

An investigation of the relationship between emotional intelligence and attachment in employees' Payame Noor University

Amir Hemmati^{1*}, Akbar Jesarati², Rasool Saeedi³ and Shahram Abdollahian³

¹*Department of Educational Administration, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran*

²*Young Researchers and Elite Club, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran*

³*Department of Curriculum Planning, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran*

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was the relation between Emotional intelligence and Attachment. For this reason, 116 employees (48 male , 68 females) were chosen random stratified and their data were gathered by Schutte emotional intelligence scale and The RSQ(Griffin and Bartholomew,1994, determine the attachment styles). After that,to analyze the data, Pearson correlation, regression analyzes was used. Result showed that Higher scores obtained from sub-scales of the relationships scales Questionnaire represent higher level of secure, fearful, dismissing and preoccupied attachment. The secure attachment styles are positively related to the intrapersonal intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, adaptability, stress management and general mood emotional intelligence. The dismissing attachment styles are negatively related to interpersonal intelligence emotional intelligence. The fearful attachment style are negatively related to intrapersonal intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, adaptability, stress management and general mood emotional intelligence. The preoccupied attachment styles are positively related to the interpersonal emotional intelligence, but negatively related to adaptability emotional intelligence. Fearful, dismissing, secure and preoccupied attachment styles combined have a significant on intrapersonal emotional intelligence and accounted for 11.9% of the intrapersonal emotional intelligence variance. Attachment styles have a significant effect on interpersonal emotional intelligence and account for 11.3% of the interpersonal emotional intelligence variance. Fearful, dismissing and preoccupied attachment styles combined have a significant effect on adaptability emotional intelligence. The attachment styles account for 7.3% of the adaptability emotional intelligence variance. The attachment styles have a significant effect on stress management emotional intelligence and account for 7.3% the stress management emotional intelligence variance. The attachment styles have a significant effect on general mood emotional intelligence and account for 6% the general mood emotional intelligence variance.

Keywords: Emotional intelligence, Attachment, Employee, Payam Noor University, Iran

INTRODUCTION

Individuals are always in an interaction and communication with their environment. There may be many factors affecting the quality of this interaction and communication. These factors can be originated either from personal characteristics or other external factors. Individuals' past experiences, personal characteristics, interests, attitudes and expectations Can influence their interpersonal relationships. Besides all, another factoe worthy of mentioning relationships among people is emotional intelligence. There are many definitions of emotional intelligence(EI) currently in literature, one useful definition states that EI involves thinking with emotion and effectively communication the outcome of that thinking (Cherniss and Golman,2001). Therefore, an individual's EI potential is

related to his or her level of cognitive, emotional/affective, intra-personal, inter-personal and aesthetic development. Obviously, individual differences in EI are more complex than an individual just thinking about how her or she feels (Harmer and Fallon, 2007). The emotional intelligence concept originally proposed by Salovey and Mayer in 1990 has provided a strong basis on which investigate individual differences in how people reason with, and about, feelings. A recently elaborated approach shifts the emphasis from a trait (Bar-On, 1997, Schutte et al, 1998) to an ability conceptualization of emotional intelligence (Mayer, Caruso and Salovey, 2000, Mayer, Salovey, Caruso and Sitarenios, 2001). According to this, emotional intelligence (Henceforth EI) is the capacity to perceive, express, understand, use and manage emotions in oneself and other people (Mayer and Salovey, 1997; Kim and et al, 2012). Over the last decade, a body of work on attachment orientations has also related to EI abilities (Collins, 1996, Kobak and Sceery, 1988, Mikulincer and Florian, 2001, Rholes, Simpson and Stevens, 1998). Attachment theory highlights the interpersonal root of adult emotionality contending that emotional defences associated with insecure attachment inhibit information processing of emotional messages and block awareness of feelings and intentions in self and other (Bowlby, 1969, 1988). Adult attachment orientations incorporate both affective and cognitive rules and strategies that drive emotional reactions in individuals and relationships. Secure, anxious/ambivalent and avoidant persons employ fundamentally different strategies of affect regulation and emotion information processing (Shaver, Collins and Clark, 1996). Attachment theory is an emotional-regulation model as well (Feeney, 1995, Kobak and Sceery, 1988). From this point of view, Kobak and Sceery (1988) state that internal working models of attachment could be understood as the entire rules that orient an individual's emotional reactions to stressful situations. Internal working models are entire characteristics strategies which emotions are regulated and behaviors are oriented. When examined in terms of attachment styles, there are research findings that secure persons can better cope with negative emotions in social interactions when compared with insecure persons (Kobak and Sceery, 1988), possess positive emotional – regulation skills (Cooper et al, 1998). Furthermore, in the researchs examining the relationships between attachment styles and emotional intelligence (Gorunmez, 2006, Kafetsios, 2004, Kim, 2005, Peck, 2003, Zimmerman, 1999) secure attachment style has been found to be associated with perception, facilitation, understanding and management of emotions (Hess and Bacigalupo, 2011). Despite numerous calls for an examination of the personality correlates of EI (e.g. Forgas, 2001) to our knowledge, no research has directly examined the relationship between attachment and EI. The aim of this study is to relationship between attachment and emotional intelligence.

