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Abstract

Substance abuse is a persistent social problem contributing to family disruption; domestic abuse; school failure; and financial costs relating to criminal prosecution, incarceration, treatment, and lost productivity and wages. Substance abuse is amenable to treatment, including psychotherapy. A client-therapist relationship is broken if the therapist leaves the organization; therefore, employee retention is especially important in treatment centers. Employee retention has been studied, but how it is affected by supervisees’ perceptions of their managers’ emotional intelligence has been a neglected area. The purpose of this nonexperimental, correlational study was to determine the relationship between employee turnover intention and perceived emotional intelligence of leaders in a substance abuse treatment center. The study was based on the theory of emotional intelligence and on an overarching research question that addressed the relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of midlevel managers at a substance abuse treatment center and the turnover intentions among employees who report to them. Data collection involved administering 3 instruments—a demographic survey, the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale, and the Turnover Intentions Composite Measure—to 44 employees at a substance abuse treatment center. Data were analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlations. Results showed that participants who rated their supervisor high on emotional intelligence were less likely to report an intention to leave than were participants who rated their supervisor low on emotional intelligence. Social change implications include the potential for improving the process of identifying and training substance abuse training center leaders, thereby improving patient outcomes.
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Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Employee turnover can have a variety of negative effects on organizations. For example, according to Allen, Bryant, and Vardaman (2010), replacing an employee can cost more than a year’s salary for the position being filled. Hausknecht and Trevor (2011) noted that turnover results in the loss of both social and human capital. In human services organizations, those negative effects can extend to the clients the organization serves. The human services industry, specifically substance abuse treatment, is not immune to these costs. Ducharme, Knudsen, and Roman (2008) studied substance abuse treatment counselors and observed that turnover affects quality of care because it severs the relationship between client and therapist. That conclusion was confirmed by Knight, Broome, Edwards, and Flynn (2011), who found that among substance abuse treatment personnel, turnover rates ranged from 18% to 25%, which can affect the client therapist relationship and impede efforts to implement and sustain new initiatives. The purpose of this quantitative study was to explore the relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of managers and employee turnover intention in a substance abuse center.

Background

Recently, researchers have begun to examine the effect of emotional intelligence on employee turnover (Elias & George, 2012; Jang & George, 2011; Peterson, 2013; Roy, 2013). Emotional intelligence incorporates a mixture of skills and competencies that determine how people understand and express themselves, which includes recognizing, understanding, controlling, and managing one’s emotions (Bar-On, 2006). These abilities are necessary in nurturing individuals, families, and communities that thrive (Bar-On,
Theorists have also posited that emotional intelligence affects people’s ability to establish and maintain relationships (Bar-On, 2005; Goleman, 2004). According to Johnson (2011), individuals with high emotional intelligence are better equipped to build strong relationships and to lead effectively than are those with low emotional intelligence. Crosbie (2006) argued that most substandard work performance is due to relationship problems rather than to a lack of job-related skills.

A substantial body of research has emerged on the connection between emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness, with several researchers concluding that high emotional intelligence is one component of successful leadership (Abdul & Ehiobuche, 2011; Côté, Lopes, Salovey, & Miners, 2010; Walter, Cole, & Humphrey, 2011). Although researchers have considered the effect of emotional intelligence on leadership and employee turnover in a variety of industries, no studies have addressed this dynamic in the field of substance abuse treatment. Social services organizations, such as substance abuse treatment centers, have an added burden with turnover given that they foster individual relationships between their counselors and their clients. When an employee leaves such an organization, a personal relationship with clients is broken.

Another area of research is the effect of emotional intelligence on turnover. Kant and Sharma (2012) claimed that emotionally intelligent people tend to be supportive, and Bushra, Usman, and Naveed (2011) found that leaders who show support are more likely to have satisfied employees who are less likely to leave the organization. Although the relationship between emotional intelligence and turnover has attracted recent research interest (Elias & George, 2012; Jang & George, 2011; Peterson, 2013; Roy, 2013), this
potential connection has not been studied among those who work in substance abuse treatment. The current study addressed a gap in the literature regarding how a leader’s emotional intelligence affects employee turnover in the field of substance abuse treatment. The results of the study could help inform how leaders interact with their subordinates in substance abuse treatment facilities.

**Statement of the Problem**

High turnover in substance abuse treatment centers can lead to compromised client care and increased organizational costs (Ducharme et al., 2008). When employees leave a substance abuse treatment facility, that organization incurs the expense of finding and training new employees, and clients can suffer due to discontinuity of care (Knight, Becan, & Flynn, 2012; Rieckmann, Fuller, Saedi, & McCarty, 2010). Also, turnover results in decreased efficiency in carrying out job-related responsibilities (McNulty, Oser, Johnson, Knudsen, & Roman, 2007). Implementing new strategies in substance abuse treatment and achieving organizational goals is hampered by high employee turnover (Knight et al., 2011).

Rothrauff, Abraham, Bride, and Roman (2011) claimed that although research on employee turnover is increasingly common in the social science literature, the topic has “scarcely been addressed with counselors working in substance abuse treatment” (p. 67). When discussing the high rate of staff turnover in this field, White and Gardner (2011) stated that “it is surprising how few scientific studies have been conducted on its prevalence, patterns, effects, and remediation strategies” (p. 56). Knight et al. (2012) observed that there is a general acceptance of the negative effects of turnover in mental
health organizations, yet limited evidence exists regarding antecedents to turnover in substance abuse treatment. The purpose of the current study was to explore why this field is experiencing high turnover by examining the effect of leaders’ emotional intelligence on employee turnover.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine whether the perceived emotional intelligence of leaders in substance abuse treatment centers was correlated with employee turnover intention. Turnover affects the quality of client care in substance abuse treatment facilities (Ducharme et al., 2008; Knight et al., 2011), and emotional intelligence has been shown to be a predictor of leadership effectiveness including subordinate turnover rates (Abdul & Ehiobuche, 2011; Côté et al., 2010; Walter et al., 2011). Having emotionally intelligent leaders who provide an atmosphere where employees feel supported and understood could increase organizational commitment and reduce turnover intention (Jordan & Troth, 2011; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005). Given these findings, it is important to examine the relationship between an employee’s perception of a leader’s emotional intelligence and the employee’s turnover intention.

**Research Question and Hypothesis**

This study was based on one overall research question: What is the relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of leaders, specifically midlevel managers, at a substance abuse treatment center and the turnover intention among employees who report to them? This question gave rise to the following hypothesis, which is stated in null and alternative form:
$H_{10}$: There is no statistically significant relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of leaders in substance abuse treatment centers and employee turnover intention.

$H_{1a}$: There is a statistically significant relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of leaders in substance abuse treatment centers and employee turnover intention.

**Theoretical Framework**

Most theories of emotional intelligence stem from Salovey and Mayer (1990), who were the first to use the term. This study was based on this original theory of emotional intelligence, defined as “the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 189). This model originally included four components: perceiving emotions, using emotions to facilitate thought, understanding emotions, and managing emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1993). The four components were later changed to the following: self emotion appraisal, others’ emotion appraisal, use of emotion, and regulation of emotion (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The latter formulation was used to create the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS; Libbrecht, Lievens, & Schollaert, 2010), which is described in greater detail in Chapter 3.

Theories of emotional intelligence are based on the assumption that emotions influence how a person thinks and acts. Some individuals, leaders included, are highly aware of their own emotions and are better able to manage them. It could be that these
same individuals are more aware of other people’s emotions and more attentive to those emotions. In this study I applied the theory of emotional intelligence by determining the relationship between leaders’ emotional intelligence and turnover intentions of those employees who report to them. I expected that leaders who exhibited higher levels of emotional intelligence would have subordinates who were less likely to leave the organization. Conversely, leaders exhibiting low levels of emotional intelligence were predicted to have higher employee turnover intentions among the employees who report to them.

**Nature of the Study**

A quantitative design was chosen because quantitative research involves examining the relationship between variables and allowed for the testing of the study’s hypothesis. Quantitative research also enables a researcher to make inferences about a population by studying a representative sample of that population (Creswell, 2009). Therefore, a correlational quantitative design was the most appropriate method of research for this study.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

I assumed that participants would understand the survey questions on the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS) and the Turnover Intentions Composite Measure (TICM) and provide honest and accurate responses. Another assumption was that the survey platform would be easy to access and would operate efficiently so as to not deter objective participation. I also assumed that the sample was representative of substance abuse treatment center employees in the targeted organization.
Although confidentiality was assured, one limitation was that participation could be limited based on fear of retaliation by supervisors. A second limitation was that data collection was limited to one substance abuse treatment organization. Finally, survey research and convenience sampling were used, and therefore findings may not represent the entire substance abuse treatment industry.

**Scope and Delimitations**

This study was confined to employees at a single substance abuse organization, a nonprofit organization licensed through the local Department of Public Health. This organization includes five inpatient sites devoted exclusively to substance abuse treatment, one inpatient facility that services individuals with both mental health and substance abuse problems, four sites that offer outpatient and community services, and a residential jail diversion program for clients facing incarceration. This organization has approximately 72 managers and over 500 employees.

I sought to determine whether a relationship exists between perceived leader emotional intelligence and employee turnover intention. Therefore, the target population included employees who work directly with the clients: clinicians, recovery specialists, and nursing staff. Administrative staff and other personnel were excluded from the study. A qualitative design was not used because a qualitative study does not show whether a relationship exists between the variables of interest, and the results of such research cannot be used to make generalizations about the population being studied.
Significance of the Study

Research has shown that substance abuse can result in deaths due to illness and overdose, disabilities that lead to unproductive lives, family disruption, school failure, child abuse, domestic violence, and debilitating diseases such as hepatitis and AIDS (Single, 2009; Smith, Lee, & Davidson, 2010). Additionally, substance abuse represents a significant expense to U.S. taxpayers. According to the National Institute on Drug Abuse (2012), overall costs of substance abuse in the United States are over $600 billion a year, including lost productivity, health costs, and crime costs.

