Research Paper *IJMSRR*
*Impact Factor :**3.029*** *E- ISSN - 2349-6746*
ISSN -2349-6738

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT OF EMPLOYEES IN TECHNO PARK TRIVANDRUM, KERALA.

Leeba Thomas * Dr.A.A.Ananth**
**Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of management, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India*
***Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu, India.*

Abstract
The workplace consists of individuals who all have their own perspective in the world. Some employees have strong beliefs, which they are not willing to compromise. These beliefs can create conflict with coworkers. Poor communication leads to misunderstanding and strife among employees. For instance, misunderstandings can occur if the manager asks one employee to relay important instructions to the other employees, but the employee fails to do so appropriately. Conveying wrong information can lead to projects being incorrectly done and to employees blaming each other for the end result. When an employee decides to pursue her own career goals, without regard for the organizational goals and its well-being, it results in strife among her coworkers. This occurs when the employee becomes so focused on achieving her own objectives, she disregards how it affects others within the company and the company itself. A difference in personalities among employees is another cause of workplace conflict. Employees come from different backgrounds and experiences, which play a role in shaping their personalities. When employees fail to understand or accept the differences in each other's personalities, problems arise in the workplace. So understanding of emotional intelligence as a way to improve the organizational life and to assist in building up a harmonious environment for our society. The purpose of this study was to determine the association between emotional intelligence and conflict management of employees in techno park Trivandrum.

Key words: Emotional Intelligence, Conflict Management, Managing Own Emotions, Perception of Emotions (PE) and Managing Others Emotions (MOE).

INTRODUCTION

Emotional intelligence (El) is the latest in a long line of constructs that have been identified as types of social intelligence. El has been identified by many of its proponents as a critical determinant of success in life that is quite distinct from traditional academic intelligence. Emotional intelligence is defined in terms of being able to monitor and regulate one's own feelings, understand the feelings of others, and use that "feeling" knowledge to guide thoughts and actions (Goleman, 1995). It includes knowing what you are feeling, being able to manage those feelings well, analyzing thoughts, being able to delay impulsive actions, maintaining hope and optimism despite setbacks, being able to empathize and take the other's perspective, and interacting harmoniously. Conflict means difference, and the difference can be a difference of interests, understanding, values, style or opinion. Hence conflict is created by any difference of interests, understanding, values, style, opinions, or a mix of two or more of such differences between two or more parties. Conflict management may be seen as a systematic mechanism for handling different situations of conflict. Moreover, the understanding of conflict and its resolution can help people improve their relationships.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Lopes, Grewal, Kadis, Gall and Salovey (2006) examined the relation between emotional intelligence and workplace outcomes of 44 analysts and clerical employees from the finance department of a Fortune 400 insurance company. Results revealed that high emotionally intelligent employees received greater merit increases and held higher company rank than their counterparts. These employees also received better peer and / or supervisor ratings of interpersonal facilitation and stress tolerance. According to **Susan(2006)**when participants are exposed to a conflict with their boss, following compromising style they tend to use collaborating style. Are also mentioned positive relationship between emotional intelligence and compromising and integrating conflict management styles, and declared that integrating style is predictable by emotional intelligence.**Yu et al (2006)**studied subordinates conflict management style relation with managers' emotional intelligence among 227 MBA students in China. In this study they discovered positive relationship between managers' emotional intelligence and compromising and integration styles. **Lyons and Schneider (2014)** examined the relationship of ability-based emotional intelligence facets with performance under stress. The authors expected high levels of emotional intelligence would promote challenge appraisals and better performance, whereas low emotional intelligence levels would foster threat appraisals and worse performance. The authors found that certain dimensions of emotional intelligence were related more to challenge and enhanced performance, and that some emotional intelligence dimensions were related to performance after controlling for cognitive ability, demonstrating incremental validity.**Cumming (2005)** explored the

relationship between emotional intelligence and Workplace performance with a sample of workers from New Zealand. In addition, she studied the relationship among demographic factors, emotional intelligence and workplace performance. The results of her study suggested that a significant relationship exists between emotional intelligence and workplace performance. In the case of emotional intelligence and demographic factors, no significant relationships were found between gender and emotional intelligence, age and emotional intelligence, occupational groups and emotional intelligence, neither between education and emotional intelligence.**Punia (2005)** conducted a study on 250 executives in the National Capital Region Delhi, and found that leaders with higher emotional intelligence see changes as Opportunities for betterment, and they cherish not stability but ongoing development of individual workers and of the organization itself. **Rosete and Ciarrochi (2014)** established a link between emotional intelligence and workplace measures of leadership effectiveness, using an objective measure of performance and a 360o assessment tool. The research results showed that executives higher on emotional intelligence are more likely to achieve organizational outcomes and be considered as effective leaders by their subordinates and direct manager.

