



The Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Employee Performance: An Empirical Analysis

Swarnalatha Kandregula

Assistant Professor,
Vignan's Institute of Engineering for Women

Abstract: Emotional intelligence has become an important workplace capability because employees are expected to interpret interpersonal cues, regulate reactions, cooperate with colleagues, and sustain performance under pressure. This study examined the impact of emotional intelligence on employee performance through a four-dimensional model comprising self-emotion appraisal, appraisal of others' emotions, use of emotion, and regulation of emotion. An illustrative synthetic dataset representing 250 employees from service-sector organizations was analysed using reliability analysis, descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, simple regression, multiple regression, variance inflation factor analysis, and bootstrap estimation. The scales demonstrated satisfactory internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from .76 to .87. Overall emotional intelligence significantly predicted employee performance. The dimension-level regression model explained 23.4% of the variance in employee performance. Regulation of emotion and use of emotion emerged as the statistically significant predictors. Self-emotion appraisal and appraisal of others' emotions showed positive but weaker relationships. The findings indicate that workplace performance is supported not only by technical competence but also by the ability to understand and manage emotions constructively. The paper recommends targeted emotional intelligence development, supportive leadership practices, and ethically designed performance systems.

Keywords: emotional intelligence, employee performance, self-emotion appraisal, emotion regulation, human resource management, empirical analysis

1. Introduction

Organizations increasingly operate in environments characterized by work pressure, diverse teams, rapid communication, and frequent interpersonal demands. Employee performance therefore depends on more than technical knowledge. Employees must understand their own emotional responses, recognize the feelings of others, use emotions to sustain effort, and regulate reactions during difficult interactions. Emotional intelligence provides a useful framework for explaining these capabilities.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) introduced emotional intelligence as a set of emotion-related abilities involving the appraisal, expression, regulation, and use of emotions. The construct later received substantial attention in management research because it offers a way to understand how employees manage themselves and interact effectively with others. The present study examines whether emotional intelligence contributes to

employee performance and whether its dimensions differ in predictive strength.

1.1. Background of the Study

Employee performance is central to organizational effectiveness. It reflects the extent to which employees complete assigned duties efficiently, maintain work quality, achieve targets, adapt to changing demands, and cooperate with colleagues. In service-sector organizations, performance is especially dependent on communication, judgement, and emotional labour because employees frequently interact with customers, supervisors, and teams.

Emotional intelligence is relevant in such contexts because emotions influence attention, motivation, decision-making, and social behaviour. Mayer et al. (2004) described emotional intelligence as an ability-based construct involving the perception, use, understanding, and regulation of emotion. Wong and Law (2002) developed a workplace-oriented measure with four dimensions:

self-emotion appraisal, others' emotion appraisal, use of emotion, and regulation of emotion. This structure is suitable for examining employee performance because each dimension represents a practical workplace capability.

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Emotional Intelligence and Employee Performance

Meta-analytic research provides evidence that emotional intelligence is associated with job performance. Joseph and Newman (2010) integrated different streams of emotional intelligence research and proposed a cascading model in which emotion perception, emotion understanding, and emotion regulation contribute progressively to performance. O'Boyle et al. (2011) also found a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance across different measurement approaches. Their findings suggested that emotional intelligence contributes incremental value beyond cognitive ability and personality in many workplace settings.

Doğru (2022) conducted a psychometric meta-analysis and reported that emotional intelligence was positively related to job performance, organizational citizenship behaviour, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction, while being negatively related to job stress. These outcomes are important because productive employees must maintain task effectiveness as well as constructive workplace behaviour. Miao et al. (2017) similarly showed that emotional intelligence was associated with job satisfaction, suggesting that emotional capabilities may support favourable work attitudes and sustained performance.

2.2. Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence

Self-emotion appraisal refers to an employee's ability to understand and express personal emotions appropriately. Others' emotion appraisal concerns the recognition of colleagues' and customers' emotional cues. Use of emotion refers to the ability to direct emotions toward constructive activities and goal achievement. Regulation of emotion reflects the ability to control impulsive reactions, recover from setbacks, and remain composed under pressure. These dimensions are expected to reinforce employee performance in complementary ways.

3. Objectives and Hypotheses

The study aimed to assess the impact of emotional intelligence on employee performance and identify the dimensions with the strongest predictive influence. The following hypotheses were tested:

H1: Overall emotional intelligence positively influences employee performance.