The client-therapist relationship, also known as the therapeutic alliance (Reeh, 2010), is a key factor in the reduction of substance abuse (Marcus, Wintersteen, Kashy, & Diamond, 2011). In a meta-analysis, Meier, Barrowclough, and Donmall (2005) found that the therapeutic alliance was consistently related to treatment retention and early improvements in substance abuse treatment. Although research addressing the therapeutic alliance and long-term treatment outcomes in substance abuse treatment is limited, there is extensive literature supporting this concept in treatment of other mental health conditions (Meier et al., 2005).

The results of this study could be used to improve training for supervisors and to inform the process of promoting employees or when hiring for leadership positions. Such improvements could in turn improve the services provided at substance abuse treatment centers, could lead to reduced employee turnover, and could improve patient outcomes resulting in improved lives and a decreased financial burden for society. Insights from
this study should assist inpatient substance abuse treatment centers in providing the best services possible. This in turn should help decrease substance abuse recidivism rates.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I described a quantitative study on the relationship between leaders’ emotional intelligence and turnover among their supervisees. Participants were employees of an organization that provides substance abuse treatment. Participating employees completed the WLEIS and the TICM, as well as a demographic survey. Data were analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlations. In Chapter 2, the relevant literature on emotional intelligence and employee turnover is reviewed. In Chapter 3, the study’s methods are described, including design, sample, instrumentation, data collection and analysis, and ethical protections. Chapter 4 presents a description of the study’s results, and Chapter 5 presents conclusions and recommendations.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Reasons for employee turnover constitute a long-standing research interest (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Hom, Griffeth, & Solaro, 1984; Lee & Mitchell, 1994; Maertz & Campion, 2004; Mobley, 1977; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Research on emotional intelligence as a variable in understanding employee turnover has increased since the concept was first introduced in the 1990s (Abraham, 1999; Carmelli, 2003; Cherniss, 1999; Jordan, Ashkanasy, & Hartel, 2002; Langhorn, 2003; Nikolaou & Tsaousis, 2002). Recent studies on the relationship between emotional intelligence and turnover intention have been conducted in organizations such as a private pathology company (Jordon & Troth, 2010), a restaurant (Jang & George, 2011), and an electronics firm (Ealias, & George, 2012). Given this research precedent, using the perception of leaders’ emotional intelligence as a variable in turnover could be helpful in understanding employee turnover in substance abuse treatment facilities. In this literature review I explore the nature of emotional intelligence and its relationship to employee turnover, especially in substance abuse treatment facilities.

This chapter begins with a definition of emotional intelligence, its history and evolution, related theories, perceived emotional intelligence, and emotional intelligence and leadership. Next, I consider the construct of employee turnover in human service organizations, with an emphasis on the substance abuse professional. Leadership impact on employee turnover is explored, with a consideration of other variables in substance abuse treatment that contribute to employee turnover.
I conducted a search for studies examining the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership, employee satisfaction and leadership, leadership in substance abuse treatment centers, and employee retention and turnover in human services and in substance abuse treatment. I used the following databases: Academic Search Complete, Business Source Complete, ERIC, Medline, PsychARTICLES, PsychINFO, and Psychiatry online. I also used the Google Scholar search engine. I used the following keywords, individually and combined: *emotional intelligence*, *leadership*, *employee satisfaction*, *substance abuse treatment*, *employee turnover*, and *retention*. In addition, I also drew on citations found in other studies, books, and reviews of the literature.

**Emotional Intelligence**

Emotional intelligence is the practical application of feelings and thinking. The definition of emotional intelligence has varied and has been expanded upon since Mayer and Salovey first offered it in 1990, but the foundation remains the same. The term was defined by Salovey and Mayer (1990) as “the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (p. 189). Understanding and managing emotions is critical as emotions influence how a person thinks, feels, and behaves. More recently, Ermer, Kahn, Salovey, and Kiehl (2012) defined emotional intelligence as “the ability to perceive, manage, and reason about emotions, in oneself and in others, and to use this information adaptively” (p. 194). Goleman’s (2004) definition includes the capacity to understand one’s own emotions and those of others, along with the ability to effectively manage relationships. For Bar-On (2010), “emotional intelligence is an array of interrelated
emotional and social competencies and skills that impact intelligent behavior” (p. 57). In addition to capacity and ability, emotional intelligence includes skills that influence the way a person behaves around others. Researchers agree that thoughts and feelings contribute to the way people act, and the way a person behaves and interacts with others influences their relationships.

There is a consensus among professionals in psychology that recognizing and managing feelings is the basis for emotional intelligence (Martins, Ramalho, & Morin, 2010). However, Chopra and Kanji (2010) asserted that defining emotional intelligence is complicated and involves several additional components. Chopra and Kanji argued that previous definitions of emotional intelligence and their measurement tools are not sufficient, and went on to define emotional intelligence as “an interconnection between feelings and the thinking process” (p. 972). Although the language used to describe this phenomenon varies, there appears to be some agreement among researchers and theorists.

Emotional intelligence can be demonstrated through certain traits and abilities that affect relationships. Goleman (1995) and Bar-On (2005) included characteristics in their definitions that may not be related to emotions or intelligence, such as motivation. Motivation can be found in all kinds of people, independent of their emotional intelligence. There are those who are motivated to succeed in life who may have little awareness of self or others. According to Clarke (2010), Goleman’s and Bar-On’s conceptualizations of emotional intelligence should be considered mixed, noting that “many argue that they include competencies that lay outside of the construct’s domain” (p. 120). For example, Goleman included “assertiveness and motivation” and Bar-On
included “stress management and general mood” (Clark, 2010, p. 120). Clarke also noted that support for the ability model of emotional intelligence over the mixed model has increased.

People with high emotional intelligence are better able to understand their own feelings, express them constructively, and support others in what they may be feeling than are those with low emotional intelligence (Kant & Sharma, 2012). Feeling supported is one of the key elements in a relationship. Goleman (2011, 2012) found that successful leaders tend to be high in emotional intelligence and asserted that people high in emotional intelligence are more likely to be successful in life. Mayer (2012), on the other hand, expressed skepticism that emotional intelligence predicts whether a person will be successful. Mayer did make claims about the predictive value of emotional intelligence—for example, that people with emotional intelligence are less likely to abuse drugs, more likely to have positive social relationships, and less likely to fight or argue. Mayer recognized that some of his claims could also be made based on an individual’s personality, but he argued that the popular definition of emotional intelligence is too expansive and should not include personality characteristics.

Emotional intelligence can be thought of as a component of multidimensional personality or as a stand-alone construct. Personality and abilities vary among individuals, and emotional intelligence varies as well (Joseph & Newman, 2010). Goleman and Bar-On included personality traits in their definitions of emotional intelligence, but Cherniss, Extein, Goleman, and Weissberg (2006) argued that an abundance of research supports emotional intelligence as an independent construct,
separate from personality and cognition. Research exploring the differences continues (Antonakis & Dietz, 2010; Van der Linden, Tsaousis, & Petrides, 2012), and recently a fourth model of emotional intelligence has been proposed that is based exclusively on personality traits: trait emotional intelligence (Cherniss, 2010). Van der Linden et al. found a strong relationship between personality and trait emotional intelligence. However, Bar-On (2005) showed that personality traits are not as easily shaped and changed as emotional intelligence is.

Emotional intelligence may not be determined by personality, and personality may not be determined by emotional intelligence; however, there are elements that influence an individual’s personality and emotional intelligence level. Some aspects of personality, such as social skills, can influence emotional intelligence. For example, people who are by nature outgoing or positive generally have good social skills and interact naturally with others (Abdul & Ehiobuche, 2011) and in this way present as more emotionally intelligent. Being self-aware and attentive to the feelings of others is a skill that many are taught from a young age. Chopra and Kanji (2010) suggested biochemical origins for emotional intelligence similar to the biochemical origins of personality, yet changing someone’s biochemical makeup is unlikely. Goleman (2004) agreed that emotional intelligence can be influenced by biology, stating that all people inherit certain attributes through their genetic makeup but emphasizing that these attributes are also shaped by environment and life experiences. While recognizing genetics and environmental influences, Goleman (2011) also emphasized the connections between brain circuitry and emotional intelligence; Goleman’s studies in brain science supported
this connection (Hallowell, 2011). Personality and emotional intelligence are often studied together, and there may be a connection between the two.

Lindebaum and Cartwright (2010) argued for the importance of considering context when measuring emotional intelligence, but also recognized the contribution of personality. Although personality, genetics, biochemistry, and a person’s environment contribute to emotional intelligence, this does not mean that a person is destined to remain the same throughout life. Personalities change over time in many areas, including self-control, emotional stability, and social skills (Roberts & Mroczek, 2008). Children can be taught emotional skills and social awareness (Dixon, 2012), and Lucas and Donnellan (2011) argued that individuals can and do change even during midlife and into their older years, particularly in behavior. These studies support the idea of training, practicing, and developing emotional intelligence.

Emotional intelligence is sometimes characterized as a soft skill that includes “character, charisma, compassion, communication, courage, empathy and persuasion” (Rao, 2012, p. 28), most of which can be learned or developed. Even if the ability to develop these skills is present, there is no guarantee that an individual will develop them. Clarke (2010) argued that it takes time and effort to develop these skills, going beyond simple training to include practice and application of the principles learned. Some people are more willing than others to do the work necessary to grow and change emotionally, similar to how some people are more willing to work hard to learn a skill or improve in other areas of their lives. Bar-On (2006) suggested that people grow in emotional and social intelligence as they age, unlike with cognitive intelligence, where growth takes
place early on in life and tends to decline as people age. Other researchers support the idea that people grow in emotional intelligence as they age (Lindebaum, 2009).