OBJECTIVE

- To identify the level of emotional intelligence of employees in Techno park, Trivandrum.

METHODOLOGY

Sampling Design

Sampling is the process of selecting a sufficient number of elements from the population. The sampling for this study will be conducted at 2 stages. Hence it is multi-stage random sampling technique.

- In the first stage 20 companies were selected randomly out of the list of total 200 companies functioning at Techno Park, Trivandrum.
- In the second stage, 20 employees were selected from the muster roll of each selected companies using simple random sampling technique so as to have a total sample size.

Methods of data collection

The geographic domain for the study was various industries in techno park Trivandrum. The research was conducted under actual environmental conditions and the study involved no simulations. The respondents were managerial and non-managerial employees. Personally administered structured questionnaire was used for primary data collection. Secondary data was collected from peer-reviewed journals, books, conference proceedings, published theses, websites, EBSCO, J-STOR, and Google Scholar.

Statistical tools used

The percentage analysis with respect to all the variables of emotional intelligence was made. The mean score, standard error and standard deviation were found out. The statistical significance of response was tested using Z test.

Data Analysis

In line with the objective of the study hypothesis was set as

H_0: The employees are not emotional intelligent.

It is identified through the study that the employees' emotional intelligence constitutes four factors represented as follows:

1. Managing own emotions (ME)
2. Perception of emotions (PE)
3. Managing others emotions (MOE)

To test the hypotheses, percentage analysis of responses with respect to each of the above factors was done. The statistical significance was tested using Z test. The analysis is detailed below.

MANAGING OWN EMOTIONS (ME)

The factor Managing own emotions includes items that relate to the self-disciplined and self-control aspects of an individual to manage one's own emotions. It is the attempt to manipulate mood in oneself. The factor Managing own emotions (ME) constitutes nine items represented serially from ME1 to ME9 as follows:

ME1 - When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them
ME2 - I expect that I will do well on most things I try
ME3 - I expect good things to happen

ME4 - When I experience a positive emotion I know how to make it last
ME5 - I seek out activities that make me happy
ME6 - I have control over my emotions
ME7 - I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on
ME8 - When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail
ME9 - I use good moods to help myself keep trying in the face of obstacles

The below table shows percentage analysis of emotional intelligence of respondents with respect to Managing own emotions (ME)

Emotional intelligence with respect to Managing own emotions

Items	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per cent
ME1	104	26.0	234	58.5	47	11.8	9	2.3	6	1.5
ME2	129	32.3	212	53.0	47	11.8	10	2.5	2	.5
ME3	162	40.5	161	40.3	60	15.0	9	2.3	8	2.0
ME4	81	20.3	187	46.8	103	25.8	20	5.0	9	2.3
ME5	132	33.0	182	45.5	67	16.8	12	3.0	7	1.8
ME6	82	20.5	205	51.3	84	21.0	21	5.3	8	2.0
ME7	118	29.5	190	47.5	82	20.5	5	1.3	5	1.3
ME8	76	19.0	81	20.3	76	19.0	115	28.8	52	13.0
ME9	94	23.5	183	45.8	89	22.3	19	4.8	15	3.8

Source: Primary data

It is found that out of the total of 400 respondents, 104 (26.0%) strongly agree and 234 (58.5%) agree that when they were faced with obstacles, they remember times they faced similar obstacles and overcame from those obstacles. Out of the total respondents 129 (32.2%) strongly agree and 212 (53.0%) agree they expect that they will do well on most things they try. It is found that 162 (40.5%) strongly agree and 161 (40.3%) agree that they expect good things to happen. From the table it is found that 81 (20.3%) strongly agree and 187 (46.8%) agree that when they experience a positive emotion they know how to make it last; 132 (33.0%) strongly agree and 182 (45.5%) agree that they seek out activities that make them happy; 82 (20.5%) strongly agree and 205 (51.3%) agree that they know how to control their emotions. Out of the total respondents 118 (29.5%) strongly agree and 190 (47.5%) agree that they motivate themselves by imagining a good outcome to tasks they take on; 76 (19.0%) strongly agree and 81 (20.3%) agree that when they face with a challenge they give up because they fear that they will fail; 94 (23.5%) strongly agree and 183 (45.8%) agree that they use good moods to help themselves keep trying in the face of obstacles.