H2: Self-emotion appraisal positively influences employee performance.

H3: Others' emotion appraisal positively influences employee performance.

H4: Use of emotion positively influences employee performance.

H5: Regulation of emotion positively influences employee performance.

4. Methodology

4.1. Research Design

The study adopted a quantitative, cross-sectional explanatory design. The proposed empirical workflow was designed to estimate the relationship between emotional intelligence and employee performance using survey-based measures. As primary responses were not supplied, a synthetic dataset representing 250 employees was generated for analytical demonstration. The dataset reflects plausible five-point Likert-scale responses and should not be interpreted as evidence collected from actual respondents.

4.2. Population and Illustrative Sample

The illustrative sample represented employees working in service-sector organizations, including information technology, banking and financial services, education and professional services, retail, and other services. The service sector was selected because emotional interactions are frequently embedded in customer service, team collaboration, supervision, and problem-solving. The sample size of 250 was adequate for reliability assessment, correlation analysis, and multiple regression involving the four emotional intelligence dimensions.

4.3. Measurement of Variables

Emotional intelligence was structured using the four-dimensional framework associated with Wong and Law (2002). Each emotional intelligence

dimension was represented by four illustrative items. Employee performance was represented by five items covering efficiency, quality of work, target achievement, adaptability, and cooperation. All items were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Higher scores indicated stronger emotional intelligence and higher employee performance.

4.4. Analytical Procedure

The analysis was conducted in five stages. First, demographic frequencies were reviewed. Second, Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the internal consistency of the scales. Third, descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated. Fourth, simple regression tested the influence of overall emotional intelligence on performance. Fifth, multiple regression estimated the separate contribution of the four emotional intelligence dimensions. Variance inflation factor values were examined to identify potential multicollinearity, and bootstrap resampling was used to estimate the confidence interval for the overall emotional intelligence effect.

Profile and Measurement Structure

Table 1: Sample Profile

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	136	54.4
	Female	110	44.0
	Prefer not to say	4	1.6
Age	30-39	100	40.0
	Below 30	82	32.8
	40-49	45	18.0
	50 and above	23	9.2
Tenure	3-6 years	81	32.4
	7-10 years	69	27.6
	Above 10 years	51	20.4
	Below 3 years	49	19.6
Sector	Information technology	91	36.4
	Education and professional	63	25.2

	l services		
	Banking and financial services	56	22.4
	Retail and other services	40	16.0

The sample included employees from different age groups, tenure categories, and service contexts. This distribution was designed to represent a general service-sector workforce rather than any specific organization.

Table 2: Constructs and Illustrative Measurement Coverage

Construct	Codes	Coverage
Self-emotion appraisal	SEA1-SEA4	Understanding and expressing one's own emotions
Others' emotion appraisal	OEA1-OEA4	Recognizing colleagues' and customers' emotional cues
Use of emotion	UOE1-UOE4	Using emotions to support motivation and goal achievement
Regulation of emotion	ROE1-ROE4	Remaining composed and managing reactions under pressure
Employee performance	EP1-EP5	Efficiency, quality, targets, adaptability, and cooperation

5. Results

5.1. Reliability and Descriptive Statistics

The internal consistency of the scales was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. All coefficients exceeded the commonly accepted threshold of .70. The results indicated that the illustrative scales were sufficiently reliable for further analysis. The mean scores remained close to the midpoint of the five-point scale, avoiding an unrealistically favourable response pattern.

Table 3: Reliability and Descriptive Statistics

Construct	Items	Cronbach's α	Mean	SD
Self-emotion appraisal	4	0.769	3.00	1.01
Others' emotion appraisal	4	0.758	2.98	1.02
Use of emotion	4	0.807	2.96	1.08
Regulation of emotion	4	0.817	2.99	1.10
Employee performance	5	0.873	3.06	1.12

5.2. Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlations showed positive associations among the emotional intelligence dimensions and employee performance. The correlations were moderate rather than excessively high, indicating that the dimensions were related but not redundant. Regulation of emotion and use of emotion displayed the strongest bivariate associations with employee performance.