According to Goleman (2011), “It’s never too late to improve your EQ abilities and competencies” (p. 13). Growing and developing emotional intelligence may be an option that some people choose while others do not.

One strand of research on emotional intelligence concerns its relationship to personal and business relationships. Some studies have shown that emotional intelligence contributes to work success at a higher percentage than do technical skills (Kant & Sharma, 2012; Lindebaum & Cartwright, 2010). A person might be mentally intelligent and yet not know how to engage with other people. According to Cherniss (2010), “People could score high on traditional intelligence tests yet do poorly in areas such as self-regulation and social relations” (p. 110). When people cannot control themselves and are unable to engage effectively with others, their relationships, both personal and professional, can be affected negatively. Other research has shown a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance (Farh, Seo, & Tesluk, 2012). It could be assumed that people who perform better on their job will be more successful at that job.

**History and Evolution of Emotional Intelligence**

Interest in emotional intelligence and the connection among thoughts, feelings, and behavior is not new. Socrates connected feelings and actions. Plato identified feelings as something in the mind. Finally, Aristotle stressed the importance of feeling and thinking for the kind of life one chooses to live (Chopra & Kanji, 2010). According to
Bar-On (2010), scholars have been interested in the concept of emotional intelligence for most of the 20th century, exploring the relationship between thoughts and feelings. Goleman (1995) traced the connection back to Aristotle, who asserted that uncontrolled anger has a direct influence on relationships with others. Song et al. (2010), in their research with college students, found a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and social relationships. Bar-On (2010) referenced Darwinian principles as a contributor to his ongoing definition of emotional intelligence, which gives special attention to how a person behaves in relationship to the expression of emotions.

The intelligent use of emotions has been an important component in theories of personal and leadership development. Carnegie was a popular proponent of learning how to develop effective relationships and how to exert a positive influence on others. According to Marshall and Allen (2012), Carnegie believed that people are primarily emotional rather than logical. Marshall and Allen cited several other theories consonant with that notion, including Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and Herzberg’s motivation theory. The assumption is that components of emotional intelligence, such as self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy, and social skills, can increase one’s influence and contribute to better leadership qualities. According to Mayer (2012), emotional intelligence includes the ability to manage others, which requires influence and is a quality of effective leaders.

Social intelligence theory is often referenced when considering the history of emotional intelligence (Campbell, 2012; Chopra & Kanji, 2010; Joseph & Newman, 2010; Mehta & Sing, 2013; Osborne, 2012). Social intelligence theory is based on the
assumption that intelligence involves more than cognition and that emotions should be considered when operationalizing intelligence. Thorndike and Stein (1937) defined social intelligence as “the ability to understand and manage people” (p. 275). Mayer and Salovey (1993) saw emotional intelligence as “a type of social intelligence” (p. 433), and Goleman (1995, 2006) distinguished between the interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of social intelligence. These aspects of social intelligence involve the relationships people have with themselves and others, which seems to be the basis of emotional intelligence.

Intelligence that includes more than the cognitive element continued to be of interest to psychologists, researchers, and business people well into the 20th century. In 1983, Gardner introduced the notion of multiple intelligences, listing seven examples: musical, spatial, verbal, logical, bodily, interpersonal, and intrapersonal. As Tan (2012) noted, Gardner’s examples can be seen as “personal intelligences” (p. 12). Although multiple intelligence theory includes many elements, relationship with oneself and with others is a part of it. Goleman (1995) characterized Gardner’s interpersonal intelligence as “capacities to discern and respond appropriately to the moods, temperaments, motivations, and desires of other people” and intrapersonal intelligence as including “access to one’s own feelings and the ability to discriminate among them and draw upon them to guide behavior” (p. 39). Within the last 30 years, the recognition of emotions and the relationship between emotions and intelligence has become increasingly evident.

The concept of emotional intelligence gave rise to the term emotional quotient, first used by Bar-On to describe ways to measure emotional and social competence (Emmerling, 2013). Attempts to measure emotional quotient led to development of the
Executive EQ Map by Cooper and Sawaf (1998), a norm-tested measure of emotional intelligence. Ferris (2009) cited a study that used this self-administered questionnaire to measure self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy, and social skills in 121 undergraduate students. In a pretest/posttest design, results showed benefits for students who were taught some skills related to emotional intelligence.

### Theories and Models of Emotional Intelligence

**Mayer and Salovey**

Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) first model of emotional intelligence incorporated earlier theories of social intelligence, as well as Wechsler’s notion that intelligence includes an ability to “deal effectively with the environment” (p. 187). Salovey and Mayer’s (1993) final model had four components: perceiving emotions, using emotions to facilitate thought, understanding emotions, and managing emotions. Later, Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2004) developed the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) and administered it to over 500 adults and 200 teenagers, arguing that the MEIS confirmed emotional intelligence as a standard intelligence. The claim that emotional intelligence is equal or superior to standard intelligence has been repeated in many other studies (Cherniss, 2010; Côté et al., 2010; Song et al., 2010).

Controversy surrounded Mayer and Salovey’s notion of EQ soon after its conception, however (Roberts, Zeidner, & Matthews, 2001), and opposition has continued (Abdul & Ehiobuche, 2011; Lindebaum & Cartwright, 2010; Martins et al., 2010). Roberts et al. (2001) challenged Mayer and Salovey’s theory of emotional intelligence based on what the researchers saw as difficulties in measuring the construct.
Roberts et al. also questioned whether emotional intelligence is different from personality. The researchers administered the Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) and a personality test called the Trait-Self Description Inventory (TSDI) to over 700 participants. The results suggested that emotional intelligence and personality have overlapping characteristics.

**Goleman**

Goleman expanded on the basic principles of emotional intelligence as established by Mayer and Salovey, who disagreed with Goleman’s modifications to EQ, contending that some of his additions (e.g., teamwork, collaboration, service orientation, and initiative) are unscientific and have nothing to do with emotions or intelligence (Mayer, 2012). Kant and Sharma (2012) echoed that criticism, citing several additional competencies Goleman attributed to emotional intelligence: communicating, cooperation, and resolving conflict. Others have agreed that Goleman’s approach to emotional intelligence is too broad, making it difficult to test (Locke, 2005; Waterhouse, 2006; Zeidner, Roberts, & Matthews, 2008). Part of the opposition to emotional intelligence stems from the popularization of Goleman’s theory (Mayer, 2012), making it difficult for professional psychologists to properly define and research it (Abdul & Ehiobuche, 2011).

Hein (2005) accused Goleman of trying to appeal to a popular audience in order to sell books and enhance his reputation as a consultant. Hein presented several criticisms of Goleman’s work:

1. He makes unsupported claims about the power and predictive ability of emotional intelligence.
2. His own, self-created definition of emotional intelligence includes aspects of personality and behavior that are not correlated to emotional intelligence as it is scientifically defined. He also interchanges terms such as emotional literacy, emotional health, emotional skill, and emotional competency. He never defines any of these other terms, but he equates them all to emotional intelligence.

3. He tries to make us believe he is presenting something new, when in fact much of what he is reporting has been studied for years under personality research.

4. He implies that anyone can learn emotional intelligence and fails to acknowledge either the relatively fixed nature of the personality traits he includes in his definition of EI or the differences in innate potential among individuals.

5. He presents himself as the sole expert in emotional intelligence and fails to give adequate credit to Mayer, Salovey, Caruso and others.

6. He represents his work as “scientific” when it does not hold up to scientific scrutiny. (para. 3)

Goleman has responded with a vigorous defense of his work. For example, in a coauthored article, Cherniss et al. (2006) dissected Waterhouse’s (2006) claim that there are “many conflicting constructs of emotional intelligence,” that it “has not been differentiated from personality plus IQ,” that “the claim that emotional intelligence determines real-world success has not been validated,” and that “research on brain function proves that there cannot be a ‘unitary emotional intelligence’” (p. 239). Cherniss et al. argued that the existence of several versions of emotional intelligence theory “is a
sign of vitality in the field, not a weakness” (p. 239), observing that IQ theory has also had numerous versions and that there is still no consensus about IQ as a construct or the best way to measure it.

Despite criticism from academics, there is no denying Goleman’s influence in the business community. When his first article was published in the *Harvard Business Review*, it was read by more people than any other article they had published in the previous 40 years (Cherniss, 2000). Many human resource professionals now use measurements of emotional intelligence in hiring and training employees (Joseph & Newman, 2010). Finally, as Chopra and Kanji (2010) noted, the popularization of Goleman’s version of emotional intelligence has increased interest among social scientists, prompting further academic research on the concept.

**Bar-On**

Bar-On (2010) defined emotional intelligence as “an array of interrelated emotional and social competencies and skills that impact intelligent behavior” (p. 57). Bar-On (2006) intended his theory of emotional intelligence to go beyond social intelligence, resulting in a model of emotional-social intelligence. In Bar-On’s view, emotional intelligence is a mixture of skills and competencies that determine how people understand and express themselves, which includes recognizing, understanding, controlling, and managing one’s emotions. Bar-On described the construction of his theory and the tools used to measure it as a 20-year process (Bar-On, 2006). Bar-On (2010) based his claim for the appropriate expression of emotions and successful adaptation in society on Darwin’s contention that the emotions are a vital component of
survival. Indeed, Bar-On claimed that all theories of emotional intelligence are indebted to Darwinian principles about thriving as a social being.

The Bar-On model has two components: the conception of social emotional intelligence, and the measurement of it. Bar-On’s conception of emotional and social intelligence was operationalized in the EQ-i, which is described below. Researchers have shown that this model and the measurements used to test it have predictive value. Emmerling (2013) cited a 3-year study by Bar-On showing a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance, and revealing that emotional intelligence was able to predict effective leadership. A meta-analysis by Bharwaney, Bar-On, and MacKinlay (2011) provided support for emotional intelligence interventions as positive influences on leadership, employee functioning, and the productivity of an organization as a whole.