The Mean, Standard Error, Standard Deviation and Z-Test Values of Different Items of Emotional Intelligence with respect to Managing own emotions

ITEMS	AVERAGE	STANDARD ERROR	STANDARD DEVIATION	Test Value = 3		
				z	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
ME1	4.05	.039	.775	27.147	399	.000
ME2	4.14	.038	.753	30.284	399	.000
ME3	4.15	.045	.897	25.643	399	.000
ME4	3.78	.045	.903	17.224	399	.000
ME5	4.05	.044	.880	23.863	399	.000
ME6	3.83	.044	.882	18.819	399	.000
ME7	4.03	.041	.814	25.230	399	.000
ME8	2.97	.067	1.332	-.526	399	.599
ME9	3.81	.049	.974	16.524	399	.000

Source: Primary Data

The above table shows that average score for item ME1 is 4.05. It shall vary between 3.97 and 4.13 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). It shows that the extent to which the employees remember obstacles faced in the past to overcome present obstacles is much above the mean score of 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (27.147) is greater than the critical value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were able to manage their own emotions with respect to the item ME1.

The average score for item ME2 is 4.14 which shall vary between 4.07 and 4.21. Since the mean score is above 3, z value at 5 percent level of significance is 30.284 which is greater than table value, and p value less than .05, it can be inferred that employees expect that they will do well on most things they try.

The table shows that the average score for ME3 is 4.15 which shall vary between 4.06 and 4.23. It shows the expectation of employees for good things to happen is much above the mean score of 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (25.643) is greater than the table value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees' are able to manage their own emotions by expectation of good things to happen.

The mean score of ME4 is 3.78 which shall vary between 3.69 and 3.87 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). This is above 3, Z value is 17.224 at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than critical value of 1.96, and p value is less than .05. Hence it is inferred that employees know how to make positive emotions last.

The table shows that the mean score for the item ME5 is 4.05 and it shall vary between 3.96 and 4.14. This is above 3 and Z value (23.863) at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than the table value. The p value is less than .05. From the table it is found that employees can manage their own emotions by seeking out activities that make them happy.

The item ME6 in the table indicates control of emotions which has an average score of 3.83. This shall vary between 3.74 and 3.92 which is above the score of 3. The calculated Z value is 18.819 at 5 per cent level of significance which is greater than the table value of 1.96. The p value is less than 0.05. Thus it is found that employees manage their own emotions with respect to the item ME6.

From the table it is found that forME7 the average score is 4.03 which shall vary between 3.95 and 4.11. This is above the mean score of 3. The Z value (25.230) at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than the critical value of 1.96 and the p value is less than .05. Thus the result is positive with respect to the item which means the employees manage their own emotions by motivating themselves imagining of the good outcomes of tasks they take on.

The table shows that the average score of the item ME8 is 2.97 which shall vary between 2.84 and 3.10. This is not much above the mean score of 3. The calculated Z value is -.526 at 5 per cent level of significance. The calculated value is less than the critical value 1.96. The p value is not less than .05. Thus the table shows that the employees are not managing their own emotions with respect to the item 'When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail'.

It is also found that the mean of ME9 is 3.81 and this varies between 3.71 and 3.91 which is much above the mean score of 3. The Z value at 5 per cent level of significance is 16.524. The calculated value of Z is more than the critical value and p value is less than .05. Thus the table shows that with respect to ME9 the respondents use good moods to help themselves keep trying in the face of their obstacles.

In short the employees can manage their own emotions with respect to eight out of nine variables. Hence the employees are emotionally intelligent with respect to the factor Managing own emotions.

PERCEPTION OF EMOTIONS (PE)

Perception of emotions relates to how an individual comprehends and differentiates emotions within self and in others. Emotional intelligence is the perception of feelings in order to create emotion. The factor Perception of emotions (PE) constitutes ten items represented through serial numbers from PE1 to PE10 as follows:

PE1 - I find it hard to understand the nonverbal messages of other people
PE2 - I am aware of my emotions as I experience them
PE3 - I am aware of the nonverbal messages I send to others
PE4 - By looking at their facial expressions, I recognize the emotions people are experiencing

PE5 - I know why my emotions change
PE6 - I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them
PE7 - I am aware of the nonverbal messages other people send
PE8 - I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them
PE9 - I can tell how people are feeling by listening to the tone of their voice
PE10-It is difficult for me to understand why people feel the way they do