Emotional Intelligence(EI)

In recent years Emotional Intelligence(EI) has become of great interest in psychological research. In researching theories on emotional intelligence and its relationship to organizational citizenship behavior, the researchers were unable to find many theoretical and empirical studies that pertained solely to these two constructs. Studies conducted with employees show that emotional intelligence is a skill that minimises the negative stress consequences (Schumacher et al, 2009). Both the public and academia remained mostly unaware of emotional intelligence until 1995, when Daniel Goleman popularised the construct in his trade book, *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Emotional intelligence quickly captured the interest of the media, general public and researchers (Salovey, Brackett and Mayer, 2004). Emotional intelligence and emotional quotient (EQ) were, in fact, selected as the most useful new words or phrases of 1995 by the American Dialect Society and, from there, the concept of emotional intelligence made it to the cover of *Time* magazine (Mayer, Salovey and Caruso, 2000). Following shortly behind this development, Bar-On (1997) introduced his work on emotional intelligence and this led to the 1990s being flooded with work by Goleman (1998), Bar-On (1997) and Mayer and Salovey (1997), who proved emotional intelligence as a type of ability. According to Salovey and Mayer (1990), emotions are organised responses that cross psychological subsystems, which include the physiological, cognitive, motivational and experiential systems. Emotions within an individual, both positive and negative, arise from a response to either an internal or an external event. Emotions can be distinguished from the closely related concept of moods in that emotions are shorter and generally more intense. With regard to intelligence, the most often cited definition is Wechsler's statement that 'intelligence is the aggregate of global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally, and to deal effectively with his environment' (Salovey and Mayer, 1990, p. 3). Closely overlapping the construct of emotional intelligence are the constructs of social intelligence, alexithymia (Salovey and Mayer, 1990; Taylor and Bagby, 2000), affective orientation (Taylor and Bagby, 2000), emotional competence (Saarni, 2000) and psychological mindedness (McCallum and Piper, 2000). It is apparent that the evolution of the definition of emotional intelligence is echoed in the various definitions of these constructs.

The construct of alexithymia, for example, refers to difficulty in identifying and distinguishing bodily sensations of emotional arousal and difficulty in describing feelings. The construct of affective orientation refers to the extent to which people are aware of their emotions. The construct of emotional competence is defined as a demonstration of capacity and skill in eliciting emotional-social transactions and is regarded more as a transaction than a characteristic. The definitions of alexithymia, affective orientation and emotional competence parallel the definition

of emotional intelligence, incorporating the aspects of thinking, feeling, being aware and expressing emotions as defined by Mayer and Salovey (1997) and Goleman (1998).

Attempting a more holistic approach and a move towards the definition of emotional intelligence are the constructs of social intelligence and psychological mindedness. The construct of social intelligence incorporates the ability to think, feel and behave in order to achieve social tasks while functioning in a social environment. The construct of psychological mindedness is more encompassing and refers to the desire to learn the possible meanings and causes of both internal and external experiences as well as to the ability to look inwards rather than only outwards at environmental factors, thus allowing the conceptualisation of the relationship across thoughts, feelings and actions within an environment. The constructs of social intelligence and psychological mindedness are therefore closer to the definition of emotional intelligence as defined by Bar-On (1997) below because they incorporate the concepts of thinking, feeling and actions within a certain environment (Schumacher et al, 2009).

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF THE BAR-ON MODEL

Darwin's early work on the importance of emotional expression for survival and adaptation (1872/1965) has influenced the ongoing development of the Bar-On model, which both stresses the importance of emotional expression and views the outcome of emotionally and socially intelligent behaviour in Darwinian terms of effective adaptation. Additional influence on this thinking can be traced to Thorndike's description of social intelligence and its importance for human performance (1920) and to Wechsler's observations relating to the impact of non-cognitive and conative factors on what he refers to as 'intelligent behaviour' (1940; 1943). Sifneos' description of alexithymia (1967) on the pathological end of the emotional-social intelligence (ESI) continuum and Appelbaum's conceptualisation of psychological mindedness (1973) on the eupsychic end of this continuum have also impacted on the ongoing development of the Bar-On model (Boyatzis, 2009).

From Darwin to the present, most descriptions, definitions and conceptualisations of ESI include one or more of the following key components: (a) the ability to recognise, to understand and to express emotions and feelings; (b) the ability to understand how others feel and to relate to them; (c) the ability to manage and to control emotions; (d) the ability to manage change, to adapt and to solve problems of both a personal and an interpersonal nature; and (e) the ability to generate positive affect and to be self-motivated (Bar-On, 2006; Emdady, 2013).