**Perceived Emotional Intelligence**

Some emotional intelligence measurement tools rely solely on self-report, such as the Multi-Factor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2001), the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEI) (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2012), and Bar-On’s Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQi) (Bar-On, 2004). In these assessments a person answers questions based on how they view themselves when it comes to emotional intelligence.

There are some questions about the validity of self-report measures when assessing a person’s emotional intelligence (Jordan & Troth, 2010). Researchers argue that responders might answer questions based on what they think will make them look
best, such as when applying for a job (Day & Carroll, 2008; Grubb III & McDaniel, 2007). Grubb III and McDaniel conducted a study testing the fakability of the short version of Bar-On’s EQi. Participants completed the assessment two times. One time they were instructed to answer the questions as honestly as possible even if doing so made them look bad. The other time they were encouraged to answer the questions as if they were applying for a job and wanted to present themselves in the best possible light. Results showed that participants were able to improve their scores significantly when consciously trying to make themselves look good.

Other emotional intelligence measurement tools include a 360-degree element in order to obtain a more rounded view of a person’s emotional intelligence level (Bar-On, 2012; Hay Group, 2014; Jordan et al., 2002; Wolfe, 2005; Wong & Law, 2002). A 360-degree assessment includes how other people perceive that individual, which may be more objective. Van der Zee, Thijs, and Schakel (2002) argued that perceptions obtained by others can be more reliable because people tend to be more lenient on themselves than they are on others. In addition, Van der Zee et al. asserted that individuals often present themselves as more emotionally intelligent because their assessment is based on personal perception rather than on performance.

Bar-On’s Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) is the most widely used self-report measure of emotional intelligence (Emmerling, 2013). After the creation of the EQ-i, the EQ 360 was developed to assess an individual’s emotional intelligence based on feedback from the individual and others. Some researchers use both instruments to compare a self-assessment with an assessment completed by others. In Johnson’s (2011) study of
managers’ and employees’ perception of management emotional intelligence and its relationship to employee well-being, managers of a police department completed the EQ-i portion of the EQ 360. Next, some of their subordinates completed the rater’s portion. Results showed that overall there was no significant difference between a manager’s and a subordinate’s views of the manager’s emotional intelligence level. Libbrecht, Lievens, and Schollaert (2010) found similar results when testing the consistency between self and other ratings of the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS).

Macik-Frey (2007) created a modified version of the WLEIS specifically to determine subordinates’ views of their manager’s emotional intelligence. In this version, questions such as “I have good control over my emotions” are rewritten to say, “I believe my manager has good control over his/her own emotions.” Bennett (2011) used this modified version in a quantitative nonexperimental study examining the relationship between employees’ perceptions of their manager and an employee’s organizational commitment. Results showed a statistically significant relationship between an employee’s perception of a manager’s emotional intelligence and that employee’s commitment to the organization. More recently, researchers have examined the relationship between subordinate’s perceptions of manager’s emotional intelligence and organizational commitment in the United States Army (Johnson, 2013), and teachers’ perceptions of the principal’s emotional intelligence in an elementary school (Werner, 2013). The perception an employee has of a leader appears to be a variable worthy of further investigation.
Leadership and Emotional Intelligence

The topic of leadership effectiveness has drawn an enormous amount of research attention in the last 25 years. An important subset of this literature is research on leadership style, and many of these studies have been based on a conception first formulated by Bass and Avolio (1993), who distinguished among three leadership styles: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. Although a detailed discussion of leadership styles is beyond the scope of this paper, it can be said that “high emotional intelligence in leaders is tied to positive leadership attributes” (Miller, 2011, p. 143).

Researchers have documented a connection between emotional intelligence and managerial competence (Abdul & Ehiobuche, 2011), leadership effectiveness (Kerr, Garvin, Heaton, & Boyle, 2005), and leadership emergence (Côté et al., 2010; Walter et al., 2011).

Turnover

Because lack of organizational commitment and high turnover can result in negative consequences for an organization, the topic of turnover has drawn considerable research attention (Allen et al., 2010; Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979). Hausknecht and Trevor (2011) summarized their meta-analysis of 115 articles as follows: “Collective turnover can lead to undesirable outcomes because it entails the loss of firm-specific human and social capital, disrupts organizations and collective function, saddles remaining members with newcomer socialization and training, and increases recruitment and selections costs” (p. 360). Although there are many reasons for and consequences of employee turnover, the
financial consequences to organizations have driven most research in this area. Subramony and Holton (2012) found that high turnover results in loss of profits in the long run. According to Allen et al. (2010), replacing an employee can cost more than a year’s salary of the position being filled. Hom et al. (2012) stated that recruiting and training new employees can cost up to two times the yearly salary of an employee. The negative results from turnover can be substantial in any organization.

Ducharme et al. (2008) studied turnover in human services and substance abuse treatment, where besides the cost of recruiting, selecting, and training new employees, turnover causes instability both for an organization and its clients. Other researchers have also concluded that high turnover in substance abuse treatment negatively affects client care (Knight et al., 2011). Substance abuse treatment, as in any human services, is about providing the best care for clients. Eby, Burke, and Maher (2010) found that clients were more likely to remain in treatment when they had the same counselor, and remaining in treatment is critical for recovery.

Eby, Burke, and Maher’s (2010) longitudinal study revealed that most substance abuse counselors left voluntarily, citing new job opportunities and general dissatisfaction as the primary reasons. In related research, Knudsen, Roman, and Abraham (2013) studied how turnover is affected by emotional exhaustion, or burnout, and pay. Contributing to burnout are substantial paperwork requirements and large caseloads (Broome, et al. 2009). Historically, low pay and a lack of benefits have contributed to high turnover in this industry (Knudsen et al., 2003; White & Garner, 2011).
The influence of leaders on an employee’s intentions to quit or to remain in an organization appears to be significant. Specifically, an employee’s direct supervisor plays a key role because he or she has the most interaction with the employee (Landry, Pinacchio, & Vanderburgh, 2010) and has a substantial effect on an employee’s perception of the work environment (Fu, Bolander, & Jones, 2009). Joo (2010) found that turnover was low when supervisors provided a supportive environment and were perceived as sympathetic and caring. Supervisors who were supportive in their communication had the greatest impact in reducing turnover intention, and Joo concluded that supportive communication helps an employee feel a greater connection to the organization. Drost, Veena, and Talia (2010) found that being in a supportive environment with positive support from a supervisor reduces turnover intention. The relationship between employee and supervisor is a key consideration when the goal is employee retention.

Aarons, Sommerfield, and Willinging (2011) studied the relationship among leadership, organizational climate, and employee retention in the human services industry. Aarons et al. collected quantitative data from 14 behavioral health agencies, including outpatient mental health centers, an organization that works with homeless adults suffering with concurring disorders, small group practices, and both inpatient and outpatient substance abuse treatment centers. Aarons et al. were especially interested in the influence of transformational leadership practices on organizational climate and employee turnover intention. Results showed that positive leadership helped create an environment where employees felt empowered and therefore had reduced turnover.
intentions. Conversely, when employees felt demoralized by their environment, there was an increase in turnover intention.

Although dissatisfaction with leaders or organizational climate can play a significant role in voluntary employee turnover, there are other antecedents as well. Lee, Gerhart, Weller, and Trevor (2008) found that, in addition to job satisfaction, other variables—such as unsolicited job offers, demographic changes, and job availability—all play a role. Pay and benefits have traditionally affected employee turnover (Carraher, 2011), and new career opportunities can influence an employee’s decision to leave an organization (Kraimer, Seibert, Wayne, Liden, & Bravo, 2011). Clearly, voluntary turnover is influenced by many variables, and organizations could benefit from continued research on the role of leadership as one of those variables.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I reviewed the literature on how emotional intelligence affects turnover. I summarized how the theory of emotional intelligence developed and how the construct has been measured. The chapter included research related to turnover in organizations in general, in human services, and in substance abuse treatment facilities. In Chapter 3, the study’s methods—including design, population, sample, instrumentation, data collection and analysis procedures, and ethical protections—are described.
Chapter 3: Research Method

The purpose of this study was to determine whether a relationship exists between perceived leaders’ emotional intelligence and subordinates’ turnover intentions. Turnover intentions have been confirmed as a strong predictor of actual turnover (Fournier, Tanner, Chonko, & Manolis, 2010; Griffeth et al., 2000) and provide several important logical and methodological advantages over measuring actual turnover. Specifically, turnover intentions allow for assessing a range of attitudes about leaving one’s job, and include individuals who are strongly committed to the organization as well as those who have concrete plans to leave. Prominent theorists of organizational turnover recognize that exiting an organization is a complex, multidimensional process that includes cognitive, affective, and behavioral components (Griffeth, Allen, Steel, & Bryan, 2005). Measures of turnover intentions are a way to more fully capture the process of turnover rather than the final turnover decision, which often provides little information (Hom et al., 2012; Perryer et al., 2010). Finally, assessing those who have already quit a job limits the sample to those individuals who quit and may impose retrospective response bias in their perceptions of the job and their leaders.

In an influential meta-analysis, Griffeth et al. (2000) affirmed that predicting individual turnover decisions in organizational research is a complex question that requires a multidimensional approach. Drawing from theoretical models and the substantial empirical literature on turnover, Griffeth et al. concluded that the best proximal predictors of turnover (i.e., those that coalesce near the turnover decision) are those that include measures of behavioral intentions (e.g., expressed intentions to quit in a
particular timeframe), thoughts of quitting (e.g., withdrawal cognitions), and behavior related to facilitating quitting (e.g., job-search behaviors).