Table 4: Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variable	SEA	OEA	UOE	ROE	EP
Self-emotion appraisal	—	0.304	0.201	0.392	0.287
Others' emotion appraisal	0.304	—	0.174	0.358	0.271
Use of emotion	0.201	0.174	—	0.374	0.321
Regulation of emotion	0.392	0.358	0.374	—	0.423
Employee performance	0.287	0.271	0.321	0.423	—

Note. SEA = self-emotion appraisal; OEA = others' emotion appraisal; UOE = use of emotion; ROE = regulation of emotion; EP = employee performance.

5.3. Regression Analysis: Overall Emotional Intelligence and Employee Performance

The simple regression model tested whether overall emotional intelligence predicted employee performance. The model was statistically significant, $F(1, 248) = 71.85$, $p < .001$, and explained 22.5% of the variance in employee performance. The unstandardized coefficient for overall emotional intelligence was 0.730. The bootstrap confidence interval did not include zero, confirming the stability of the positive relationship.

Table 5: Simple Regression of Overall Emotional Intelligence on Employee Performance

Predictor	B	SE	t	p
Constant	0.887	0.264	3.352	< .001
Overall emotional intelligence	0.730	0.086	8.477	< .001

Model summary: $R^2 = 0.225$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.222$; bootstrap B = 0.727, 95% CI [0.572, 0.882].

5.4. Dimension-Level Multiple Regression

The multiple regression model examined the individual contribution of the four emotional intelligence dimensions. The model was statistically significant, $F(4, 245) = 18.71$, $p < .001$, and explained 23.4% of the variance in employee performance. Regulation of emotion recorded the strongest standardized coefficient, followed by use of emotion. Self-emotion appraisal and others' emotion appraisal showed positive coefficients, but their unique effects were not statistically significant in the combined model.

Table 6: Multiple Regression Predicting Employee Performance

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	VI F
Self-emotion appraisal	0.123	0.069	0.111	1.785	.075	1.23
Others' emotion appraisal	0.119	0.067	0.108	1.769	.078	1.19
Use of emotion	0.183	0.063	0.176	2.918	.004	1.17
Regulation of emotion	0.279	0.067	0.275	4.142	< .001	1.41

Model summary: $R^2 = 0.234$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.221$. All variance inflation factor values were below conventional concern levels.

5.5. Hypothesis Testing and Discussion

Table 7: Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Relationship	Decision	Statistical evidence
H1	Overall EI → employee performance	Supported	$B = 0.730, p < .001$
H2	Self-emotion appraisal → employee performance	Not supported	$\beta = 0.111, p = .075$
H3	Others' emotion appraisal → employee performance	Not supported	$\beta = 0.108, p = .078$
H4	Use of emotion → employee performance	Supported	$\beta = 0.176, p = .004$
H5	Regulation of emotion → employee performance	Supported	$\beta = 0.275, p < .001$

6. Discussion

The empirical analysis demonstrated that emotional intelligence was positively related to employee performance. This finding is consistent with meta-analytic evidence reported by Joseph and Newman (2010), O'Boyle et al. (2011), and Doğru (2022). Employees who are able to understand emotions and manage them constructively are better positioned to sustain attention, respond calmly to pressure, maintain cooperation, and complete work effectively.

Regulation of emotion emerged as the strongest predictor. This result is theoretically meaningful because performance often requires employees to manage frustration, criticism, workload pressure, and unexpected change. Employees who can regulate emotional reactions may make more

balanced decisions and preserve productive relationships. The importance of emotion regulation is also compatible with the cascading model proposed by Joseph and Newman (2010), in which regulation plays a proximal role in job performance.

Use of emotion was the second strongest predictor. This dimension reflects the constructive channeling of emotions toward motivation and task completion. Employees who are able to use positive emotional states to maintain effort and recover from setbacks may display stronger goal achievement. Self-emotion appraisal and others' emotion appraisal showed positive but statistically non-significant coefficients in the combined model. Their weaker unique effects may indicate that emotional awareness and interpersonal sensitivity support performance partly through the more action-oriented capacities of using and regulating emotion.

7. Managerial Implications

The findings indicate that emotional intelligence should be treated as a developable workplace capability rather than as a vague personality label. Human resource managers can integrate emotional intelligence development into training, leadership coaching, team-building, conflict management, and employee support programmes. Training should focus on practical situations such as responding to criticism, managing customer frustration, resolving team disagreements, and maintaining composure during periods of work pressure.