The Bar-On model provides the theoretical basis for the emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i) instrument, which was originally developed to assess various aspects of this construct and to examine its conceptualisation. According to this model, ESI is a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate to them, and cope with daily demands. The emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators referred to in this conceptualisation include the five key components described above, each of these components, in turn, also comprising a number of closely related competencies, skills and facilitators. Consistent with this model, to be emotionally and socially intelligent is effectively to understand and express oneself, to understand and relate well to others, and to cope successfully with daily demands, challenges and pressures. This is based, first and foremost, on one's intrapersonal ability to be aware of one's feelings, to understand one's strengths and weaknesses and to express one's feelings and thoughts non-destructively. On the interpersonal level, being emotionally and socially intelligent encompasses the ability to be aware of others' emotions, feelings and needs and to establish and maintain cooperative, constructive and mutually satisfying relationships. Ultimately, being emotionally and socially intelligent means to manage personal, social and environmental change effectively by realistically and flexibly coping with the immediate situation, solving problems and making decisions. To do this, people need to manage emotions so that their emotions work for them and not against them and to be sufficiently optimistic, positive and self-motivated (Bar-On, 2006; Bandali, 2013).

Bar-On (1997) defines emotional intelligence as an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies and skills. These influence one's ability to cope with environmental demands and pressures (Bar-On, 2000, p. 365).

A description of the emotional intelligence model of Bar-On comprises five scales with fifteen subscales. These are comprising self-regard, emotional awareness, assertiveness, independence and self-actualisation; comprising empathy, social responsibility and interpersonal relationships; comprising stress tolerance and impulse control; comprising reality testing, flexibility and problem solving; and comprising optimism and happiness (Bar-On, 2000). The description of each of the scales is presented in below. According to McCallum and Piper (2000), the model proposed by Bar-On is perhaps the clearest and most comprehensive to date. The model of emotional intelligence by Bar-On (1997) can be summarised as follows:

- The model comprises the intrapersonal, interpersonal, stress management, adaptability and general mood scales

- The scales of stress management, adaptability and general mood are unique to the model
- The model maps more clearly onto the five-factor model
- Its definition offers the context of environment.

Attachment

Bowlby's Theory of Attachment

The theory of attachment was originally developed by John Bowlby (1907 - 1990), who was attempting to understand the intense distress experienced by infants who had been separated from their parents. Bowlby observed that separated infants would go to extraordinary lengths (e.g., crying, clinging, frantically searching) to prevent separation from their parents or to reestablish proximity to a missing parent. At the time of Bowlby's initial writings, psychoanalytic writers held that these expressions were manifestations of immature defense mechanisms that were operating to repress emotional pain, but Bowlby noted that such expressions are common to a wide variety of mammalian species, and speculated that these behaviors may serve an evolutionary function.

Drawing on ethological theory, Bowlby postulated that these attachment behaviors, such as crying and searching, were adaptive responses to separation from with a primary attachment figure-someone who provides support, protection, and care. Because human infants, like other mammalian infants, cannot feed or protect themselves, they are dependent upon the care and protection of "older and wiser" adults. Bowlby argued that, over the course of evolutionary history, infants who were able to maintain proximity to an attachment figure via attachment behaviors would be more likely to survive to a reproductive age. According to Bowlby, a motivational system, what he called the attachment behavioral system, was gradually "designed" by natural selection to regulate proximity to an attachment figure.

In historical research designed to further differentiate forms of attachment, Ainsworth et al(1978) conducted studies using the strange situation task. This involved observing infants' reactions to the separation from their caregiver in a structured lab. The authors identified three categories of attachment: secure, anxious-resistant and anxious-avoidant. Secure attachment included mother-baby dyads where the mother was attentive to the baby's needs and the baby was able to safely explore the environment. Babies were thus upset by their mother's separation and content upon her return. Anxious-resistant attachment included mothers who were inconsistent, they interfered with the baby's exploration, yet ignored them at same time. This inconsistency resulted in uncertainty in the baby. These babies became upset with the absence of their mother, and demonstrated both a desire for closeness and anger with her return. Anxious-avoidant attachment described mothers who consistently rejected their baby. These babies were unbothered by the separation from their mother and avoided her upon her return.

A more recent conceptualization of attachment was proposed by Bartholomew and Horowitz(1991). These authors examined attachment in young adults and highlighted four categories: secure attachment, preoccupied attachment, fearful attachment and dismissing attachment. These authors based their model of attachment on two orthogonal, bipolar (high-low) dimensions: (1) internalized evaluation of self and (2) internalized evaluation of others. Similar to Ainsworth et al(1978), these authors posited securely attached individuals(high evaluations of self and other) develop a positive sense of self worth and expect others to care for them. All other attachment styles(preoccupied, fearful and dismissing) are clustered together and labeled as forms of insecure attachment(Bartholomew and Horowitz,1991). Preoccupied attachment(low self-evaluation, high evaluation of others) is characterized by low self-esteem and high need of support and approval from others. Fearful attachment(low self-evaluation,low evaluation of others) is marked by a sense of unworthiness and mistrust of others. Dismissing attachment(high self-evaluation, low evaluation of others) is defined by a persistent avoidance of others in favor of self.