In the current study, emotional intelligence was assessed using the WLEIS, a tool that allows an individual to rate his or her peers or leaders on their levels of displayed emotional intelligence. This perspective was important for the purposes of this study because the perception of a leader’s emotional intelligence was hypothesized to relate to the rater’s turnover intentions. In this study, the leader-subordinate relationship was assessed in terms of its social and emotional quality on the assumption that the interpersonal relationship between leaders and subordinates affects organizational commitment. In short, the dyadic relationship between leader and subordinate was studied to determine whether employees’ perception of a manager’s emotional intelligence was related to the employee’s turnover intention.

**Research Design and Rationale**

The purpose of this study was to examine the predictive value of perceived leader emotional intelligence on employee turnover intention. A nonexperimental quantitative approach was used to examine the relationship between the independent variable of leader emotional intelligence and the dependent variable of employee turnover intention. A nonexperimental design was chosen because an experimental design requires manipulation of variables, use of control groups, and control of other environmental variables (Creswell, 2009). Such studies are typically conducted in laboratory settings or in the field. In the current study, participants self-reported their perceptions of a
manager’s emotional intelligence along with their own turnover intentions. No experimental manipulations were imposed.

Organizational research often involves the perceptions employees have of an organization (Hedge & Borman, 2008). The current study was a correlational study in which relationships between variables of interest in a natural environment were observed (Creswell, 2009). A benefit is that the data can be collected relatively easily, with the potential to find results that contribute to the literature about the relationship between emotional intelligence and turnover intentions. A drawback is that causal conclusions cannot be made. The study was limited to a single organization, and a convenience sample was used. Recruitment emails were sent to the direct-care employees of a substance abuse treatment center requesting their voluntary participation.

**Research Question and Hypothesis**

This study was based on one research question: What is the relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of leaders, specifically midlevel managers, at a substance abuse treatment center and the turnover intention among employees who report to them? This question gave rise to the following hypothesis, which is stated in null and alternative form:

\[ H_{10} \]: There is no statistically significant relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of leaders in substance abuse treatment centers and employee turnover intention.
There is a statistically significant relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of leaders in substance abuse treatment centers and employee turnover intention.

**Setting, Population, and Sample**

The setting for this study was a single substance abuse treatment organization located in the Northeast United States. The organization was incorporated as a nonprofit corporation in 1996 and has since grown from one to 11 facilities. Services provided by this organization include individual counseling, family treatment, group counseling, medication management, first-offender driver alcohol education, transitional services, and more. The corporation consists of approximately 500 employees including executive managers, clinical directors, clinicians, recovery specialists, registered nurses, psychiatrists, and administrative staff. All clinicians, recovery specialists, and nurses (those who work directly with the clients providing clinical services) of the organization received an email from the vice president of human resources requesting their participation.

Data were collected using a secure online survey hosted by SurveyMonkey. Potential participants received an email requesting their voluntary participation, which included a direct link to the survey site (Appendix A). The form described the nature of the study, provided contact information for the primary researcher, and included a statement regarding the anonymity of the responses. Participants were asked to indicate their informed consent. They then proceeded through a series of pages containing the two main instruments and a demographic survey. Participants could track their overall
progress with a progress bar that updated on each page. The online experience concluded with a debriefing page to inform participants that they were finished with the surveys, to reaffirm the anonymity of responses, and to provide contact information for the primary researcher. Once a participant clicked the “submit” button on this page, the data were transferred to a secure location in SurveyMonkey system protected by a password set by the primary researcher. Only the primary researcher had access to the data.

Sample size was determined using corrected population correlations of emotional intelligence and workplace behaviors drawn from recent meta-analyses, as well as Fisher’s Z transformation calculation for statistical power and sample size in correlational research (Cohen, 1988). Based on two meta-analyses of emotional intelligence and workplace behavior (O’Boyle, Humphrey, Pollack, Hawyer, & Story, 2011; Zhang & Wang, 2011), the corrected population correlation for emotional intelligence and workplace behaviors ranged from $r = .25$ to $r = .30$. These meta-analyses focused primarily on employee performance and substantiated an emotional intelligence-performance relationship in organizational settings. Performance has also been consistently linked to turnover meta-analysis (e.g., Griffeth et al., 2000). Using Fisher’s Z transformation formula, the estimated sample size for this study was at least 85 individuals to achieve an 80% power threshold for the bivariate correlations between emotional intelligence and workplace behavior (e.g., turnover intention).
Data Collection and Instrumentation

Data collection was based on the WLEIS and TICM, a composite measure of turnover intentions, withdrawal cognitions, and job-search behaviors that has been widely used in organizational turnover literature (Hom et al., 1984).

Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS)

Wong and Law (2002) developed a 16-item scale that addresses four dimensions of emotional intelligence targeted toward dyadic leader-subordinate relationships: self-emotion appraisal, others’ emotion appraisal, use of emotion, and regulation of emotion. There are four items for each of the four measures, all of which employ a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

To calculate scores from the WLEIS, I averaged responses across the 16 WLEIS items to create five separate scores for each individual: an overall emotional intelligence score that was the average of all 16 WLEIS items, and subscores for each of the four four-item dimensions of the WLEIS (self-emotion appraisal, others’ emotion appraisal, use of emotion, and regulation of emotion). The items were scored such that higher scores indicated higher levels of emotional intelligence. Scores could range from 1 to 5.

The WLEIS has garnered strong evidence for reliability, construct validity, and convergent validity with existing emotional intelligence measures, as well as predictive relationships with a variety of organizational behavior characteristics such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and leadership quality (Law, Wong, & Song, 2004; Law, Wong, Huang, & Li, 2008; Shi & Wang, 2007; Song et al., 2010; Wong & Law, 2002). Using the WLEIS, Wong and Law (2002) studied the effects of emotional
intelligence on performance and attitude; results showed internal consistency reliability coefficients that ranged from .83 to .90 on the four factors. Research examining the effect of the emotional intelligence of employees and managers on job satisfaction and performance showed reliability coefficients that ranged from .76 to .89 for the four factors (Sy, Tram, & O’Hara, 2006). Law et al. (2004) provided ample evidence of discriminant, convergent, criterion, and construct validity of the WLEIS. In addition to examining the differences between this tool and personality assessments, Law et al.’s research included an examination of self-reports and other ratings.

Libbrecht et al. (2010) found that the WLEIS can be used to assess an individual’s perceptions of a peer’s or leader’s emotional intelligence. Libbrecht et al.’s findings suggested that the WLEIS is psychometrically robust across peer rater groups, indicating that the WLEIS can be applied to self-ratings (e.g., how one feels about his or her own emotional intelligence qualities) as well as ratings of others (how one perceives a peer’s emotional intelligence qualities). The WLEIS is a useful instrument for addressing multiple aspects of interpersonal dynamics such as the leader-subordinate relationship. Individual items for the WLEIS are in Appendix B.

**Turnover Intentions Composite Measure (TICM)**

Hom et al. (1984) proposed that measuring turnover intentions should include questions about the likelihood of turnover-related behaviors (e.g., actual likelihood of quitting, likelihood of engaging in alternative job searches) as well as general thoughts of quitting. Hom et al. advocated for a 7-item composite measure in which two items are designed to assess the likelihood of turnover-related behaviors using a risk-based
response format (e.g., “What is the percentage chance that you will engage in the following”), and five items designed to assess withdrawal cognitions using a standard Likert-type response format (e.g., “What is the extent to which you agree/disagree with the following?”). Individual items for the turnover intentions survey are in Appendix C.

In their original research, Hom et al. (1984) found several significant correlations with turnover, reinforcing the instrument’s validity—specifically, thoughts of quitting \( r = .23 \), intention to quit \( r = .24 \), intention to search \( r = .31 \), and search behavior \( r = .30 \). Reliability coefficients in these areas all fell within an acceptable range: thoughts of quitting (.87), intention to quit (.75), intention to search (.91), and actual search behavior (.78).

To calculate scores for turnover intention in the current study, I averaged responses on the TICM to create three scores: an overall turnover intentions score that was the average of all seven items, a behavioral score that was the average of the two likelihood-of-quitting items, and a withdrawal cognitions score that was the average of the five withdrawal cognitions items. The items were scored such that higher scores indicated higher turnover intentions. Scores could range from 1 to 5.

**Demographic Variables**

Participants completed a demographic survey (Appendix D) consisting of items recommended by the American Psychological Association (2010) for describing general characteristics of a sample: age, gender, race/ethnicity, educational level, annual household income, and tenure in the field and the current organization. All demographic
items except for tenure were presented in a multiple-choice format, with the instruction to choose the most appropriate option.

Supervisor’s gender was asked in order to explore potential gender differences in the supervisory relationship. Although there were no hypotheses related to gender differences in this study, some emotional intelligence researchers (Joseph & Newman, 2010; Tsaousis & Kazi, 2013) identified gender as an important covariate, while others found that gender made no significant difference (Fernández-Berrocal, Cabello, Castillo, & Extremera, 2012; Noor-Azniza, Malek, Ibrahim, & Farid, 2011).

**Data Analysis**

The primary research question in this study was addressed using Pearson product-moment correlations. The Pearson correlation was designed to evaluate the strength and direction of the relationship between two quantitative, interval-scale variables. In the current study, the relationship between turnover intention and supervisor emotional intelligence (both assessed by the employee) was evaluated. All analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software package for statistical analysis.

**Protection of Participants**

Due to the nonexperimental design of this study, participants were not subjected to any manipulation or deception. No individually identifying information was collected from participants. The demographic data were used only to aggregate general characteristics of the sample. All data were collected electronically through secure measures and were stored on a password-protected website. Electronic data will be stored
on a secure hard drive for 7 years. Information provided by participants was used for the sole purpose of research and will be kept secure and confidential. No data were collected for the study until approval from Walden University’s Institutional Review Board was obtained.