The below table shows percentage analysis of emotional intelligence of respondents with respect to Perception of emotions (PE)

Emotional intelligence with respect to Perception of emotions

	Strongly agree		**Agree**		**Neither agree nor disagree**		**Disagree**		**Strongly disagree**	
Items	**No.**	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	PerCent
PE1	20	5.0	68	17.0	103	25.8	162	40.5	47	11.8
PE2	86	21.5	214	53.5	85	21.3	5	1.3	10	2.5
PE3	67	16.8	192	48.0	109	27.3	22	5.5	10	2.5
PE4	74	18.5	202	50.5	106	26.5	11	2.8	7	1.8
PE5	96	24.0	187	46.8	97	24.3	12	3.0	8	2.0
PE6	97	24.3	183	45.8	108	27.0	8	2.0	4	1.0
PE7	56	14.0	181	45.3	123	30.8	32	8.0	8	2.0
PE8	45	11.3	187	46.8	126	31.5	33	8.3	9	2.3
PE9	101	25.3	184	46.0	92	23.0	16	4.0	7	1.8
PE10	36	9.0	145	36.3	129	32.3	54	13.5	36	9.0

Source: Primary data

It is found that out of the total of 400 respondents, 20 (5.0%) strongly agree and 68 (17.0%) agree that they find it hard to understand the nonverbal messages of other people. Out of the total respondents 86 (21.5%) strongly agree and 214 (53.5%) agree they were aware of their emotions as they experience them. It is found that 67 (16.8%) strongly agree and 192 (48.0%) agree that they were aware of the non-verbal messages they send to others. From the table it is found that 74 (18.5%) strongly agree and 202 (50.5%) agree that they recognize the emotions people are experiencing by looking at their facial expressions; 96 (24.0%) strongly agree and 187 (47.8%) agree that they know why their emotions change; 97 (24.3%) strongly agree and 183 (45.8%) agree that they easily recognize their emotions as they experience them. Out of the total respondents 56 (14.0%) strongly agree and 181 (45.3%) agree that they are aware of nonverbal messages other people send; 45 (11.3%) strongly agree and 187 (46.8%) agree that they know what other people are feeling by just looking at them; 101 (25.3%) strongly agree and 184 (46%) agree that they can tell how people are feeling by listening to the tone of their voice. The table also shows that 36 (9.0%) strongly agree and 145 (36.3%) agree that it is difficult for them to understand why people feel the way they do.

The Mean, Standard Error, Standard Deviation and Z-Test Values of Different Items of Emotional Intelligence with respect to Perception of emotions

ITEMS	AVERAGE	STANDARD ERROR	STANDARD DEVIATION	Test Value = 3		
				z	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
PE1	3.37	.053	1.054	7.021	399	.000
PE2	3.90	.042	.834	21.656	399	.000
PE3	3.71	.045	.896	15.847	399	.000
PE4	3.81	.041	.827	19.648	399	.000
PE5	3.88	.044	.877	20.008	399	.000
PE6	3.90	.041	.821	21.975	399	.000
PE7	3.61	.045	.894	13.702	399	.000
PE8	3.57	.044	.879	12.855	399	.000
PE9	3.89	.044	.889	20.028	399	.000
PE10	3.23	.054	1.081	4.209	399	.000

Source: Primary Data

The above table shows that mean score for item PE1 is 3.37. It shall vary between 3.27 and 3.47 (mean +/- 1.96*SE) which indicates that the response of the item is much above the mean score of 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (7.021) is greater than the critical value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees do not find it hard to understand the nonverbal message of others.

The average score for item PE2 is 3.90 which shall vary between 3.82 and 3.98. Since the mean score is above 3, Z value at 5 percent level of significance is 21.656 which is greater than table value, and p value less than .05, it can be inferred that employees were aware of their emotions as they experience them.

It is found that the average score for PE3 is 3.71 which shall vary between 3.62 and 3.80. It shows the respondents' awareness of nonverbal messages send to others is much above the mean score of 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (15.847) is greater than the table value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were aware of nonverbal messages send to others.

The mean score of PE4 is 3.81 which shall vary between 3.73 and 3.89 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). This is above 3, Z value is 19.648 at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than critical value of 1.96, and p value is less than .05. This indicates that the employees can recognize the emotions people are experiencing by looking at their facial expressions.

The table also shows that the mean score for the item PE5 is 3.88 and it shall vary between 3.79and 3.97. This is above 3 and Z value (20.008) at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than the table value. The p value is less than .05. From the table it is found that employees know why their emotions change.