In related investigation(Brennan,Clark and Shaver,1998, Wei,Russell, Mallinckrodt and Vogel,2007) focused their attention on insecure attachment and proposed that it be viewed along two dimensions, attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance. Similar to Horowitz(1991) model, evaluation of self and others was deemed important. Attachment anxiety is considered to manifest from a negative working model of self as unworthy of love. When the attachment system is activated, anxiously attached individuals engage in a hyperactivation strategy in order to cope. These strategies include but are not limited to rumination, intense observation of attachment figures for indication of abandonment, an intensification of feelings of distress and behaviors associated with maintaining closeness with this figure which often involves intense emotional reactions(Lopez and Brennan,2000,Mallinckrodt,Porter and Kvlighan,2005). On the other hand, attachment avoidance is considered to manifest from a negative working model of others as untrustworthy. When the attachment system is activated, avoidantly attached individuals utilize a deactivation strategy in order to cope with stressful feelings (Fraley, Davis and Shaver,1998, Mikulincer and Shaver,2007). This involves distancing themselves from the attachment figure and suppressing any negative emotional reactions that may initially become activated. Individuals may exhibit high levels of anxious attachment, high levels of avoidant attachment, high levels of both anxious and avoidant attachment, or low levels of anxious

and avoidant attachment. Individuals who are low in both anxious and avoidant attachment are considered as having a healthy and secure attachment to others (Brennan et al, 1998, Wei et al, 2007).

Attachment and Emotional intelligence

Although there is little research that has examined attachment and emotional intelligence directly, there are several studies on the cognitive and affective aspect of attachment which guide our thinking about individual differences in the perception, facilitation, understanding and management of emotion (Riggio and Reichard, 2009). First, there is abundant evidence for the relationship between attachment and emotional perception. Developmental research has shown secure infants have sensitive and responsive caregivers who communicate effectively with their offspring (Bringing and Robinson, 1991). Recent work on adult attachment documents some emotion perception biases of attachment (Magai, Distel and Liker, 1995). Magai et al found that secure individuals were relatively accurate in decoding facial expressions of negative emotions, while avoidant persons had lower scores in emotion decoding accuracy (especially joy). Anxious/ambivalent males were inaccurate in decoding anger but anxious/ambivalent females were more accurate, highlighting gender as a moderator of the attachment and emotional intelligence relationships. Despite these interesting insights, Magai et al's (1995) research was limited in its employing Ekman and Friesen's (1975) test. Recent failures to replicate Magai et al's findings (Zoula, 1999) could be attributed to the fact that Ekman's test involves posed facial expressions and employs a target method for assessing accuracy. The EI test which was used in the present study assesses a wider range of emotion perception abilities and employs the consensus method.

More recently, work that employed both laboratory and naturalistic tasks of emotion decoding accuracy found a positive association between secure attachment and emotion decoding accuracy of partners' facial expressions (Kafetsios, 2000).

Attachment involved complex interactions between affect and cognition that can sustain hypotheses related to emotion facilitation and understanding. It is noteworthy that these two EI sub-domains have been found to correlate highly (Mayer, Salovey and Caruso, 2000).

In the other study, Kafetsios (2004) found that Secure attachment was positively related to all sub-scales (except perception of emotion) and total EI score.

In the same study, the results indicated that among both genders, emotional intelligence was positively correlated with secure attachment style and negatively with avoidant and ambivalent attachment styles. Multivariate regression analysis showed that ambivalent, avoidant and secure attachment styles could explain 25% and 17% of variability in emotional intelligence among female and male participant respectively (Azadi et al, 2010; Kim and et al, 2012).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

The participants were all employees, men and women of Urmia payame Noor university, were busy with their job in the educational year 2013. 116 employees (48 male, 68 females) selected by using stratified random sampling method from among Urmia payame Noor university employees. Participants ranged in age from 35 to 45 years old ($M=40$, $SD=2.12$). Participants completed the following questionnaire measures, all scales were adapted for Iranian population:

The Relationships scales Questionnaire (RSQ):

The RSQ, developed by Griffin and Bartholomew (1994), was used to determine the attachment styles. This inventory is a 17 item Likert type scale and measures four different attachment styles (Secure, dismissing, fearful and preoccupied). The reliability coefficients of the scale were calculated by the test-retest method and varied between .54 and .78. The parallel form validity of this scale was tested with the relationship Questionnaire (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991; Keane, 2006) and the correlation coefficients varied between .49 and .61. Also test-retest reliability within Iran adaptation studies ranged between .54 - .78 (Azadi et al, 2010; Emdady, 2013).

Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-I)

According to Bar-On (2000), the EQ-i was originally constructed to examine empirically a theory of psychological well-being. What has been developed is a theoretically eclectic and multi-factorial approach to describe operationally and assess quantitatively the complex interrelated concepts of the non-cognitive competencies and skills that influence one's ability to cope with life and to achieve psychological well-being (Van Rooyen and Partners, 2000).

Dimensions, administration and interpretation: It comprises 133 brief items and employs a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'very seldom' or 'not true of me' to 'very often true of me' or 'true of me'. It takes 30 to 40 minutes to complete, although there is no formal time limit. The EQ-i is suitable for individuals of 16 years and older. It renders a total EQ score, consisting of five composite scale scores namely (1) the intrapersonal composite scale, (2) the interpersonal composite scale, (3) the adaptability composite scale, (4) the stress-management composite scale and (5) the general-mood composite scale, comprising fifteen subscale scores (Riggio and Reichard, 2009).

With regard to the reliability of the EQ-i, two basic types of reliability studies were conducted on the EQ-i, namely internal consistency and re-test reliability. The Cronbach alpha coefficients are high for all the sub-scales. The coefficients range from a low of 0.69 (social responsibility) to a high of 0.86 (self-regard), with an overall average internal consistency of 0.76. This indicates very good reliability (Bar-On, 2000; Van Rooyen and Partners, 2000). Re-test reliability refers to the temporal stability of the instrument over time. Two South African groups were re-tested, one group after one month and the second after four months. The average re-test reliability coefficient after one month was 0.85 and, after four months, 0.75 (Bar-On, 2000; Van Rooyen and Partners, 2000). Furthermore, the inventory includes the following four validity indicators, namely omission rate (the number of omitted responses), inconsistency index (the degree of inconsistency across similar types of items), positive impression (the tendency to give an exaggerated positive response) and negative impression (the tendency to give an exaggerated negative response). The EQ-i has a built-in correction factor that automatically adjusts the scale scores. This is an important feature for self-report measures in that it reduces the distorting effects of social-response bias, thereby increasing the accuracy of the results obtained (Bar-On, 2000).

RESULT

Descriptive statistics of the Bar-On's Emotional Quotient Inventory and the relationships Scales Questionnaire Sub-scales, correlation analysis between the attachment styles and emotional intelligence abilities and regression analysis to examine the predictive level of attachment styles on emotional intelligence abilities are given below:

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations of the Bar-On's EQ and RSQ Sub-scales.

		N	M	Ss
Emotional intelligence	Intrapersonal intelligence	116	99.75	11.51
	Interpersonal intelligence	116	68.65	7.37
	Adaptability	116	53.26	7.05
	Stress Management	116	41.20	7.22
	General Mood	116	45.53	6.16
Attachment Styles	Secure	116	4.16	1.03
	Dismissing	116	4.25	1.08
	Fearful	116	4.16	1.27
	Preoccupied	116	3.92	1.09

The scores obtained from all sub-scales of the Bar-On's Emotional Quotient Inventory indicate a positive situation. Higher scores obtained from sub-scales of the relationships scales Questionnaire represent higher level of secure, fearful, dismissing and preoccupied attachment.

Table 2: Correlation between Attachment styles and Emotional intelligence

		Intrapersonal intelligence	Interpersonal intelligence	Adaptability	Stress Management	General Mood
Secure	r	.33	.32	.20	.21	.24
Dismissing	r	-.01	-.13	.07	.02	.01
Fearful	r	-.19	-.10	-.12	-.21	-.17
Preoccupied	r	-.04	.10	-.14	-.08	-.03

N=116

Table 2 shows that the secure attachment styles are positively related to the intrapersonal intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, adaptability, stress management and general mood emotional intelligence ($p < .01$).

The dismissing attachment styles are negatively related to interpersonal intelligence emotional intelligence ($p < .01$). The fearful attachment style are negatively related to intrapersonal intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, adaptability, stress management and general mood emotional intelligence ($p < .01$). The preoccupied attachment styles are positively related to the interpersonal emotional intelligence ($p < .05$), but negatively related to adaptability emotional intelligence ($p < .01$).

Table 3: Result of Regression Analyses Predicting scores of Attachment styles on Intrapersonal Emotional intelligence.

Attachment styles	R	R2	F	B	t
Fearful	0.35	.12	15.45*	-.06	-1.16
Dismissing				.04	.834
Secure				.32	6.54
Preoccupied				-.07	-1.40

 $p < .05$

Resulting given in the Table 3 show that fearful, dismissing, secure and preoccupied attachment styles combined have a significant on intrapersonal emotional intelligence and accounted for 11.9% of the intrapersonal emotional intelligence variance ($R=0.34, R^2=0.11, F(4,116) = 14.63, p < .01$). As a whole, this model significantly predicts the intrapersonal emotional intelligence, Among the specific RSQ scales, secure attachment style ($B=.32$) was the only predictor of intrapersonal emotional intelligence ($p < .05$).

Table 4: Result of Regression Analyses Predicting scores of Attachment styles on Interpersonal Emotional intelligence.