Participants were protected by giving informed consent before participating, by participating voluntarily, and being allowed to withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason. The consent form described the study’s procedures, benefits, risks, and confidentiality. No individuals are identified in any manner in the research findings or throughout the final dissertation. In addition, all participants were offered a debriefing session by phone in order to pose any specific questions. No inducements of any kind were provided in exchange for completing the study, and all participants were offered a copy of the final results.

**Summary**

Employees’ perceptions of a manager’s emotional intelligence and their own turnover intentions, although limited to a single substance abuse organization, should provide insight into the effect leaders can have on employees. Consideration of emotional intelligence when promoting or hiring managers in a substance abuse treatment center could influence the atmosphere in that organization. The information gained from this study can be used to improve training for managers and could result in increased awareness of the connection between leadership and employee turnover.

In this chapter, I described the current study’s research methods, including design, rationale, setting, sample and sampling procedures, data collection and data analysis,
instrumentation, and materials. The protection of human participants and ethical considerations were also addressed. In the following chapter, the results of the study are presented.
Chapter 4: Results

In this chapter, the results are presented for a nonexperimental, correlational study of the relationship between employee turnover intention and perceived emotional intelligence of leaders in a substance abuse treatment center. Emotional intelligence was assessed using the WLEIS (Appendix B), and turnover intention was assessed with the TICM (Appendix C). Participants also completed a demographic survey (Appendix D). Invitations were issued to eligible employees of the treatment center. A total of 44 employees agreed to participate.

This study was conducted to examine the relationship between leaders’ perceived emotional intelligence and employee turnover intention. The study was based on one research question: What is the relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of leaders, specifically midlevel managers, at a substance abuse treatment center and the turnover intention among employees who report to them? That question gave rise to one hypothesis, which is stated below in null and alternative form:

\[ H_0 \]: There is no statistically significant relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of leaders in substance abuse treatment centers and employee turnover intention.

\[ H_{a}: \] There is a statistically significant relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of leaders in substance abuse treatment centers and employee turnover intention.
Data Collection

An email invitation was sent to eligible employees at the participating substance abuse treatment center. A total of 44 employees participated in the study. Because the invitation was sent via the vice president of human resources, I do not know exactly how many invitations were sent and therefore cannot calculate a response rate. Data collection took place over a 4-week period.

Participants completed a demographic survey and a modified version of the WLEIS, which consists of 16 items designed to assess emotional intelligence. Participants rated their immediate supervisor using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from totally disagree to totally agree. Participants also completed the TICM, a 7-item instrument designed to measure an employee’s likelihood of quitting or looking for another job. Two items assessed the likelihood of turnover-related behavior using a risk-based response format, and five items assessed withdrawal cognition.

Demographic Data

Participants completed a demographic survey that asked their gender, age, ethnicity, education, annual household income, gender of supervisor, years of experience, and years working for the organization under study. Of the 44 participants, eight (18%) were male and 36 (82%) were female. The gender, age, and ethnicity of the participants were consistent with the gender, age, and ethnicity of eligible participants and therefore reasonably represented the population.

The majority of participants held an advanced degree and had a household income of less than $80,000. These results were not surprising because an advanced degree is
necessary for many of the positions held by participants, and household income of less than $80,000 might be expected when at least one partner works in social services. Data on age, ethnicity, education, and income are summarized in Figures 1-4.

*Figure 1.* Participants’ ages in years.
Figure 2. Participants’ race/ethnicity.

Figure 3. Participants’ highest educational level.
It was determined that a sample size of at least 85 individuals would be needed to achieve an 80% power threshold for bivariate correlations between perceptions of emotional intelligence and turnover intention. With 44 participants, a statistically significant negative correlation was found in most cases, at either $p < .01$ or $p < .05$. The only exception was the average of likelihood-of-quitting items and the average of manager’s emotion regulation scores. In these calculations, the correlation approached, rather than achieved, statistical significance ($p < .10$). Correlation results were consistent despite the small sample size. Given the match between the sample’s demographics and

Figure 4. Participants’ household income.

**Correlation Results**

It was determined that a sample size of at least 85 individuals would be needed to achieve an 80% power threshold for bivariate correlations between perceptions of emotional intelligence and turnover intention. With 44 participants, a statistically significant negative correlation was found in most cases, at either $p < .01$ or $p < .05$. The only exception was the average of likelihood-of-quitting items and the average of manager’s emotion regulation scores. In these calculations, the correlation approached, rather than achieved, statistical significance ($p < .10$). Correlation results were consistent despite the small sample size. Given the match between the sample’s demographics and
the population’s characteristics, it is unlikely that a larger sample would have yielded substantially different results.

To calculate WLEIS scores, responses were averaged across the 16 WLEIS items to create five separate scores for each individual: an overall emotional intelligence score that was the average of all 16 WLEIS items, and subscores for each of the four dimensions of the WLEIS (self-emotion appraisal, others’ emotion appraisal, use of emotion, and regulation of emotion). The items were scored such that higher scores indicated higher levels of emotional intelligence. Scores could range from 1 to 5.

To calculate TICM scores, responses were averaged to create three scores: an overall turnover intention score that was the average of all seven items, a behavioral score that was the average of the two likelihood-of-quitting items, and a withdrawal cognition score that was the average of the five withdrawal cognition items. The items were scored such that higher scores indicated higher turnover intention. Scores could range from 1 to 5.

Data analysis based on Pearson correlations showed a statistically significant relationship between perceived emotional intelligence of managers and turnover intentions of employees. This result means that the study’s alternative hypothesis was supported: There was a statistically significant relationship between the perceived emotional intelligence of leaders in substance abuse treatment centers and employee turnover intention. Table 1 is a summary of the all the correlations that were computed.
Table 1

Summary of Emotional Intelligence and Turnover Intention Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average of all EI questions</th>
<th>Average of turnover intention questions</th>
<th>Likelihood of quitting questions</th>
<th>Turnover cognition questions</th>
<th>Self-emotional appraisal</th>
<th>Others’ emotional appraisal</th>
<th>Use of emotion</th>
<th>Emotion regulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of all EI questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.493**</td>
<td>-.343*</td>
<td>-.519**</td>
<td>.955**</td>
<td>.891**</td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>.871**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of turnover intention questions</td>
<td>-.493**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.871**</td>
<td>.976**</td>
<td>-.413**</td>
<td>-.501**</td>
<td>-.505**</td>
<td>-.302**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of quitting questions</td>
<td>-.343*</td>
<td>.871**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.743**</td>
<td>-.285*</td>
<td>-.271*</td>
<td>-.377**</td>
<td>-.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover cognition questions</td>
<td>-.519**</td>
<td>.976**</td>
<td>.743**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.437**</td>
<td>-.562**</td>
<td>-.520**</td>
<td>-.315**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-emotional appraisal</td>
<td>.955**</td>
<td>-.413**</td>
<td>-.285*</td>
<td>-.437**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.791**</td>
<td>.868**</td>
<td>.801**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ emotional appraisal</td>
<td>.891**</td>
<td>-.501**</td>
<td>-.271*</td>
<td>-.562**</td>
<td>.791**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.745**</td>
<td>.685**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of emotion</td>
<td>.910**</td>
<td>-.505**</td>
<td>-.377**</td>
<td>-.520**</td>
<td>.868**</td>
<td>.745**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.707**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion regulation</td>
<td>.871**</td>
<td>-.302**</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>-.315**</td>
<td>.801**</td>
<td>.685**</td>
<td>.707**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of all EI questions</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of turnover intention questions</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Pearson correlations are summarized below. Scatterplots of these correlations appear in Appendix D.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between overall perceived emotional intelligence scores and the average of all turnover intention items. A
significant negative correlation was found: \( r (n = 39) = -0.493, p < .01 \). Turnover intentions were higher when supervisors had lower overall emotional intelligence scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between overall perceived emotional intelligence scores and the average of likelihood-of-quitting items. A significant negative correlation was found: \( r (n = 40) = -0.343, p < .05 \). Likelihood of quitting was higher when supervisors had lower overall emotional intelligence scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between overall perceived emotional intelligence scores and the average of turnover cognition items. A significant negative correlation was found: \( r (n = 39) = -0.519, p < .01 \). Turnover cognition was higher when supervisors had lower overall emotional intelligence scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the average of WLEIS items 1-4 (emotional appraisal of manager) and the average of all turnover intention items. A significant negative correlation was found: \( r (n = 40) = -0.413, p < .01 \). Turnover intention was higher when supervisors had lower emotional self-appraisal scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the average of items 5-8 (manager’s emotional appraisal of others) and the average of all turnover intention items. A significant negative correlation was found: \( r (n = 39) = -0.501, p < .01 \). Turnover intention was higher when supervisors had lower emotional-appraisal-of-others scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the average of items 9-12 (manager’s use of emotion) and the average of all turnover intention items.
A significant negative correlation was found: $r (n = 40) = -.505, p < .01$. Turnover intention was higher when supervisors had lower use-of-emotions scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the average of questions 13-16 (manager’s emotion regulation) and the average of all turnover intention items. A significant negative correlation was found: $r (n = 41) = -.302, p < .05$. Turnover intention was higher when supervisors had lower emotion regulation scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the average of questions 13-16 (manager’s emotion regulation) and the average of all turnover intention items. A significant negative correlation was found: $r (n = 41) = -.302, p < .05$. Turnover intention was higher when supervisors had lower emotion regulation scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the average of items 1-4 (self-emotion appraisal of manager) and the average of likelihood-of-quitting items. A significant negative correlation was found: $r (n = 41) = -.285, p < .05$. Likelihood of quitting was greater when supervisors had lower self-emotion appraisal scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the average of items 1-4 (self-emotion appraisal of manager) and the average of likelihood-of-quitting items. A significant negative correlation was found: $r (n = 41) = -.285, p < .05$. Likelihood of quitting was greater when supervisors had lower self-emotion appraisal scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the average of items 5-8 (managers’ appraisal of others’ emotions) and the average of likelihood-of-quitting items. A significant negative correlation was found: $r (n = 40) = -.271, p < .05$. Likelihood of quitting was greater when supervisors had lower perceived ability to appraise others’ emotions.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the averages of items 9-12 (manager’s use of emotion) and the average of likelihood-of-quitting items. A significant negative correlation was found: $r (n = 41) = -.377, p < .01$. Likelihood of quitting was greater when supervisors had lower use-of-emotions scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the average of items 13-16 (manager’s emotion regulation) and the average of likelihood-of-quitting
items. A negative correlation approached significance: $r (n = 42) = -0.218, p < .10$.