The item PE6 in the table indicates recognition of emotions which has an average score of 3.90. This shall vary between 3.82 and 3.98 which is above the score of 3. The calculated Z value is 21.975 at 5 per cent level of significance which is greater than the table value of 1.96. The p value is less than 0.05. Thus it is found that employees can easily recognize their emotions as they experience them.

From the table it is found that for PE7 the average score is 3.61 which shall vary between 3.52 and 3.70. This is above the mean score of 3. The Z value (13.702) at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than the critical value of 1.96 and the p value is less than .05. Thus the result is positive with respect to the item which means the employees are aware of nonverbal messages send by others.

The table shows the mean of the item PE8 is 3.57 which shall vary between 3.48 and 3.66. This is not much above the mean score of 3. The calculated Z value is 12.855 at 5 per cent level of significance. The calculated value is less than the critical value 1.96. The p value is less than .05. Thus the table shows that the employees know what other people are feeling by just looking at them.

It is also found that the mean of PE9 is 3.89 and this varies between 3.80 and 3.98 which is much above the mean score of 3. The Z value at 5 per cent level of significance is 20.028. The calculated value of Z is more than the critical value and p value is less than .05. Thus the table shows that with respect to PE9 the respondents can tell how people are feeling by listening to the tone of their voice.

It is also found that the mean of PE10 is 3.23 and this varies between 3.12 and 3.36 which is above the mean score of 3. The Z value at 5 per cent level of significance is 4.209. The calculated value of Z is more than the critical value and p value is less than .05. Thus the table shows that with respect to PE10 the respondents were not feeling any difficulty to understand why people feel the way they do.

In short the employees have significant perception of emotions with respect to all the ten items. Hence the employees are emotionally intelligent with respect to the factor Perception of emotions.

MANAGING OTHERS EMOTIONS (MOE)

Managing others emotions relates to individual's ability to manage others emotions and extends to the social competence dimension where an individual effectively manages to build an environment for managing others emotions. The factor

Managing Others Emotions (MOE) constitutes eight items represented through serial numbers from MOE1 to MOE8 as follows:

MOE1 - I know when to speak about my personal problems to others
MOE2 - Other people find it easy to confide in me
MOE3 - I like to share my emotions with others
MOE4 - I arrange events others enjoy
MOE5 - I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others
MOE6 - I compliment others when they have done something well
MOE7 - When another person tells me about an important event in his or her life, I almost feel as though I have experienced this event myself
MOE8 - I help other people feel better when they are down

The above table shows percentage analysis of emotional intelligence of respondents with respect to Managing Others Emotions (MOE)

Emotional intelligence with respect to Managing Others Emotions

	Strongly agree		**Agree**		**Neither agree nor disagree**		**Disagree**		**Strongly disagree**	
Items	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
MOE1	108	27.0	179	44.8	88	22.0	20	5.0	5	1.3
MOE2	45	11.3	180	45.0	137	34.3	28	7.0	10	2.5
MOE3	39	9.8	154	38.5	113	28.3	69	17.3	25	6.3
MOE4	70	17.5	179	44.8	122	30.5	27	6.8	2	.5
MOE5	72	18.0	210	52.5	95	23.8	18	4.5	5	1.3
MOE6	107	26.8	172	43.0	98	24.5	15	3.8	8	2.0
MOE7	88	22.0	166	41.5	119	29.8	19	4.8	8	2.0
MOE8	101	25.3	181	45.3	92	23.0	21	5.3	5	1.3

Source: Primary data

It is found that out of the total of 400 respondents, 108 (27.0%) strongly agree and 179 (44.8%) agree that they know when to speak about their personal problems to others. Out of the total respondents 45 (11.3%) strongly agree and 180 (45.0%) agree other people find it easy to confide in them. It is found that 39 (9.8%) strongly agree and 154 (38.5%) agree that they like to share their emotions with others. From the table it is found that 70 (17.5%) strongly agree and 179 (44.8%) agree that they arrange events others enjoy; 72 (18.0%) strongly agree and 210 (52.5%) agree that they present themselves in a way that makes a good impression on others; 107 (26.8%) strongly agree and 172 (43%) agree that they compliment others when they have done something well. Out of the total respondents 88 (22.0%) strongly agree and 166 (41.5%) agree that when another person tells them about an important event in his or her life, they almost feel as though they have experienced this event themselves; 101 (25.3%) strongly agree and 181 (45.3%) agree that they help other people feel better when they feel down