Attachment styles	R	R2	F	B	t
Fearful	0.34	.11	14.63*	-.06	1.11
Dismissing				-.10	-2.000
Secure				.33	6.60
Preoccupied				.03	.54

 $p < .05$

Resulting given in the Table 4 show that attachment styles have a significant effect on interpersonal emotional intelligence and account for 11.3% of the interpersonal emotional intelligence variance ($R=0.34, R^2=0.11, F(4,116)=14.63, p < .01$). As a whole, this model significantly predicts the interpersonal emotional intelligence. Among the specific RSQ scales, the secure ($B=.33$) and dismissing attachment styles ($B=-.10$) are the predictors of the intrapersonal emotional intelligence ($p < .05$).

Table 5: Result of Regression Analyses Predicting scores of Attachment styles on Adaptability Emotional intelligence.

Attachment styles	R	R2	F	B	t
Fearful	0.27	.07	9.04*	-.04	-.75
Dismissing				.086	1.76
Secure				.22	4.27
Preoccupied				-.14	-2.98

 $p < .05$

Resulting given in the Table 5 show that fearful, dismissing and preoccupied attachment styles combined have a significant effect on adaptability emotional intelligence ($R=0.27, R^2=0.07, F(4,116)=9.04, p < .05$). The attachment styles account for 7.3% of the adaptability emotional intelligence variance. As a whole, this model significantly predicts the adaptability emotional intelligence. Among the specific RSQ scales, the secure ($B=.22$) and preoccupied attachment styles ($B=-.14$) are the predictors of the adaptability emotional intelligence ($p < .05$).

Table 6: Result of Regression Analyses Predicting scores of Attachment styles on Stress Management Emotional intelligence.

Attachment styles	R	R2	F	B	t
Fearful	0.27	.07	9.03*	-.15	-2.87
Dismissing				.08	1.64
Secure				.17	3.32
Preoccupied				-.07	-1.34

 $p < .05$ **Table 7: Result of Regression Analyses Predicting scores of Attachment styles on General mood Emotional intelligence.**

Attachment styles	R	R2	F	B	t
Fearful	0.26	.06	8.47*	-.09	-1.77
Dismissing				.07	1.34
Secure				.22	4.26
Preoccupied				-.04	-.74

 $p < .05$

Resulting given in the Table 6 show that the attachment styles have a significant effect on stress management emotional intelligence ($R=0.27, R^2=0.07, F(4,116)=9.03, p < .01$) and account for 7.3% the stress management emotional intelligence variance. As a whole, this model significantly predicts the stress management emotional

intelligence. Among the specific RSQ scales, the fearful ($B=-.153$) and secure attachment styles ($B=.167$) are the predictors of the stress management emotional intelligence ($p<.05$).

Resulting given in the Table 7 show that the attachment styles have a significant effect on general mood emotional intelligence ($R=0.26$, $R^2=0.06$, $F(4,116)=8.47$, $p<.01$) and account for 6% the general mood emotional intelligence variance. As a whole, this model significantly predicts the general mood emotional intelligence. Among the specific RSQ scales, the secure attachment style ($B=-.22$) is the only predictor of the general mood emotional intelligence ($p<.05$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the research findings, overall attachment style scores significantly predict emotional intelligence scores. Consistent with previous investigations on relationships between attachment styles and emotional intelligence (Gorunmez, 2006, Kafetsios, 2004, Kim, 2005, Peck, 2003, Zimmermann, 1999, Khledian, 2013, Azadi et al, 2010), this study found positive correlations between the secure attachment styles and emotional intelligence. Research result also indicate that secure attachment styles predict intrapersonal emotional intelligence. According to this result, it may be stated that people with secure attachment styles have more positive characteristics comprising intrapersonal skills such as self-consciousness, self-esteem, self-awareness, and self-actualization than those with fearful, dismissing, and preoccupied attachment styles. Individuals with intrapersonal skills have more self-confidence in coping with problems (Turkum, 2002), independent and self-confident (Acar, 2001, Goleman, 2000, Stein and Book, 2003) are aware of their emotions (Goleman, 2000) and more self-actualized (Bar-On, 2006). Many studies report that individuals with secure attachment style have higher level of self-esteem than those with fearful, dismissing and preoccupied attachment styles support the result of present research (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991, Brenna and Bosson, 1998, Brenna and Morris, 1997, Sumer and Gungor, 1999). In light of these findings, we can conclude that individuals with secure attachment styles have better intrapersonal skills as well. Self-confidence of individuals leads to self-determination and their better coping with the problems. Therefore, the importance of developing a secure attachment from early childhood period has been verified again.