Likelihood of quitting was greater when supervisors had lower emotion regulation scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the averages of items 1-4 (self-emotion appraisal of manager) and the average of turnover cognition items. A significant negative correlation was found: $r (n = 40) = -0.437, p < .01$. Turnover cognition was higher when supervisors had lower self-emotion appraisal scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the averages of items 5-8 (managers’ emotional appraisal of others) and the average of turnover cognition items. A significant negative correlation was found: $r (n = 39) = -0.562, p < .01$. Turnover cognition was higher when supervisors had lower appraisal-of-others’-emotion scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the averages of items 9-12 (manager’s use of emotion) and the average of turnover cognition items. A significant negative correlation was found: $r (n = 40) = -0.520, p < .01$. Turnover cognition was higher when supervisors had lower use-of-emotions scores.

A Pearson correlation was computed to test the relationship between the averages of items 13-16 (manager’s emotion regulation) and the average of turnover cognition items. A significant negative correlation was found: $r (n = 41) = -0.315, p < .05$. Turnover cognition was higher when supervisors had lower emotion regulation scores.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I presented the results for a nonexperimental, correlational study of the relationship between employee turnover intention and perceived emotional
intelligence of leaders in a substance abuse treatment center. Emotional intelligence was assessed with the WLEIS, and turnover intention was assessed with the TICM. A series of Pearson correlations demonstrated a statistically significant relationship between perceived emotional intelligence of managers and turnover intentions of employees, confirming the study’s alternative hypothesis. This research helps confirm the validity and reliability of the WLEIS and the TICM. In the following chapter, conclusions and recommendations are presented.
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

Turnover in substance abuse treatment centers continues at an estimated rate of one in three clinicians, with some researchers reporting rates up to 50% (Garner & Hunter, 2014, p. 63). This turnover affects not only the organization but the individuals seeking services (Knight et al., 2011). Clients seeking services for substance abuse will need to start over with another clinician after their clinician leaves. Because the relationship with a counselor is a critical element of recovery (Marcus et al., 2011; Meier et al., 2005), clinician turnover can impede clients’ recovery.

Several factors contribute to turnover in substance abuse treatment, including burnout and low salaries (Knudsen et al., 2013), excessive paperwork and large caseloads (Broom et al., 2009), and lack of benefits (Knudsen et al., 2013; White & Garner, 2011). Most of these factors are consistent across organizations, but one thing differs from organization to organization: leadership. Findings in the current study support previous research showing that leaders influence an employee’s intentions to quit or remain with an organization (Aarons et al., 2011).

The purpose of this study was to determine whether perceptions of leader emotional intelligence were related to employee turnover intention in a substance abuse treatment center. I hypothesized that employees who saw their supervisor as emotionally intelligent would have lower turnover intention. In the remainder of this chapter, the current study’s results are analyzed, and limitations, implications for social change, and recommendations for further study are presented.
Interpretation of Findings

Results of the current study revealed a significant relationship between perceptions of leader emotional intelligence and employee turnover intention, supporting the study’s alternative hypothesis. When employees rated their supervisor as high in emotional intelligence, they had lower turnover intention scores. Other researchers have studied leaders’ influence on organizational commitment in a police department (Johnson, 2013), and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ emotional intelligence in an elementary school (Warner, 2013). The current study extends an understanding of how leaders’ perceived emotional intelligence affects organizations.

Emotional intelligence is a construct about which researchers have disagreed. For some theorists such as Goleman (1995) and Bar-On (2005), it includes personality traits (e.g., assertiveness, motivation) as well as general temperament. Others such as Clark (2010) have argued that the construct is properly confined to an ability that results in observable behavior. Theorists have also differed regarding the importance of awareness of one’s own and others’ emotions versus the ability to regulate one’s emotions. Are emotionally intelligent people especially skilled at discerning emotions in others, or at regulating their own emotions according to the dictates of a given situation?

For Wong and Law (2002), who developed the WLEIS, the answer to the above question was “both.” The instrument asks participants to rate supervisors on their ability to understand their own emotions and to discern others’ emotions based on their behavior. The instrument also solicits ratings on supervisors’ ability to manage their own emotions (e.g., controlling one’s temper or calming down quickly after becoming angry).
Although in the current study participants were asked to rate a supervisor on these abilities, the nature of their own work as direct service providers could have influenced how they saw their managers. For example, anyone providing substance abuse treatment in a one-to-one setting will benefit from an ability to sense a patient’s emotions. For example, a skilled therapist will be able to tell when a patient’s apparent anger at the therapist masks an anger at his or her own behavior, as well as the extent to which a flat affect is an attempt to avoid personal disclosure.

This ability to discern a patient’s emotional state is more valuable for therapists or direct service providers than it is for those who supervise those providers. In their relationship with a supervisor, participants in the current study were perhaps more likely to value a manager’s ability to manage his or her own emotions than to sense others’ emotions. Sensing others’ emotions is what therapists need to do, and they might be less concerned about a supervisor’s ability to do that than they are with how that person controls him- or herself in encounters with supervisees.

The TICM scores turnover intention on three dimensions: an overall score, a behavioral score, and a withdrawal cognitions score. In the current study, although employees may have had high turnover intention scores, in some cases they were still not likely to leave the organization. This finding is consistent with previous research. For example, Eby and Rothrauff-Laschober (2011) noted that there were several reasons why employees stayed at an organization even if they were not happy with the leaders or with environmental factors in the organization. Also, Gellatly, Cowden, and Cummings (2014) found that commitment to an organization depended on several variables, including
perceptions of the organization and relationships with coworkers. Because the current study did not involve interviews, there was no way to know which organizational factors were most important to participants, but it is known that some people stay in jobs they do not like or where they are not happy.

Again, the nature of the services performed by participants in the current study could have influenced their responses, this time on the TICM. It is not inaccurate to say that one has a relationship with the organization one works for, but it is perhaps more accurate to say that one has a relationship with the people in that organization. In any organization, those people will include coworkers—colleagues, underlings, and superiors. In a substance abuse treatment center, however, those people also include patients. One’s intention to leave where one works could be affected about the commitment one has to the people one serves—in this case, substance abuse patients. Loyalty to one’s clients could mitigate some of the dissatisfaction one might have with a supervisor.

The literature reviewed for this study showed an emphasis on emotional intelligence as an important variable in organizational leadership. According to Goleman (2012), successful leaders have higher levels of emotional intelligence than do less successful leaders. High emotional intelligence suggests an ability to be empathic and supportive. Miller (2011) concluded that there is a correlation between high emotional intelligence and effective attributes of leadership. Other researchers have also posited a connection between emotional intelligence and effective leadership (Abdul & Ehiobuche, 2011; Côté et al., 2010; Kerr et al., 2005; Walter et al., 2011).
In the current study, turnover intention was an indicator of leadership effectiveness. In other words, it was assumed that one measure of a leader’s success is the stability of the organization’s workforce. Turnover negatively affects most organizations. When employees leave, they take important institutional knowledge with them. Also, hiring and training new employees constitutes a significant expense. To these deleterious effects of turnover across organizations, one must add the negative impact on client success in a therapy-based treatment center when the therapist leaves.

Because workforce continuity is especially important in a substance abuse treatment center, anything that contributes to that continuity should be valorized. Results of this study suggest that leaders’ emotional intelligence, as assessed by their supervisees, affects those employees’ turnover intention. It thus behooves organizations to stress emotional intelligence when hiring leaders and when promoting current employees to leadership positions. In the current study, the WLEIS was used to have subordinates rate the emotional intelligence of their immediate supervisor. The instrument can also be used as a self-report (Libbrecht et al., 2010), and making it—or the MSCEI or EQi—part of the hiring and promotion process would be in a treatment center’s best interests.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The current study was quantitative and was based on responses to two instruments. A qualitative study would lend depth to the topic explored here by incorporating individual interviews. Such an approach could shed light on why individual employees stay in a substance abuse treatment center despite a professed consideration of leaving.
Relatedly, one could apply Parrish’s (2015) approach to a substance abuse setting. Parrish studied leaders in higher education by conducting semistructured interviews before and after a leadership development initiative. The purpose was to determine the importance of emotional intelligence for effective leadership. A similar study conducted in a substance abuse setting could address whether leadership training is affected by participants’ emotional intelligence.

Another approach would be to replicate Johnson’s (2011) police department study in a substance abuse treatment center. In Johnson’s study, subordinates, a manager’s supervisor, and managers themselves assessed the manager’s emotional intelligence. Managers knew they were being evaluated because they were part of the process. The current study revealed a relationship between perceptions of emotional intelligence and turnover intention, but it did not show which managers might be causing problems. Also, I did not ask managers to rate themselves. Doing so might have yielded a more complete picture of emotional intelligence in substance abuse treatment settings.

