski, S., Hall, M., Klein, L., & Baum, A. (2001). Appraised Control, Coping, and Stress in a Community Sample: A test of the Goodness-of-Fit Hypothesis. *Annuals of Behavioral Medicine, 23* 158-165