As a whole, attachment styles significantly predict the interpersonal emotional intelligence. Among the specific RSQ scales, secure and dismissing attachment styles are the predictors of the intrapersonal emotional intelligence. The interpersonal emotional intelligence was positively correlated with the secure attachment, but negatively correlated with the dismissing attachment style. Individuals with dismissing attachment style have positive self-concepts and negative concepts towards others. They tend to appreciate themselves as worthy and have negative attitudes towards others. They are reluctant for close relationships and tend to deny their need or demand for social relationship (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991, Hamarta, 2004). Hence, these kinds of people are not expected to have effective and close relationships with others and to have interpersonal skills (Emdady, 2013). Most research on attachment report that attachment during childhood have a deep impact on the development of social efficiency and quality of peer interactions (Mallinckrodt, 2000). According to the attachment theory, caregiver's positive responses lead to positive internal working models and develop a secure attachment style (Bretherton, 1985, Bowlby, 1982). This process helps individuals with secure attachment develop a better interpersonal relationship. Interpersonal skills are related to social skills. Individual skills are related to social skills. Individuals with higher levels of social skills establish more effective interactions with others and demonstrate empathetic attitudes. Lopes and Friends (2003) reported that individuals with higher levels of emotional intelligence are more likely to have positive relations with others as well as perceived support and less likely to report negative interactions with close friends. Positive point of view from interpersonal relationships helps individuals with secure attachment style demonstrate positive social skills. Consistent with the previous research (Anders and Tucker, 2000, Deniz, Hamarta and Ari, 2005, DiTommaso, Branen-Menulty, Ross and Burgess, 2002). It was found that people with secure attachment style have higher levels of social skills in the present study. The attachment styles predict the adaptability emotional intelligence as a whole. Among the specific RSQ scales, secure and preoccupied attachment styles are the predictors of the adaptability emotional intelligence. Adaptability is positively correlated with the secure attachment style, yet shows a negative correlation with the preoccupied attachment style. Adaptability is related to the reality-testing, flexibility and problem solving. Individuals having higher levels of adaptability emotional intelligence can determine the problems of work, family and private life and effective solutions (Acar, 2001, Stein and Book, 2003). Hence, the secure attachment affects these skills. Research result suggesting that adolescents with secure attachment styles are more adaptive (Colin, 1996, Zimmermann, Maier, Winter and Grossmann, 2001) support the present findings. Whereas people with secure attachment style are expected to understand and handle with their problems, it is difficult for people with preoccupied and fearful attachment styles to do so. Lopez et al (1997) and Zimmerman et al (2001) stated that individuals with insecure attachment styles have more difficulty in making reparative problem solving efforts. This finding is also similar to the present research findings. As a whole, the attachment styles significantly predict the stress management emotional intelligence. Among the specific RSQ scores, the fearful and

secure attachment styles have been found as the predictors of the stress management emotional intelligence. Individuals with stress management abilities can cope with stress without any desperation, introversion and without losing their control. These kinds of people generally feel peaceful, rarely lose their temper and easily cope with oppression (Acar, 2001, Stein and Book, 2003). They can take necessary precautions when solving their problems and have self confidence in problem solving. Rather than what happens in the environment, stress reaction arises according to what kind of a reaction the individual gives to that situation. The individuals aim to preserve their psychological and social integration against stress. Coping with stress refers to the cognitive and behavioral efforts of individuals. As a whole, the attachment styles significantly predict the general mood emotional intelligence. Among the specific RSQ scores, secure attachment styles was found to be only predictor of the general mood emotional intelligence. The general mood dimension of emotional intelligence comprises optimism and happiness. Optimistic people can think positively even in negative situations (Acar, 2001, Stein and Book, 2003). According to Collins and Read (1990), secure people usually perceive their relationship as satisfying and have feeling of acceptance from others. Consistent with the present research findings, Sable (2007) states that people with secure attachment styles have higher levels of psychological and physical well-being than people with other attachment styles. With the finding that the emotional intelligence develops depending on maturation (Kafetsios, 2004), further research on this subject would provide more profound information if they are designed in a longitudinal model. The education of caregivers becomes more important when thinking that attachment styles originate in the early childhood. Therefore, people with secure attachment styles would feel efficient regarding their emotional intelligence. Thus, they would establish healthy relationships with others and be satisfied with their life.

Limitations

Caution should be exercised when interpreting the findings presented for this study due to the small sample size. Future research should attempt to generate a larger participant sample.