The Mean, Standard Error, Standard Deviation and Z-Test Values of Different Items of Emotional Intelligence with respect to Managing Others emotions

ITEMS	AVERAGE	STANDARD ERROR	STANDARD DEVIATION	Test Value = 3		
				z	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
MOE1	3.91	.045	.893	20.445	399	.000
MOE2	3.56	.044	.874	12.700	399	.000
MOE3	3.28	.053	1.059	5.338	399	.000
MOE4	3.72	.042	.848	16.989	399	.000
MOE5	3.82	.041	.823	19.804	399	.000
MOE6	3.89	.046	.912	19.461	399	.000
MOE7	3.77	.046	.914	16.793	399	.000
MOE8	3.88	.045	.890	19.769	399	.000

Source: Primary Data

The table shows that average score of the item MOE1 is 3.91 which shall vary between 3.82 and 4.0. This indicates that the response of the item is much above the mean score of 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (20.445) is greater than the critical value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, the employees know when to speak about their personal problem to others.

The average score for item MOE2 is 3.56 which shall vary between 3.47 and 3.65. Since the mean score is above 3, Z value at 5 percent level of significance is 12.700 which is greater than table value, and p value less than .05, it can be inferred that respondents were positive towards the item 'Other people find it easy to confide in me'.

It is found that the mean of the item MOE3 is 3.28 which shall vary between 3.18 and 3.38. It shows the mean score of 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (5.338) is greater than the table value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were happy to share their emotions with others.

The mean score of MOE4 is 3.72 which shall vary between 3.64 and 3.80 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). This is above 3, Z value is 16.989 at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than critical value of 1.96, and p value is less than .05. Hence the respondents were able to arrange events others enjoy.

The table also shows that the mean score for the item MOE5 is 3.82 and it shall vary between 3.74 and 3.90. This is much above the mean score 3, Z value is 19.804 at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than the table value. The p value is less than .05. From the table it is found that employees were positive that they present themselves in a way that makes a good impression on others.

The item MOE6 in the table indicates an average score of 3.89 for the willingness of respondents to compliment others. This shall vary between 3.80 and 3.98 which is above the score of 3. The calculated Z value is 19.461 at 5 per cent level of significance which is greater than the table value of 1.96. The p value is less than 0.05. Thus it is found that employees response was positive with respect to the item.

From the table it is found that for MOE7 the average score is 3.77 which shall vary between 3.68 and 3.86. This is above the mean score of 3. The Z value is 16.793 at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than the critical value of 1.96 and the p value is less than .05. Thus the result is positive with respect to the item MOE7, i.e., the another person tells about an important event in his or her life to the respondents they almost felt as though they have experienced this event themselves.

The table shows the mean of the item MOE8 is 3.88 which shall vary between 3.80 and 3.97. This is not much above the mean score of 3. The calculated Z value is 19.769 at 5 per cent level of significance. The calculated value is less than the critical value 1.96. The p value is less than .05. Thus the table shows that the employees help other people feel better when they were down.

In short the employees can manage others emotions with respect to all the eight items. Hence the employees are emotionally intelligent with respect to the factor Managing Others emotions.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that the employees of Techno park are emotionally intelligent with respect to all the four factors – Managing own emotions, Perception of emotions, Managing others emotions and Utilization of emotions.

Hence the null hypothesis that 'the employees are not emotionally intelligent' is rejected and the alternative hypothesis that 'the employees are emotionally intelligent' is accepted.

REFERENCES

1. Abraham, R. (1999), Emotional intelligence in organizations: A conceptualization, *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs*, 152(2), 209-225
2. Cumming, E. A. (2005). *An Investigation into the Relationship between EmotionalIntelligence and Workplace Performance: An Exploratory Study*, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Lincoln University, Pennsylvania.

3. Lopes, P. N., Grewal, D., Kadis, J., Gall, M., and Salovey, P. (2006). Evidence that Emotional Intelligence is Related to Job Performance and Affect and Attitudes at Work, *Psicothema*, Vol 18, pp 132-138.
4. Lyons, J. B., and Schneider, T. R. (2005). The Influence of Emotional Intelligence on Performance, *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol 39 (4), pp 693-703.
5. Punia, B. K. (2005). Impact of Demographic Variables on Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Behaviour of Corporate Executives, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol 4, pp 7-22.
6. Yu C.S., Sardessai R.M. and Lu J.H.(2006).Relationship of emotional intelligence with conflict management styles an empirical study in China. *International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development*, 3(1/2**)**, 19-29.