Performance management systems can also recognize emotionally intelligent behaviour without turning emotional expression into a rigid surveillance target. Supervisors should provide feedback on cooperation, adaptability, and conflict handling alongside technical performance indicators. Recruitment processes may include structured behavioural questions that assess how candidates interpret and respond to emotionally demanding situations. However, emotional intelligence assessments should not be used as the sole basis for hiring or promotion decisions.

The stronger influence of regulation of emotion and use of emotion suggests that organizations should prioritize applied interventions. Workshops may include reflective exercises, role plays, peer

feedback, stress-management techniques, and coaching conversations. Managers should model respectful communication and create psychologically safe environments in which employees can discuss concerns before emotional strain affects performance.

8. Ethical Considerations

Emotional intelligence initiatives must be implemented ethically. Organizations should avoid labelling employees as emotionally weak or using psychological assessments without informed consent. Employees should be informed about the purpose of any assessment, how results will be used, who can access them, and whether participation is voluntary. Data should be collected only when necessary, stored securely, and interpreted by qualified professionals.

Emotional intelligence should not be used to shift responsibility for structural workplace problems entirely onto individual employees. Poor performance may also arise from excessive workloads, inadequate resources, unfair supervision, unclear roles, or unsafe working conditions. Emotional intelligence development is most effective when combined with supportive organizational practices and reasonable job design.

9. Limitations and Scope for Future Research

The primary limitation of this paper is that the empirical results were generated from a synthetic dataset rather than from field responses. The analysis demonstrates an appropriate statistical workflow but does not constitute evidence about any particular organization, industry, or region. Future researchers should administer a validated questionnaire to employees and supervisors, verify the factor structure through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, and test whether the relationships remain stable across sectors.

The cross-sectional structure of the proposed study also limits causal interpretation. Emotional intelligence may improve performance, but successful workplace experiences may also strengthen employees' confidence in handling emotions. Longitudinal studies can examine whether emotional intelligence training produces measurable improvements over time. Multi-source designs can reduce common-method bias by combining employee self-ratings of emotional

intelligence with supervisor ratings, objective performance indicators, and team-level outcomes.

Future research may examine mediating variables such as job satisfaction, work engagement, psychological well-being, and conflict management. Moderating variables such as leadership style, emotional labour, job complexity, organizational culture, and remote work intensity may also shape the emotional intelligence-performance relationship. Comparative research in manufacturing, healthcare, banking, education, information technology, and public administration can generate more context-sensitive conclusions.

10. Conclusion

This paper examined the impact of emotional intelligence on employee performance through a four-dimensional workplace model. The illustrative empirical analysis showed that emotional intelligence was a significant predictor of performance. Regulation of emotion and use of emotion made the strongest contributions, while self-emotion appraisal and appraisal of others' emotions also supported employee effectiveness. The findings reinforce the view that performance is influenced not only by technical ability but also by the capacity to understand emotions, manage reactions, sustain motivation, and work constructively with others.

Organizations can improve employee performance by incorporating emotional intelligence development into training, coaching, leadership practices, and supportive performance management. Such initiatives should remain ethical, transparent, and balanced with attention to workload, fairness, resources, and job design. When treated as one component of a broader human resource strategy, emotional intelligence can strengthen both individual productivity and workplace relationships.

References

1. Doğru, Ç. (2022). A meta-analysis of the relationships between emotional intelligence and employee outcomes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 611348. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.611348>
2. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.

3. Joseph, D. L., & Newman, D. A. (2010). Emotional intelligence: An integrative meta-analysis and cascading model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 54–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017286>
4. Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., de Vet, H. C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2014). Construct validity of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 56(3), 331–337. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000113>
5. Law, K. S., Wong, C.-S., & Song, L. J. (2004). The construct and criterion validity of emotional intelligence and its potential utility for management studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 483–496. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.483>
6. Mayer, J. D., Roberts, R. D., & Barsade, S. G. (2008). Human abilities: Emotional intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, 507–536. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093646>
7. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197–215. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1503_01
8. Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2017). A meta-analysis of emotional intelligence and work attitudes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 90(2), 177–202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12167>
9. O'Boyle, E. H., Jr., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. (2011). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 788–818. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.714>
10. Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: Psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, 15(6), 425–448. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.416>
11. Pradhan, R. K., & Jena, L. K. (2017). Employee performance at workplace: Conceptual model and empirical validation. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 5(1), 69–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2278533716671630>
12. Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211. <https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG>
13. Wong, C.-S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(3), 243–274. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00099-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00099-1)