Implications

The current study has a number of practical implications for managers, leaders and organizations. Firstly, develop programs for the employees' emotional intelligence ability. If the employees feel secure, emotionally stable, satisfied and affectively connected to organization, commit against their responsibility. More importantly, developing employees' emotional intelligence competency such as interpersonal to increase employees' ability to cope with change. Besides, academicians who are involved in social interaction need emotional intelligence competency to work effectively in a social setting. Therefore, developing those competencies might help academic staff to improve work performance, such as, maintaining high academic standards in the classroom, teaching quality, research dedication and producing not only the brightest students but also those sought and employable for the industry. This study has implications for the strategic managerial roles and responsibilities as change agents in the organization. Besides, to enhance employees' motivation, they also need to consider incorporating a culture of appreciation and reward for those who are deserving and a progressive management approach that leads to development and improvement in work quality and management of change.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bar-On, R., Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Technical manual, Toronto: Multi Health systems Inc. **1997**.
- [2] Bar-On, R., Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory. Inc **R.2004** .
- [3] Bar-On and J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and the application at home, school and in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. **2000**. pp. 363-388.
- [4] Bar-On, R. The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, **18**, **2006** : 13-25.
- [5] Bar-On and J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and the application at home, school and in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. **2000**; pp. 92-117.
- [6] Bar-On and J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and the application at home, school and in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. **2000** ; pp. 118-135.
- [7] Bandali, E., Dehnavi, A., Mansouri, M., and Nami, A., *Euro J of Experimental Biology*, **2013**, **3**, **1** : 388-393 .
- [8] Cherniss, C. and Goleman, D., *The emotionally intelligence workplace* ; Jossey-Bass. **2001**.
- [9] Cooper, C., L. Dewe, P.J and O'Driscoll, M. P., *Organizational stress*, Sage Publications : CA. **1998** .
- [10] Darwin, C. (1872/1965). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. **2001**.
- [11] Emdady, M., and Bagheri, N., *European J of Experimental Biology*, **2013**, **3**, **1** ; 554-558 .
- [12] Goleman, D., *Working with emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing plc. **1998**.
- [13] Harmer, R., and Fallon, B., The role of emotional intelligence in the pursuit of a spiritual life: Implications for individuals in organizations, *Organisations 7 People*, Vol.14, No. **2001**. 2,76-80.
- [14] J.D. Mayer (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence*., New York: Dude Publishing. **1990**: pp. 1-27.

- [15] J.D. Hess, A. C. Bacigalupo, *Journal of Management Decision.*, **2011** , 49, 5 ; 710-721.
- [16] Lopes. P, and Salovey. P, Toward a broader education: Social, emotional and practical skills. In P. **2003**.
- [17] L. Schumacher. J, V. Wheeler and A. S. Carr., *J of Business & Industrial Marketing.*, **2009** ; 269-277.
- [18] Mikolajczak. M, and Luminet. O, Trait emotional intelligence and the cognitive appraisal of stressful events: An exploratory study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, **2008**, 44 (7): 1445-1453.
- [19] Mikolajczak. M, Menil. C, and Luminet. O., *J of Research in Personality*, **2007**, 41 (5) :1107-1117.
- [20] M. Berges, and Augusto. J.M., *J of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 14 (2) ; **2007**: 163-171.
- [21] Mayer. J.D, Salovey. P, and Caruso. D.Rx., Emotional intelligence as Zeitgeist, as personality, and as a mental ability. In R. **2000**.
- [22] McCallum. M, and Piper. W.E., Psychological mindedness and emotional intelligence. In R. **2000**.
- [23] Mayer. J.D, Cobb. C.D and Casey. D., Educational policy on emotional intelligence: Does it make sense? In P. **2000** .
- [24] Mayer. J.D and Salovey. P., Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications. In P. **2000** .
- [25] Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence.*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. **2000**:pp. 40-67 .
- [26] R. E. Boyatzis, *Journal of Management Development.*, **2009**, 29 , 9 ; 749-770 .
- [27] R. E. Riggio and R. J. Reichard, *Journal of Managerial Psychology.*, **2008**, 23, 2; 169-185.
- [28] Salovey. M, A. Brackett and J.D. Mayer (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence: Key readings on the Mayer and Salovey model*. New York: Dude Publishing. **2004**. :pp.287-303.
- [29] Salovey. M, A. Brackett and J.D. Mayer (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence.*, **1997**. pp. 29-60.
- [30] Salovey. M, A. Brackett and J.D. Mayer (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence.*, **2000**; pp. 265-285
- [31] Saarni. C., Emotional competence: A developmental perspective. In R. **2000**.
- [32] Salovey. P, Brackett. M.A, and Mayer. J.D., *Emotional intelligence.*, New York: Dude Publishing , **2004**.
- [33] Salovey. P, and Mayer. J.D., Imagination, cognition, and personality. In P. **2004**.
- [34] Schutte. N.S, Malouf. J.M, Hall. L.E, Haggerty ,D.J, Cooper, J.T, Golden ,C. J and dornheim ,L. Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25 ; **1998**:167-177.
- [35] Taylor. G.J., and Bagby., R.M. An overview of the alexithymia construct. In R. Bar-On and J.D.A. **2000**.
- [36] T. P. Keane, *Management Research News.*, **2006**, 29 , 3 ; 128-138 .
- [37] T.Kim, J. J-E. Yoo, G. Lee and J. Kim, *Inter J of Contemporary Hospit Manage.*, **2012**, 24, 7; 1029 - 1046.
- [38] Van Rooyen. j, and Partnern., Bar-On EQ-I training manual . Adapted from Multi Health Systems (MHS), Canada. **2000** .