Another possibility for further study is to explore whether leaders’ emotional intelligence is related to other areas of employee functioning, such as burnout. Turnover and burnout in substance abuse treatment research are often connected (Young, 2015). Fischer et al. (2013) found a connection between supervisory relationships and the reduction of burnout. If leaders are strong in emotional intelligence, they are likely to create a supportive atmosphere for subordinates.
Recommendations for Action

One way to help reduce employee turnover in substance abuse treatment is by focusing on managers. High turnover in certain departments or areas might mean there are problems with particular managers. A connection between perceptions of individual managers and subordinates’ turnover intention could mean that improved training and support for those managers are in order.

Because this study confirmed the importance of managerial emotional intelligence on employee retention, it lends support for including an emotional intelligence assessment when recruiting or promoting leaders in substance abuse treatment centers. Leadership acumen has many components, and emotional intelligence is an important one. Testing prospective hires for their emotional intelligence could help substance abuse treatment centers select the best leaders, which in turn could improve employee retention and overall organizational effectiveness.

Results of the current study will be included in a report provided to the executive management of the participating substance abuse treatment center. Although the report will not reveal specific supervisors, it will illustrate the importance of developing managers who are emotionally intelligent. Emotional intelligence can be learned and developed (Clarke, 2010; Lindebaum, 2009); therefore, incorporating training to promote emotional intelligence will benefit an organization’s leaders, their subordinates, and the clients served.
Limitations of the Study

This study was limited by a small sample; only 44 people participated. Although potential participants were promised anonymity, it is possible that some were hesitant to participate for fear of retaliation by supervisors. It is possible that employees who were invited to complete the survey but chose not to have different experiences and perceptions than do those who participated in the study. The demographic profiles of participants were consistent with the overall demographic profile of the organization under study, but the study’s small sample means that caution should be exercised in generalizing the results to other substance abuse treatment centers.

Implications for Social Change

Substance abuse is a persistent social problem leading to family disruption, domestic and child abuse, school failure, and disease (Single, 2009; Smith et al., 2010). Substance abuse costs over $600 billion a year in lost productivity, health care costs, and crime and incarceration costs (National Institute on Drug Abuse, 2012). Substance abuse is amenable to treatment, one prominent form of which is psychotherapy (Marcus et al., 2011). The strength of the client-therapist relationship is related to treatment retention and success (Meier et al., 2005). That relationship is threatened if therapists are unhappy with their working conditions, including how they feel about their supervisors.

In this study, I explored the relationship between substance abuse treatment center employees’ intention to quit and their perceptions of supervisors’ emotional intelligence. I found a significant relationship between perceived emotional intelligence of managers and the turnover intentions of employees. Participants who perceived their supervisor as
high in emotional intelligence were less likely to report that they were considering leaving the organization than were participants who rated their supervisor low in emotional intelligence.

Results of this study provide insight into the dynamics of how employees’ perceptions of a supervisor’s emotional intelligence influences their turnover intention. Results could be used to inform the process by which substance abuse treatment center leaders are recruited, promoted, and trained. Improvements in that process could enhance employee retention and thereby improve client services and outcomes. The result will be a more mentally healthy citizenry, with decreased costs born by society at large. This study joins a long train of research designed to reduce the scourge of substance abuse and contribute to more productive lives for all citizens.

Summary

In this chapter, I interpreted the results of a study that revealed a significant relationship between substance abuse treatment center employees’ perceptions of supervisors’ emotional intelligence and those employees’ intentions to leave the organization. This study joins a substantial body of literature on how to improve substance abuse treatment, and it fills a gap in that literature regarding how treatment center employees’ commitment to the job is affected by how they perceive a supervisor’s emotional intelligence. This study provides the basis for further research in this important area, and its results can be used to improve the process of recruiting, placing, and training leaders, an improvement that can ultimately lead to better outcomes for substance abuse patients.
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Appendix A: Informed Consent Form

You are invited to take part in a research study exploring perceptions of leader’s emotional intelligence and employee turnover intention. This study is being conducted by a researcher named Suzanne Jafferian, who is a doctoral student at Walden University. You may be familiar with Suzanne as a per diem clinician who previously worked at MATC, but this study is separate from that role.

The researcher is inviting all clinicians, counselors, recovery specialists, nurses, and those who have direct client contact to be in the study. If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete two brief surveys and answer some general demographic questions, all of which should take less than 10 minutes.

Consent to Participate
This email is part of a process called “informed consent” to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

Voluntary Nature of the Study
Your participation in this study is voluntary. This means that everyone will respect your decision of whether or not you want to be in the study. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with any organization. If you initially decide to participate, you are still free to withdraw at any time.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study
Being in this study does not pose risk to your safety or wellbeing, and while there are no personal benefits as a participant, if a relationship is found between the variables being examined then the leaders could make adjustments to better support employees in this working environment.

Compensation
There is no compensation for your participation in this study.

Confidentiality
To help ensure your privacy and to protect the identity of all participants, names, address, and other identifiable information will be purposely left out of this study. In addition, the study is completely anonymous and all information collected will be held in the strictest confidence; raw data will be reviewed by the researcher and supervising academic chair, however only the overall survey results will be reviewed by others. All data will be collected electronically through secure measures and will be stored on a password protected survey. Data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the university.
Contacts and Questions
Suzanne’s faculty advisor is Dr. Barbara Chappell, her email is barbara.chappell@waldenu.edu. You may ask any questions you have now by contacting the researcher via phone #781-801-3457 or by email at suzanne.jafferian@waldenu.edu. You also have the option of contacting her later should other questions arise. If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call Dr. Leilani Endicott. She is the Walden University representative who can discuss this with you. Her phone number is 612-312-1210. Walden University’s approval number for this study is 04-10-15-0236768 and it expires on April 9, 2016.

Statement of Consent

I have read the above information and I feel I understand the study well enough to make a decision about my involvement. By clicking the link below, I understand that I am agreeing to the terms described above. If you have agreed to participate in this study, simply follow the link below to begin. Once you begin, please complete both surveys. Submission of the completed assessment forms will indicate consent to participate.

Please print or save this form for your records.
Appendix B: Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale

Please rate your supervisor using the following scale: 1 = Totally disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Totally agree.

My manager:

1. Has a good sense of why he/she has certain feelings most of the time.
2. Has good understanding of his/her own emotions.
3. Really understands what he/she feels.
4. Always knows whether or not he/she is happy.
5. Always knows his/her friends’ emotions from their behavior.
6. Is a good observer of others’ emotions.
7. Is sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others.
8. Has good understanding of the emotions of people around him/her.
9. Always sets goals for himself/herself and then tries his/her best to achieve them.
10. Always tells himself/herself he/she is a competent person.
11. Is a self-motivated person.
12. He/she would always encourage himself/herself to try his/her best.
13. Is able to control his/her temper and handle difficulties rationally.
14. Is quite capable of controlling his/her own emotions.
15. He/she can always calm down quickly when he/she is very angry.
16. Has good control of his/her own emotions.
Appendix C: Turnover Intentions Composite Measure

Please respond to these two questions using the following scale: 1 = No chance, 2 = 25% chance, 3 = 50% chance, 4 = 75% chance, and 5 = 100% chance.

1. What are the chances that you will search for an alternative role to your current job (e.g., another job, full-time student, etc.) during the next 12 months?
2. What are the chances that you will leave your current during the next 12 months?

Please respond to these five statements using the following scale: 1 = Totally disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Totally agree.

3. I am thinking about quitting my job.
4. I have searched for an alternative job since I joined this organization.
5. I am actively seeking an alternative job or role (an activity other than my present job).
6. I am constantly searching for a better alternative.
7. I often think about quitting my present job
Appendix D: Demographic Survey

1. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. What is your age in years?
   a. 18-24
   b. 25-34
   c. 35-44
   d. 45-54
   e. 55-64
   d. 65 or older

3. What is your ethnicity?
   a. Caucasian
   b. African American
   c. Hispanic
   d. Asian
   e. Other

4. What is your highest completed education level?
   a. High school or GED degree
   b. Some college
   c. 2-year college degree (Associate)
   d. 4-year college degree (BA, BS)
   e. Master’s degree
   f. Doctoral degree

5. Most recent annual household income
   a. less than 40k
   b. between 40k and 60k
   c. between 60k and 80k
   d. between 80k and 100k
   e. greater than 100k

5. What is the gender of your supervisor?
   a. Male
   b. Female

6. How long have you worked in substance abuse treatment?
   ___ Years
   ___ Months
6. How long have you worked for this organization?
   ____ Years
   ____ Months
Appendix E: Scatterplots of Pearson Correlations

Figure 5. Scatterplot of correlation between overall emotional intelligence of manager and average turnover intention.
Figure 6. Scatterplot of correlation between overall emotional intelligence of manager and average likelihood of quitting.

Figure 7. Scatterplot of correlation between overall emotional intelligence of manager and average turnover cognition.
Figure 8. Scatterplot of correlation between emotional self-appraisal of manager and average turnover intention.

Figure 9. Scatterplot of correlation between manager’s emotional appraisal of others and overall turnover intention.
Figure 10. Scatterplot of correlation between manager’s use of emotion and overall turnover intention.

Figure 11. Scatterplot of correlation between manager’s emotion regulation and overall turnover intention.
Figure 12. Scatterplot of correlation between manager’s self-emotion appraisal and likelihood of quitting.

Figure 13. Scatterplot of correlation between manager’s appraisal of others’ emotions and likelihood of quitting.
Figure 14. Scatterplot of correlation between manager’s use of emotion and likelihood of quitting.

Figure 15. Scatterplot of correlation between manager’s emotion regulation and likelihood of quitting.
Figure 16. Scatterplot of correlation between manager’s self-emotion appraisal and turnover cognition.

Figure 17. Scatterplot of correlation between manager’s emotional appraisal of others and turnover cognition.
Figure 18. Scatterplot of correlation between manager’s use of emotion and turnover cognition.

Figure 19. Scatterplot of correlation between manager’s emotion regulation and turnover cognition.